issue no. 3 autumn 1985

MISHKAN

A THEOLOGICAL FORUM ON JEWISH EVANGELISM

CONTENTS

THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE: A THEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT
Statement by Jacob Jocz 1

THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE IN ANCIENT AND MODERN TIMES
A survey of recent literature by
Oskar Skarsaune 14

THE USE OF THE TANACH IN THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW
Statement by Walter Riggans 28
Response by Scott A. Swanson 39

THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS
Statement by Baruch Maoz 46
Response by John Goldingay 64

THE QUEST FOR A MESSIANIC THEOLOGY
A comment by A. G. Fruchtenbaum 67

THE INFLUENCE OF THE TANACH AND THE TALMUD ON ISLAM AND THE QUR'AN
Report from a UCCI-Seminar 69

JEWISH MUSIC AND WORSHIP
Report from a Seminar 74

BOOK REVIEW 82

Jerusalem

MISHKAN

A Forum on the Gospel and the Jewish People

"JEWISH-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE"

ISSUE 3 / 1985

General Editor: Ole Chr. M. Kvarme

United Christian Council in Israel · Jerusalem

{Inside cover} Editorial

Historical Divide and Theological Truth?

Reactions to Mishkan have, as our readers might guess, been varied, but even persons opposed to its evangelical stance have admitted respect for the sane presentation of its material. However, we are asked, how can you explain the need for such a journal to *Israelis*?

Let me respond in this way. It is a fact of life, understood well by the average Israeli, that people have varieties of religious faith from secular atheism to firm monotheism. Further, it is a fact of history that the vast majority of Christians have been Gentiles and the vast majority of those professing Judaism have been born within the Jewish people. This historical divide, however, has for many become a fundamental theological truth, namely that Judaism is for Jewish people and Jesus is really for Gentiles. Consequently, both Synagogue and Church have told Jews who do believe in Jesus that they are no longer Jews.

But we reject this as methodologically unacceptable and theologically in error. Jesus and the earliest believers were Jewish. It was a few generations before Gentiles gained numerical superiority and a few more before the church effectively forgot its Jewish roots. Moreover, there have always been Jewish believers in Jesus as Messiah and Lord. Both Synagogue and Church must take responsibility for the split that Jews have come to see as natural and right, today. Contrary to popular belief, we see it as biblically correct to assert that it is Jewish to believe in Jesus.

Contrary to another popular belief that Jewish people cannot accept faith in Jesus unless coerced or bribed or taken advantage of in marginal circumstances by unscrupulous missionaries we assert that Jews can and do believe in Jesus from pure motives, in genuine faith, and as mature people. Messianic Jews or Hebrew Christians in Israel are real persons with their own integrity, with weaknesses and strengths, and with a heart-felt desire for the very best for Israel.

Therefore the editors of Mishkan have produced this journal to deal openly, responsibly and theologically with that area of life which interfaces with the Church and with Israel. Israelis, as well as Christians and Jews in general, have been influenced heavily by the popular beliefs stated above. It is the aim of Mishkan to show that biblical faith and identity reflect a different understanding of Jewish-Christian relations: out of this faith and identity flows a natural witness about Jesus the Messiah to Jewish people as well as natural development of distinct congregations of Jewish believers in Jesus.

And so in this third issue of Mishkan, we continue the debate. There is a major article by the late Prof. Jacob Jocz, of blessed memory, on the relationship between faithful witness to what we believe to be true on the one hand, and faithful dialogue as **{73}** we seek to genuinely listen to those who witness to another belief on the other. He investigates this very issue of whether we should allow Jewish-Christian dialogue to assume that the historical divide is properly reflecting theological truth, or whether that divide should be challenged.

The contribution of Prof. Jocz concerning conceptual aspects of the dialogue is followed up by the Norwegian Scholar Oskar Skarsaune in a survey on recent literature concerning the Jewish-Christian dialogue in ancient times, in the Middle Ages and in modern times. Two further papers by Baruch Maoz and Walter Riggans, both editors of the journal, and responses from John Goldingay and Scott Swanson examine that other front line issue in our area, the relationship between the two Testaments. The approaches are quite different, but again the assertion is there that believing in Jesus, along with all the theological implications of that, is fully consonant with the Tanach's teaching about God.

In our selection of reports in this issue, we share with our readers material from two interesting seminars held in Israel recently. F. Tavor led a seminar at Baptist Village, Petach Tikva under the auspices of the Theological Commission of the UCCI on the influence of the Tanach and Talmudic traditions on the basic beliefs and practices of Islam (and not only Christianity therefore), and a report of that seminar's main points is included as an explanatory paper in this reflected field of study.

A seminar on "Jewish Music and Worship" was recently held in Tel-Aviv under the auspices of the Caspari Center for Biblical and Jewish Studies, with Stuart Dauermann – a musicologist and a Jews-for-Jesus staff member from San Francisco – as seminar leader and lecturer. The report from this seminar shows how important this issue is for a better understanding of the Jewish roots of the Church and for the development of messianic-Jewish congregations today.

We trust that they will lead our readers into deeper and fuller appreciation of the historical and theological debate.

Walter Riggans

{1}The Jewish-Christian Dialogue:

A Theological Assessment

Statement by Jacob Jocz

Jacob Jocz, who passed into glory on August 15th, 1983, was born to Hebrew-Christian parents in Vilna, Lithuania, in 1906. He studied at Frankfurt-am-Main, at St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, England and at the University of Edinburgh where he achieved his Ph.D. and D.Litt. in 1945 and 1957. In 1960 he was appointed Professor of Systematic Theology at Wycliffe College of the University of Toronto where he served until his retirement in 1976. His most known books are: *The Jewish People and* Jesus *Christ* (revised ed. Baker Book House, 1980) and *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ After Auschwitz* (Baker Book House, 1980). The manuscript of the present article was made available to MISHKAN by the International Hebrew Christian Alliance, whose Executive Secretary, Ronald H. Lewis, we want to thank, as we bless the memory of Jacob Jocz.

Dialogue, once a scholastic method, has acquired broad sociological use in modern times. It is now employed in industry, commerce and politics. As a result of this wide application, there is considerable confusion over what is meant by "dialogue." In some quarters there is an almost superstitious faith that dialogue is the panacea for all group tensions, the assumption being that people who talk to each other will understand each time. When in spite of much talking tensions do not diminish, we are told that *true* dialogue has not taken place.

The dialogical method has now penetrated the troubled area of Jewish-Christian relations. There is a sincere effort on both sides to meet and talk. This search for common understanding is only to be encouraged. It is high time that Jews and Christians meet and talk in all sincerity to one another. The question we want to raise is whether dialogue as presently understood does sufficient justice to the Christian position when divorced from the obligation to witness to the Faith.

1. Dialogue as a political method

The reason why dialogue makes such an appeal to modern man is that it springs from the basic democratic principle of personal freedom. Aristotle rightly regarded freedom as the basis of democracy.[1] But democratic freedom can only persist when governed by law. Otherwise, it degenerates into anarchy and becomes subverted.[2] Democracy therefore offers only a limited freedom, but within these limits it provides the maximum possibility of self-expression in the form of freedom of speech and the right to hold views and propagate them. Debate therefore is at the heart of every democratic system. Where debate is prohibited, democracy is dead. Undoubtedly, the contest of opinions carries dangers in that it makes for hesitancy and inefficiency, but this is the price of freedom.

[1] *Politics*, IV. 8. 7 (1294a)
[2] *Politics*, IV, 4. 25f.

{2} The gullibility of the crowd which readily responds to demagogues is another danger of which both ancient and modern writers are only too aware.[3] But in spite of this Aristotle seems to favor democracy as the most tolerable of political systems.[4] "Herein he differs from his master Plato who favored aristocratic rule.[5] That democracy is unable to prevent misuse of power, be it power of the word (propaganda), or power of the purse, or power of social privilege, we know from experience. But in spite of subversions it has this advantage – that it offers a maximum opportunity for criticism and propagation of heterodox views. It is this which distinguishes the West from Communism with its monoparty system.

Democracy is no modern invention; it was already practiced in one form or another in pre-historic times and later in Greece and Rome.[6] But whenever democracy over-reached itself it ended in dictatorship. Its main problem has been the question of leadership: without leadership it stagnates; under strong leadership it turns into oligarchy. For this reason true democracy has never been achieved. The problem derives from the difficulty of reconciling the right of the individual with the rights of the majority. The test of democracy lies in its willingness to heed and guard the rights of the minority. Where minorities have no voice democracy simply means mass-dictatorship.

The adage *vox populi*, vox *dei,* is in essence a non-democratic sentiment. The idea that the majority knows better than the individual is a non-biblical view.[7] In the Bible, the Prophet, as a rule, is the better informed person, though he stands alone.

A free society will never muzzle the voice of the minority, even if the minority consists of one single man. Only within the tension of the free exchange of views can democracy be kept alive. The Bill of Rights which guarantees freedom of worship and speech to the individual is grounded in the prophetic tradition. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations (Dec. 10, 1948) continues in the line of the same tradition. Article 18 affirms every man's right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion: "this freedom includes freedom to change his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance." Article 19 explains the extent of that freedom: "this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." It means that democratic freedom presupposes not only the right to hold views but also freely to propagate such as long as these do not endanger the public order. In this battle of ideas which is the very life of democracy, there must be no coercion. Socrates, we are told, held that only brutish and intractable tempers resort to force, the wise eschew violence and win by persuasion.[8] The multi-party system of the West rests upon the right to persuade. Here dialogue can only mean that only one view is right, though it is left to the individual to decide which is right and which is wrong.

---

[3] *Politics*, VI, 5; cf. Also M. V. C. Jeffreys, *Personal Values in the modern World (New Orleans Pelican, 1962), pp. 62. 149*

[4] *Politics,* IV, 2. 2.

[5] Cf. J. M. Todd, *The ancient world* (1938), pp. 107. 159

[6] For pre-historic democracy in Mesopotamia, see Sabatino Moscati, *The Face of the Ancient Orient (Chicago: Qudrangle, 1960), pp. 20f*

[7] *Cf. Jacques Maritain, Christianity & Democracy,* (New Yprk: Hillary, 1945), p. 18ff; cf. also Aristotle *Politics* III. 11. 2

[8] Cf. Xenophon, *Memorabilia, ch. 2*

{3} 2. Dialogue as a philosophical method.

Dialogue is nothing else but conversation. As such it is practiced daily by all people capable of speech. Exchange of sentiments, views and ideas in daily encounter is the normal expression of human relationships. Speech is the most characteristic feature of *homo sapiens.* To speak means to speak to somebody even though only a monologue develops. By monologue we mean the attitude which takes no notice of the other person and only pays attention to one's own voice. Only speech and counter-speech make for dialogue. Without a participating and active partner there can be no dialogue.

Plato used the dialogical method as a philosophical tool by developing Socrates' attempt to make people think by question and answer into a literary device. This dramatized search for truth was not an aimless quest. The questions and answers which made up the dialogue were formulated with great precision and moved in a definite direction. The philosopher already knew the answer *before* he posed the question. Dialogue for Plato was therefore "argumentative conversation"[9] leading to a pre-selected goal. This left no room for a neutral position: it was either yes or no.[10] If the partner in the dialogue produced the wrong answer, the philosopher's duty was to start all over again. The fault was with the master and not with the pupil. Given the right question any reasonable person would arrive at the right answer which would move the pupil in the direction of the philosopher's own position. As to the rightness of his position there could be no doubt. A dialogue would be pointless unless there were a position to convey.

It is true that Plato later moved away from the dialogical method to the more precise formulation of scientific truth,[11] but in respect to life situations dialogue remained for him the most trusted method of approach. Personal encounter was so important to him that he preferred it to the written word.

With the appearance of the I-Thou philosophy in our generation, the subject of dialogue has received added attention. For Ferdinand Ebner, speech is the only and decisive medium in human relationships. Ebner attaches supreme importance to the word as the only means whereby the I is able to confront the Thou and in this confrontation find meaning for his own existence.[12] But such encounter by means of the word cannot count upon a placid response of assent as the obvious outcome. Logstrup explains the situation: "The other person is not a 'thou,' who must believe me on my word, but an 'I,' who is to test my theses by a totally impersonal mental process."[13] It means that for Ebner real dialogue only takes place in speech and counter-speech. At the moment when the two partners agree to differ, dialogue ends.

The dynamic of dialogical encounter depends upon the full freedom of each participant to question and to disagree. The dialogical encounter therefore begins at the point of disagreement.

---

[9] *Encyclopedia Britannica* (14th ed.) VII, p. 317
[10] Richard Robinson, *Plato's Earlier Dialectic* (New York: Oxford Univ., 1953), p. 77f
[11] Robinson, p. 84.
[12] Cf. Ferdinand Ebner, *Das Wort un die Geisigen Realitäten*, 1921. For a discussion of Ebner's position, see *Theologische Rundschau,* Heft 2. 1959. p. 113ff.
[13] "Der andere ist nihct ein Du, das mir auf mein Wort glauben soll, sondern ein Ich, das in einer gänzlich unpersönlichen Verstandesüberlegung meine Thesen prüfen soll" (Ebner, p. 114)

Where partners agree there can only be an exchange of information or a confirmation of views but no dialogue.

{4} Those who quote Buber in favor of a less militant position tend to overlook the philosophical tradition. But even for Buber the encounter between I and Thou carries a dynamic tension, for it elicits response. It is only in the act of responding that the other man is able to reveal the fact that he is responsible.[14] The case of teacher and pupil serves as a good example: is dialogical encounter possible in such a situation? For Buber it is possible on the principle of "inclusion." By "inclusion" he means "the extension of one's own concreteness" so as to include the complete presence of the other person's reality. [15]It means that the teacher in his selection of subjects and his exertion of personal influence takes the personality of the pupil seriously. Buber warns against "relativizing," for it would interfere with the other person's "primal destiny." We must therefore avoid arbitrary action so as not to violate "the truth, the strength of conviction, the 'standpoint,'" which forms the centre of the other person's individuality. How is it then possible for the teacher to exert his influence? Buber thinks he is able to answer this problem on the principle of "inclusion": at the point when the teacher and pupil find themselves in a common situation of educating and being educated at the same time, the difficulty disappears.[16] It means that not only the pupil but the teacher is also the learner. In such a situation a true friendship develops when dialogue is possible. But at the same time Buber is practical enough to know that human relationships are not confined to teacher and pupil. What happens when two teachers meet who hold opposite views? The answer is that the dialogical encounter is a creative relationship.[17]

Buber holds that such turning towards the other in order to communicate results in the enrichment of both in that it "reaches out beyond the special sphere of each."[18]

In the last analysis, there is no difference between Ebner and Buber on this score. For both, dialogical encounter is a dynamic force whereby an existential relationship is created between man and man. In such a relationship there must be speech and counter-speech, the partners acting in complete freedom. In essence, there is no difference between Plato's philosopher and Buber's teacher; they both have a position to defend and they do so by means of question and answer.

3. Dialogue as a biblical method

It is noteworthy that biblical history begins with dialogical encounter. God and Adam meet: *ayyekah?* "Where are you?" is God's question addressed to man. The question is of an existential order. God is not asking for the location; Adam was not expected to describe where he was, but what he was doing. All questions addressed to Israel carry the same connotation: "Why will you die, O house of Israel?" (Ezek. 18:31); "O inhabitants of Jerusalem and men of Judah, judge, I pray you between me and my vineyard. What more was there to be done for my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" (Isa. 5:3f); "Is Israel a slave? Is he a homeborn servant? Why then has he become a prey?" (Jer. 2:14). The prophet invites his people to enter into a dialogical relationship: "Come

---

[14] Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man (London: Kegan Paul, 1947), p. 92.*
[15] *Buber, p. 97*
[16] *Buber, p. 99f*
[17] *Buber, p. 205*
[18] *Buber, p. 203*

now, let us reason together, says the Lord..." (Isa. 1:18).[19] "What wrong did your fathers find in me that they went far from me, and went after worthlessness and became worthless?" (Jer. 2:5).

These are more than rhetorical questions, for the prophets press for an answer. These questions are so phrased as to appeal both to heart and reason. For biblical dialogue Ezek. 18 is perhaps the best example. While in exile, the rising generation is raising a fundamental issue: "the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." What kind of justice is this? This anguished question on the part of the oppressed and captive **{5}** minority forms the centre of this chapter. The prophet takes the question seriously and turns it into a normal issue for each individual. It is noteworthy that he never attempts a theodicy: he does not try to justify God but instead reminds the questioner of his own true position: coram Deo. There is here a real dialogue of question and answer. The prophet so formulates each question that only one answer is possible and it always amounts to this: man reaps what he tows, there is no escape from it. Yet the vicious circle can be broken, for God does not delight in the death of the sinner; rather let him *return* and live.

The situation in the gospels is very similar; here, too, there is question and answer. Sometimes the questioner is one man, at other times a whole group; sometimes it is a disciple who poses the question; at other times the Master Himself does the questioning. Here is a typical example: "Why do you speak to them in parables?" (Mt. 13:10). Though Jesus then explains to them the reason for his use of the parabolic method, it is not a straight-forward answer. There is in the answer a dialectic involved which requires further elucidation. The disciples must have been wondering what was behind the answer. We have here a dialogue in suspense. They must have returned to the subject at some other time though we are not told about it. A more apt example is the dialogical situation as it developed in Luke 7:36ff: Jesus is the guest of a certain Pharisee by name of Simon. During the meal a woman enters, breaks an alabaster flask of ointment, and begins to anoint the Master's feet. Simon, seeing how willingly Jesus submits to the touch of a woman of ill-fame, forms some unkind thoughts about his guest and Jesus, knowing what is in the mind of Simon, tells him a story: A certain creditor had two debtors: one owed him 500 denarii and the other 50. When they could not pay, he forgave them both. At this point the dialogue begins: "which of them loved him more?" The question is so phrased that Simon has no alternative: "the one, I suppose, to whom he forgave more." What follows is a typical dialogical situation in biblical style: "Simon, do you see this woman? I entered your house, you gave me no water for my feet, but she wet my feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair ... Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much..."

In this dramatic incident we have all the ingredients of the biblical situation: personal encounter, the *Sitz-im-Leben*[20] environment, the exchange of question and answer. But above all, there is here the tension which points beyond the immediate situation toward an existential attitude: while Simon may be a scrupulous Pharisee, he lacks the essence of love which makes for true piety. When we compare the Platonic dialogues with the biblical situations we must allow that there is a certain affinity of intention. But at the same time, Plato's dialogues lack the intensity of the life-situation because they are primarily literary devices. While Plato aims to move his interlocutor to reflection, the prophet presses for immediate action in terms of total change. In one respect, however, the method is identical: both Jesus and Plato do not ask questions in order to obtain

---

[19] *"Please, come, let us discuss" – or "argue it out."*
[20] *"The given situation."*

information; they already know the answer before they ask. The question is asked to elicit an answer, but it must be the right answer. For Plato it is a matter of right opinion *(orthodoxa),* for Jesus a right relationship to God.

{6} 4. The Limitations of the Dialogical Method

For precise formulation of truth, Plato found the dialogical method liable to error. Behind this recognition is the fact that the teacher's task is a complicated one: first, he appeals to the native intelligence of his pupil; then he tries to move his pupil's will to action while respecting his resistance, so that the knowledge imparted becomes assimilated as the pupil's own. Plato's reminiscence theory of knowledge greatly simplifies the problem once it is accepted as valid. Because the metaphysical presuppositions of the theory are unacceptable to us, we confront a more radical situation: teacher and pupil face each other as giver and receiver. Because man is essentially a learner, his teacher is always the *other* man. Buber's method of "inclusion" solves the teacher's problem only, it does little for the pupil, though friendship between them eases the tension. We certainly learn from one another and the process continues from cradle to grave. But we always learn in face of contradiction. What the other man knows is a challenge to me and he owes it to me as a debt. The moral obligation to impart knowledge derives from the fact that all man's knowledge rests upon the labour of others so that everyone is a debtor to someone else. When knowledge is a matter of life and death, negligence in sharing becomes a moral crime.

All imparting of knowledge, however, meets with resistance, for it means a displacement of an entrenched position. In the case of technical skill resistance is minimal, but when it is a matter of wisdom the situation becomes complex, for wisdom reflects a mode of life and therefore constitutes a moral challenge: why is the good life to be preferred? Why should man submit to an ethical code? Why must I accept the authority of the Law?

These questions can be answered dialogically, as Plato did. But these are not ultimate answers for they are open to contradiction. In the last resort there is no answer except an appeal to ultimate authority: "thus saith the Lord." This is how the Law is enunciated: "God spake these words, and said..." (Ex. 20:1).

In the Bible dialogue and authority go hand in hand. This is why the prophet is not only the teacher but also the herald. He is sent with a message: "'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.' Now therefore hear the word of the Lord" (Amos 7:15f). Jesus, we are told, spoke with authority and not as the scribes (Mt. 7:28). The task of the herald is to proclaim the message without fear or favor (cf. 2 Tim. 4:2). The disciple has a debt to discharge: "What I tell you in the dark, utter in the light, and what you hear whispered, proclaim upon the housetops" (Mt. 10:27; cf. Rom. 1:14).

It is at the point of authority that the dialogical method breaks down. Revelation means that there are things we do not know unless we are told. Paul asks the question: how are men to call upon God in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in Him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without a preacher? (Rom. 10:14). The apostle is the one who is sent with the authority of the Sender.

It seems that the missionary method of the Church has always been twofold: dialogical encounter and authoritative witness. Neither can be used without the other. Separation of dialogue from witness creates an artificial situation and falsifies man's position before God.

{7} 5. Dialogue and Jewish missions

The Jewish position *vis a vis* the gospel is a complicated one. The Jewish people is not outside the Covenant, Judaism is not without the knowledge of God. The dialogue between Church and Synagogue is a domestic affair. From the beginning the controversy about Jesus was a controversy between Jews and Jews.[21] The Christian mission to the Jews is as old as the Church itself. It began when Jesus preached the gospel of the Kingdom of God to His own people. The primitive Church followed His example: Simon Peter was the Apostle to the circumcision (Gal. 2:8). The early Church consisted of Jews and Gentiles.[22] An example of a Christian-Jewish dialogue is shown in the case of Justin's encounter with the Jew Trypho.[23] The *Dialogue* before us is a literary device, probably borrowed from Plato, but the situation is true to life and the objections raised by the Jewish opponent have persisted to this very day. Behind the *Dialogue* is therefore a genuine historic situation. But much of the controversy concerns Old Testament exegesis which the Church employed to prove her case. Though Justin is the main speaker, Trypho's voice is frequently heard. It would be unjust to belittle the encounter; one only wishes that the later disputes between Christians and Jews had been carried out in a similar spirit of courtesy and mutual respect. In the Epistle of Barnabas, we already meet with the bitter note of invective which later developed into stark hatred.

For centuries the argument between the two parties centered upon messianic interpretation of Old Testament texts. Christian apologists adopted a strangely contradictory position: on the one hand they argued from rabbinic literature to prove messianic fulfillment, on the other hand they poked fun at the Synagogue's faith.[24] Thus what began as a dialogical confrontation eventually developed into a violent controversy, with the Church increasingly impatient at Jewish resistance. Eisenmenger gives four reasons for the Church's failure to convert Jews: 1) their unalterable hatred of Jesus; 2) their obduracy, blindness and hardness of heart in matters of spiritual things; 3) their contempt of those who become converts; 4) the dangers converts are exposed to at the hands of Jews. Though Eisenmenger closes his scurrilous book with a pious prayer for Jewish conversion, he has passed the ability to meet Jews in dialogical encounter.

The missionary method in more modern times has undergone a gradual change. It is not fashionable any more to deride Judaism or to belittle Jewish piety. Christian Hebraists, mainly Germans, men like Franz Delitzsch, Gustaf Dalman, Hermann Strack, have greatly contributed towards a deeper appreciation of Judaism in the Christian Church. In addition, the revival of modern Christianity has helped towards a new orientation in Christendom.[25] In the past a Jew was

---

[21] *Cf. J. Jocz, The Jewish People & Jesus Christ* (Naperville, III.:Allenson, 1949), p. 66

[22] Jocz, p. 146ff

[23] Jocz, p. 71, Some scholars identify Trypho with Rabbi Tarfon, a colleague of R. Akiba, who was a bitter opponent of Christianity; cf. Karl Thieme, *Kirche und Synagoge, 1945, p. 238 n3.*

[24] *Cf. J. Jocz, "Das exegetische Problem und die Judenmission," Judaica*, Heft 1, 1956, 12ff.; cf. also J. A. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum*, 1711. II, pp. 650-55.

[25] For modern Hebrew Christianity, see Jocz, *The Jewish People & Jesus Christ*, pp. 235ff

expected to separate himself from his brethren on becoming a Christian. Now it is taken for granted that a Hebrew Christian affirms his heritage and remains loyal to his people. The contemporary Jewish Christian, unlike the medieval convert, is not an enemy but a lover of his people.[26] Though the Jewish community views the Hebrew Christian with hostile suspicion and accuses him of ulterior motives, his influence in the Church is most beneficial for Jewish-Christian relations. There is at present **{8}** a greater awareness among Christian people of their roots in the Old Testament and their link with Jewish tradition than there has been for centuries. This raises the fundamental question: Is there an essential difference between the two faiths?

6. Non-missionary dialogue

Those who favor dialogue but depreciate mission assume that the difference between Judaism and Christianity is only an apparent one. We share the same spiritual heritage, hold the same values, and believe in the same God of Israel. A Jew who becomes a Christian only adds "some additional matters" to what he already believes, according to Frederick Grant, former President of one theological seminary and professor emeritus of another theological school.[27] This attitude is part of the general syncretism which pervades science-orientated culture. There seems to be a close connection between science and syncretism. The greater the influence of science upon our culture the stronger becomes the syncretistic tendency in society. This openness for extraneous views may look like an enrichment but it frequently leads to shallowness and confusion. The uncritical absorption of conflicting presuppositions in the end results in cynical agnosticism. When everyone is declared right, truth ceases to matter.

Syncretism in the Church is not a new phenomenon but in times of crisis it breaks out with added force.[28] The missionary report *Rethinking Missions (1932)* which stands out as a classical example of religious syncretism is a typical document of our times. The basic assumption behind this document is the religious truth underlying all world-religions. Once this is an accepted principle it is only a matter of the degree of excellence between one religion and another. The Report therefore calls upon the Church to abandon "conscious and direct evangelism" and instead "cooperate wholeheartedly with nonChristian agencies for social improvement."[29]

Once religion is the common denominator, our closest relative is naturally the Synagogue; the Church has more in common with Judaism than with any other religion. What is more, our common heritage derives from the same source and is therefore homogeneous to both.[30] There is only one issue which divides us: the Messiahship of Jesus Christ. Once we decide that this is not a fundamental issue, mission to the Jews loses its rationale.

Those who advocate a non-missionary approach to the Jewish people work on the basis of a theological compromise: there are two ways to God according to the twofold Covenant, the one

---

[26] Cf. the case of Fr. Daniel, a Jewish war hero and a Camelite monk, in Marc Galanter, "A Dissent on Brother Daniel," *Commentary* (July 1963), pp. 10-17; also Msgr. John M. Oesterreicher, The Brotherhood of Christians & Jews, (Inst. of Judeo-Christian Studies), 1964.
[27] "Evangelical Jews?" *Christianity Today (Jan. 7. 1966), p. 47.*
[28] *Cf. the excellent study of syncretism by W. A. Visser's Hooft, No Other Name* (Philadelphia: Westminster. 1963)
[29] *Rethinking Missions*, p. 326
[30] Cf. J. Jocz, *A theology of Election* (Naperville, III.: Allenson, 1958), pp. 31-51

on Mount Sinai, the other on Golgotha.[31] James Parkes is not the originator of this view; it was already suggested by Trypho in his argument with Justin,[32] and repeated by Sholem Asch in *The Nazarene.*[33] Lessing's *Nathan der Weise* assumes a similar principle. Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr are motivated by the same reasoning.

{9} Since the declaration on the Jewish people by Vatican II the question of the Jewish-Christian dialogue has received renewed attention. The Vatican document recommends "mutual understanding and respect" based upon "biblical and theological studies and ... brotherly dialogue." In a footnote it is explained that "mutual" means a two-way communication and that the intention of the document is to "promote dialogue." The Church is urged to take the initiative in an encounter with the Jewish people.[34]

Jews have asked the question: What does dialogue mean in the Jewish-Christian encounter?

On this issue, opinion is sharply divided. A section of Reform Jews seems to favor conversation with the Church at the deepest level. On the Orthodox side this is vigorously rejected. But even on the Reform side there is opposition. Eliezer Berkovitz, chairman of the department of Jewish philosophy at the Hebrew Theological College (Skokie, Ill.), speaks for a large section of Jewish opinion when he says: "as to dialogue in the purely theological sense, nothing could be more fruitless[35] and pointless. Judaism is Judaism because it rejects Christianity, and Christianity is Christianity because it rejects Judaism."[36] On this level, we are told unequivocally, there can be no "fraternal dialogue." On the other hand, Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, the Director of the Interreligious Affairs Department (American Jewish Committee, New York) is all for dialogue even at the deepest level.[37] There is some support for this view by men such as Professor David Flusser of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, but they are a small minority. Rejection of dialogue at the religious level is not only advocated by the ultra-orthodox such as Rabbi Menahem Porush, a spokesman for Agudat Yisrael in the *Knesset,* but by such enlightened scholars as R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, dean of the faculty of the Humanities and Professor of Comparative Religion at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Werblowsky sees in the Jewish-Christian dialogue a falsification of the true position of both sides. He sincerely questions the theological possibility of dialogical engagement between a convinced Christian and a committed Jew. He warns against a "friendly, tolerant get-together of nice liberal-minded people believing that the Christian and the Jewish religions are equally good, and singing in chorus 'we are all jolly good fellows'" as a substitute for true dialogue. Prof. Werblowsky holds that if the Christian is true to his profession he will desire the Jew's conversion, and if the Jew is a true Jew, he will look upon the Christian as an aberration of biblical faith.[38]

---

[31] James Parkes, *Judaism and Christianity* (London: Victor Gollanz, 1948), pp. 21, 25, 30, etc
[32] Jocz, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ, p. 319*
[33] S. Asch, *The Nazarene (New York: G. P. Putman, 1939), pp. 612f.*
[34] *W. M. Abbott, ed., Documents of Vatican II* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1966), p. 665
[35] The text reads 'fruitful,' but this is an obvious misprint, judging from the context.
[36] *Judaism*, (Winter 1966), pp. 80 f.
[37] Cf. *Jewish-Christian Relations*. The Proceedings of an Institute held at St. Mary's College, St. Mary's Kansas (Feb. 21-22, 1965), p. 110.
[38] *The Jewish Chronicle* (London: Oct. 30, 1964 and No. 6, 164)

Trude Weiss-Rosmarin reduces the problem to a simple statement: "The differences between Judaism and Christianity are not just differences. They are mutually exclusive assertions of belief, and belief is not a legitimate subject for dialogue and conversation." Her conclusion is that only in areas of peace, civil rights and other social concerns can there be dialogue between Christians and Jews but never at the level of faith.[39]

In Jewish opinion the common humanity of Christians and Jews requires encounter and exchange of views, but it must be limited to the ordinary human concerns. Such encounter, of course, has never completely ceased even at the worst of times when the two camps were facing each other in bitter hostility. That this is now done frequently and in a different spirit is a matter of rejoicing. But to call this Jewish-Christian "dialogue" in the deeper sense of the word is nothing but an illusion. Prof Werblowsky aptly describes the situation as "a doubly lopsided affair."

{10} 7. The Synagogue's recovery of Mission

The historic churches have largely abandoned the direct missionary endeavor. The reasons for this are complex and manifold. The Christian attitude to Jewish missions is not to be dissociated from the change of strategy in the foreign mission field. Syncretism has now reached a state where to many the missionary outreach of the Church is sheer embarrassment. Denominations still have missionary boards and missionary budgets; what they lack is missionary zeal. The extent of syncretistic pressure is best gauged by the Church's attitude to Jewish missions. At present the barometer stands at zero. The result is most unfortunate: private individuals and some ultra-fanatical groups have taken up the work which the Church is failing to do. As a consequence both Jews and Christians receive a falsified image. Jews associate Christian missions with far-fetched exegesis, some forms of bribery and deprecatory remarks about Judaism.[40] Christians interpret the non-missionary attitude on the part of the Church as a tacit acknowledgement that in essence there is no difference, "one religion is as good as another." Both Judaism and Christianity are accidents of birth. In fact it is held in some quarters that the conversion of Jews is in bad taste.[41] One of the most violently vociferous enemies of missions to Jews associates it with "anti-Semitic diabolism" and describes it as "imperialistic Gentile compulsion to make Christians out of Jews."[42]

The oddity of the present situation lies in the fact that while the Church has given up the evangelistic effort among Jews, Judaism is becoming increasingly conscious of its missionary obligation to non-Jews. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations under the able direction of Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath is now officially committed to seeking the conversion of the "unaffiliated" Jews and Gentiles: "both the unsynagogued and the unchurched." Here are Dr. Eisendrath's ipsissima verba: "Our failure to launch an aggressive program of conversion reflects, I

---

[39] *Congress Bi-Weekly* (June 20. 1966)

[40] A quaint example of exegesis is the book by Albert Huisjen, *The Home Front of Jewish Missions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1962). His appreciation of Judaism is nil. His more recent book, *Talking about Jesus with a Jewish Neighbor* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1964), is equally deficient. As for underhand methods, there appeared in the *Toronto Jewish Voice* (Nov. 4, 1966) an advertisement giving details of a meeting without the slightest hint that it was an evangelistic meeting arranged by a Christian denomination!

[41] *Christianity Today* (January 7, 1966), p. 47

[42] A Roy Eckardt, "End to the Christian-Jewish Dialogue", *The Christian Century* (March 30, 1966), pp. 394ff.

fear, an unbecoming distrust of the Gentile – an unpleasant, provincial attitude toward our faith, as if it were an exclusive club into which one has to be born."[43]

Dr. Eisendrath speaks for Reform Judaism, but the Orthodox Synagogue is not entirely idle. The National Jewish Information Service directed by Moshe M. Maggal of Los Angeles is engaged in a vigorous campaign on a double front, stirring up Jewish opinion in support of active missionary work among non-Jews and at the same time propagating the Jewish faith by an extensive literary endeavor. Rabbi Maggal in "An Open Letter to our Rabbis" (Sept. 1966) concludes his Address with the *imprimatur* and *nihil obstat* of an Episcopalian Bishop. In fact, James Pike did more than this: he offered his episcopal blessing: "I am glad to see this work going on ... Every blessing."[44]

This revival of the missionary spirit on the part of Judaism is finding expression in the serious periodicals of the scholastic Jewish community. Erich Isaac, professor of City University (New York), regards the present moment most opportune for the missionary **{11}** advance of Judaism. This applies specially to the African continent where Christianity is in retreat. Ernst Simon, professor of education at Jerusalem University calls for a reconsideration of the theological implications of Israel's election with a view to the nations of the world. He affirms the Synagogue's position which "has always been open to sincere proselytes."[45]

It is worth noting that the "unaffiliated" Gentiles to whom Dr. Eisendrath refers are in a different category from unaffiliated Jews for the simple reason that Jews are always Jews whether affiliated or not. It means that the Church cannot claim the same freedom as does the Synagogue.

8. Dialogue or Witness?

In our analysis, we found that for Plato the dialogical encounter had a premeditated purpose, it was geared towards the elucidation of truth. Dialogue, for Plato, was ideologically motivated: the philosopher's task was to help the other person to arrive at self-evident truths. Buber does not exclude the possibility of dialogue between opponents: "In a genuine dialogue each of the partners, even when he stands in opposition to the other, heeds, affirms, and confirms his opponent as an existing other."[46] On the contrary, the very diversity of opinion keeps dialogue alive. It is unfortunate that because of the delicacy of Jewish-Christian relationships, the vigorous and robust concept of dialogue as a real life-encounter has had to be toned down to mere gentle conversation. This social interpretation of dialogue robs it of its truly existential character. Buber himself is rightly described as a "passionate witness to biblical faith,"[47] and has a critical approach to other people's views.[48] Dialogue in terms of truce is bound to be a dull and lifeless affair.

Dialogue which demands a neutral position of both partners is a radical departure from the classical meaning of dialogical encounter. Reuel L. Howe's dialogical exposition suffers from an inner contradiction: on the one hand, he tells us that dialogue serves the purpose of helping the

---

[43] *Christianity Today* (Jan. 7, 1966), p. 47; cf. also: WCC, Committee on Jews, Newsletter, 3/1966.
[44]. It would be interesting to speculate whether the controversial bishop would be willing to extend a similar blessing to a Christian organization evangelizing Jews.
[45] Ernst Simon, "The Jews as God's Witnesses to the World." *Judaism* (Summer 1966), pp. 30611.
[46] M. Buber, *Pointing the Way* (Evanston: Harper, 1957), p. 238.
[47] Malcolm L. Diamond, *Martin Buber – Jewish Existentialist* (New York: Oxford Univ., 1960), pp. 79f. 48.
[48] "We cannot go back into an uncritical acceptance of men's statements" (*Pointing the Way, p. 227*).

other person to make a decision, but on the other hand, he warns against persuading any person toward a point of view.[49] At the same time, we are told that "conviction can only be born out of a dialogue between alternatives."[50] One wonders who is to present the "alternative" if persuasion is illegitimate. Mr. Howe's difficulty has something to do with his understanding of the meaning of truth. For him truth seems to be an accumulative dimension; he therefore holds that "the truth of each needs to be brought into relation with the truth of others in order that the full dimension of the truth each has may be known." This, to him, is the task of dialogue.[51] But the "truth" of faith is never accumulative; in fact, it has no plural. The biblical category is a dialogical encounter between God and man which takes place by the miracle of the Word. Such encounter can never be turned into a philosophical debating society.

In the Bible dialogue and witness are never separate. Witness carries authority beyond the speaker and points to the One who is the source of the message: "go and say to this people . . ." (Isa. 6:9). It is the conviction of having been sent which has persuasive effect upon the listener. This constitutes the challenge to decision: is he a true or false prophet? The witness cannot authenticate his message, all he can do is stand by it even at the point of death. This is why the word martyr means witness to the uttermost. Dialogue which by-passes witness moves out of the existential situation into the area of philosophizing. **{12}** Prof. Thomas B. McDormand deals with the relationship of dialogue to witness. Dialogue can be a help to witness but it also can displace witness and become a substitute for it.[52].

When this happens, Christian witness becomes perverted for it precludes God's redemptive answer to man's questioning. Entrenchment is man's usual condition whether it be in the Church or Synagogue. What Hans Urs von Balthasar says about the Old Covenant when divorced from the Church is more cogently applied to the Synagogue when divorced from the Gospel: it degenerates into self-sufficiency.[53] No one who really believes that the Gospel is Gods redemptive answer to mans need, be he Jew or Greek, can afford to substitute "dialogue" for the prophetic assertion: Thus saith the Lord! Dialogue is essential for human encounter, but witness is the expression of personal faith. For the believing Christian the two are inseparable and mean the same thing.

---

[49] Reuel L. Howe, *The Miracle of Dialogue* (New York: Seabury, 1963), p. 57.
[50] Howe, p. 61.
[51] Howe, p. 121.
[52] Cf. T. B. McDormand, "Dialogue or Witness?" *Christianity Today* (Dec. 3, 1965), p. 25; cf. also Prof. Elwyn A Smith, "Christians & Jews," WCC, Committee on Jews, Newsletter (Jan. 1965).
[53] Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Martin Buber and Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1961), p. 109.

{14} The Jewish-Christian Dialogue in Ancient and Modern Times:

A Survey of Recent Literature

by Oskar Skarsaune

Dr. Skarsaune is a lecturer in Patristic Studies and Church History at the Free Faculty in Oslo. His doctoral dissertation deals with Justin's dialogue with Trypho: "The Proof from Prophecy – A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition."

Introduction

The informed reader may object that our title contains a euphemism. "Dialogue" is hardly a proper designation for the verbal war which marked the relationship between Christian Europe and its Jewish minority for extended periods, not to mention the many episodes when the violence became more than purely verbal. Despite this correct objection, the title has been chosen with due consideration. In recent years without doubt real encounters and conversations between Jews and Christians have developed, and this modern dialogue has caused a natural search for the history of the dialogue also in the centuries when the picture was more generally marked by verbal war, social discrimination and periodically by physical violence. The modern dialogue has further led to mutual conversations about those aspects of our common history which were definitely not marked by dialogue. Which factors created and sustained Christian anti-Semitism? What can we do today to prevent its continued existence? Questions like these have not only been on the agenda in almost all dialogue consultations between Jews and Christians, they have also caused an intensive debate within the church itself.

The dialogue between Judaism and Christianity is different from other contemporary interfaith encounters: it is also a dialogue about a common history. When we want to say something to one another, history immediately presses itself upon us, and the dialogue is therefore full of statements about the past. History stays with us and gives the dialogue breadth and depth. This means that few are able to survey the flow of relevant literature that is being published every year. Particularly in the last ten years a large flow of dialogue literature has been published, but it seems that this wave now is about to culminate. However, there can be no doubt that the modern dialogue between Christianity and Judaism will leave permanent traces in Christian theology, particularly on the European continent.

In the following we shall present a survey of some recent literature that has appeared particularly on German soil concerning the Christian/Jewish dialogue in antiquity, in the middle ages and in modern times.

{15} Dialogue and Polemic in Antiquity

There are three kinds of sources with regard to the polemic between Jews and Christians in antiquity: Jewish, Christian and pagan. The Christian sources are without comparison the most extensive, the most direct and also the most accessible. However, it is a paradox that the Christian sources also are the least examined. This pertains particularly to the many source writings which pretend to render actual polemic encounters between Christians and Jews.

From the pre-Constantine era at least three dialogues have been kept:

- Justin's dialogue with Trypho the Jew from approximately 160 AD;

- the dispute between Timothy and Aquilla from approximately 200 AD;

- and the dialogue between Athanasius and Sacceus from approximately 325 AD.

There is probably a direct literary link between these writings, but the question is made even more complicated by the fact that some of them or all three in addition may be dependent on the lost dialogue between Jason and Papiscus which was described by Ariston of Pella, probably immediately after the Bar-Kochba revolt (133-135 AD). A fifth**,** member of this dialogue family is the dispute between Simon and Theophilus from the 4th or the 5th century. Of these writings only the work of Justin Martyr has been made the subject of two larger monographic studies.[1] With regard to the other writings few articles have been written, some summary descriptions are provided in general instructions to early Christian literature, and there is also a lack of proper text editions[2] Much is to be done in this area of research, but so far the recent interest in the early religious dialogue between Jews and Christians has not paid much attention to this material.

To a certain extent the same is true with regard to the more extensive literature which has not the form of dialogues, but is direct or indirect polemic against Judaism: the so-called Adversus Judaeos-literature, which already in the pre-Constantine era counted at least seven writings. Some of these writings have been published in excellent text editions and have been subject of monographic studies once or more times, but not primarily from the point of view of the religious polemic as such.[3] These writings have more been used as interesting sources for the early history of theology, as some of these writings contain rather archaic Christian material.

---

[1]P. Prigent, *Justin et L'Ancien Testament* (Paris 1964), and my thesis, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition* (Oslo 1981, will be published in the series Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Leiden, at the end of this year.) See also A. von Harnack, *Judentum and Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho* (Texte und Untersuchungen 39/1, Leipzig 1913, pp. 47-98), and W. A Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London 1965). However, in none of these studies the dialogue as such is the object of the research.

[2]A classic study of the Christian sources up to the Renaissance is A Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos. A Birdseye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge 1935). A recent study which was not available to me as this paper was written, is H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld* (1.-11. Jh.) (Europäische Hochschulschriften XXIII/172, Bern 1984).

[3] An exception is: R.I. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology* (Yale Publications in Religion 15, New Haven and London 1971). In his introduction Wilken presents a brief survey of the history of the dialogue up to Cyril (+444 AD)
and shows that the dialogue did not stop early in the 2nd cent. as is often claimed.

The pagan source material is mainly found in the literature of the critics of Christianity in antiquity. Not seldom they use Jewish arguments against Christianity, as can be seen in the material from Kelsos around 175 AD. Also Marcion sometimes makes the Jews his allies when he wants to show the problematic interpretation of the Old Testament found in the Church. Also in this respect little has been done to analyze the Jewish opinions and arguments which these authors use.

So far the new interest for the religious dialogue in antiquity has therefore focused upon the Jewish material. Previously this material has also been the focal attention for research, both among Christians and Jewish scholars.[4] Two questions have been at the center of this research: 1. Is it possible to find in the rabbinic sources – Targums, Talmud and Midrash – direct or indirect references to Jesus and the Church and/or polemic against them? 2. Is it possible in the liturgical practice of Judaism to find changes which have been implemented in order to cause a clear separation of Judaism and Christianity?

In two recently published books *Johann Maier* has given an excellent survey with regard to the study of the Jewish material and has himself provided a significant research contribution. In his first book Maier deals with *"Jesus of Nazareth in the Talmudic Tradition"* (Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung).

{16} In recent research there has been a critical tendency to limit the references to Jesus or the Christians in the talmudic traditions. In this respect Maier himself has set an unbeatable record, as his detailed analysis of the material leads him to the conclusion that there are no original or certain references to Jesus in the Talmud. However, this is in concordance with the a priori considerations of Maier that there is no reason to believe that the talmudic rabbis were particularly concerned with Christianity or Jesus. The opposite view is a typical Christian prejudice according to Maier.

The talmudic texts about Jesus Ben Pandera have usually been interpreted as references to Jesus of Nazareth. However, Maier is of the opinion that these texts originally referred to a different Jesus from the second century, and this name was first identified with Jesus of Nazareth by the Jewry in the Western Diaspora (e.g. by Kelsos) and some centuries later by rabbinic traditions in the post-talmudic era. On this point and throughout his studies Maier pursues detailed form criticism and an analysis of the history of traditions which quite often become rather sophisticated and hypothetical. When he denies references to Jesus or Christianity, his premise or argument is that such polemic does not play any role in the context, and that the purpose of the text is not to take issue with Jesus. But how relevant is this argument? Quite a lot of important historical material is contained in the Talmud and in the Midrashim, particularly in the subordinate clauses, in contexts where the focus is upon other matters.

It should also be mentioned that Maier rather exclusively keeps to the material which previous research has interpreted as references to Jesus and the Church. However, he thereby passes over important rabbinic source material: the rather extensive rabbinic material of scripture interpretation

[4] Two old classics are R. Travers Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London 1903, reprint New York 1975), and H. L. Strack, *Jesus die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben. Texte,Übersetzung und Erläuterungen* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin 37, Leipzig 1910). Among recent studies it is worth noting M. Goldstein, *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition* (New York 1950); J. Z. Lauterbach, Jesus in the Talmud, idem*, Rabbinic Essays* (Cincinnati 1951), pp. 473-570; K Hruby, *Die Stellung der jüdischen Gesetzeslehrer zur werdenden Kirche* (Schriften zur Judentumskunde 4, Zürich 1971).

which has close parallels in polemic and unpolemic texts in the writings of the Church fathers. If this material were used for parallel studies of the Christian and Jewish sources,[5] a broader and methodically more certain basis could be developed for the drawing up of the main lines in the religious dispute which undoubtedly is reflected in this source material.

The second book of Johann Maier deals with "*Jewish Attitudes to Christianity in Antiquity*" (Jüdische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum in the Antike). The first half of this book deals with the Scripture Canon of Judaism, its development and the rules for how to deal with heretical books, what the rabbis called Giljonim or also Avon-Gillajon. Previous research has usually interpreted this designation as reference to the Gospels (in Greek: Evangelion). However, Maier demonstrates convincingly that the first two designations (heretic books, giljonim) are not references to the Gospel books, and he energetically argues that this is the case also with regard to Avon-Gillajon, despite the striking similarity between the two words (Avon-Gillajon – Evangelion). Maier does not deny that these terms in later times came to be used for the Gospel books, but maintains that this was not **{17}** their original reference. Although Maier's argument seems somewhat forced on this point, this book contains an up-to-date description of the canonization of the Scriptures within Judaism and its attitude to heretical books.

Whereas the two books of Johann Maier are marked by their comprehensive treatment of the material, a very interesting case-study to one specific topic within the religious dispute between Jews and Christians has been written by *Annelise Butterweck: The Wrestling of Jacob at Yabbok. Genesis 32, 4ff. in the Jewish Tradition Until Early Middle Ages* (Jakobs Ringkampf am Jabbok). In the rabbinic tradition the story in Genesis 32 received great importance, as the names of Jacob and Israel appear prominently in this chapter, and because the angel with whom Jacob wrestled, is identified with the guardian angel of Esau-Edom. Edom was identified with Rome, and the text was thus interpreted as speaking about the irrevocable election of Israel and its final victory over Rome. Butterweck demonstrates strikingly how little this interpretative tradition was influenced by the Roman Empire. Or differently said: The polemic against the Christian Roman Empire which Butterweck follows up until Rashi, is more traditional anti-Rome than it is actually anti-Christian.

The religious dispute is indirectly brought into the picture as Butterweck deals with the oldest tradition of Christian interpretation of the same story about Jacob. Here it is clearly shown that the Christian interpretation is markedly dependent upon the Jewish tradition, but it is also radically changed through its christological focus. In the long run it is the cumulative effect of this kind of case study which will provide us with a more clear picture of Christian-Jewish relations and the religious dialogue in this period.

The Jewish view of the Roman Empire is also the topic of the book of *C. Stemberger, The Roman Rule in the Judgment of the Jews* (Die Römische Herrschaft im Urteil der Juden). Relevant Jewish material from the book of Daniel to medieval texts is analyzed in chronological order. As one could expect, the material is rather complex from flaming protest and demonification of Rome to rather positive descriptions which give Rome a central role in God's plan in history, also as an instrument of God's punishment in His upbringing of Israel. It is particularly in the rabbinic

[5] An example of such a comparative study is T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis 1-11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian with Particular Reference to the Influence of Jewish Exegetical Tradition* (Lund 1978).

literature that we encounter this relatively friendly attitude towards Rome. In this respect the story about Jochanan Ben Zakai, the founder of normative Judaism after the fall of the Temple, is symptomatic. He was smuggled out of the beleaguered Jerusalem, he was given audience before Vespasian, and under his protection he founded the rabbinic academy in Jabne. But also those rabbis who were most friendly towards Rome, kept the notion about the eschatological dethronement of Rome and the final liberation of Israel from the Roman yoke. The book of Stemberger provides a good survey of the material, but not much more. Again a parallel analysis of the Christian material could have added constructive perspectives.

There is still much to be done in the study of the dialogue and the polemic between Christians and Jews in antiquity. However, research in this period has been much more extensive than with regard to the Middle Ages.

Dialogue and Polemic in the Middle Ages

It is hardly possible to give a short and penetrating description of the relationship between the medieval Corpus Christianum (the Christian literature) and the Jews, as the picture is very complex and marked by contradictions.[6] Already early in the Middle Ages we encounter trends which continue the anti-Jewish polemic of the ancient church. In its most **{18}** aggressive form this anti-Jewish polemic is found in the writings of Agobard of Lyon (9 cent. AD). However, the background to the intense polemic of Agobard was a popular Christian Philo-Semitism. Many lay-Christians say they prefer the sermons in the synagogues to those in the churches, that the Jews are loved for the sake of the prophets, that they are the real people of God etc. Somewhat later, in the early and high Scholasticism, we find Christian Bible expositors who are ready to learn from the Jews about the literal meaning of the text of the Old Testament, and who freely associate with their scholarly Jewish colleagues in a friendly way. Most known among these is Andrew of St. Victor (12 cent. AD), who quoted Jewish Bible interpretation with predilection, and who also without any polemic refers to the Jewish interpretation of Isaiah 7,14 and Isaiah 53 as if they were his own.[7]

This interaction between Jewish and Christian scholars is the topic of the comprehensive study of *Marianne Awerbuch: Christian Jewish Encounter in the Time of Early Scholasticism* (Christlich/jüdische Begegnung im Zeitalter der Frühscholastik). For the one who knows the classical book of *Beryl Smalley* on medieval Bible interpretation, much of the material will be well known. However, the study of Awerbuch goes more in depth and it sets the scholarly exchange of opinions between Jews and Christians into a broader historical framework. One important concern is to look for those elements which point in a more negative direction – towards the horrible persecutions of Jews during the Crusades. The picture of the early Middle Ages becomes here tremendously complex and full of contrast, and Awerbuch has provided much insight and a significant contribution to the drawing of this picture.

---

[6] A helpful survey of the ancient and medieval material is found in *Kirche und Synagoge, Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden. Darstellung mit Quellen* (ed. K H. Rengsdorf and S. von Kortzfleisch, Stuttgart 1968).
[7] Cf. B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle* Ages (Notre Dame, Indiana 1978) p. 112-185.

The Middle Ages are also fascinating because we now for the first time encounter Jewish literature as a response to the Christian anti-Judaeos literature.[8] We are not just referred to reading between the lines in order to know what Jews thought and said to one another and to their Christian surroundings. This does not mean that Jews were given freedom of expression in the modern senses of the term. It was a considerable risk to speak publicly against the dogmas of the Church, and several of the public "dialogues" which were arranged by Christian authorities, were really some kind of a process against Jews or leading rabbis. But also here the picture is complex, and most clearly we see the contrast within some few decades of the 13th century.

A public discussion was set up in Paris in 1240 in order to prove that the Talmud contained blasphemies against God, Christ, Mary and many points in the doctrine of the Church, that the Talmud was a hindrance for the Jews to see the truth, and other points. This public discussion was followed by a grand burning of many copies of the Talmud,[9] and French Jewry suffered a severe blow. Some 20 years later a public discussion of a different kind was held in Barcelona (1263) under the leadership of the Spanish king. The main discussants were the Jewish convert Paulus Christianus and the esteemed Rabbi of Spain, Moses Nachmanides. In this discussion Paulus Christianus based his strategy upon a new **{19}** doctrine that had been developed by Hebrew scholars among the Dominicans, particularly by Raymond Martini that the Talmud was rather an ally of the Church in its mission to the Jews, as both the Talmud and the Midrashim contained important statements that proved the Messiahship of Jesus.

There are two independent reports from this highly interesting dialogue in Barcelona: the public, Latin report of the Dominicans and the Hebrew report of Nachmanides which aimed at the Jewish public. This gives us the unique opportunity to a parallel study of the two sources with use of cross references, so that a rather objective picture can be formed of the actual development of the debate. Both in our times as well as in the last century a number of studies of this dialogue have been published.[10] However, these studies are all surpassed by the monograph of *Hans-Georg von Mutius, The Christian-Jewish Enforced Dialogue in Barcelona according to the Hebrew Protocol of Moses Nachmanides* (Die christlich-jüdische Zwangsdisputation zu Barcelona nach dem hebräischen Protokoll des Moses Nachmanides). This study is a detailed, exegetical analysis of the report of Nachmanides, constantly compared with the Latin protocol. Previous studies both of Jewish and Christian scholars were often partial, marked by an interest to prove which was the best report, and which side of the dialogue won. In this respect the study of von Mutius is praiseworthy in its objectiveness. He clearly shows how both parts in the discussion at times maneuvered themselves into difficult positions by their pretensions to be able to provide strange proofs in matters of faith. He also argues well that both reports are propaganda items which systematically report or keep silent for their own benefit. Von Mutius does not discuss the wider historical and

[8]Sources in translation are partly given in F. E. Talmage, *Disputation and Dialogue: Readings* in *the Jewish-Christian encounter* (New York 1975), and M. Braude, *Conscience on Trial* (New York 1962), and in *Kirche und Synagogue* 1 (note 6). Cf. O. S. Rankin, *Jewish Religious Polemic* (Edinburgh 1956, reprint New York 1970), and the broad, systematic study of the Jewish religious polemic by D. J. Lasker, *Jewish Philosophical Polemics Against Christianity in the Middle Ages* (New York 1977).

[9] In 1242 221 wagons with Talmud copies were burned.

[10] Among others H. Denifle, *Quellen zur Disputation Pablos Christiani mit Mose Nachmani zu Barcelona 1263* in Historisches Jahrbuch 8 (1887), pp. 225-244; C. Roth, *The Disputation of Barcelona (1263),* Harvard Theological Review 43 (1950), pp. 117-144; M. A Cohen, *Reflections on the Text and Context of the Disputation of Barcelona,* Hebrew Union College Annual 35 (1964), pp. 157-191; and Rankin, op. cit., pp. 157-210 (text) and 228-235 (notes).

political context of the dialogue in Barcelona. However, it is thought-provoking that the dialogue was followed by an enforced visit of the church authorities to the synagogue of Nachmanides. In the synagogue, the general of the dominican order preached a sermon, but Nachmanides was given opportunity to respond. It is possible that the outspokenness of Nachmanides at this and later opportunities was one of the reasons why he later found it necessary to immigrate to the land of Israel.

Even more outspoken than Nachmanides was the anonymous author of the book which usually is given the title "*the Old Refutation"; Nizzachon Vetus.* This book was written in Hebrew probably around the year 1300, a date which is approximate and with a margin of 30 to 40 years in each direction. This is the most comprehensive compendium of anti-Christian arguments particularly in the German area, although the writing also contains many traditions from France and has a compilatory character. *David Berger* has now published a new critical edition of the Hebrew text, together with an English translation, an excellent introduction, a commentary and excurses. The commentary of Berger, who himself is an active participant in the modern dialogue from the Jewish side, is marked by a **{20}** detailed knowledge of the older and contemporary refutation literature and by great scholarly knowledge, and his introduction is in itself a compendium of the polemic and the dialogue from antiquity onwards. The particular importance of *Nizzachon Vetus* is the rather detailed discussion on texts from the New Testament in this book. The strategy here is twofold: partly to defame Jesus and his disciples and to point to contradictions and incredible elements in the Gospels, but also to point to contradictions between the Jewish Jesus of the Gospels and the Jesus of Christian doctrine. For instance Matthew 5,17 is quoted as a proof that Jesus never wanted to abolish the law or exempt his disciples from obedience to the Torah. One is struck by the relevance of this material for our present day, particularly when reading modem American examples of the same kind of refutation literature.[11]

As already indicated, the horrible Crusade pogroms against the Jews are always audible background noise to the more peaceful encounters between Jews and Christians in this period. These pogroms have often been described in the historical literature. Less known and researched is perhaps the internal protest within the church against these pogroms. A contemporary Jewish historian, *Efraim Bar-Yacob,* has given a magnanimous and beautiful expression of the significance of Bernhard of Clairvaux in this respect:

"In that year 1146 the enemy came and suppressed Israel... Rudolf, a monk, persecuted Israel in shameful way, he acted against the people of God in order to wipe them out, to strangle and to destroy them ... Wherever he came, he spoke evil against all Jews in all lands, and in this way he set the snakes and the dogs against us, saying: "Revenge the crucified first of all on his enemies who live amongst you, and then go to war against the Ishmaelites." We heard this, and our hearts melted and our courage fell ... But the Eternal One heard our complaint and turned to us with his mercy, sending us another worthy monk after this criminal. This other monk was among the best and most renowned monks, who knew and understood their Law. His name was Bernhard from the city of Clairvaux in France. According to their customs he also preached to the people and said the following: "It is good if you will go against the Ishmaelites, but the one who touches a Jew in order to do him evil, his act will be as sinful as if he touched Jesus himself." Everybody honored this

[11]Cf. G. Sigal, *The Jew and the Christian Missionary A Jewish Response to Missionary Christianity* (New York 1981).

monk as one of their saints, and one could never prove that he had received any bribery in order to say the good that he had spoken about Israel... If our Creator had not sent us this Bernhard and his letter, there would have been no rest nor refuge left of Israel."[12]

In his book on "*Critique and Response in Christianity and Judaism* "(Kritik und Gegenkritik in Christentum und Judentum), Piroska Mathe has given a detailed description of the Christian critique of the persecution of the Jews which was first caused by the Crusades and later by the Great Plague. The picture is rather nuanced: the *ecclesia* as a political authority could have good economic and political reasons to protect "their" Jews and so they did. But there are also examples where regular Christians protected Jewish people by **{21}** hiding them away, out of the Crusaders' sight. Sporadically one also finds theological criticism of the vulgar reasons given for the persecutions.

In this brief survey of a small number of recent studies it has not been possible to present an overall picture, neither of history itself nor the extant literature about the religious polemic in this turbulent period. Jewish scholars have traditionally dominated this field of research, not least because the primary sources demand intimate knowledge of the Semitic languages. However, in recent years also Christian scholars have had more appetite for this material, and it is probably not by accident that many of these studies have been published within the regular "dialogue-series."

The Modern Dialogue: Jewish "Heimholung" and Self-Criticism in the Church

When we now jump from the Middle Ages to our time, we exclude two important periods in the history of the dialogue. The Renaissance and the Reformation on the one hand, and the development of the Enlightenment in the 17. and 18. cent. on the other. In recent years it is understandable that the question of Martin Luther and the Jews again has been put on the agenda in the Jewish-Lutheran dialogue. But it is probably correct to say that the two mentioned periods not in the same way as antiquity and the Middle Ages have been the object of renewed research as a result of the modern dialogue.

In the last century conditions had developed within certain Jewish circles for a new approach to Jesus the Jew. This approach was independent of the traditional Jewish research on Jesus which in its beginning proposed rather desperate interpretations and was often influenced positively and negatively by contemporary Christian scholars who pioneered research on the life of Jesus.[13] Through the classical book of *Joseph Klausner* on "*Jesus of Nazareth*"(Jerusalem 1922) the new trend among Jewish scholars developed its own distinctions and a more consistent approach. Since Klausner, Jewish scholars have been involved in research on the life of Jesus, and consistently emphasized his Jewishness: partly in polemic to Christian interpretations of Jesus and partly in polemic against the Christ-dogma of the Church. Not only was Jesus a Jew, he was also strictly observant of the Law and a pious Jew who never broke the Torah nor taught his disciples to do so. This Jewishness of Jesus and his positive relation to the Torah have been the basic condition for what in recent years has been called the Jewish "Bringing-Home" of Jesus (Die Heimholung Jesu). For one of the modern representatives of this Heimholung, *Prof. David Flusser*, the mentioned

[12]Quoted according to the German translation in *Kirche und Synagoge 1, pp.* 121f.

[13] The history of Jewish research on Jesus from the pioneer Joseph Salvador (1838) has been written by G. Lindeskog, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum,* 1938/Darmstadt 1973.

condition functions as a simple historical criterion in his research on the Gospels: for him those elements of the Gospels which contradict Jewish observances of the Law, do not have their origin in the life or the teaching of Jesus. *Pinchas Lapide* has become a very capable spokesman for this trend in Jewish scholarship. In recent years he has published a number of books in a tempo which has been faster than most people manage to read them, and he has frequently appeared in public discussions and events both in Central Europe and in the Scandinavian countries. Judging from the high frequency in the publication of books from the hand of Lapide, it would be tempting to regard him more as a popular writer than a scholar with solid basis for his many historical contentions and statements. However, there is reason to take Lapide seriously, as also many leading German theologians have done by engaging themselves in dialogue with him **{22}** and by letting dialogue reports be printed. Lapide is not only a master of communication and formulations, he is not only to a large extent a typical representative for new trends in the Jewish interpretation of Jesus,[14] – he is first of all interesting because he so strikingly demonstrates that also the Jewish counterpart does not remain unmoved when the dialogue develops with great intensity over the years.

In the earliest books of Lapide it was only Jesus himself who was the object for the "Heimholung". With regard to the disciples of Jesus and the Gospel writers, Lapide expressed a clearly negative attitude, – not to speak about the attitude towards Paul, who was regarded as the one who uprooted Christianity from its Jewish mother soil and planted it into a new Greek context.[15] This has been and still is the dominating understanding of Paul within the Jewish scholarly tradition. However, Lapide's "Heimholung" of Jesus has become more and more comprehensive, and it seems that there is a certain dynamic in this program: the more within the New Testament which can be shown to be rooted in Jewish tradition, thoughts and reality, the less is there within the New Testament which becomes objectionable from the Jewish side.

It is particularly in two areas that Lapide has extended his original program of "Heimholung": in 1977 Lapide published his book *"Resurrection, A Jewish Faith Experience"* (Auferstehung, ein jüdisches Glaubenserlebnis). With this book Lapide wanted to show that it is possible to accept the resurrection of Jesus from the dead both from the point of view of a Jewish understanding of reality as well as with regard to the basic dogmas of Judaism. With different words: although one accepts that Jesus really was resurrected from the dead, one is therefore not obliged to become a Christian; also Judaism has a "place" for a resurrected Jesus who has brought knowledge about the God of the Bible to the ends of the earth through the church of the Gentiles. Lapide may here point to Maimonides for support for such an understanding within Jewish tradition itself.

This understanding of the resurrection of Jesus naturally raises a number of questions. Lapide fails e.g. to observe two basic distinctions between the incidents of resurrections as they are told in the Old Testament, in the New Testament and in the rabbinic literature and which are part of our immanent history, and the eschatological resurrection of the dead at the end of times which is the interpretative frame for the resurrection of Jesus in the New Testament. Lazarus, the son of the widow and the others – they died again. But the resurrection of Jesus belongs to a different category, and in the New Testament this can only be understood in connection with his exaltation

[14] Lapide's book *Ist das nicht Josephs Sohn? is* an attempt to write the history of the "Heimholung" from the rabbis of the Middle Ages to modern Israeli school books.
[15] Cf. *Ökumene aus Christen und Juden* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1972); *Der Rabbi aus Nazaret. Wandlungen des jüdischen Jesusbildes* (Trier 1974).

to the right hand of the Father and to his reign in heaven and on earth. It was this element in the preaching of the apostles which became so provocative for the Jewish leaders in the first time of the Jerusalem community, and one has not "brought the resurrection home" before one has taken a stand with regard **{23}** to this question. There is therefore more to talk about. Nevertheless, the book of Lapide on the resurrection is both sympathetic and moving, despite the fact that from a scholarly point of view it repeats opinions and arguments with regard to the resurrection stories and their historicity which for a long time have been dealt with in detail and in depth within Christian research on the New Testament.

Equally interesting is the second area: the attempt of Lapide also to "bring Paul home". However, Lapide is not the first one to attempt a Jewish reading of Paul.[16] In a typical dialogue book from 1974 the American Rabbi M. Wyschogrod gave significant indication with regard to an interpretation of Paul which lets his teaching about justification stand out as rather typical Jewish teaching.[17] Wyschogrod read Paul like this: The Law (Torah) keeps its validity for all circumcised Jews, but for Gentiles, their faith in Jesus is regarded as the "righteousness" which saves them – as Judaism always has taught that righteous Gentiles have a share in the world to come. In this way, Paul's doctrine of justification becomes a slight modification of a particular form of a basic Jewish dogma.

Lapide interprets Paul on the same line, and he sees his missionary endeavor among Gentiles as something typically Jewish. However, Lapide has some difficulties in placing Paul totally within the walls of Rabbinic Judaism. When he comes to Romans 7 and Paul's teaching that sinful man without Christ is lost and without hope, then Lapide presents an eloquent and energetic protest. Also Judaism knows the despair because of the weakness of the flesh and the power of the evil inclination, but the belief that man has been created in the image of God, excludes all resignation. It is true that "man is exposed to sin, but he is not surrendered nor submitted to it. Almost in the same way as Goethe speaks, the Jew here maintains: The one who always toils and strives, him we shall redeem."[18]

On the basis of this head-on collision with Paul in Romans 7 it would be easy also to question other aspects of Lapide's interpretation of Paul. But this does not prevent that a Jewish reading of Paul in a significant way may stimulate Christian Pauline exegesis. Although there are central elements in Paul's theology which Lapide is not able to come to grips with, he also has moving words to say about Paul the Jew – words which were unthinkable in his first books: "What is then this Paul from the point of view of a believing Jew? He is neither an anti-Semite nor anti-Jewish nor an apostate and even less an anti-nomian – expressions which would have caused great anger with Paul himself. In his own way he remained a faithful Jew and a missionary, but more than anything a hero of faith, not of the lukewarm and rational *Pistis* of the philosophers, but of the ardent and glowing Hebrew *Emuna* which is based on his experience of faith and encounter "with

[16] Cf. L. Baeck, *The Faith of Paul,* The Journal of Jewish Studies 3 (1952), pp. 93-110; H: J. Schoeps, *Paulus, Eie Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte* (Tubingen 1959, reprint Darmstadt 1972) and particularly Sh. Ben-Chorin, *Paulus. Der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht* (Munchen 1970).
[17] M. Wyschogrod, *The Law, Jews and Gentiles,* in P. D. Opsahl/M. H. Tanenbaum (eds.), *Speaking of God Today: Jews and Lutherans in Conversation* (Philadelphia 1974), pp. 3-14.
[18] Stuhlmacher/Lapide, *Paulus, p.* 51.

Christ", and which was expressed in his commission, to which he committed himself and his whole life."[19]

Also among Christians the intensive participation in dialogue with Jews leaves deep and lasting impressions. One of the questions which have been much debated within the churches, is whether the Church still has a mandate to evangelize the Jews, with baptism and church planting as a goal. A growing number of churches now publicly answer "no" to this question, but it should also be noted that the evangelical movement that emphasizes the Gospel ministry to Jewish people, has been strengthened and that Hebrew Christian/Messianic Jewish congregations in Israel and in the Diaspora have grown in the last decade. However, the questions here indicated need more in-depth treatment that is possible to give in this article.

In conclusion I would like to mention a rather interesting collection of articles that in a sensitive way demonstrate how the encounter between Jews and Christians in the area of **{24}** Bible research may lead to self-criticism and new beginnings in Christian Bible exposition. In the book "*Biblical Studies: Meeting Grounds of Jews and Christians"* (New York 1980), it is worth noting two articles respectively about the Old and New Testament, by Joseph Blenkinsopp (a Catholic Old Testament scholar) and Leonard S. Kravitz (an American Reform rabbi). In a brief, but impressive survey Blenkinsopp shows how the heritage from Wellhausen has marked both Old Testament and New Testament theology up to this day. For Wellhausen the prophetic movement in the time before the exile was the unsurpassed climax in the history of Israel, "the history which follows has nowhere to go but down". The period after the exile is one long history of decline, with Mishna and Talmud as the products of this decline. In accordance with this understanding the inter-testamental literature was regarded as representing "Spät-Judentum" (Late Judaism) – but what should we then call the Judaism of Talmud? However, this model becomes problematic when one attempts to place the New Testament in the context of the history of Judaism. According to this understanding, the New Testament originates in the midst of deteriorated Judaism. It is then natural to maintain that the New Testament relates antithetical to contemporary Judaism and has direct relationship back to the splendor of the prophetic movement. But such a picture is not historically valid. The New Testament is not antithetical to its "contemporary Judaism." On the contrary, there are many elements in what Wellhausen regarded as symptoms of decline in "late Judaism" which are weaved into the New Testament as positive conditions both for its terminology, its structure of thought, its world view and its message. If one therefore were to implement the program of Wellhausen, one also has to draw radical consequences for New Testament theology: one would then be forced to "de-Judaize" the New Testament in the same way as Marcion did and as e.g. Bultmann has attempted to do in his program of de-mythologization. Blenkinsopp presents an alternative program, and claims that Judaism in all of its relevant history has to be taken seriously. He proposes that the Jewish past and contemporary setting of the New Testament must be integrated in a new attempt to write a Christian theology of the Old Testament. He notes, however, that he has not himself yet worked out the details of such a theological program, but he is convinced that this is a "must" for the future.

With regard to the New Testament L. S. Kravitz presents an interesting view to American and Reform-Jewish reaction to the reading of the New Testament. The atmosphere here is different

[19] Op. cit., pp. 59f.

from Lapide and those Jews who are closer to the Orthodox stream. From one point of view Kravitz has a greater distance to the New Testament, but therefore also a greater openness to read it on its own premises, and to speak sympathetically about the elements in the New Testament that definitely break the frame of traditional Judaism. On this point Reform Judaism gives a different starting point than the more orthodox circles. **{25}** Kravitz clearly sees that from a Jewish point of view the problem with Jesus is not his teaching with regard to details in halachic questions, but the unique authority Jesus claimed for himself in revealing and conveying the will of God. With regard to the resurrection, Kravitz makes no attempt to "bring it home". He emphasizes the classical Jewish arguments for the denial of the Messiahship of Jesus, and says about the resurrection: "To the Jewish reader, the resurrection of Jesus is an element of faith which he does not share. Were he to believe in it, then even as the synoptic gospels and John are structured, he would be brought to a belief in the mission of Jesus and the new meaning of Messiah, the Christ, which is the ultimate message of these books. The crucial question for him is not the person of Jesus but the state of the world. Though the religion founded in Jesus' name has done much to change the world, it remains a place, alas, where nation still lifts up sword against nation and war is yet learned every day. Not only do lambs not lie down with lions, but men and women cannot lie down in peace, and many there are who make them afraid."

Concluding Remarks

It is neither possible nor justifiable to draw a simple conclusion from these glimpses into the recent literature blossoming in the dialogue between Jews and Christians and the renewed concern with history which this dialogue has caused. The dialogue has brought movement in many areas, and it is difficult to predict the results for the long run. But there is one concluding remark 1 would like to emphasize, and I hope that the reader already has sensed this: it is the very basic and fundamental questions in our Christian faith which are brought into focus again in our encounter with living Judaism. When a theological tradition for a long period of time has been mainly talking to itself, it is inevitable that a high degree of sophistication and subtleness develops. In this respect the encounter between our theological traditions and living Judaism could become a very healthy cure.

Books Surveyed

Awerbuch, M.; *Christlich jüdische Begenung im Zeitalter der Frühscholastik* (Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog 8), Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Munchen 1980.

Berger, D; *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: – A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus with an introduction, translation, and commentary* (Judaica, Texts and Translation 4), The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia 5739-1979.

Boadt, L. / Croner, H. / Klenicki, L. (eds.); *Biblical Studies: Meeting Grounds of Jews and Christians* (Studies in Judaism and Christianity), Paulist Press, New York 1980.

Butterweck, A.; *Jakobs Ringkampf am Jabbok. Gen. 32,4ff in der jüdischen Tradition bis zum Frühmittelalter* (Judentum und Umwelt 3), Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main/Bern 1981.

Lapide, P.; *Ist das nicht Josephs Sohn? Jesus im heutigen Judentum,* Calwer Verlag / Kösel-Verlag, Stuttgart/München 1976.

Lapide, P.; *Jesus im Widerstreit. Ein jüdisch-christlicher Dialog*, Calwer Verlag/KöselVerlag, Stuttgart/München 1976.

Lapide, P.; *Auferstehung. Ein jüdisches Glaubenserlebnis*, Calwer Verlag/Kösel-Verlag, Stuttgart/München 1978.

Lapide, P. and Stuhlmacher, P.; *Paulus, Rabbi und Apostel. Ein jüdisch-christlicher Dialog,* Calwer Verlag/Kösel-Verlag, Stuttgart/München 1981.

{26}

Lauer, S. (Hg.); *Kritik und Gegenkritik im Christentum und Judentum* (Judaica et Christiana 3), Verlag Peter Lang, Bern/Frankfurt am Main/Las Vegas 1981.

Maier, J.; *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung* (Ertrage der Forschung 82), Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1978.

Maier, J.; *Jüdische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum in der Antike* (Erträge der Forschung 177), Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1982.

Mutius, H.-G. von; *Die christlich jüdische Zwangsdisputation zu Barcelona nach dem hebraischen Protokoll des Moses Nachmanides* (Judentum und Umwelt 5), Verlag Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main/Bern 1982.

Stemberger, G.; *Die römische Herrschaft im Urteil der Juden* (Ertrage der Forschung 195), Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 1983.

{28} The Use of the Tanach in the Gospel According to Matthew

Statement by Walter Riggans

Walter Riggans is a staff member of the Israel Trust of the Anglican Church and Director of the Immanuel House Study Center, Tel Aviv.

Editor's Note

The origin of this paper lies in a series of UCCI theological seminars given over two years to lay believers and the general public in Israel. The format is therefore simple with a minimum of technical language and footnotes. It is an attempt at summarizing the consensus about Matthew in his day and age, and at pointing in the right direction for a proper understanding of his hermeneutic.

Introduction

At the outset, let me confess my conservatism with regards to three matters:

a. I believe Matthew was a Jewish believer writing primarily to Jewish believers.

b. I take the Antioch area to be the geo-political focus of the Gospel.

c. I date the Gospel around 85 AD.

In reaction to Marcion's belief that Christianity was a new and spiritual religion vis-a-vis the religion of the Jews, the early church asserted for itself the canonicity of the Tanach, and saw itself as historically and theologically based upon the Tanach and the Jewish people. Matthew speaks powerfully to that issue, and so stands linking the two Testaments. At the same time, there is no narrow sectarian Jewish-Christian feel about Matthew; rather, he knows of and endorses the move out to all nations with the Gospel. One might look at Mat. 2:1ff.; 4:16-17; 8:5-13; 12:18-21; 13:47 ff.; 15:22-28; 21:33-34; 22:1-14; 24:14; 26:13; 28:18 f. Matthew knows the need to build the Church on what God has begun with Israel, as one work of God, and therefore he stresses the historical, theological and moral teaching of the Tanach. Yet he also knows the need to include all the nations in this one work of God. And so we are not surprised to find his gospel linking the two Testaments.

{29} The Church saw in the Gospel according to Matthew the fullest presentation of the answers to its needs, and it was the most quoted book in the first centuries. Why? We shall now investigate this question, and I hope to present a series of contexts in which to understand better the use Matthew makes of the Tanach. The contexts will overlap and feed one another.

Context One: Against the Rabbinic Polemic

A sense of purpose pervades Matthew's gospel. It is not enough for him to suppose that Jesus' life and teaching can be drawn out from the mold that is perfectly fashioned in the Tanach. He maintains that "something entirely new has arisen which brings Scripture to a fullness previously unrealized", as expressed by the Jewish scholar Samuel Sandmel.[20] Matthew wrote his gospel some fifty years after Jesus' ascension, and some fifteen years after the destruction of the Temple. By this time the Jewish leaders who were inspired to regroup around the Torah in rebuilding their faith and people had indeed begun a reconstruction campaign led by R Yochanan ben Zakkai at Yavne. After the 66-70 war, these Yavne scholars attempted also to purge Judaism of any type of apocalyptic stress and so on both counts there was bound to be confrontation with the followers of Jesus. The rabbis also began to speak of the fulfillment of what was written in the Tanach, but as we know, in their view the term "to fulfill" really meant to bring out in one's life what is perfectly fashioned in the principles of Scriptures. That is to say that any time one keeps a command, then one has fulfilled that command. However, according to Matthew, the real context is this, that Jesus came to complete what was incomplete, to realize what was unrealized, and what was unrealizable until he came. He did not come to take part – even in a marvelous way – in something that was already complete and perfect. In short, Jesus came to do something unique, and he is unique.

For the rabbis there was the ideal (the Torah) and our attempts to fulfill it, the attempts being but poor shadows of the glory of the ideal. For Matthew, however, there were shadows in Israel and in the Tanach, and Jesus provided the substance and the Light. Matthew thus claims that the true path of life, love and righteousness is not leading to nor coming from Yavne, but to and from Jesus.

Context Two: Antinomianism

A fundamental issue was exploding within the Church, namely, how to understand the relationship between law and spirit. Does the believer's freedom in the spirit mean that he is now under no form of controlled life-style at all? Is everything dependent on his own discretion and feeling? Or is there a law of behavior pertaining to all believers, governing their morality and their relationship to authorities over them? **{30}** This became a dilemma in the life of the Church with some saying any form of prescribed life-style was a hindrance to and even an enemy of growth in the Spirit of God. Matthew does not want to revalidate the Torah, as understood in rabbinic circles, but neither will he submit to those who claim to be without legal/moral restraint. Instead, he says the true context is a new frame of reference for the Torah after a New Exodus under a New Moses. He presents his material to show a *prescribed* basis under the God of grace for the Church's way of life which fulfills the Torah given under the first Covenant. And we are *inspired* by Jesus' life and authority. Jesus enables us to live a life more radically in conformity with the Torah of God, understanding God's intentions and goals. For instance, we see Jesus teaching that God condescended to allow for fallen human nature in the Torah of Moses, but that we can now follow the true goal of God (Matt. 19:2-9; Gen. l-2; Deut. 24:1-4). The righteousness demanded by Jesus is fundamentally a commitment to the principle of the Kingdom of God upon

[20] S. Sandmel, *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*, Cincinatti 1957.

which the Torah was based. It is neither Moses nor the Torah which was at odds with God's will, but rather the people of Israel. Jesus preaches the Kingdom, and from that the Torah takes its authority and context. The Torah is not an end in itself, and when it becomes so, and when people spend their energies in minutiae, then they are actually "evading commitment to God through their religious pursuits." (Margaret Pamment)

This demands a righteousness exceeding that of the Scribes and Pharisees, and it is significant that only Matthew records this word of Jesus (5:20). This New Torah is, of course, a fulfilling of the Old, and catches it up into something more far-reaching than seen before. It is not a rejection of the Torah of Moses. It is so radical in its demands (not only no adultery, but no lust, etc.) that it is quite impractical without the grace of Jesus at work in our lives. It is not legally enforceable, since you cannot prove lust or murder in a man's heart, let alone legislate for degree of lust or other sins of the heart. But this is of concern only to the rabbinic approach that Matthew is confronting. Matthew is not interested in *Halachah,* in the way the Yavne school was. But he is concerned for the Torah, as mediated by Jesus, that we might obey God in our lives and relationships. Jesus makes it clear what God wants from us. Jesus sets his authority not against the Torah as such, but against certain interpretations and applications, and he claims the true interpretation. No one who followed Jesus' teaching as seen, e.g., in Matt. 5, would have found himself outside of the Torah community.

Paul also, by the way of an aside, speaks of being under the Torah of the Messiah (1 Cor. 9:21; Gal. 6:2), and the choice of vocabulary is significant. It is known that at Qumran the Messiah was seen as "God's Torah", and his coming was seen as a "new Exodus" (1 Q Is. a 51:4,7; 26:8). This type of thinking and vocabulary was to be found among Jewish **{31}** apocalyptic groups. In the mid-second century AD we find the Shepherd of Hermas in a Christian milieu calling Jesus the "Torah of God" (Sim. VIII, 3:2). Even Justin Martyr, also in the mid-second century, calls Jesus "another Torah" and "the true eternal and final Torah" (Dial. II: 2:4; 24:1; 43:1; 51:3; etc.). From the turn of the third century comes Clement of Alexandria and says that in the early work, "The Preaching of Peter," Jesus is called "Torah and Word" (Strom. I. 19; II 15; Ecl. Proph. 58). Matthew is at the heart of the spread of this movement of interpretation.

Context Three: Scripture as Inspiration for Life-Style

How then does Matthew understand and use the Tanach to teach his readers? How should they use it in their lives? John Goldingay has differentiated four aspects of the material of the Tanach[21]:

a. *The Tanach has explicit commands*. Does Matthew look to these as his basis in presenting a prescribed way of life in Jesus?

b. *The Tanach has narrative portions*. These contain examples of behavior, good and bad. Stories can be as powerful in inspiring conduct as precepts (cf. Jesus' use of parables). Is this Matthew's basic approach?

[21] J. Goldingay, "The Old Testament and Christian Faith: Jesus and the Old Testament in Matthew 1-5," *Themelios* 8. 1 (Sept. 1982) 4-10; 8. 2 (Jan. 1983) 5-12

c. *The Tanach has prophetic principles.* By this we mean justice, holiness, faithfulness, mercy, etc. Does Matthew basically appeal to these?

d. *The Tanach has an overall view of reality.* Perhaps then Matthew sees that the best way to use the Tanach is as the source of true perspectives on life, not as directly controlling our lives?

The first of Goldingay's aspects refers to *Halachah,* the legal discussions and decisions of the rabbis which are found in the Mishna and Gemara of the Talmud and in other rabbinic literature. The other three would most easily come under the heading *Haggadah,* the rabbinic story-telling which is found in Midrash material in Jewish exegesis. I believe Matthew focuses on the last three, and instead of the pairing of Halachah/Haggadah, he understands the true pairing to be Jesus/Haggadah, or Jesus/Tanach. Let us not forget that in Jewish tradition also, Haggadah is authoritative, albeit next to Halachah. Thus, it is not said that the Tanach has no authority, but it is next to Jesus. As W. D. Davies said, "The New Testament is not dominated by the Old. It is the Gospel itself that provides the pattern for the understanding of the Old: the New Testament interprets the Old in the light of Christ. It does not merely interpret Christ in the light of the Old Testament."

Haggadah gives motivations, inspiration and foundation to Halachah in Jewish traditions, and Matthew would be happy with this definition. In his view, what is deficient about the Torah is not that it implies petty obedience to petty rules, nor that it avoids the really important issues in life, nor that it encourages showy religion, nor that it is based on a system of trying to score points from God. These are all anti-Semitic caricatures which must be condemned as such. No, the deficiency is that, to use a phrase of E. P. Sanders, "it is not worth anything in comparison with being in Christ." For Matthew, the Tanach is full of offers to us from God's self-giving love, and full of demands made upon us by God, but **{32}** none of these is God's final word to us. Jesus is God's final word, His total word. Jesus is God's complete offer to us and demand from us. He fulfills all the relational patterns of the Tanach.

Jesus' words are therefore gracious but also prescriptive. The Sermon on the Mount (i.e. the New Torah) is not the description of a disciple, but rather the prescription for a disciple. The will of God is mediated to us through Jesus, who therefore fulfills the Torah.

Context Four: Against the Simplistic Solution

This solution says that Jesus came to become the centre of Israel's life, in place of the Torah. But Matthew leaves the Torah in its place of honor, invaluable for the growth of the people of God. Matthew does not remove the Torah from the heart of Israel's life, because it never was at the heart. The Lord God Himself was always at the heart! We might look, e.g. at the passage Ex. 20:2-17, where the important thing, as stressed by the rabbinic commentaries themselves, is to note that before the Ten Words are given, the Lord presents Himself as Israel's Redeemer who has saved her and given her life, and who therefore has the right to His claim on her. The Torah

derives its authority from the Kingdom of God, the very rule of God in the universe. First the indicative, the God who reveals Himself as the Lord, and then the imperative.[22]

So when Matthew embraced Jesus as Messiah and Lord, he embraced what had always been the centre of Israel's life. We will better understand Matthew's presentation of Jesus as the New Torah when we better understand the meaning of Torah, a term pregnant with meaning. It is invariably translated as "Law" in English. But, when Orthodox Jewish scholars translate it in this way they mean something other than that which generally comes into the Gentile mind. In the Church it has been translated as "Law" as much as a convenient piece of subtle propaganda as an attempt at a dynamic translation. It lends itself to the caricature of pious Jews suffering intolerably from the impersonal burden of the Law.

There have been attempts at new translations in recent years. At this point we shall look at some one-word equivalents for use in translation work and conversation, rather than at paragraph-long definitions. Some prefer the term "Revelation," but this is too general. It already has a distinct place in the theological vocabulary. Other prefer "Teaching," and of **{33}** course the Hebrew form for teacher is Moreh, which is linked to the word Torah. Yet this strikes me as also too general. The term "instruction" is closer to the mark, since it carries a sense of authority with it.

My own suggestion for a translation of "Torah" into English is "Direction." I base this on the etymology of the root and on a contextual analysis of passages in the Tanach and rabbinic writings. The entire Tanach and in particular the Pentateuch reveals God's "Direction" for our life. The prophets are constantly calling us back or "directing" us back to it. This term carries a sense of authority (when my boss directs me to do something, I do it), and a sense of care (manufacturers put Directions on their products so that we get the best out of them).

God directs us to obey His will and to pattern ourselves after His will, and gives us directions for life even when we abandon Him. It also has a forward-pointing connotation which is appropriate, since Torah is all along pointing to Jesus who is the new Torah, the True Direction. He is the Way, the Truth and the Life, and this quote from John's Gospel is in tune with the theology of Matthew.

Context Five: Spirit, Law and Authority

Matthew even arranges his material to show that Jesus is to be approached with the same awe with which one would approach Moses, the great prophet and teacher. Therefore he arranges the teaching of Jesus into five sections, paralleling the five authoritative books of Moses. Each section ends with a chosen formula, which is found at 7:28; 12:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1.

It is even possible, as M. D. Goulder insists[4], that these five blocks of teaching correspond intentionally with the themes of the festival year.

- *Pentecost* is covered by the Sermon on the Mount (sic) which opens reminiscent of Pss. 1 and 119, part of the readings for the feast and whose central theme is the fulfillment of the Torah.

---

[22] W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*, Berkley-Los Angeles-London 1974. Note: Since the footnote number is missing in the original text, we have arbitrarily inserted it at the end of this paragraph.

[4] M. D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, London 1974.

- *New Year* with its theme of repentance has the prophetic reading (haphtorah) from Is. 35, which is covered in the answer of Jesus to John the Baptist's question in Matt. 11. Matt. 10 and 11 have further the disciples sent out to preach the Kingdom of Heaven, and Jesus reproaching lack of repentance.

- *The Day of Atonement* has Jonah for the *haphtorah,* and Matt. 12 is about the unforgivable sin, and the one greater than Jonah.

- *Sukkot* is covered by Mt. 12 and the harvest parables. It breaks into seven units with an eighth, closing paragraph parallel.

- *Hannukkah* with its remembrance of the dedication of the Temple in 164 BC is covered by Matt. 17-19 where we have the transfiguration and the founding of the Church on Peter.

- *Passover* is dealt with in Matt. 23-25, with its many themes and references.

{34} The life and teaching of Jesus have all of God's own authority. The believers were being taught what it meant to be a Messianic, New Age believer with a biblical foundation and orientation. In this context of Jesus' authority we should see Matt. 7:28 f. This does not mean that Jesus had a forceful and assured personality whereas the Scribes and Pharisees faltered and staggered undecidedly. On the contrary, they were confident and dogmatic, seeing themselves as the guardians of the infallible revelation of God. No, it means that Jesus taught with the "assurance of first-hand knowledge"[5].

Jesus' spirit is not in competition with being Torah/Direction for life. He is free to love and serve his Father, and free to say no to the temptations of the world. He freely served the authorities under his Father, and e.g., paid the temple tax (Matt. 17:24). Significantly again, only Matthew records this incident.

Where Jesus is, the Torah is, in the sense of God's manifest will and power. If we compare this saying of Jesus about himself in Matt. 18:20 with rabbinic sayings about the Torah, it looks as if Matthew is saying that Jesus is the very Shekhinah (Presence) of God, and the very Torah too.[23] It is the Scribes who are criticized in Matthew for rationalizing the Torah, and for living lives with a gap between keeping the letters of their laws but fighting against their spirit (7:15-20;15:1-20; 23). Jesus combines the prescribed life-style with the spirit of love, and with the authority of God (5:7; 9:12 f; 12:1-8; 18:21-35; 25:31-46).

Context Six: Foundation and Background

There is a world of difference between the words *foundation* and *background.* If the Tanach is only background for the New Testament, then it is dispensable, a luxury, or an option for the learned in order to make some aspects of the gospel more interesting. This is the approach of too many preachers. But if the Tanach is the foundation of the New Testament, then it is indispensable and part of the whole truth.

---

[5] T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge 1931

[6] Cf. P. Avot 3, 2 and Avot de R. Natan B, ch. 34. Note: The footnote number is missing in the original text.

For Matthew, the Tanach is without question foundational. Had Matthew really a cavalier attitude to the Tanach as some say from the way he presents the so-called "antitheses" of 5:21-48, then he would not have been at such pains to show Jesus' fulfillment of it. It would have been easier to bypass the Tanach altogether, as some in the early Church wanted to.

Something that may not have been fully appreciated is the fact that the very concept of fulfillment, a concept found consistently in Matthew, implies foundational value in the first event or teaching, a value which is respected and built upon the anti-type, or the fulfillment. In short, there is something basic and true which needs to be fulfilled, and that cannot be side-stepped nor belittled. In other words, Matthew reflects Jesus' own respect for the authority of the Tanach (Matt. 5:17-20). He underscores the divine quality of the Torah, and calls Israel back to the fundamentals of their Torah.

{35} Context Seven: The Concept of Fulfillment

The term which has been used most in this paper is that of "fulfillment." In what way is it true to say, as Matthew does repeatedly, that the Tanach is fulfilled in Jesus' life and ministry? Matthew has more quotes (60 from 25 books) and more allusions (76) to the Tanach than any other book in the New Testament. It is very important for him to show Jesus and the events of his life as, to coin phrase, "fully shadowed" within the text of the Tanach.

In Matt. 2:13-15, within the context of the visit of the Magi, and the massacre of the children, comes the departure of Jesus' family to Egypt, and their return after the death of Herod. Matthew claims this as fulfilling Hosea 11:1, a conclusion that has embarrassed the Church ever since. How could he use the Tanach in this way? Hosea 11:1 is not prediction, but merely a statement of fact, referring to the Exodus from Egypt, a fact already in Hosea's past. Thus it is a post-diction, not a pre-diction. Matthew is often accused by westerners of ignoring original contexts and reading into the Tanach, i.e. of eisegesis.

Let us look into this last context and thereby try to understand Matthew's use of the Tanach. The question of Matthew's faithfulness to the Tanach must be settled with respect to the canons of interpretation of Palestinian Judaism of his day, not to the canons of interpretation of the modern west. In Matthew's day the rabbis were already involved in the process of defining correct rules for exegesis, and in the Talmud (Hul. 6a; Erub. 23b; Yeb. 24a) we see debates on this. There were two basic approaches to be sanctioned, one called *Peshat,* a literal, historical interpretation, and one called *Midrash,* from the root darash , to seek, to resort, to interpret. This latter became the characteristic mode of rabbinic Judaism, and was regarded as a faithful approach to the text of the Tanach, drawing out its hidden meanings as well as, over and above, its plain meaning.

Midrashic exegesis begins from a text and moves out from it, although still anchored in it – however tenuously. The meaning is extended and its implications drawn out with every possible association of ideas. Examples may be found in a multitude of books, or in encyclopedias under the heading "Midrash". Midrashic exegesis had two basic tasks:

a. To edify the community; build it up morally; exhort it.

b. To reconcile interpretations and theological outlooks as they developed. Matthew fits in well here, as a midrashic scribe in the Kingdom of Heaven. We see rabbinic methods of exegesis in his gospel[24]:

> a. *Qal va Homer,* the argument from the lesser important to the more important: Matt. 7:11; 12:12;
>
> b. *Av ve Toldot,* the basic principle and its corollaries: Matt. 5:17-20; 5:21-48; 6:1, 2-18;
>
> c. *Klal,* a generalizing principle based on specifics: Matt. 7:12; 22:34-40;
>
> d. *Glossing*, an explanation or interpretation of a text by the addition of words either in the text or in the margin: c.f. Mk. 2:23-28 with Matt. 12:1-8.

Matthew knows the Septuagint (e.g. 2:23-24; 21:16) and the Targums well (e.g. 26:52 and the Targum on Is. 50:11). He conflates different texts (e.g. 21:5 from Is. 62:11 in the LXX and Zech. 9:9) and he adds interpretations into the text (e.g. Mic. 5:1 where Matthew adds "by no means"). All these matters mentioned in the above few paragraphs show Matthew to be at home in his own time and place, and being faithful to received canons of interpretation.

{36} But we must also look further. At Qumran there was developed another mode of interpretation known as *Pesher,* implying a special wisdom to understand the true meaning. At Qumran the word is used of supernatural wisdom, or insight, given by God to interpret divine mysteries, not just ordinary problems. The word for this mystery is *Raz,* and not until the mystery and the interpretation come together is God's will communicated. The Qumran commentary on Hab. 2:1f reads:

> *"God commanded Habakkuk to write the things that were coming upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the epoch He did not make known to him. And as for the words, so HE MAY RUN WHO READS IT; their interpretation* (pesher) *concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries* (razim) *of the words of His servants the prophets."*
>
> (1 QP Hab. VII, 1-5)

Might we not have here something of the mind-set of Matthew vis-a-vis Jesus, albeit that for Matthew Jesus was even more than the Teacher of Righteousness was for the Qumran community? We can push the parallel too far between Matthew's approach to the Tanach and the full-blooded *Pesher* approach, because there are differences[8], but the general context is very important for us to grasp. Matthew interprets the Tanach in ways that were perfectly acceptable to his readers *and his critics,* the difference being that his critics would use the same methods to prove other things.

---

[7] For the following and other rabbinic modes, see H. L. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, New York 1969, pp. 93-98. Note: The footnote number is missing in the original text.

[8] F.F. Bruce, B*iblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts,* London 1960; particularly pp. 75 ff

Let me return to the present. In my reading and conversations I have found these models of "fulfillment" in use by believers:

a. *Something is predicted and later on that something happens. The prediction has been fulfilled.*

b. *Some need is presented and then that need is met* (e.g. someone fulfilling the requirements of a job.)

c. *An outline is given and then it is filled out,* (or a skeleton is fleshed out).

I think most believers work with the first model. Although there are predictions in the Bible, I do not believe that this was the primary concern of Matthew, nor the New Testament as a whole. Matthew seems to be working with the latter two models in his midrashic interpretation of the Tanach. This is common to the basic uses of the term "fulfill" in the New Testament (e.g. Mt. 13:48; Lk 2:40; 3:5; Jn. 12:3; even Mt. 23:32; 2 Thess. 1:11).

In essence, prophecy is discerning and speaking out the will of God, and Jesus realizes in himself this will of God completely; therefore he fulfils the Torah and the Prophets. F. F. Bruce puts it well:

"Here, then is the key to that distinctive interpretation of the Old Testament which we find fulfilled in *the ancient promises, and in fulfilling them he has given them a new meaning in which their original meaning is not set aside but caught up into something more comprehensive and far-reaching than was foreseen before He came. "*[9]

Therefore when Jesus says that he has come to fulfill the Torah (Mat. 5:17-20), he is saying that he has come to meet all the needs expected of Israel. He will be the True Son of God, living a life of total love and faith and obedience to the Father. He will fully present and represent God to the nations. *Jesus* fleshes out the skeleton of Israel into the full beauty, design, strength, and purpose of God's eternal will. In short, he fulfills Israel and the Tanach by filling them to the full.

{37} Therefore when Matthew speaks of Hos. 11:1, he does *not* mean that it was a prediction. Let us look at the context of Hos. ll and see if the "meeting needs" model of fulfillment meets the needs of that passage. The whole context concerns the gracious and eternal love of the Father to Israel, but also Israel's inability to respond to the way that God intends. We see the pattern clearly in verses 1-3. So we find the sorrow of the Father who knows that he must come in judgment (v. 5). In v. 7 we see the judgment. Yet in v. 8 the love of God is shown again for Israel in spite of her lack of love and commitment. There is a desperate need for a True Israel to come and be what Israel is meant to be, and Jesus does come to fulfill that need. To pass on to the third model of fulfillment mentioned above, Jesus comes and fleshes out, or fills to the full, the outline given by Israel. Jesus relives and reverses Israel's disobedience in the wilderness.

Matthew parallels Jesus' early life with that of Israel, and even a casual glance at the Synoptics shows that Matthew's presentation in the first half of his work varies significantly from the arrangements of Mark and Luke. Jesus is presented as the embodiment of Israel. Another example

[9] F.F. Bruce, ibid. p. 88.

of this midrashic approach is in Matt. 4:1-11. The tempter works from passages or themes from the Tanach, and Jesus answers with quotations from the Tanach, all of which come from Deut. 6-8. There we see God allowing his "son" Israel to wander 40 years in the wilderness to discipline him, and in Matthew we see Jesus tested in the wilderness 40 days and proving to be triumphant.

Isn't this the meaning of "fulfill" – to fill to the full? Matthew's context is a relational one, not a predictive one, and he sees Jesus as fulfilling the "relational patterns" (C.F.D. Moule). He is the one substance and light to the shadows of the Tanach and Israel's life.

Conclusion

How to begin to draw these contexts together? As I said in the introduction, they flow into one another and build up into a whole picture. Let me suggest a few summary statements:

1. *Matthew knows that there is continuity and yet also discontinuity.* He has no sympathy with those who say there is only discontinuity, and that we can do without the Tanach altogether. But he also disagrees with those who overstress the continuity, *because Jesus is not predictable.* He does not simply play out a role given without ambiguity in the Tanach, and which was in principle quite predictable. He is unique, and has the freedom of true uniqueness.

2. *Matthew knows that the Tanach is the foundation of the life and teaching of Jesus,* although Jesus is the decisive factor in the whole plan and word of God.

3. *Matthew asserts that Jesus has fulfilled the Tanach.* He is fully shadowed there, and meets the needs of Israel from God and the demands of God from Israel. He fills out the attempts of Israel in his own life of love and faith and obedience.

{38}

4. *Matthew asserts that life with Jesus in the freedom of the Spirit still has a prescribed lifestyle;* Jesus is now in him and teaches the true Direction of God.

5. *Matthew's gospel is a pastoral, not an evangelical document* That is to say, that although it can be used in our sharing of the Gospel with the world, its primary purpose for Matthew was to build up the Church, and in particular Jewish believers.

It is a didactive, exhortatory enterprise. Matthew even makes great use of the pedagogical device of combining teachings in sets rather than simply leaving them on their own. This is also common in rabbinic writings.[10] The masses of references to, and quotations from, the Tanach were not intended to be self-evident proof that Jesus must be who he says he is, since he unambiguously fulfills all the texts, but rather to assure the Church in the face of growing criticism from the re-grouping scribal parties that its vision of Jesus was fully consonant with the revelation of God and His Direction given in the Scriptures.

[10] Examples are numerous: two – 8:28; 9:27; 10:30; 26:60; three – 4:1-11; 6:1-18; 8:1-15; 10:26, 28, 31; 22:15-40; 26:39-44; seven – 12:45; 18:21-22; 22:25; 23:13-30. This was not, I think, to help evangelists, but catechists and pastors.

I trust that this is our experience also. We can bless God for inspiring Matthew to so teach us, and we can bless the early Church for placing Matthew's gospel at the interface of the two Testaments.

{39} Response

by Scott A. Swanson

Scott A. Swanson, a graduate from Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California, and from Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, is presently doing studies in the Department of Ancient Semitic Languages at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

Rev. Riggans has given a fine presentation of Matthew's use of the Tanach which shows a special concern that this illumine the Christian's proper relationship to the Tanach. Such a task necessarily involves many complex issues about which vigorous debate is raging among Matthean specialists. This makes the important work of synthesis and summary a difficult undertaking of which I hesitate to be critical. However, while I agree with Riggans on many points and in terms of the overall thrust of his articles, I feel there are some problems which should not go unchallenged. The following remarks are thus offered in the spirit of an open-ended discussion. Regarding introductory matters, it is to be noted that Riggans takes up W. D. Davies' thesis that Matthew is a response to Yavne Judaism. The case for the later dating which this requires (c. 85 C.E.) is not at all unambiguous, and there are good arguments to be made for a pre-70 C.E. date.[26] Furthermore, it is not necessary to hang Matthew's theology on a hypothetical reconstruction of his church and its foes. So it is commonly assumed that Matthew is waging a battle on two fronts: against a rabbinic polemic (tending towards legalism) on the one side, and against an antinomian reaction with his church on the other. It is true that Matthew's particular concerns may be reflected in his distinctive emphases. Nevertheless, Jesus' own confrontation with the Pharisees as represented in the text can be regarded as authentic and therefore determinative,[27] and we might expect him to anticipate an antinomian misunderstanding among his followers. In any case the message of Matthew is clear enough and too important to make it depend on a questionable theoretical framework.

We may distinguish two issues combined in our topics. The first is the question of how Matthew views Jesus' life and mission as the fulfillment of the Tanach. **{40}** The second is how he presents Jesus and Jesus' teaching specifically in relationship to the law, or what is the role of the law in the believer's life. The theological priority belongs to the first of these, so we will treat them in that order, therefore taking up the second half of Riggans' paper first. The matter of the alleged parallel with so-called "midrashic" modes of interpretation in Matthew's use of the Tanach is a complex one. It is unfortunate that Riggans has merely transmitted one point of view, giving the impression that the issue could be characterized so straightforwardly. In fact I believe that fundamental errors in the claim are being increasingly demonstrated.

Midrash is a distinct literary genre within rabbinic Judaism and it is not clearly established before the fourth century (C.E.). Prior to that time, one may identify various types of exegetical or

---

[26] See, for example, D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 3rd ed. (London: Tyndale, 1970), pp. 45-46; J. A. T. Robinson, *Reading the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1976), pp. 13-30, 86-117; R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), pp. 599-609.

[27] The oft-made claim that Matthew's references to the Jewish leaders involve anachronisms is unwarranted. D. A. Carson, "The Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Reappraisal, "*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25/2 (June 1982), pp. 161-174.

interpretative procedures throughout the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, Targums, and Qumran literature, as well as the NT, which have been described as "midrashic". But there is no general agreement as to what constitutes the method, indeed, whether it is properly a collection of techniques at all, or rather a certain religious orientation to the text.

The issue here, however, is not a terminological one. Rather, it is specifically what kind of interpretative activity is being referred to, and whether or not it may be found in the NT text. Thus, it is essential to distinguish the various aspects of the interpretative process in order to demonstrate a legitimate parallel.[28]

In the first place, one may identify the purely formal and structural level. Here one finds frequent agreement between the NT and a wide spectrum of the contemporary literature on conventional patterns for Tanach citation. These include a formal looseness of quotation or allusion which only contrasts to modern practice (largely an extension of legal concerns such as copyright), and raises no problems of legitimacy.

Riggans also refers to *middoth,* the rabbinic rules of interpretation, such as the *qal vahomer.* From the original 7 attributed to Hillel, to the later 32, these rabbinic lists have sometimes been misunderstood as codifying the accepted and established techniques of rabbinic exegesis. Most of them, however, are not unique to midrash, and the 7 are in fact paralleled in Hellenistic Greek rhetoric.[29] Nor are they intended to codify the entire repertoire of rabbinic exegesis, which often proceeded *ad hoc,* justifying procedures as the need arose.

The distinctive character of midrash is better identified in terms of what D. Moo labels "appropriation techniques."[30] These include the various means by which Scriptures may be handled in order to respond to current questions, concerns, or situations. As Riggans accurately notes, midrash could go beyond the *peshat,* or natural meaning (which is preserved in "direct" appropriation), by employing various appropriation devices to modify or in some way alter what appeared the straight forward meaning.

Some of the *middoth* are principles of logical deduction that help determine the *peshat.* Others validate inferences from types of verbal association which would be viewed as going beyond this. But even some of these interpretive moves, it is important to note, would not *necessarily* transgress the context and authorial intent, (where, that is, literary techniques such as word-play have been employed by the author himself). The point is that the rabbinic interpreter was not bound by the limitations of the text on its own terms. He saw his sacred task rather to draw out of the "closed sign system" of the Scripture by often ingenious devices ever new meanings for the ongoing life of the community. It has not been proven that Matthew had any recourse to such an approach.

---

[28] A most helpful recent work which advances the discussion of this analysis and comparison of the use of the OT is Douglas J. Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Almond Press, 1983). See also E. Earle Ellis, "How the NT uses the Old," in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods,* ed. 1. Howard Marshall (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 199-219.

[29] See Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* (Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 109-115, and the reference cited there.

[30] D. Moo, *The OT in the Gospel Passion Narratives*, pp. 25-30.

{41} Why then should Matthew's hermeneutic be different and unique? The answer is found in terms of the basic underlying perspective and presuppositions (Ellis) or "hermeneutical axioms" (Moo) of the interpreter. These beliefs are the most determinative of the way the Tanach is used. The key perception for Matthew and the New Testament church was *eschatological:* Jesus had come, and in his person, life and work had fulfilled the Scriptures of the Tanach. Whereas, for rabbinic Judaism the prophecies had not been fulfilled, and the community's identity could not be confirmed by new events which claimed direct appeal to the Tanach. The Tanach itself had to be seen as all-sufficient for defining and directing the community's changing life; thus the focus was on developing more elaborate appropriation techniques.

The *pesher* commentaries of Qumran are frequently claimed to provide a closer parallel than midrash, though they make use of similar appropriation techniques. Here it is the operative hermeneutical axiom which more closely resembles that of the New Testament. There is the claim to the authority of a new revelation, which validates an eschatological conception of history and the community's place in it. Yet the difference is fundamental, and is why *pesher is* not averse to the approach of midrash. The claim of *pesher* is not one of correspondence with the Tanach, one which fits with what could be seen there. Rather, its stance could almost be described as disjunction with the Tanach. Scripture was essentially a vehicle for the "mystery," the understanding of which depended solely on the *pesher* ("interpretation"), not unlike the gnostic sense of gnosis. In sharp contrast, the New Testament use stressed the "perspicuity" of the Tanach's witness to Jesus, "a witness which was clear and (should be) understandable by all in the light of its fulfillment." (cf. Lk. 24:25-26)[31]

W. C. Kaiser observes that the urgent apologetic and evangelistic concerns of the New Testament church would have made departure from its and Jesus' distinctive hermeneutic extremely unlikely.[32] The task was to convince a hostile community that the correspondence claimed between Jesus and the Tanach was real. He fit what was there in the Tanach.

At various points in his paper, Riggans rightly stresses the centrality of the principle of typology to Matthew's eschatological or fulfillment hermeneutic. This operates, together with a conception of corporate existence, to illumine the prophetic meaning of the entire Tanach history, including specific events and personalities.[33] But it is not a meaning overlaid on the Tanach text from a later perspective: Tanach theology itself demonstrates successive stair-like stages of type-antitype development.[34]

Thus, in every case where the Tanach is applied to Jesus by himself or Matthew, either direct prediction or the principle of typology is found. Matthew identifies Jesus as the explicitly promised Messiah and divine deliverer, who also in his own person and history reiterates and fulfills various types. Thus he is the greater Moses, the greater son of David, the representative prophet, and the

---

[31] Ibid, pp. 390-391.
[32] Walter C. Kaiser, *Toward an Exegetical Theology: Biblical Exegesis for Preaching and Teaching*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), p. 56.
[33] See the excellent discussion on typology in Ellis, pp. 210-214; and cf. R H. Gundry, *The Use of the OT in St Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 209-212.
[34] For a brief but rich overview see Leonard Goppelt, *Typos: the Typological Interpretation of the OT in the New,* Transl. D. H. Madvig (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 38-44, note 99.

representative righteous sufferer. And he is "the representative Israelite in whose individual history the history of the whole nation, apart from its sin and apostacy, is recapitulated and anticipated."[35] Thus, the application to him of Hos. 11:1 is not at all "embarrassing" or mysterious.

It appears then, that in Matthew's day there was not one set of interpretive "canons" which could command universal acceptance. Matthew was indeed faithful in his hermeneutic, but to the pattern received from Jesus and the Tanach itself, and not to some autonomous cultural norm. It is ironic that Riggans warns us against presuming to **{42}** impose on Scripture the canons of interpretation of the modern West. It is in fact the "modern" (post-Kantian) West which has long since abandoned the basis for objective hermeneutic. A "new hermeneutic" for which ultimately only the interpreter's horizon can determine "meaning," finds great affinity with systems such as *midrash* and *pesher* which create new meanings for present significance. Faithfulness to Scripture demands that we allow it to judge the basic hermeneutic assumptions of its own day, as well as those which dominate our own.

Riggans next examines the idea of fulfillment, and he is right to urge that the "prediction" model by itself does not provide the sufficient conceptual framework or hermeneutical key for Matthew's use of the Tanach. But does his "meeting-needs-model" succeed? Surely it is true as far as it goes. The fulfillment that Jesus brings certainly and wonderfully meets all of Israel's needs which have been repeatedly demonstrated in the Tanach. But is this all that he fulfills? The mere presence of a need, however desperate, is obviously no guarantee that it will be met.

The Matthean formula is explicit. Repeatedly, as in Mt. 2:15, though often abbreviated, we find "that what is spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled." A need is met, but that is subordinate to the thought here. For Matthew, it is fundamentally always the specific word of God that is fulfilled. It is thus the nature of that word which must determine our concept of fulfillment.

In the first place, it is, after all, crucially predictive. I do not believe that one can underestimate the great importance in the New Testament, and especially for Matthew, of this principle. That a specific historical event can clearly be seen to have been announced by God beforehand in detail, glorifies God's sovereignty before believer and unbeliever alike.

Fulfillment is thus profoundly apologetic. It provides verification, in the sense of irrefutable testimony to the truth of the proclaimed message.[36] Its powerful implications are illustrated, for example, in the strenuous attempts by so much of biblical scholarship to establish a "Deutero-Isaiah" and a Maccabean Daniel, with virtually no more justification than the need to deny the predictive prophecy.

For the believer, moreover, this fulfillment confirms our faith in God's salvific purpose. As W. J. Beecher argued, "The Bible offers very few predictions save in the form of promises or threatenings."[37] Thus, for those who hope in God, predictive fulfillment is essentially inseparable

---

[35] Gundry, p. 210

[36] C. F. D. Moule stresses the importance of this in the entire ancient world, though he goes on to argue that this definition by itself is inadequate. "Fulfillment words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse," *Essays in New Testament Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982),pp. 3-36; see also Michael Green, *Evangelism in the Early Church* (1970, rep. Highland Books, 1984), pp. 95-99.

[37] Quoted in W. C. Kaiser, *Toward an Old Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), p. 263

from promise fulfillment. The principle of typological fulfillment can also be encompassed under this rubric, for God has instilled Israel's very history with promise. What God does for Israel in the type provides the basis for expectation of the greater thing he will do in the antitype.

The other side to the issue of Matthew's use of the Tanach is the question of his attitude to the Law[38]: specifically, what place it has in our lives in relationship to Jesus and his commands. I appreciate Riggans' formulations here, particularly under his "context two." Nevertheless, I select some matters for criticism or comment.

"Context three" I found less helpful. Where does Matthew say or imply that we should use the Tanach as our *haggadah?* There is no doubt that the Tanach should inspire and motivate us, but how is this a central concern of Matthew? How similar is the way the Tanach serves as the foundation for Matthew to the way Haggadah might be said to provide a foundation for Halacha? Perhaps some illustrations would have helped here.

"Context four" addresses the meaning of the word "Torah". I am not convinced that the dominant biblical meaning of **{43}** Torah is "instruction" or "direction" rather than "law", even though this view is widely accepted. It may be so. But as usually argued, the position has depended on at least two false assumptions, one philological, the other historical-critical. The first is that the root or etymology (study of a word's previous meanings) necessarily provides an important guide to the meaning of the word. Such considerations may in fact be entirely irrelevant to the particular meaning of a word in a given time and context. Secondly, the argument has assumed the critical reconstruction of biblical history which views the so-called priestly and deuteronomic law codes as late (and often presumably inferior) developments. The frequent appearance of the word "Torah" in these undisputed legal contexts may then be regarded as a derivative narrowing of meaning, reflecting a later tendency toward legalism. But what if these legal contexts are early, and remained constructive for Israel's experience throughout her entire history, such as that there is frequent subsequent reference to them?

Meaning must be determined in terms of context and semantic fields (groups of related words). But the larger context for any particular period should include the revelation given by God (and received as normative Scripture) up to that time. If Torah serves as a technical or key term in the Tanach, and through the Septuagint, also in the New Testament, the issue is important for biblical theology. Do we find in the Tanach a "broader" meaning (such as divine instruction in general), and is this or does it become more central? Or is there rather an extension of scope or application of the sense "law" as such? Does the meaning of the Torah indicate that God offers us his personal direction for every area of our lives? This is a valuable truth in itself. Or does it imply rather that we must pay greater heed to specific commandments (legal prescriptions) intended to be comprehensive in scope, to which obedience promises blessing, but neglect (still) threatens judgment? In any event, the concept is more than the individual word, even though a central one, and our theology on this issue can only be determined by reference to the entire Scriptural teaching on divine law/instruction.

---

[38] In Jesus' day "the Law" *(-nomos - Torah)* could refer to the first five books of the Bible, or to the entire Tanach. It could also refer to the Mosaic law contained within the Scriptures. (This use is most frequent in Paul). In the present discussion I take it in terms of "these commandments" of Matt. 9:19 by which is indicated those to be found in all the Scriptures of Tanach (5:17-18). In this use then, the law of Tanach-Old Testament law, and not the five books of Moses.

In "context five," the author apparently means by "spirit" the true intention of the law in which love and freely-given service is prominent, as opposed to the (legalistic?) approach of the Scribes and Pharisees. But their error, which is condemned by Jesus in Matthew, is not the too great stress on the law, overly concerned with its written details (the "letter" of the law). On the contrary, (see the passages Riggans cites there), they have actually failed to take the Law seriously enough, even replacing it with their traditions, and by their sin and hypocrisy they have voided its actual written demands. Remember, even in Jesus' judgment against the Pharisees for their preoccupation with details of legal observance or relatively minor matters while they neglected the "weightier" matters of the law, he says, "You should have practiced the latter, without neglecting the former" (Matt. 23:23).

I wonder if it is really legitimate to speak of Jesus' teaching as a "new Torah" (W. D. Davies). It may be significant that Matthew never mentions this, when, as Riggans observes, the concept or a near equivalent may have been popular in contemporary messianic expectation. It seem that, for Jesus at least, Torah is always the Torah of the Tanach, and he gives no indication that it is to be replaced.

Matt. 5:17-20 is a difficult passage, but it is the most crucial one for this issue, and must be adequately reckoned with. It does seem to me, that for any of the most defensible interpretations, the conclusion is unavoidable that Jesus and Matthew **{44}** regard the law as still valid, such that it bears divine authority for the practice of the Church. According to vs. 19, we are to "practice and teach" even the least of the Tanach's commands! The exacting demands of the Law remain in force, and are even heightened (the "antitheses"). So our righteousness must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees (5:20), and we are to be perfect (5:48). Note that this is not the Pauline use of imputed righteousness – "righteousness of God apart from the law," (Rom. 3:21). Of course, Matthew cannot be facilely opposed to Paul. For Matthew also the authority of the Law is surpassed by Christ. We see this in particular on the issues of Sabbath (12:8), ceremonial purity (15:1-20), and divorce (19:3-12), and Jesus' demands regarding the latter are more stringent.

There are three valid approaches to the resolution of this tension, and here I believe I am in agreement with Riggans. Firstly, we should view the continuing demand of the Law christocentrically, that is, always in the framework of Christ's authoritative interpretation of it ("…but I say to you"). Is this equivalent to Paul's "law of Christ"? Secondly, in both Matthew and Paul, the love command is given special place, as "summing up" all the other commands. Thus it functions as a hermeneutical principle (though a limited one) to help us understand the intent of specific demands. This should not, however, be taken to imply the abrogation of any commands. A third way would affirm that all of the ethical demands of the Law still stand, and Jesus' relationship to this is essentially to add more. These perspectives are complementary and the particular law(s) under consideration will determine which approach(es) is appropriate for its own case.

Let us not avoid the implications. Matthew gives us Jesus' words in the concluding statement of this gospel that discipleship involves "teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you" (28:20). "Everything" includes of prime importance total commitment to follow Jesus, but then this commitment must incorporate all of Jesus' specific commandments, which, by way of 5:19, extends to all those of the Tanach as well! This is truly "kingdom ethics," but through Christ's redemptive

work we already begin to experience the presence of the Kingdom in the power of the resurrection and the Holy Spirit.[39]

[39]To help us in thinking through this issue of the law in Matt. there have recently appeared a few important contributions that richly repay careful study: Norman Anderson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983) especially Part 11: "The Ethics of the Kingdom"; D. A Carson, *Commentary on Matthew* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983); Roger Mohrlang, *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984); Douglas J. Moo, "Jesus and the Authority of the Mosaic Law," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20 (1984), pp. 3-49.

{46} The Use of the Old Testament in the Letter to the Hebrews

Statement by Baruch Maoz

Baruch Maoz is Field Superintendent for Christian Witness to Israel and Pastor of Grace and Truth Christian Assembly in Rehovot, Israel. He also edits "Me'Et Le'Et," a Jewish-Christian quarterly published in Hebrew.

Introduction

One of the issues facing us today is the legitimacy of the Church's claim to the Old Testament. The same question may be asked about the basis of the Gospel's claim upon Israel. The increasing number of published works on the subject shows how Christianity has been obsessed with nagging doubt as to the legitimacy of its claim to the Old Testament. The Christian message considers itself to be a fulfillment of Old Testament expectation, and Christianity has rightly considered that issue to be the hinge upon which its own legitimacy turns. If its claim to be the necessary goal of Old Testament revelation can be disproven, Christianity is, at the very best, a distortion of its parent religion. It can have no binding force in relation to any who wish to adhere or to begin to adhere to its superior parent.

Consequently, the use made by the New Testament of the Old is of paramount interest to any who are concerned about Jewish evangelism. It is also of inestimable consequence to those, like the present author, who are Jewish and who conceive of their Jewishness as culminating in obedience to God in Christ. Jews either should or should not believe in Jesus and whether they should or not may wholly be determined by the revelation in which the Old Testament stands to the New.

In the course of this paper I wish to demonstrate that the apostolic writers used the Old Testament in a manner which was unbiased, truly in accordance with its native, objective and necessary meaning. They translated Old Testament language in a manner true to its nature and in no way added, altered or avoided the message that language conveyed. The relationship between the Old Testament and the New may therefore be best described in **{47}** terms of *homology*. By *homology* we mean that there is between two things not a mere resemblance, but a real and vital – in this case, an "economic" – correspondence. Our meaning will become clearer as the study progresses.

The present study is an attempt to examine this position by a survey of the Letter to the Hebrews and the use it makes of the Old Testament. It is conducted out of the conviction that Hebrews is a true example of the New Testament's use of the Old, such as is found throughout the New Testament. There are particular advantages in using the Letter to the Hebrews. For one, it is a portion of Scripture which most manifestly deals with many of the questions related to our study in a conscious, pronounced and premeditated manner. The writer's use of the Old Testament is more extensive and perhaps also somewhat more intensive than that of any other New Testament writer. Not every text or problem will be discussed. Rather, examples of textual types and kinds

of problems raised by the use of the Old Testament in the Letter to the Hebrews will be highlighted. Special attention will be given to a number of particular issues which I deem to be significant. Following the summary, some of the wider implications for Christian hermeneutics will be indicated.

The Problem

We might well ask with F. F. Bruce: "How is it written of the Son of Man that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt?"[1] The answer given by the New Testament writers has provoked some serious scholars to speak of it in terms such as a "remarkable speculation,"[2] "curious, more subtle and ingenious than convincing."[3] Richard Longenecker has concluded that "as students of history we can appreciate something of what was involved in their (the apostles') exegetical procedures, and as Christians we commit ourselves to their conclusions. But apart from a revelatory stance on our part, I suggest that we cannot reproduce their *pesher exegesis* ... we must also recognize the uniqueness of Jesus as the true interpreter of the Old Testament and the distinctive place he gave to the apostles in the explication of the prophetic word."[4]

In other words, apostolic practice is faulty, but its conclusions are correct. One ought, therefore to relate to the apostles much in the manner the apostles were instructed to relate to the Pharisees: follow their teaching but not their practice. Farrar rightly describes this premise as "an exegetical fraud"[5] which "may be morally edifying, but is historically false."[6] Both the event and the seriousness with which the New Testament writers involved the Old Testament ought to encourage us to question Longenecker's conclusions. A New Testament writer uses the Old Testament "not just to prove particular arguments or to supply occasional illustrations, but because it is upon the authority of the Old Testament that the validity of his own position entirely depends."[7]

The New Testament writers, let alone those who authored the Old Testament, did not begin with a Christological premise. Rather, they arrived at a Christological conclusion by **{48}** virtue of the events and divine speech which combined to make up the revelationary process they were "inscripturating." Their conclusions were formulated and the context of these determined by the process involved. Each purported "fulfillment" was measured and recognized by the criteria provided in the Old Testament. Consequently, the Old Testament had a crucial role to play. If the New Testament is to be legitimately recognized as the fulfillment of the Old, then the teaching and events recorded therein must be the true and necessary product of Old Testament realities. This of necessity implies that the apostolic use of the Old Testament must be demonstrably valid.

Some have sought to evade the issue by recourse to apostolic inspiration: If the apostles acted under inspiration of the Spirit, who dares question their conduct?. David Baron rejects all such

---

[1] F. F. Bruce, *This is That.* The Paternoster Press, 1968. p. 29
[2] A. B. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Klock & Klock, 1980 – reprint. p. 241
[3] Ibid.
[4] R. Longnecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period.* Eerdmans, 1977. p. 217
[5] F. W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (Baker Book House, 1961) pp. 333-4.
[6] Ibid.
[7] R. V. C. Tasker. *The Old Testament in the New Testament*. SCM Press, 1954. p. 103

discussions of the subject with the rejoinder: "When we have the Epistle to the Hebrews as a guide, and find in it the Psalms cited and used as an argument to prove the divinity of the Messiah, all doubt as to the real interpretation vanishes and we at once acquiesce in the apostolic explication."[8] Nor is such argumentation restricted to the evangelical camp. Liberal theologians are similarly disposed to attribute a priori religious authority to the apostolic band. The point of the matter is that, to a Jewish mind, whether or not the apostles were indeed inspired will be largely determined by their use of the Old Testament: Was such a use fraudulent? Was it true to the real import of Old Testament revelation? If not, no claim to inspired interpretation can be recognized as valid.

Other attempted resolutions of the problem make reference to then-contemporary rabbinic practice. Such reference cannot affect this study because it skirts the issue as to whether or not the New Testament use of the Old, however rabbinic it may purportedly be, involves either a distortion of the Old Testament or a true rendering of its meaning. A substitution of rabbinic authority for apostolic can in no way legitimate a misinterpretation.

A Proposed Solution

It is my contention that the New Testament nowhere presupposes a break with the Old. On the contrary, the New Testament claims the Old and presupposes it altogether. According to the New Testament, the Old Testament is not a mere prelude to the coming of the Messiah but an ongoing interpreter and a continuing foundation which must never be dismantled. The Old Testament was and is God's Word for today – if you hear his voice.

I hope that one of the products of the present inquiry will be renewed vigor in presenting the claim of Christ upon Israel. There is no doubt in my mind that Israel's future is **{49}** altogether contingent upon its obedience to God in Christ. The Church can not, and may not ignore its duties toward Israel. Furthermore, a renewed discovery of the Old Testament could only lead to renewed vitality in the lives of those who seek to honor God by their obedience.

Argument A: Which Text or Texts Used?

Much attention and no little scholarly effort has been devoted to discover which, if any text or texts of the Old Testament lie behind Old Testament quotations in Hebrews. The present study bypasses this issue because it is the writer's conviction that it does not affect the matter under consideration. The writer to the Hebrews was not so concerned about quoting a text as a meaning. In no case does the writer quote a text which has a meaning other than that found in the original Old Testament source.

This is not to deny the value of efforts to discover first century contemporary textual sources. Such findings have been valuable in proving what may be quite obvious to some, namely, that the New Testament's use of the Old is by no means foreign to the spirit of Judaism. Brief reference shall be made to this point when discussing targums further on in this study. However, where such corollaries with Judaism may be verified, they are in full accord with the original meaning of the

[8] David Baron, *Types, Psalms and Prophecies*. (Yanetz ltd., 1978) p. 145.

Old Testament; where contemporary usages, in fact, constituted a departure from the original and objective meanings, the New Testament writers ignored them.

Kenneth J. Thomas has amply demonstrated that the writer of Hebrews could quote verbatim if he wanted to.[9] The full statement "you are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek"[10] is faithfully brought and faithfully reproduced in Heb. 6:20, 7:11, 21. The writer's use of Jeremiah 31:21-34 gives "conclusive evidence that he knew the original text yet chose variant readings to suit his purposes."[11] In Hebrews 8:8-12 there are extensive departures from the Masoretic text, but not a shred of departure from its meaning. "They continued not in my covenant" instead of "they broke" introduces no new meaning, but indicates a fact implied. Neither is it an alteration of sense when "I will carve" or "engrave" is substituted for "put" as the verb describing God placing his law in the people's hearts. On the other hand, these two word substitutions serve to bring out an aspect of meaning vital to the author's purpose, which is to exhort his readers to continue in their loyalty to God's truth in Christ.

Hence, whether or not the writer of Hebrews used certain known texts is unimportant to this study. The relevant point is that all Old Testament quotes in Hebrews demonstrate a conscious, purposeful selection of the text quoted as well as of the variations in which they appear.

Argument B: Descriptive Terms

One of the difficulties facing us in the study of Old Testament-New Testament relations is the lack of a common terminology that will also be linguistically valid as a description of New Testament practice in this sphere. Type, symbol, allegory, parable – these and other terms are used with varying and conflicting meanings. What is a type to some is a symbol to others; what one considers an allegory is to another nothing but a parable. There is also a mistaken tendency to align certain biblical terms far too closely with their modern usage, as if they were originally intended to serve as technical terms for the science of biblical hermeneutics. *Tupos*, *paradigma, parable, skia, allegoromenon* and the like are neither **{50}** necessarily consistent in their original biblical uses nor necessarily exclusive of each other. Indeed, *skia, tupos* and *hupodigma* are used interchangeably by the writer of Hebrews (8:5), whereas *allegoromenon* is Paul's term for an instructive illustration, for which the writer to the Hebrews employs the term *paradigma.* All this is true also of the related term *digma* (Jude 7), and at times even of the term *tupos* (1 Corinthians 10:6, 1 Timothy 4:12) and Peter's *hupogrammos* (1 Peter 2:21). Note that, to the writer of Hebrews what is a *skia* can also be a *hupodigma* (Hebrews 8:5) in what it is a pre-representation (foreshadowing) of a reality and an illustrative example of it.

So too with the Old Testament. A *mashal is* both an illustrative example (such as Isaiah's well-known parable of the vineyard[12] or Jothan's equally famous parable of the trees who sought a king to rule over them[13] and a proverb, and epigram – a short, pithy saying such as can be found in the book of Proverbs.[14] Sometimes a proverb combines an illustrative example

[9] Kenneth J. Thomas, "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews." *New Testament Studies*, 1965. pp. 303-325
[10] Heb. 5:6
[11] Thomas, p. 310
[12] Isa. 5:1-2.
[13] Jud. 9:7-15
[14] Prov. 1:7

and an epigraphic statement. "He who sends a fool on an errand cuts his own leg off and displays the stump"[15], or "The Lord pulls down the proud man's home but fixes the widow's boundary-stones."[16]

The writer to the Hebrews used the Old Testament in a number of ways, but, above all, the Old Testament formed the essential content of his message. Delete the Old Testament terms and references from the Letter to the Hebrews and you will hardly be left with propositions. "God," "fathers," "prophets," "sin," "purification," "promise," "oath," "covenant," "Melchizedek," "priesthood," "sanctuary" – Old Testament terminology forms the essence of the writer's message. The author simply cannot speak of Christ except in Old Testament terms. He can express himself as a Christian only by Old Testament terminology.

Secondly, the Old Testament serves our writer as the authority by which his claims concerning Christ are established. He sets out to prove that Christ is greater than Moses on the strength of Old Testament evidence.[17] He establishes Christ's priesthood on Old Testament promises.[18] He indicates the passing away of the Sinaitic covenant by Old Testament references which indicate that this was to be expected.[19]

Thirdly, he uses the Old Testament *homologically* in order to teach his readers to recognize the significance and possible consequence of their actions. The writer compares his readers' tendency to turn back due to pressures in the course of their pilgrimage, during which they are supported mainly by promises, with the tendency of their fathers to do likewise on the way to the promised land.[20] He teaches the priesthood of Christ by drawing homological parallels and contrasts between the priesthood of Christ and those of Aaron and Melchizedek.[21]

{51} Fourthly, the writer uses the Old Testament in order to illustrate, that is, to clarify and enforce a point. In Chapter 11, he makes reference to the forefathers, who set an example of faith by their fortitude and thereby called their descendants to follow suit.

In all these instances the author establishes his case on the firm foundation of the original meaning of the Old Testament passages to which he makes reference.

Argument C: "Fulfillment"

The writer to the Hebrews conceived of the Old Testament in relation to his message primarily in terms of fulfillment. But he thought of fulfillment in terms which somewhat vary from those commonly assumed today. The whole Old Testament was "being fulfilled" – not just predictions, but its promises, its motifs, its historical process, its themes, and its purpose. It was reaching its fullness *(pleroma)*. He thought more in terms of a consummating climax than of prediction-come-true. Of course, nowhere does he deny the existence of "prediction." Some of his

[15] Prov. 26:6 NEB.
[16] Prov. 15:25 NEB
[17] Heb. 3:1-6
[18] Heb. 7:1-28
[19] Heb. 8:1-10:18
[20] Heb. 3:7-19; 10:36-11:1; 11:7 ff.
[21] Heb. 7:1 ff.

arguments are actually based on predictive elements in Psalm 8, Psalm 110 and Jeremiah 31. But even then he thinks more in terms of promise than of prediction, of purpose being accomplished than of a forecast come true. Hence, prophecy, according to Hebrews must not be thought of primarily in terms of divinely inspired fortune-telling, the foreclosure of events ("I know what he is going to do"), but as an inspired foretelling of intent ("I know what I am going to do").

Biblical history is to be conceived as a process in which development is a vital component. There is a "now" and a "then," a "long ago" and "the present last days" (1:1-2). These are related to each other by an inner and essential unity of content which is more coherently and more extensively expressed as time goes by. In some senses terms of reference such as "past," "present" and "future" are misleading, because all times lead into each other, coalescing into one. Thus what was said in the past is still being said "today, if you hear his voice" (3:15).

The coming Christ is considered to be a turning point in biblical history, following which things are other than they were before. This change is best described by the term "fulfilled," achieving this intended perfection without which none are able to be made perfect (11:40). We, not the Israelites who followed Joshua into Canaan, have entered the promised rest (chapter 4). It is we who have a better priest (Chapter 5-7) the accomplishment of a better covenant (Chapter 8) as promised in the past, and who worship in a better tabernacle where a much better sacrifice accords us a fuller salvation (Chapter 9-10). History is one whole, encompassing past, present and future. Each stage leads to a greater fullness *(pleroma)* of the one preceding it, all striving toward the same divinely appointed goal.

{52} This is the point C. Vos makes so well when he reminds us that, in the New Testament it is generally true that "instead of the usual verb plerousthai, the verb teleisthai is employed (to be 'accomplished' instead of to be 'fulfilled'). The force of the conjunctions is 'telic', 'in order that,' not 'so that.' This does not involve any artificial or mechanical concept of the relationship, as though the ensuing fact existed in the last analysis for the sake of the fulfillment of the prophecy."[22] What was in view was a connected sequence of events leading to an intended goal. Insofar as prophecy is concerned, the biblical concept "stands at the opposite pole to every mechanical view about the relationship between prophecy and fulfillment: The 'telos' is not the end chronologically, conceived as the final step in the list of time-sequence; it is the end in the sense of final purpose, that in which the revelation-process seeking its goal comes to rest. Hence Jesus comprehensively affirms that 'the things concerning' Him have a *telos* (Luke 22:37)."[23]

Biblical prophecy is historic in nature. It has to do with the present into which it was ken, even while relating to the future. Nor is it void of a past, for its terms of reference were all quarried out of whatever had preceded it. The writer to the Hebrews is deeply conscious of this fact. That is why he is not concerned with literal, verbal quotations any more than he is concerned with literal, verbal fulfillment. He quotes literal meanings resident and ever abiding in the words. Both the words and the use he makes of these are open to objective scrutiny and honest discovery.

---

[22] Geerhardus Vos, *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation*, R. B. Gaffin, Ed. Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980. p. 352ff.
[23] Ibid.

Argument D: Allegory, Symbolism, Illustration

It has been contended that the author of Hebrews is prominently characterized by his allegorical treatment of the Old Testament and that his closest parallel is Philo the Alexandrian. As we have just observed, the first half of the statement is false. As to the second half, perhaps it will suffice if we note with Longenecker the "fundamental distinctions between Philo and the writer to the Hebrews"[24]:

1. Philo thought in terms of a cosmology which lay behind the phenomena of history; the writer to the Hebrews thought in terms of historiological redemption.

2. Philo viewed the primary tension of life as involving eternal prototypes; Hebrews is concerned with the tension between prophetic anticipation and historic fulfillment.

3. Philo considered history as the occasion of revelational insights and religious speculation; Hebrews assumes that history is designedly revelatory.

4. Philo treated biblical history allegorically while Hebrews spells out what amounts to homological correspondence within the framework of redemptive history.

5.Philo interpreted his Old Testament in terms of Platonic philosophy; Hebrews presents an interpretation of the Old Testament from its own messianic perspective.

Any claims to Philonic influence in Hebrews must contend with the above-mentioned differences.

Does the author of Hebrews engage in allegorical interpretation at all? In order to answer this question we must first define more precisely what is meant by allegory. All too much confusion has arisen on this point due to differing uses of the term. Allegory, as used in this study, is an extended metaphor, with the following difference: Unlike a metaphor, an allegory is an event, a person, or a circumstance in real history which has a meaning not **{53}** limited by the historical framework in which it is found. Allegory as here defined (and practiced by Origen, by many of his contemporaries and by their followers today) is not what Paul meant by allegory in Galatians 4:24ff, where the Greek term simply means "illustration".[25] Take, for example, the writer of to the Hebrews' extended reference to the tabernacle, its structure, furniture, cult and priesthood. These serve the author as points of comparison and as indications of meaning that have to do with Christ. But here is no allegory. Types, shadows, paradigms, and the like are basically portrayals or patterns and symbols which do not add to nor ignore one iota of their original meaning. The tabernacle and all that was associated with it was originally intended to be a symbol. God explicitly told Moses that he would dwell among the people according to the pattern of the tabernacle shown him on the mount (Exodus 25:8-9). There was, therefore, a real relationship between the manner of God's dwelling among the people and the tabernacle: the

---

[24] Longenecker, pp. 173-5

[25] "Those who utilize the allegorical approach frequently accept (historical) narratives as such, but instead of expressing their meaning in view of their concrete historical setting, they use them as allegories to teach spiritual lessons ... (which have) no organic relation to the narratives being explained." Robert A Traina, *Methodical Bible Study A New Approach to Hermeneutics,* Asbury Theological Seminary, 1952. pp. 172-3.

latter was a pattern of the former. Hence, when the writer to the Hebrews referred to the tabernacle in this way, he did so in accordance with its native, intended purpose. We may therefore conclude that the Epistle to the Hebrews does indeed use symbolism: the symbolism of the Old Testament. But this is not allegorizing. It is the proper use of existing symbolism. There is no transforming of historical data into symbolic images.

After all, even symbols have objective meanings. Symbolism is but one of the ways man communicates, and communication is impossible apart from objective, unambivalent and verifiable meaning. Hebrews evidences no "double meaning." There are varying applications, but the meaning is one. A greater truth may have various facets, but none of them is contradictory. The truth of the original, necessary meaning is maintained. Indeed, the original meaning is that which renders the varying applications valid, lending them both direction and power to bind the conscience to those to whom application is made.

We must, however, go a step further and state that the major issues which engage the author centre upon the contrasts between the pattern of realities as portrayed in the tabernacle and the work of Christ, rather than upon the similarities.[26] This is why the term "shadow" suits the writer's purposes so well. This is the rationale behind the writer's contrast of the Old Testament with the New Testament's "better promise," "greater high priest," "better sacrifice," fuller redemption and more conclusive forgiveness of sins.

Neither is Melchizedek used allegorically in the sense commonly attached to this term. Many of the statements relating to Melchizedek in the letter to the Hebrews do not in fact refer to Melchizedek but to the manner in which Scripture presents him.[27] There is not an allegorisation of the person of Melchizedek, nor "rabbinic trifling."[28] Melchizedek is the nearest equivalent in Hebrews to the transformation of an historical Old Testament figure into an allegorisation, a symbolic representation of Christ. But "near" is not to have arrived. The author himself indicates that his reference is to the historical Melchizedek not as he existed in real history, but as he was described in the pages of holy writ; in speaking of him as "without father, without mother, without pedigree" he says that Melchizedek was made to be like the Son of God *(aphomoyomenos).*[29] This "making to be like" has to do with the manner in which facts concerning Melchizedek are either mentioned or omitted and not to any purported facts in themselves. Our writer engaged in no hermeneutical eccentricities, no flights of spiritual fancy; he was closely rooted to biblical exegesis and to historical reality, so that he carefully differentiates between history and the manner in which it is narrated.

{54} Of course, the author of Hebrews did not restrict his use of the Old Testament to the intended nature of its several parts. He lived in the atmosphere of the Old Testament, and its rich soil was the ground out of which he quarried most of his terminology. At times he used terms and referred

---

[26] "It is not the analogy but the differences ... that the writer to the Hebrews emphasizes." F. F. Bruce, p. 91.
[27] Franz Delitzch, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,* T. L. Kingsbury, Trans. Klock & Klock, 1978-Reprint. p. 335. Delitzsch calls Chrysostom to his support: "made like unto the Son of God. Wherein does this likeness consist? In this, that we know of no beginning and no end of either. In the one case because they have found no record, in the other because they have no existence.".
[28] John Brown, *Hebrews,* Banner of Truth Trust, 1972. p. 333.
[29] Heb. 7:3

to matters of Old Testament revelation in order to illustrate. But illustration is not symbolism. Illustration actually derives its force from the fact that it has to do with realities somehow either related or similar. Unlike allegory, it is altogether contingent upon an incipient recognition of the historical validity of the data used. The historical reality of a smoking mountain and the awesome appearance of God at Sinai is the very strength of the author's reference to his appeal, "How shall we escape?"[30] The reality lends strength to the illustrative appeal.

Let us examine this concept somewhat more fully. In chapter 11, the writer conjures up a long list of Old Testament personages as examples, or illustrations, of faith. Faith has already been described by the author as an expectation of things not seen but hoped for, leading to fortitude and a willingness to suffer the loss of all that is visible and contingent. The writer enlists the example of Abraham who was one of many that, "not having received the fulfillment of the promise, but having seen them from afar off were convinced of their reality"[31] and therefore confessed that they were "strangers and pilgrims on the earth. They that say such things plainly declare that they seek a country."[32] The logic is clear and simple, founded upon facts. "Truly, if it were just any country they wanted, they could have easily returned to the land from whence they came."[33] But no, they desired a better country. Abraham left his fatherland and lives in a strange country dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, looking for a city "whose builder and maker is God"[34]: not just any city, nor just any country, but one over which God would rule manifestly and to which they would be guided by his sovereign hand.

This is all a matter of history and is open to application in any number of circumstances. But, what of the qualifying statement: "a country, that is a heavenly"[35]? May we legitimately restrict the meaning of the terms "a city whose builder and maker is God"[36] to the historical sense which we have indicated? I think not. However, this does not denigrate nor distort the historical realities of Abraham's behavior in expectation. There is no reason to understand the writer as denying nor ignoring Abraham, Isaac and Jacob's expectations of an earthly country. He is not stating that their real hopes were for "a better country, that is a heavenly"[37] as against an earthly one. In speaking of Abraham, the writer has carefully chosen terms which allow for a wider significance, but he has done so without distorting the historical facts as given in the Old Testament. He does not speak of Abraham's heavenly expectation as the conscious object of the Patriarch's hopes, but as the ultimate sphere where they would be fulfilled. The words "that is a heavenly" are an editorial comment, not a description of Abraham's conscious expectations. Abraham knew nothing of the new heavens or the new earth and it would be foolish to deny that his hopes **{55}** were earthly. Nor ought we deny that the promise made to him was an earthly one. What has happened is that perspectives have now changed. Readers today are in a position to know that Joshua had not "given them rest." Arriving in the land and taking possession of it did not give Israel the lasting Sabbath of God, not even when the boundaries were extended as they were in the days of Solomon. That is why the Holy Spirit continues to say "in David," "today, if you hear his voice,

---

[30] Heb. 2:3
[31] Heb. 11:13
[32] Ibid.
[33] Heb. 11:15
[34] Heb. 11:10
[35] Heb. 11:16
[36] Heb. 11:10
[37] Heb. 11:16

harden not your hearts as in the day of provocation."[38] That is why the author wrote in terms of a rest which "yet remained to the people of God."[39] The people of God today, not Abraham, Isaac or Jacob, know that their hope in God will ultimately be fulfilled only in a country "that is heavenly."

Here illustration and symbolism are combined. Abraham's faith is illustrative of what ours should be. On the other hand, the terms "country," "city," and so on are borrowed from historical realities and derive their ability to intimate the lesson intended from the force of that historicity. They are used in order to present a different reality, no less historical (or destined to become such) and no less real.

Argument E: Homology

The main use of the Old Testament which characterizes the author to the Hebrews is best described by the term homology. It is here our author is most obviously in agreement with other New Testament writers. Homology is the basic logic behind every kind of use of the Old Testament which can be found in the writer's work and which we have not discussed. The term homology as used in this study is synonymous with the terms type or typology as used by F. Foulkes, R. T. France, and E. E. Ellis. Homology is preferred because it is less often used synonymously with the term allegory and more closely reflects the real meaning and rationale of each text in question. Homology is the recognition of "recurring patterns of divine action and human response as described in the Scriptures."[40] As Calvin once said "God is always like himself," and homology is an application of this truth in the sphere of hermeneutics. It conceives of the relationship between Old Testament and New Testament in terms of divine self-consistency.[41] Stated differently, homology is a specific biblical theology being practically applied.[42]

As we have seen, the tabernacle could serve as a symbol of the manner in which God would dwell among his people because of the homological relationship between the two: Sin was the reason that the tabernacle was needed and atonement was its purpose. Atonement was achieved by

---

[38] Heb. 4:7
[39] Heb. 4:9
[40] F. F. Bruce, p. 14
[41] ". . . the conviction which lies at the root of New Testament *homology* is that there is a consistency in God's dealings with men. Thus his acts in the Old Testament will present a pattern which can be seen to be repeated in the New Testament events; these may therefore be interpreted by reference to the pattern displayed in the Old Testament. New Testament (homology) is thus essentially the tracing of the constant principles of God's working in history." R T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament,* Tyndale Press. 1971, p. 39.
"Unlike allegory, *homological* exegesis regards the words of scripture not as metaphors hiding deeper meaning but as the record of historical events out of whose literal sense the meaning of the text arises." E. E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity,* Eerdmans, 1978. pp. 168-9.
"Homology is ... a distinct discipline. It is essentially the recognition of a correspondence between New and Old Testament events, based on a conviction of the unchanging character of the principles of God's working, and a consequent understanding and description of the New Testament event in terms of the Old Testament model... the coming and work of Jesus, the principles of God's working, already imperfectly embodied in the Old Testament ... In that sense, the Old Testament history pointed forward to Jesus." France, p. 40.
"How could it possibly be otherwise? This word is the testimony of an unalterable nature. Distance of space and time therefore can make no material alteration respecting it." D. Fairbain, *The Interpretation of Prophecy,* Banner of Truth Trust, 1964. pp. 51-2.
[42] France, pp. 41-2

vicarious sufferings. Access to God was exclusively contingent upon atoning sacrifices. A sameness of logic, of inner meaning, is evident.

{56} The homological relationship is also obvious between the inclination of Hebrews' recipients to turn back in the face of difficulty and to conceive of the little good in Egypt (Hebrews 11:24-26) as more concrete than the promised good, as yet unseen. The implications were also clear to the author, and, on the basis of the "kal va-chomer" principle (how much more), he concluded that if those who transgressed the previous covenant were punished, how much more those who would trample underfoot the new covenant, sealed with the blood of the Son of God (10:23-31).

Rather than history losing its force in homology, it maintains its impact to the full.[43] Indeed, the force of an homological inference is the main product of historical realities and the primary reason they are narrated.[44] This is precisely how the writer to the Hebrews uses the Old Testament. It can be said of him as Phythian-Adams said of Paul:

> "Paul did not go to the Old Testament for appropriate figures of speech: he went to it – or rather he lived in it – because he read there a story of redemption which was repeating itself in the events of the New Age of Christ. It was for him no mere analogy that there was a new Israel, a new deliverance from bondage, a new Covenant, a new Inheritance; and what is true of St. Paul is equally true of the other writers of the New Testament. What they found in the Old Testament, when they compared the events recorded there with those which had happened, and were happening, and were to happen, to themselves as real and intimate 'economic' relationship, not a striking, but accidental, resemblance. *This* has God done when he went first to choose him out a People; *this* he had promised through the prophets to do yet once more at the end of the age; and *this* he had actually done, or was in the process of doing, under his new Dispensation of Holy Spirit."[45]

We must remember that the writer to the Hebrews was addressing a Jewish readership. Any evident distortion of the text by divorcing it from its context would carry no weight to a Jewish mind.

History and original meaning were two vitally related aspects in which the Old Testament revelation was given. It was of utmost importance to the writer of Hebrews that his use of the Old Testament, the sole ground for his appeal to the readers, would be demonstrably true to its original intent. That is why he was more interested in meaning than in the verbal correctness of his quotations. It is here that many Christian commentators, liberal and evangelical, err so greatly. The

---

[43] "*Homology* is thus to be distinguished from two other methods of applying the Old Testament: the appeal to prediction, and allegory. (Homology is not) prediction; in itself it is simply a person, event, etc. recorded as historical fact, with no intrinsic reference to the future ... A prediction looks forward to and demands an event which is to be its fulfillment; (homology), however, consists essentially in looking back and discerning previous examples of a pattern now reaching its culmination ... (Homology) is not allegory. It is grounded in history and does not lose sight of the actual historical character of the events with which it is concerned. (Homology) may be described as 'the theological interpretation of the Old Testament history'." France, pp. 39-40

[44] "(Homology) is not so much a system of interpretation as a spiritual perspective…" Ellis, *Prophecy*, p. 165

[45] Pythian-Adams, pp.10-1

writer to the Hebrews had no Christological axe to grind. The Old Testament was his only a-priori supposition. Consequently, he took the Old Testament at face value.[46]

History and objective meaning are the crux of the writer's use of the Old Testament. In this he shared the conviction of all New Testament writers. Edmund Clowney had demonstrated this in relation to the crucifixion event and the Psalmist's statement to the effect that he was given vinegar and gall to drink:

> ". . . that cry is dramatized in the New Testament in all four Gospels where it is recorded that Jesus Christ ... was offered vinegar to drink. Some people would completely misunderstand this kind of fulfillment of promise by saying here is a promise that was not fulfilled, an imperfection, an error: The promise says gall and vinegar, but when are we told that Jesus was ever fed gall? No record of that, only vinegar. Therefore here is a partial fulfillment. In Psalm 69 figurative language is being used. The psalmist describes his agony and suffering and he is using figures **{57}** of speech connected with eating and drinking to say how much he has had to endure suffering. But in the New Testament, so that we won't miss it and know that Christ is identified with the suffering servant of the Psalm, a particular attention is drawn to the vinegar so that the fulfillment is super fulfilled; not only he fulfills the role of suffering servant, but it is dramatized by figurative language, the reality of the fulfillment"[47]

The point being made is that the original, intended meaning is so important that even literalistic fulfillment is sometimes employed in order to intimate the homological relationship between Old and New Testament events, so that the one is accomplished in the sense of fullness to the fullest extent (pleroma). The New Testament presupposes the Old and for that reason cannot, dare not, risk the charge of misconstruction. To a Jewish mind, the New Testament is either true or it is a falsehood. The writer to the Hebrews knew this well but displayed no indication of being threatened by such knowledge. To his mind, an objective hermeneutic of the Old Testament naturally and therefore inevitably, leads to specific Christological expectations, which found their fulfillment described in the New. Of course, some features of the New Testament are not fully present in the Old. This is because, once again, the New Testament assumes the Old and therefore goes further. But it is also true to say that ". . . many essential features of the Christian faith are not explicitly developed in the New Testament because (they are) adequately presented in the Old and taken for granted."[48] The New Testament is completely dependent on the Old in so many ways that, were there no Old Testament, the New Testament could not indicate the way of salvation.

Thus, the New Testament takes its meaning, its value and its content from the Old in a sense not generally recognized nor readily acknowledged. The writer of Hebrews had no such difficulty. He unhesitantly used the meaning of the Old Testament in order to make his point: Stay true to Christ, who is greater than all.

---

46 "Words lifted from the scriptural context can never be a testimonium to the Jewish mind. The word becomes a testimonium for something or other after one has brought out its meaning with the aid of other parts of Scripture." Ellis, *Prophecy*, p. 161 (quoting J. W. Doeve's Hermeneutics, p. 116.)

47 Edmund Clowney, *How the Bible is Being Interpreted,* Study Cassette, Westminster Theological Seminary

48 J. Bright, The Authority of the Old Testament. p. 204

Argument F: The Targums[49]

Rabbi Yehuda, son of Ilai, a second century rabbi, once declared, "He who translates a verse literally is a liar and he who adds to it is a blasphemer."[50] In Nehemiah 8:1-8 the people are described as listening at once both to the reading of the Torah and to its interpretation, the readers giving the sense of the Scripture so that the people could understand. This practice was popularized by the Targums, which were paraphrased translations of the Scriptures into Aramaic, widely used in New Testament Palestine. These Targums were a vivid expression of Israel's conviction that paramount in the Old Testament was its meaning. Consequently, in the Targums, interpretation is woven into the text itself. The rendering is meant to arise out of a true understanding of the texts concerned.[51] Sometimes paraphrase was used in order to bring out the intended meaning, or an aspect of the intended meaning, of an Old Testament passage. But targumistic writers evidenced, by their choice of terms, a ". . . deep reflection on the inspired Word, and profound reverence for it..." [52] The author of the Letter to the Hebrews seems to have used the Old Testament in just such a manner, carefully avoiding targumistic liberties, at times evident among some of the Targums popular in his time.

The difference between every Old Testament text known to us today and the author's quotes made by the author of Hebrews indeed, between various quotes of the same text, thus become an important clue to his purpose at each point of his argument. This is **{58}** obvious in the writer's use of Jeremiah 31: In Chapter 8 he used one order of words most likely to emphasize the difference between the passing, contingent nature of the Mosaic covenant in contrast with the new one brought by Christ. In Chapter 10 he uses a term which serves to emphasize the completeness of the atoning sacrifice in ensuring total forgiveness of sins, now no longer needing to be repeated.

Targums always "presuppose a text of Scripture."[53] At their best they alter words and the order of words but not the meaning. At times they bring out one possible sense intended for discussion while ignoring others. But they are subject to the text itself.

Targums were used very much as differing translations are used today when, on occasion, authors prefer varying versions or make up their own. Choices are made in light of the immediate purpose so as to emphasize one facet of what the text is understood to be saying. In other words, the reference is not so much to words as to meaning. As T W. Manson has stated,

> ". . . we tend to think of the text as objective fact and interpretation as subjective opinion. It may be doubted whether the early Jewish and Christian translators and expositors of Scripture made any such sharp distinction. For them the meaning of the text was of primary importance and they seem to have had greater confidence than we moderns in their ability to find it. Once found, it became a clear duty to express it, and accurate reproduction of the traditional wording of the divine oracles took second place to publication of what was held to be their essential meaning and immediate application. Odd as it may seem to us, the

---

[49] For this section I acknowledge my debt to M. McNamara and E. E. Ellis
[50] Tos. Meg. 4, 41; Kiddushin 49a
[51] T. W. Manson, *The Argument from Prophecy* as quoted in Ellis, pp. 179-80.
[52] Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament* (Eerdmans, 1972), p. 71
[53] McNamara, p. 19.

> freedom with which they handled the biblical text is a direct result of the supreme importance they attached to it."[54]

This well expresses the logic of the author's use of the Old Testament in his Epistle to the Hebrews. Where he differs from some Targumists is precisely in the fact that he never engages in distortion of his texts in order to make his point, a discretion not as obviously shared by many Jewish interpreters at that time.

Summary of the Argument

The author of Hebrews evidences conscious dependence upon the Old Testament for the validity of his case, a validity established by using the Old Testament in accordance with its original, objective meaning: History is treated as history, prediction as prediction and symbol as symbol. Illustrative use no less than history, prediction, or symbol, derives its value from the original, natural meaning. The Greek renderings of the Old Testament found in this epistle, be they targums, ad hoc creations or quotes from recognized texts, serve to convey an application, a practical meaning of the Hebrew. Variations in rendering indicate an applicatory intent on the part of the writer. The writer to the Hebrews treats the Old Testament in the most scientific, objective manner possible, never adding to a text, never distorting it, never denying or ignoring its native sense.

The main rationale behind his use of the Old Testament is homological. Scripture is conceived of as the revelation of God who is eternally immutable and therefore consistent with himself, in whom the slightest shadow of change is impossible. Yesterday, today, forever – he is the same. Because of this, we may confidently follow the apostles in their use of the Old Testament.

{59} Israel and the Church

This understanding of the relationship between the Old and the New Testament has immense significance in relation to Jewish evangelism and to the claims of Christ.

The author of the Letter to the Hebrews displays a consistent appreciation for the Old Testament as having value in itself. Like Paul, the writer could speak of the Old Testament as "able to make one wise unto salvation and profitable for teaching, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be fully furnished to every good work."[55] He did not conceive of the Old Testament as deriving its value from the New. His quotes from the Old Testament indicate this point beyond reasonable doubt. The Old Testament is God's work and, like an oath, "the end of all dispute."[56] As far as the author is concerned, Christian problems may be resolved on the grounds of Old Testament revelation; not on these exclusively, but certainly substantially.

---

[54] T.W. Manson, *The Argument from Prophecy* as quoted in Ellis, pp. 179-80.
[55] 2 Tim. 3:15-17
[56] Heb. 6:16

The writer to the Hebrews also recognized a basic continuity between Old Testament revelation and the New. This continuity, however, did not do away with the Old Testament distinctiveness.[57] Just here lies our problem. A. Kellog asked concerning Leviticus, and some may rightly ask of the whole Old Testament, "Of what use (then) can the book be to believers now?"[58] A Christological premise, the product of New Testament teaching, is not acceptable today any more than it was to the original recipients of the letter to the Hebrews. The solution rests with the use made of the Old Testament by the author of that letter.

Happily, he was not hampered by the modern concept of an Old Testament and a New. To his mind, revelation was an ongoing process: in the past "to the fathers," in the present "to us;" in the past by means of prophets, in the present by a Son. There were differences, but there was an ongoing unity because the God who spoke then and thus to the fathers now spoke by other means. The result is an abiding, continuing history, leading to fulfillment.[59]

We ought not be surprised by the historical element in Scripture, nor embarrassed by it. This is one of many human elements which serve to convey the divine word. It is a point of contact between man and God's message, thus enabling Scripture to be indeed "a book for the salvation of mankind." [60] This "is one of the most distinguishing characteristics of Scripture as divine revelation."[61]

Modern man should develop the same sympathetic understanding and intimacy with the history of God's revelation as was characteristic of the author of the Letter to the Hebrews. Revelation unfolds itself within history and as history, though not as history exclusively. This is divine history in its origin, its direction, its vital characteristics and its intended end; this is what renders it revelation. However, it is not an other-worldly revelation. It occurred in this world and is couched in terms borrowed from the here and now of human existence. This inevitably means that the Old Testament speaks from a perspective of its own, while at the same time it conveys the same essential message revealed in the New. There is continuity and there is discontinuity. Consequently, a Christological premise is not essential to a Christian understanding of the Old Testament because the natural and **{60}** therefore necessary conclusion of a true reading of the Old Testament will be Christological. Christ is the meaning of the Old Testament in no forced manner, without the unwelcome aid of what has been described as "curious speculation."[62]

---

[57] "The Old Testament is different (from the New) in that it was not in the first instance a document of the church at all: it was not written by Christians for Christians. The more seriously we take it in its plain meaning, the more clearly we see that it is the document of a religion genetically related to our own, yet not precisely the same as our own. It is a document of the faith of old Israel, only secondarily a document of the church. Its message is not of and by itself a Christian message. Yet we must preach a Christian message from it (what other kind, pray, are we to preach?), if we are to use it in the pulpit at all." J. Bright, *The Authority* of *the Old Testament. p.* 183ff.

[58] S. H. Kellogg, *The Book of Leviticus*, Klock & Klock, 1978, pp. 24-25

[59] "Our Lord did not come to found a new religion, but simply to usher in the fulfillment of something promised long beforehand ... God's kingdom first meant a present, real relation between Himself and his people ... (which) without losing its older meaning obtains a distinctly eschatological sense." Vos, p. 304.

[60] P. Fairbain, *Old Testament Hermeneutics, C.* Westerson, ed., John Knox Press, 1979, p. 70.

[61] P. Fairbain, *The Revelation* of *the Law, T & T* Clark, 1869, p. 261. 62. A B. Bruce, pg. 241.

[62] A. B. Bruce, pg. 241/

Israel is not the Church, neither is the Church Israel. The two are insolubly linked to each other, yet are not identical. The Church has no past nor future apart from Israel. Israel has no future apart from the Church. The pivot around which the destiny of both revolve is Jesus Christ, and the Old and New Testaments are obvious indications of this. Christ is the whole meaning of Israel, its intended fulfillment. May the day soon come when, realizing the truth of the fact, Israel will embrace its calling to bring "life from the dead."

{62} BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, David, *Types, Psalms and Prophecies,* Yanetz Ltd., 1978.

Barr, James, *The Semantics of Biblical Language,* Oxford University Press, 1961.

Bright, J. *The Authority* of *the Old Testament,* Baker Book House, 1975.

Brown, John, *Hebrews,* Banner of Truth Trust, 1972.

Bruce, A B. *The Epistle to the Hebrews,* Klock & Klock, 1980 – Reprint.

Bruce, F. F., *This is That,* The Paternoster Press, 1968.

Clowney, Edmund, "How the Bible is Being Interpreted," Study Cassette, Westminster Theological Seminary.

Davidson, A B., *Old Testament Prophecy, T & T* Clark, 1912.

Delitzsch, Franz, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, T.* L. Kingsbury, Translator, Klock & Klock, 1978 – Reprint.

Dodd, C.H., *The Authority* of *the Bible,* Harper & Brothers, 1929.

Ellis, E. E., *Prophecy & Hermeneutics in Early Christianity,* Eerdmans, 1978.

Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics, C. Westermann, Ed. John Knox Press, 1979.

Fairbairn, P., *The Revelation of the Law, T & T* Clark, 1869.

Farrar, F. W., *History* of *Interpretation,* Baker Book House, 1961.

France, R T., *Jesus and the Old Testament,* Tyndale Press, 1971.

Johnson, S. Lewis, *The Old Testament in the New,* Zondervan Publishing, 1980. Kaiser, Walter C. Jr.,

Kaiser, Walter C. Jr., *Toward an Old Testament Theology,* Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.

Kellogg, S. H., *The Book* of *Leviticus,* Klock & Klock, 1978.

Longenecker, R, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period,* Eerdmans, 1977.

McNamara, Martin, *Targum and Testament,* Eerdmans, 1972.

Phythian-Adams, W. J., *The Way of At-One-Ment.* SCM Press, 1954.

Tasker, R V G., *The Old Testament in the New Testament,* SCM Press, 1954.

Thisleton, Anthony C., *The Two Horizons,* Paternoster Press, 1980.

Thomas, Kenneth J., "The Old Testament Citations in Hebrews," *New Testament Studies,* 1965.

Traina, Robert A, *Methodical Bible Study A New Approach to Hermeneutics,* Asbury Theological Seminary, 1952.

Vos, G., *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: The Shorter Writings of Q* Vos, R B. Gaffin, Ed., Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980.

Vos, Geerhardus, *Biblical Theology,* Eerdmans, 1948.

{64} The use of the Old Testament in the Letter to the Hebrews

Response by John Goldingay to:

"The Use of the Old Testament in the Letter to the Hebrews"

The Rev. Dr. John Goldingay is Vice Principal and lecturer in Old Testament and Hebrew at St. John's College, Nottingham, England, a Church of England theological college.

I agree with many of the major concerns of Mr. Maoz's article, but I have questions about one central feature of it, and it is on this central feature that I therefore concentrate. I share Mr. Maoz's concern to affirm the fact and the importance of the intrinsic link between the Testaments (and his dislike of the term "Old Testament", which I therefore avoid here!).

Mr. Maoz also wishes to emphasize a further point, that each specific NT reference to a biblical text must be "truly in accordance with its native, objective and necessary meaning." "The writer to the Hebrews treats the Old Testament in the most scientific, objective manner possible, never adding to a text, never distorting it, never denying or ignoring its native sense." In principle, this seems a rather twentieth century thing to claim for the writer; and it is difficult to reconcile with his actual use of scripture.

Let us consider the opening chapter of Hebrews, with its seven biblical references. I have checked how these are treated in two commentaries on Hebrews which I find useful, the ones by John Brown and F. F. Bruce. In each case Brown affirms that the biblical text quoted in Hebrews bears the original reference to Christ which Hebrews seems to attribute to it and which Mr. Maoz believes it must have if that use of scripture, and our Christian claim to the Hebrew scriptures, are to be judged valid. In each case, Bruce infers that Hebrews' application of the biblical text does not correspond to its original meaning.

1. Heb. 1:5a-Ps. 2: 7. Brown takes Ps. 2 as directly messianic. Bruce refers sympathetically to the view that the psalm relates to the coronation liturgy of the Davidic dynasty, and sees the messianic interpretation as a later development.

2. Heb. 1¯5b - 11 Sam. 734. Brown takes as a directly messianic promise. Bruce sees the original reference as to David's actual son Solomon, though he does not see the promises as "exhausted" in the reference to him.

{65}

3. Heb. 1:6 – Ps. 97:7 LXX (also Deut. 32:43 LXX). Brown refers to "the kingdom of Christ", Bruce to the reign of Yahweh, the God of Israel.

4. Heb. 1:7-Ps.104: 4. Brown takes the psalm to denote the fact that angels are merely created beings. Bruce assumes that the original refers to God using the elements as his agents.

5. Heb. 1:8-9 - Ps. 45:8-9 (EVV 6-7). Brown declares that the original is messianic, Bruce that it celebrates a royal wedding.

6. Heb. 1:10-12-Ps. 102:25-27. Brown infers that the passage refers to the Messiah, Bruce that is refers to Yahweh the god of Israel.

7. Heb. 1:13-Ps. 110.1 Brown takes this as an originally messianic psalm, Bruce as a royal psalm which later came to have a messianic application.

Each commentator maintains a consistent line of interpretation through Heb. 1; each is working out a principle of interpretation. Brown believes that the NT's interpretation invariably corresponds to the text's original meaning. Bruce distinguishes between what the passages would have meant when they were written, and what they came to mean to the NT writers and other Jews of their day. Brown, like Mr. Maoz, is troubled at the idea that there might be a difference between what Hebrews meant and what the texts it quotes originally meant; for him, this would threaten Hebrews' inspiration and its authority. Evidently Bruce does not feel this.

I believe that Bruce is correct in the principles and in the application of his exegetical method. Mr. Maoz notes that scripture uses earthly, not heavenly languages and has to be understood by means of earthly grammatical rules in the light of earthly historical contexts. It is precisely these principles that lead Bruce to his kind of understanding of the texts which Hebrews quotes. Mr. Maoz believes that texts such as the passages from the Psalms listed above are to be interpreted according to usual historical and grammatical rules, *and* that Hebrews' use of such texts must reflect the objective meaning which these grammatical, historical methods seek to discover. These two views are not incompatible in theory, but are so in practice. Bruce's exegesis reflects the fact that the application of usual grammatical, historical methods of exegesis to the Psalms produces an understanding of them which is different from the one which Hebrews gives us. Brown, and I take it Mr. Maoz, maintain that the result of applying grammatical, historical methods to the Psalms is other than Bruce believes. I can only invite the reader to consider the passages listed above and see which approach gives a more plausible account of their historical meaning. For myself, I am clear that Brown is reading into the Psalms meanings that are not natural to their historical context, on the assumption that Hebrews presupposes a grammatical, historical exegesis of the Psalms.

Actually Hebrews is not trying to do exegesis of this kind. Its scriptural interpretation has a different dynamic. I was helped to appreciate this point by a consideration of John 11:49-52. Here John relates Caiaphas' suggestion that it is in everyone's interests if Jesus is killed. Caiaphas is far more right than he realizes: "he did not say this of his own accord," John comments, "but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation." John's approach to interpreting Caiaphas is here similar to the approach the NT often takes to interpreting the Hebrew Bible. Caiaphas' words have a meaning in the context of his speech to the council, and in this sense he certainly "spoke them of his own accord." John could also see another Spirit-given meaning to his words, which Caiaphas knew nothing of.

{66} In a similar way, statements in the Hebrew Bible which have a meaning in the context of God's dealings with Israel (a meaning itself Spirit-given) may sometimes have a second meaning which becomes clear to the person inspired by the Spirit in the light of Jesus' coming. It is this second meaning (what R. N. Longenecker refers to as a "revelatory" one) which Hebrews offers us. It is not an exercise in historical exegesis. It is a charismatic reading of the Hebrew Bible in the light of the coming of Jesus. Longenecker believes that we need to come to understand the NT's method of

using scripture, but that this does not commit us to seeing it as a method we should use. That does not imply that "in other words, apostolic practice is faulty, but its conclusions are correct," as Mr. Maoz suggests. This is to evaluate NT practice on the basis of alien criteria, if it is not aiming at our sort of exegesis.

It is true that the NT's interpretation of scripture might only convince someone who believed in Jesus already. Mr. Maoz implies that Hebrews' "exegesis" has to be "objectively" correct in order to be convincing to unbelieving Jews. Yet one reason why NT use of the Hebrew Bible takes the form it does is that in NT times, unbelieving and believing Jews would have agreed that (e.g.) Psalms 2, 45, and 110 were messianic. Disagreement concerned who was the messiah they pointed to. Today, however, Jewish scholars assume as naturally as Christian ones that these royal psalms originally referred to the reigning Davidic king. We may be making it harder to commend Jesus if we insist that Hebrews' understanding of the Psalms must be people's starting-point.

More fundamentally, however, I wonder whether one should expect arguing about scriptural interpretation to be a key factor in bringing Jews to recognize Jesus. In the gospels, at least, discussion of how Jesus can be the fulfillment of the Hebrew Bible often gets nowhere with those who are not yet believers. People come to believe in Jesus through being confronted by the authority of his words and deeds, or by his appearing to them as the crucified and risen one. It is after they have come to faith in him in this way that their faith is built up and filled out through the study of the scriptures.

Another way to put this point would be to observe that the link between the Hebrew Bible and Jesus has to be understood theologically, not merely exegetically. Whether the teaching of Hebrews may and must be accepted by Jews depends not so much on the validity of the exegetical techniques which it shares with documents such as the Qumran documents, Philo, and the rabbinic writings. It depends on the theological convictions that distinguish Hebrews and other NT writings from these, and in particular on the validity of the NT's convictions regarding the theological links between faith in Jesus and the faith of the Hebrew Bible. Are these two faiths indeed one? Does the story of Israel come to its climax in the story of Jesus? Does Jesus fulfill the hopes of the prophets? Does his behavioural teaching correspond to and build on that of the Hebrew Scriptures? It is these questions which have to be capable of an affirmative answer if believing in Jesus is a Jewish thing to do (and, for that matter, if believing in Jesus is to be possible for gentiles, given that Jesus seems to have assumed that the answer to these questions was "Yes"). Whether the NT's interpretative techniques correspond to ours is in this connection an indifferent matter.

{67} REFERENCES

Brown, J., *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews,* Edinburgh: Oliphant, 1862, Reprinted London: Banner of Truth, 1961.

Bruce, *F. F., Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964 / London: Marshall, 1965.

Longenecker, R N., *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

I have discussed many of the above points further in *Approaches to Old Testament Interpretation* (Leicester / Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1981).

"The Old Testament and Christian Faith: Jesus and the Old Testament in Matthew 1-5," *Themelios* 8, 1 (September 1982) 4-10; 8, 2 (January 1983) 5-12.

"Inspiration, Infallibility, and Criticism", *The Churchman* 90 (1976) 6-23.

{67} The Quest for a Messianic Theology

A comment by Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum

Editor's Note

MISHKAN Issue No. 2, Winter 1985, brought a paper by Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum on the Quest for a Messianic Theology, and a response by David Stern. Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum has sent us the following comment to Stern's response.

My friend David Stern accuses me of having a "hidden agenda." However, my concerns have always been quite plain, and one of my concerns has been to raise the level of theological knowledge and finesse among Jewish believers. When I find theological weakness in a group, it has therefore also been my agenda to point the weakness out, hoping to force adherence back to the Scriptures for them to rethink their positions. If I am critical of certain aspects of the Messianic Jewish movement, that arises from my well-stated agenda of pointing out theological weaknesses.

David criticizes me for quoting from the newsletter of the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations on the grounds that what is found in it does not express the general sentiments of the movement. However, if an organization issues a **{68}** newsletter and makes theological statements in it, a reader has the right to expect and believe that the statements reflect the views of the organization. If not, then there should be a disclaimer. But the newsletter I quoted had no such disclaimer.

David's example about the Christian Airplane Pilot's Fellowship is used to say that if the Fellowship of Christian Pilots have the right to have a rule that one should know how to fly in order to join, then the UMJC has the right to make the Sabbath requirement of their membership. But these are two different issues. Knowing how to fly a plane is not a theological issue, but keeping the Sabbath is a theological issue. Furthermore, one of the founders and present leader of the UMJC has made it quite plain that he considers the keeping of the Sabbath a criterion to evaluate a Jewish believer's loyalty to his Jewishness. Is that really fair? So what was the UMJC's motivation for passing the Sabbath rule for membership? According to one of those who formulated the rule, the issue was a test of loyalty to Jewishness. Again, the issue of mandatory keeping of the Sabbath is a theological issue, but flying a plane is not. David's statement that Matthew 23:8 does not prohibit messianic Jewish leaders to call themselves "rabbis" is itself a pontificating statement because taken in its simple meaning, that's exactly what the prohibition is. True, the Messiah was trying to teach a lesson of humility, but the lesson included the prohibition of using the term "rabbi" as a title. His interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11 is also quite open to debate in Greek commentaries, and there are commentaries that would disagree with his conclusions. So the three problems have not faded away, and David's dismissal of them won't make them fade away.

As to whether the God of the Bible is the same as the God of rabbinic Judaism, David counters by stating that the same could be said about different viewpoints within Christendom: is the God of the dispensationalists who will rapture before the tribulation the same as the God of the post-tribulationalists? But this difference has to do with a disagreement over what will be God's program and is not a disagreement over the person of God. But rabbinic Judaism's teachings on the person of

God is radically different from the teaching of Scripture and the teaching accepted by at least the vast majority of Jewish believers in the Messiahship of Jesus. So it can generally be asked if it is the same God in the light of the fact that the God of the Bible is a triunity and the God of rabbinic Judaism is not. The issue of disagreement is not God's program, but God's person. This should be sufficient to clarify the major points and/or objections raised by my friend David Stern. I've always enjoyed my discussions with him.

{69}The Influence of the Tanach and the Talmud on Islam and the Qur'an

In recent years the Theological Commission of the United Christian Council in Israel has held a number of seminars on topics relating to evangelism among Jewish people as well as among Muslims. The following is a report from a seminar held at the Baptist Village in Petach Tikva which dealt with the influence of the Tanach (the Old Testament) and the Talmud on Islam and the Qur'an. The seminar was led by Ray G. Register, presently chairman of the UCCI, and the opening lecture was given by an Islamic scholar, who is here presented under the pseudonym F. Tavor.

In this brief report we present an outline of the two main parts of the opening lecture by F. Tavor: "The five pillars of Islam," and "The dogmas of Islam," and a brief comment by Ray G. Register concerning the significance of this topic for the Gospel ministry in Israel. For those who would like to pursue the study of the topic of this report, notes have been added with references particularly to the Qur'an and to rabbinic literature; the reading of these primary sources will provide a fresh and most illuminating impression of the historical and theological links between Judaism and Islam.

The Five Pillars of Islam

F. Tavor emphasized in his lecture that the overall structure of Islam, as a house of faith, with its beliefs and worship patterns, is very similar in architectural design to the historical edifice of Judaism. Islam is framed within five pillars, namely:

- *The Shahadah,* or testimony, that God is absolutely One.

- *The five daily prayers,* at morning, noon, afternoon, sunset and evening.

- *The fast of Ramadan,* for one lunar month.

- *The Zakat,* or 2 per cent of each Muslim's yearly profit.

- *The pilgrimage to Mecca,* once in a lifetime.

With regard to each of these pillars a link back to the Old Testament and postbiblical Judaism can be demonstrated. – *The Shahadah,* the testimony that God is absolutely one, is the direct equivalent of the Jewish testimony, the *Shma':* "Listen, O Israel, Our God is the only One God."[1] This testimony is for both faiths the entrance into the faith community, and serves as a definition of that community.[2] Not only that, but it is the key-word given to a dead Muslim just before the burial by the Imam: "When the two angels receive you, tell them: God – **{70}** the only one – is my God and

[1] See Deut. 6,4 and Qur'an 2:130, 285. 5:64

[2] The Shma' is the heart of the worship of the synagogue as can be seen in the Prayer Book (ed. J. M. Hertz) pp. 116. 306. It is the culmination of the Bar Mitzvah prayer before the aliya to read the Torah (Prayer Book p. 1042). It is recited upon walking and before sleep (Berachot 2:3; 4b). It is proof of Jewish identity (Megillah 13a)

Mohammed is my prophet and Islam is my religion."[3] This also reminds us of the Jewish Tradition vis-a-vis the *Shma'*:[4]

- *The five daily prayers.* Before he prays, a Muslim must make sure his body is clean[5], another parallel to Judaism.[6] The timing of prayers, especially morning and evening, shows the same similarity.[7] It is interesting to remember that the Muslim's prostration during prayer with the forehead on the ground[8] is an old Jewish practice, as reflected in the fact that until quite recently old Iraqi Rabbis used to pray this way, and in the fact that Eastern Jews tend to kneel at the ports upon aliya to Israel. The practice is Biblical. [9]

- *The fast of Ramadan* probably has its roots in the Jewish worship of Yom-Kippur[10] with a difference in length due to a desire to appear different, or even to appear more spiritual.[11]

- *The Zakat,* giving offerings, and even tithes, is another Biblical practice[12], but the 10 per cent ideal becomes only 2 per cent.[13]

- *The pilgrimage to Mecca* is reminiscent, of course, of the Jewish command to make pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[14] Remember that originally God ordered Muslims to face Jerusalem in prayer[15] and, only later did Mecca replace it. It remains an aspiration for a pious Muslim to perfect his pilgrimage to Mecca by visiting Jerusalem and praying at AL-Aqsa Mosque.

Apart from these similarities and dependencies, there are also other significant overlapping features with biblical and Jewish tradition:

A sheep, or some animal is slaughtered as a sacrifice during the pilgrimage (Hajj)[16] as in biblical Judaism during the pilgrimage feasts.[17] As in Judaism[18] the animal must be sound and without

---

[3] See Kenneth Cragg: *The Call of the Minaret*, 1956, pp. 35-68; Constance E. Paduick: *Muslim Devotions,* 1961, p. 82

[4] The Confession on a Death Bed culminates in reciting the Shma' (Prayer Book, p. 1064). Martyrs traditionally recite it at death (Berachot 61b)

[5] Qur'an 4:43; 5:7

[6] See Berachot 15a; 22a

[7] See Berachot 26b; 4:1. The basic three times of prayer correspondent to the temple times of sacrifice, Ps. 5:4;1 Kings 18:36; Ezra 9:5; Ps. 55:18; Dan. 6:11. See also Qur'an 11:114; 17:78-79; 20:30; 30:17-18

[8] Qur'an 2:158; 48:29; 96:19. See Paduick, op. cit., p. 9, note 1

[9] See Josh. 7:6; 1 Kings 18:42; Berachot 28b; 30a, 31a; 34a-b; Yoma 6:2

[10] Lev. 23:26-32.

[11] See Qur'an, 2:179-185.

[12] Lev. 27:30-33; Num. 18:21-32

[13] Qur'an 2:43, 110, 177, 277; 4:162; 5:58

[14] Exod. 23:17; 34:23; Deut. 16:16; 2 Chr. 8:13. See Josephus, Ant. 4:203-4; Hagigah 1:1; 6a; Pesahim 8b. See Qur'an 2:196-203; 3:97; 22:26-33

[15] Qur'an 2:136-145; 17:1

[16] Qur'an 2:196; 22:28-33.

[17] For Passover see Exod. 12:1-28; 12:43-49; Deut. 16:1-8; Pesahim 64b; 5:1; 10:1-9. For Pentecost see Bikkurim 3:3. For Tabernacles see Num. 29:12-35.

[18] Lev. 22:17-25; Deut. 15:21-23; 17:1; Berachot 6. 19.

blemish.[19] Similarly, prohibited foods for Muslims include pork and blood from any animal[20], as in Judaism.[21]

The Dogmas of Islam

In the realm of teaching there is also a number of striking analogies which reflect the historical and theological link between Islam and Judaism. F. Tavor emphasized the following five points: – *The Fatihah* is the *introductory chapter,* or *prayer,* in the Qur'an. It has seven verses, as follows:

1. In the name of Allah, the Gracious, the Merciful.

2. All praises belong to Allah, Lord of the worlds.

3. The Gracious, the Merciful.

4. The Master of the Day of Judgment.

5. Thee alone do we worship and Thee alone we implore for help.

6. Guide us in the right path.

7. The path of those to whom Thou hast bestowed Thy blessings, those who have not incurred Thy displeasure and those who have not gone astray.

Every verse in this prayer is in harmony with traditional Jewish prayers, especially verse four within the context of the Day of Atonement.[22]

- *Al-Ikhlas is* a small Surah in the Qur'an, and it means *Sincerely*. It also shows clear Jewish influence, especially in regard to the stressing of the oneness of God. The four verses are:

1. In the name of Allah, the Gracious.

2. Say, He is Allah, the One. Allah, the independent and besought by all.

3. He begets not, nor is begotten.

4. And there is none like Him.[23]

- *Al-Jannah* is the doctrine of *Paradise.* This is very important and vividly illustrated in Islamic traditions.[24] An example is from the Qur'an, surat 47:15: "Therein are rivers of waters which do not

[19] Qur'an 5:4; 22:30.
[20] Qur'an 5:4.
[21] Lev. 7:26-27; 17:10; Deut. 14:7-8
[22] See the Amidah for the Day of Atonement, Prayer Book, pp. 894-904
[23] See Pesahim 56a; Exodus Rabbah (Soncino) Vol. 2, XXIX:5, pp. 339-40.
[24] Qur'an, 3:15, 198; 9:72; 15:45-48; 22:23; 32:19; 38:49-52, etc.

corrupt, and rivers of milk whose taste does not change, and rivers of wine, a delight to those who drink, and rivers of clear honey..." This imagery is both Jewish and Midrashic.[25]

{71}

- *Al-Sakeenah. This is* the Hebrew concept of Shekhinah[26], the presence and indwelling of God, and also is one of the Qur'an's great themes. In Islam *Al-Sakeenah* particularly means the presence of the peace and the grace of God.[27]

- *Haileq.* The Qur'an speaks of those with a *share* or no *share* in the world to come.[28] This is also built upon Jewish belief and wording.[29]

F. Tavor also pointed to the way of thought of traditional Jewish scholars and to the four major aspects of their search for real knowledge of God:

1. A search for the correct interpretation of the Tanach.

2. A search for personalized wisdom and light for their souls.

3. A search for the practical application of the Tanach.

4. A desire to come closer to God that He might reveal His will.

It cannot be mere coincidence that Muslim scholars seek the same things in the same way:

1. How to understand the word of God and the teaching of Islam.

1. How to live according to God's message revealed to Muhammed.

2. Lessons derived from the experience of believers who existed before Islam.

3. A kind of worship that draws Muslims nearer to God.

In conclusion, Mr. Tavor encouraged work in this area of comparative study of Judaism and Islam, paying particular attention to the periods of co-operation between Jews and Muslims. Indeed it might be a particular help to Christians working in Israel to study the bridges and the links between Judaism and Islam. At the very least, it may help to prevent the polarizing whereby foreign workers take sides and fail to see connections at all between the two faith communities.

Ray G. Register, Nazareth
and Mishkan editors.

---

[25] Pesahim 54a; Midrash on Ps. 90:12; Ta'an'' 25a; Baba Bathra 75a; Numbers Rabbah X111:2
[26] Qur'an 9:26, 40; 45:4; 48:4; 18, 26.
[27] Numbers Rabbah XI:S; XIII:6; Sanhedrin 39a; Shabbat 22b; Berachot 6a; Genesis Rabbah LXXXV1:6.
[28] Qur'an 3:77.
[29] Sanhedrin 11:1, 2; 99b; 105a. See also 13:2

{71} Comment

This brief introduction by F. Tavor to the influence of Judaism on Islam is a helpful tool for those who wish to share the message of Christ in the Jewish Arab context of the Middle East. Current political tensions tend to overshadow the many obvious links between Judaism and Islam. F. Tavor's insights into these links from the standpoint of a professionally competent scholar who also deals with matters of religion and life give the subject relevance.

All too often the Christian who seeks to share his faith with Jewish people bears a bias against Muslims and the Arab community. Perhaps this is because he knows so little about the Arab culture and the Muslim religion. Or perhaps he has so over-identified with the Jewish and Israeli viewpoint that he becomes biased against the Arab Muslim for both political and spiritual reasons. At the same time the Christian working and living in the Arab culture picks up a natural bias against the Jewish community.

A brief study of the Qur'an will also reveal that Mohammed was very disappointed that the Jews did not accept him as a new Messiah. Their political intrigues against him fueled this disappointment into outright rejection of the Jews as we see in *Surat al-Ma'ida* (The Table 5:85):

"Strongest among men in enmity to the Believers wilt thou find the Jews and Pagans." (Yusif Ali Translation)

This anti-Jewish bias in the Qur'an naturally encourages the underlying enmity between Jews and Arabs in the modern Middle East. It therefore can influence the Christian worker who lives and works in the Arab sector to take a negative stance toward Jews, or it can cause the opposite reaction for those working among the Jews toward the Arabs.

{72} Therefore, observations concerning the natural historical and spiritual links between Judaism and Islam may help the Christian worker to understand the two cultures better and to enable him to utilize the common thought patterns in the presentation of the Gospel. He will also easily detect that Islam has adopted many of the Jewish polemical stances against the Gospel, for example, the unity of God versus the trinity. At the same time the concept of *shekinah* or the spirit of God can act as a natural bridge of understanding of the incarnation for both Jew and Muslim. An additional contribution to understanding the relation between Judaism and Islam can be made by comparing the relation between the Jewish concept of the "chosen people" and the Islamic concept of *Ummah* or the *nation of Islam.* These and similar insights into the links and the enmity between the sons of Isaac and the sons of Ishmael are necessary for the Christian worker who wants to aid in building bridges so that God's grace can move and make them one in Christ!

{74} Jewish Music and Worship:
A Biblical Application – Oriented Survey

The following is a report from a seminar on "Jewish Music and Worship" with particular view to their significance for Christian congregations in a Jewish context.

The seminar was held at the Immanuel House, Tel Aviv, June 14-15,1985 under the auspices of the Caspari Center for Biblical and Jewish Studies and was led by Stuart Dauermann, a musicologist working with Jews for Jesus in San Francisco, USA.

Introduction

The past twenty years have witnessed the rise of various attempts by believers to recover music and worship that are both biblical and Jewish (i.e. music reflective of that used by ancient Israel in the Scriptures to worship God). One such example has been the "Davidic Praise" movement. Upon analysis, however, this phenomenon reveals striking similarities to some modern Neo-Pentecostal worship practices. Another effort to rediscover true Jewish worship has led some to appropriate portions of the synagogue liturgy, replete with Ashkenazi accent and eighteenth century East European melody. This latter attempt tends to be warmly accepted as authentic until its *aficionados* confront Sephardi or Oriental worship practices and musical traditions; at that point the quest for truly Jewish music suffers another temporary but by no means insurmountable setback!

This resurgence of interest in Jewish worship practice seems to be due to two factors: the increasing appreciation on the part of Gentile Christians for their Jewish biblical roots, and the sizeable growth (especially in North America) of communities of Jewish believers in Messiah who are trying to hammer out a working definition of their Jewishness as it relates to their newly discovered though ancient faith.

Who would be interested in asking the question: "What is biblical music and worship?" Three groups immediately come to mind: the merely curious, whose **{75}** interest in biblical music is similar to that of Indiana Jones ("Raiders of the Lost Ark") – namely, a fascination with long-vanished peoples, archeological artifacts and ancient cultures; the Biblicist, who attempts to discover and follow the exact practice of the Temple and/or the Jewish apostles; and finally, the application-oriented person, who wants to discover and apply those guidelines found in Scripture to his or her unique cultural setting. Perhaps most students of Scripture have part of all three perspectives jostling within them simultaneously!

The attempt to define biblical Jewish music and worship runs into unique problems in the light of the Exile: since modern Jewry is composed of scattered Jewish communities (the Diaspora), each with its own distinctive culture and music, we no longer have scholarly or popular consensus as to what biblical Jewish music once was. Since the history of Jewish music spans nearly four millennia and is as diverse and subject to geographical and cultural upheaval as are the Jewish people themselves, dare we hope to arrive at a satisfactory answer, one which will belie the

Sprichwort "Two Jews, three opinions?" Our method in this study will be to analyze what the Scriptures *describe* concerning Jewish music and worship, and then to examine what they *prescribe* (whether by command or by principle), so that we may understand and apply Messiah's teaching to our lives in joyful obedience (Luke 6:46-49).

I. What do the Scriptures Say?

a. Unique Problems

Our quest for the "lost grail" of biblical music runs into some unique problems at the outset: no one possesses notations or sheet music from that period, and tape recordings were of course non-existent; therefore we will never have an exact idea of how that music sounded. Furthermore, no representatives from that culture are alive today, and so musicologists have little ability to verify many of their tentative hypotheses from first-hand sources. As well, what little notation of Jewish music we have comes to us from Europe in an extremely stylized fashion, at least 1500 years removed from the biblical period.[1]

All is not lost however. The oral traditions of Temple music have been somewhat preserved in isolated Jewish communities of the Near and Middle East (e.g. the Bukharan and Yemenite Jews)[2], which until this century were shielded from much of the transformational effects of contact with other cultures. Musicologists such as Idelsohn and Levine have recorded and analyzed this music and have found striking similarities to Gregorian chants and music of the ancient Oriental churches.[3] To some extent Jewish synagogue liturgy, which was at its inception contemporaneous with Temple worship, preserved some musical practices prevalent in the Temple and again, some of these were eventually absorbed into ancient church liturgies. Though modern rabbinic liturgy has been modified and altered to the point where it no longer accurately reflects Temple practice, it remains a helpful guide inasmuch as it does perpetuate some ancient Jewish worship forms.

b. "A Text Without a Context"

Abraham and his descendants were not born in a cultural vacuum, and King David did not fashion his instruments out of old Bibles (1 Chron. 23:5)! Though it may surprise some of us, they were influenced by musical forms, melodies, instruments and practices from surrounding host cultures, even as modern Christians and Orthodox Jews have adapted the electric guitar or bass, the synthesizer and electric organ for **{76}** use in religious music. Some of those contemporaneous influences came from Sumeria, of which Ur was an important city (Gen. 11:28,31). In that civilization (as in Israel) harps, seven-stringed lyres, double oboes, drums and horns were used in religious services, though stringed instruments dominated. Choral groups were trained in temple-connected schools, its members drawn from one educated class expert in the liturgy. As well, Sumerian psalms of lament written under threat of enemy invasion bear striking similarity to the

---

[1] Werner, Eric, "Jewish Music", *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie, Vol. 9. (London: Macmillan, 1980), p. 615.
[2] Idelsohn, A. Z. *Jewish Music in its Historical Development,* N. Y. Schocken Books, 1967, pp. 22-23, 43.
[3] ibid., pp. 47. 56. 61. 110-111. 132. Levine, Joseph A. "Psalmody" in *Journal of Synagogue Music*, vol. XII, No. 2, Dec. 1982, pp. 34-42.

equivalent Hebrew psalms.[4] In Assyrian religious services, hymns and chants were sung antiphonally by priests and congregation; responsorial singing was practiced; stress was laid upon vocal music, and liturgical offices were hereditary.[5] The priests of Egypt, in addition to many of the above elements, used eleven-stringed harps and many percussion instruments in their worship. The Talmud, giving testimony to this influence, conveys an apocryphal legend that when Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, she brought with her one thousand different kinds of musical instruments.[6] In all of the above examples, Israel borrowed or made use of her neighbours' musical cultures, adapting them for worship of Jehovah. However, though there were areas of musical congruity with surrounding cultures, there were also many areas of strict discontinuity. Israel refused to engage in the frenzied pipe and drum music of the Phoenicians which was used to drown out the cries of wailing children about to be sacrificed in Moloch worship.[7] As well, the Jewish people were commanded to spurn the worship of Canaanite, Moabite, Ammonite and Philistine gods, among them the Ashtarot (Joshua 23:7; Judges 10:8-10; I Kings 18:21). These ceremonies were often accompanied by gross drunkenness, self-mutilation and cult prostitution.[8] Considering the power music can have over one's personality, we may have another influential factor here contributing to our people's backsliding and syncretism during First Temple times.

c. The Hidden World of Biblical Music

Music played a tremendous role in the life of the community of Israel, both in daily affairs and in divine worship. Whether to memorize Scripture (Deut. 31:19, 22; II Sam. 1:17-18), to induce prophesy (I Sam. 10:5; 19:20; II Kings 3:15) or to praise God, music was an integral part of the religious life of Israel. But also military songs (Num. 10:35, 36;), work songs (Is. 16a0), love songs (Song of Songs), drinking songs (Psalm 69:12; Isa. 24:9), victory and dance songs (I Sam. 18:6, 7; Jer. 31:4), songs of derision (Lam. 3:14, 63), and songs of mourning ([I Sam. 1:17-27; Jer. 22:18) all demonstrate the pervasive full-blown role of music in the daily life of pre-exilic Israel. Music also assumes a place of priority for the twentieth century cosmopolitan, whose ears are full of radio jingles and television commercials. For many believers today, however, sacred music serves in a much more restricted and unimaginative role than it did in biblical times.

d. "East is East and West is Best"

One prejudice that many bring unawares to a study of biblical music is that ancient Israel's music must have sounded like what we would instantly recognize today as Jewish music. The truth is that Temple music may have been closer in sound to classical Arab music than to "Fiddler on the Roof" or the Barry Sisters. Semitic musical forms would have been reflected in sound, style, role of the voice and types of instruments used in First and Second Temple times. There the following distinctives were probably found: simple melodies with much repetition; a twenty- **{77}** four quarter-tone octave; much ornamentation (tremolo, trilling, bending of tone) and improvisation in a tightly controlled traditional structure; melodies which fit the words and not vice-versa;

---

[4] Sendrey, ALfred, *Music in Ancient Israel*, London, Vision, 1969, pp. 35-39
[5] ibid., pp. 44-46; Idelsohn, op. cit., p. 7
[6] TB Shabbat 56b; Sendrey, op. cit., pp. 39-41
[7] Sendrey, op., pp. 54-55.
[8] ibid., pp. 58-59; Idelsohn, op., pp. 5, 6.

asymmetrical (or nonwestern) meter; very little harmony; predominance of voice and not of instrument; and mood being conveyed not by mode (i.e. by major or minor scales) but by tempo.[9]

e. Temple Services

A brief analysis of instrumental and vocal practice in Temple worship may help us to develop a fairly realistic image of what biblical Jewish music was like. Singing in the Temple was originally restricted to Levites alone,[10] though the laity of Israel was eventually incorporated into the Temple service, perhaps first through doxologies and later in refrains.[11] Approximately 4,000 Levites were involved in praising God through music (1 Chron. 23:5) – no halfway measures here! The leader and conductor of the Levites in David's time was Asaph, who played the cymbals (perhaps to keep the beat or mark liturgical transitions – 1 Chron. 16:5). Hezekiah's desire to restore traditional worship to the Temple Mount after a period of national apostasy is described in 2 Chron. 29:25-30. Since his restoration hearkens back to an earlier musical practice, it is most helpful for our research. There we note that instrumental music accompanied the singing of David's psalms and the offering of sacrifices; cymbals, harps and lyres were used; trumpets were sounded at the time of sacrifices; only the Levites sang and their praises were sung joyfully, with all present bowing down to God in worship.

During Second Temple times, the emphasis on instrumental music diminished. While at the dedication of the Second Temple possibly 128 cymbals (Ezra 2:41; 3:10) and 120 trumpets (II Chron. 5:12) were employed, by the end of that period, in Messiah's day, only one pair of cymbals was employed and only a maximum of six harps and twelve flutes or reed instruments were allowed (Mishnah Arachin 2:3; Tamid 7:3). Vocal and textual considerations became paramount, while instrumental emphasis correspondingly decreased (TB Sukkah 50b-53a). Quite probably plucked instruments were used supportively to double the vocal line, with perhaps some embellishments added. This philosophy of music is echoed nearly two millennia later in a statement by Dietrich Bonhoeffer, "Thus music is completely the servant of the Word."[12] During Second Temple times, Levitical singers were admitted to the choir at age thirty and served until the age of fifty, when voice quality began to decline. All choir members had to undergo five years of initial training[13] (what some church-choir directors would give to see such practices re-enacted today!).

II. A Jewish Music Ministry Governed by Biblical Principles

a. The Scriptural Principles

One of the first lessons that we can learn from Temple worship is that music was a critical aspect of priestly function. Music ministry was led by the Levites and was part of the presentation of the offerings and sacrifices. In that we too are priests of God (Rom. 12:1; Heb. 13:10-15; Rev. 1:6) and in that Jewish believers are the spiritual remnant which fulfills priestly function in Israel (1

---

[9] Idelsohn, op. cit., pp. 24-28.
[10] 1 Chron. 15:16-28; 16:41-42: 23:3-5, 13, 30; 25:1-31; 2 Chron. 6:11-14; 7:6; 9:14-15/
[11] Sendrey, op. cit., pp. 5,6
[12] Bonhoeffer, Dietrich, *Life Together,* transl. by John W. Doberstein. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1954, p. 59.
[13] TB Hullin, 24a; Sendrey, op. cit., pp. 170-71.

Peter 2:5, 9-10 – provided that one accepts a Jewish Christian audience for 1 Peter), we find ourselves challenged to take our responsibility as priests of Messiah and **{78}** of the Father more seriously and reverently as we worship Him musically in spirit and in truth. Our generation needs to be reminded once again about the dignity, stature and importance of the music ministry.[14]

The content of our worship can be greatly enriched by a study of the Psalms. The important contributions of this book (in which 70% of the individual psalms refer to music in some way) have yet to be appropriated by twentieth-century saints. Indeed, "the fact that the longest book in the entire Bible is a book of *music* seems to have escaped the attention of many believers."[15]

The briefest and most succinct description of their contents is found in 1 Chron. 16:4:

"(David) appointed some of the Levites to minister before the Ark of the Lord, to make petition (*l'hazkir),* to give thanks *(l'hodot),* and to praise (*l'hallel)."* The first word, *l'hazkir,* can be translated "to bring before God's remembrance" (i.e. to make petition) or again, "to bring before the people's remembrance" God's mighty attributes and acts; *l'hodot* refers to public acknowledgement of who God is and what He has done; *l'hallel* involves describing the wonders and excellencies of the One who is worthy of praise. These three activities comprise the bedrock of biblical worship.

In the New Testament we find three different categories of praise in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16: *psalms* – sacred or Scripture songs sung to musical accompaniment in the character, spirit and manner of Hebrew Bible songs; *hymns* – praise songs on scriptural themes with poetic structure; *spiritual songs* – songs centered on the believer's experience. The tendency of our generation has been to focus on one of these categories to the neglect of the others, while Scripture would suggest a more balanced spiritual music diet.

The concept of a prayerful and well-prepared music ministry dedicated to God is sometimes demeaned by those who would see a strictly pre-apostolic context for such activities; since we are no longer under the Mosaic law, believers in Messiah should have a totally different approach to music, so it is argued. While Ephesians 5:19 and Colossians 3:16 of necessity moderate the above stance, it is the book of Revelation which deals it a death-blow. As Robert Coleman points out in his book *Songs of Heaven*[16] there are no less than fourteen different songs in that description of the affairs of heaven and of the eternal order. As the glories of God are eternal, so is His praise; biblically, His praise is linked indissolubly to song!

b. Challenges and Questions

Our music is pleasing to God when ministered in spirit, devotion and truth. Psalm 69:30-31 makes this extraordinary statement: "I will praise God's name in song and glorify Him with thanksgiving. This will please the Lord more than an ox, more than a bull with its horns and hoofs." We must search our hearts and ask whether we are directing people's hearts and thoughts (and our own as

---

[14] TB Arachin 11a; Sendrey, op. cit., p. 169. Note: Since the footnote number is missing in the original text, we have arbitrarily inserted it at the end of this paragraph.
[15] Allen, Ronald Barclay, *Praise! A Matter of Life and Breath*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1980, p. 22
[16] Coleman, Robert E., *Songs of Heaven*, New Jersey: Flemming Revell, 1980

well) to God or to ourselves when we worship. Bonhoeffer has said: "Where the singing is not to the Lord, it is singing in the honor of the self or the music, and the new song becomes a song to idols."[17]

Since our music is directed toward the King of Kings, we must give Him our best. In Psalm 33:3 we are exhorted to play skillfully to God; the 4,000 Levites of David's time practiced five years each before ever singing a note in the Temple. Is the hasty choosing of songs four minutes before the worship service a fulfillment of this commandment? Music can be profitably used to encourage fellow-believers in their **{79}** spiritual walk. Through it we have ample opportunity to teach, exhort and build up one another (Col. 3:16, Deut. 32:4447; I Cor. 14:26). As well, music should be used evangelistically, to call the world (whether Jewish or Gentile) back to God their Creator. The Scriptures refer to this evangelistic aspect of music in many places: Psalms 9:11; 18:49-50; 22:22-23; 40:3; 108:1-4; Romans 15:6-12. In this regard, however, we must ask ourselves some hard questions. Is our music culturally suited to the people to whom we are reaching out, or are we transmitting confusing signals to them? For example, are we using too much non-Jewish music while seeking to testify to the Jewishness of what we believe? Also, is our music theologically accurate? Since no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own private interpretation (2 Peter 1:20), it follows that no songwriter can feel the freedom in the Spirit to use Scripture improperly or inaccurately in composition. *Caveat lector!*

c. Definitions

As Jews who believe in Messiah and accept the apostolically written New Testament as the Word of God, we must ask ourselves a paraphrase of the Passover question: "Why is our music different from all others?" Our answer must be that it both *is*, and *is not* different. It is different from other music in that it should be identifiably Jewish (taking into consideration the wide divergence of Diaspora definitions of Jewish culture): The same point, ably emphasized by Idelsohn, is most a propos for Messianic Jews in the 1980's: "As long as (the Jew's) consciousness was strong, wherever he developed his spiritual culture and lived accordingly, his religious song was Jewish."[18] However, one doesn't have to be Jewish to write Messianic Jewish music; one only has to be well versed in its musical genre. This is more easily said than done, however, and there are not a few examples of such music which miss the mark of cultural authenticity. For that matter, incidentally, not all songs written by Messianic Jews can rightly be considered Messianic Jewish music. If the song is not identifiably Jewish in sound, then it is not Messianic *Jewish* music.

Messianic Jewish music must truly be *Messianic,* acceptable to Messiah and reflective of His teaching (John 17:8, 20; Acts 26:15-16; 1 Cor. 15:3a). If the music is not apostolically acceptable in doctrine, it is not Messianic music. Music must not seek to disguise our faith in Messiah, but rather, it must honor Yeshua through proclaiming it. This point should be true of all Christian music, incidentally.

Last of all, our music must be presented in a way that seeks to honor God: it must endeavor to serve both God and man (Luke 22:25-26); it must be ministered in holiness (Eph. 5:4; Heb. 12:14); and its motive must be theodoxical above all things, bringing glory to God (Deut. 6:4-5; Jn. 14:15).

---

[17] Bonhoeffer, op. cit., pp. 58-59
[18] Idelsohn, op. cit., p. 177.

"And all the angels stood round about the throne.... and fell before the throne on their faces and worshipped God, saying, Amen, blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honour and power and might be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen!'" (Rev. 7:11, 12).

{82} BOOK REVIEW
Israel and the Early Evangelicals

"The Bible and the Sword"
by Barbara Tuchman, Published by Peter Mac, London 1982, 412 pp.

Review by Walter Barker,
Director, The Church's Ministry among the Jews, St. Albans, England.

Miss Tuchman has a unique ability to re-create not only in a valid manner the events of history but also to expose the human personalities and factors which go to make up so much of life. A whole series of historical writings have flowed from her pen many of which have been exceedingly popular, and "The Bible and the Sword," first published in 1956, is no exception. This method of historical writing without doubt is a great help to the ordinary person who finds historical study dry and boring. It is not without its risks and dangers. Not only does the analytical method over-simplify the issues in order to provide interest and drama, it is not easy for the popular writer to separate himself from popular prejudice capsulated in the attitude "how could intelligent men ever believe that?" How easy it is to be right after the event!

The lure of the Holy Land has affected human-kind since the day when Moses sent two spies to look over the Promised Land. To the secular mind absurdities mount on absurdities. Miss Tuchman does her best to be sympathetic and understanding to the evangelicals of the first half of the nineteenth century and, as with so many moderns, finds it exceedingly difficult. The book concentrates on Lord Shaftesbury because of his obvious political influence at a time when it was possible for the establishment of an Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem. But it was another great philanthropist and political leader, William Wilberforce, earlier leader of Anglican evangelicals, who directed Christian's minds to the significance and importance of the Jewish people. The book emphasizes the strangeness of believing that the Jews were to be converted in any numbers because of the apparent lack of numerical success of the London Jews Society and other like bodies in the preaching of the gospel to the Jews. The belief that this could ever happen strains the imagination! However, we have to recognize that tied up with the belief in the conversion of the Jew was also a similar declaration that the Jews would return to their land and would establish once again sovereignty over their ancient territory. Does this strain the imagination in 1985? It certainly did at that time. Nothing heaped more contempt on the early evangelical's heads than that particular item of their **{83}** faith about the Jews. Indeed, many a learned article was written to prove conclusively that Jews were incapable of governing themselves. They were only fit for the ghettos, according to many, so the whole prospect of their being able to till the soil and defend themselves with their own weapons was ludicrous. It is, of course, true that the evangelicals' beliefs were not based on a narrow assessment of the Jews as they saw them in the world at the time but on what they believed was God's concern for His people. It is also true that there were divisions of opinion about how and when these mighty events would take place. For example, Wilberforce considered that Jews would come to Christ in great numbers before they returned to the land, and as far as that is concerned, we know that Wilberforce was wrong. He might not have

been right on the details, but his faith has been more than abundantly justified. Many accusations are made against the Israelis but not against their agricultural and defensive abilities.

The major thesis of the book illustrates the twin underlying factors which the writer sees as leading to British involvement in the events in Palestine: the influence of the Christian religion through the Bible and the demands of the British Empire through politics. To prove her point, she starts with Joseph of Arimathea and enlightens the story through the centuries with chapters on "The Pilgrim Movement," "The Crusades," "The People of the Book" and "The Eclipse of the Bible." The author does admit that there are weak sections to the argument. The Crusades are not very important in terms of British history. If it were not for Richard Lionheart and his extraordinary episode, the Crusaders would have had little influence on the history of England. The telescoping of history which is inevitable in a book of three hundred pages covering two thousand years has its delirious effects at this point. The period between Richard and the Reformation, when the British people became the "People of the Book," was getting on for four hundred years. The number of British people who went on pilgrimage during those years was minute and un-influential. Any impression that the peoples of these islands have had a concern about the Holy Land ever since the days of Joseph of Arimathea, since it is possible to string along a number of the incidents in our history which indicates in that way, would be far from the truth. Even after the publication of the King James Bible at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when the Bible molded the thinking of so many English people in a unique way, concerns of Christianity were largely internal. This is shown by the fact that the missionary interest within the Protestant Church did not arise until the end of the eighteenth century. It is true, regrettably perhaps, that the Christian followed the explorer, trader and administrator. It was only in the nineteenth century that the great missionary explorers in Africa opened up territory for later occupation by the politicians.

For those interested in the State of Israel, the later chapters leading up to the Balfour Declaration are the most interesting. Miss Tuchman gives a succinct and interesting account of the original maneuverings which resulted in the sending out of Bishop Solomon Alexander, the first Protestant Bishop in the Middle East. She pays her own tribute to Lord Shaftesbury who undoubtedly was a predominant influence in pushing this forward although admittedly finding it difficult to appreciate his religious motivation. It is at this point that the modem writer finds it difficult not be simplistic in assessing and judging attitudes. Inevitably, she pays generous tribute to his philanthropic **{84}** and social concerns. These, however, cannot be divided from Shaftesbury's total religious view of life. Today we divide social service and religious belief in accordance with good secular analysis, so creating difficulties for Christians in the twentieth century. The dilemma: do we preach the gospel and convert individuals or do we change the social system, is not one which could have disturbed Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, or the disciples of Jesus for that matter. If God is in control of the whole of life because he is the Lord of history, slavery is unjust and therefore must be opposed and abolished. All men need God in Jesus Christ so the gospel should be preached to Gentile and Jew alike. Given present day attitudes to success (not a concept that occurs very clearly in the scriptures) it is inevitable that doubt will be cast on the results of the missionary movement amongst the Jews. It so happens that only a few weeks before this review was being written, the writer stood in the Protestant Cemetery on Mount Zion in Jerusalem by the graves where many of the actors in this particular episode of Jewish and Palestinian history are to be found. The figures of Jews converting to Christianity during this early period are quoted as evidence of the failure of the mission. This, however, is to be judged by modern commercial standards. The disciples of our Lord were not sent out to convert either Jews or Gentiles. They

were sent out to preach the gospel to every creature. The fruit of their endeavors was to be through the work of God and Him alone. During the years covering the establishment of the first bishopric, the number of baptisms of Jews remained fairly steady at about ten or twelve a year. These would be adults and would be drawn from between eight and ten thousand Jews living in the city of Jerusalem at that time. Many parish clergy would be rather pleased with that result today. However, the success of this work cannot be seen by studying baptism registers. God is not in a hurry. The Wilberforces and Shaftesburys of this world did not live to see their faith come to fruition. We now have a Jewish State in Palestine. That aspect of their faith has been fully justified. In a sense, also, it is possible to appreciate that the lives and testimonies of the early missionaries in Palestine have a part to play in the unfolding of what has happened in the past one hundred and fifty years.

When the first workers of the London Jews Society arrived in Jerusalem, how much concern was there shown in the world for the Jews of Palestine? A little charitable money came from some Jews but what else? When the first accounts from the missionaries arrived back in Europe, both Christians and Jews began to realize the plight of Palestinian Jewry. Other Christians and Jews began to feel an obligation. Decades passed and then other Jews began to see Palestine as the place to which they could go and settle. Now we have a Jewish majority in Palestine and amongst that Jewish majority a minority of Jewish believers in Messiah who in God's grace are now the primary evangelists to their own people. For some of us this is a remarkable sequence of events which we feel we have been privileged to see. We pay tribute to those who were sent before us, who believed yet did not see.