

## The Law

**I Jesus' teaching (synthesis). Law in general** (continuity). Q: Luke 16:16-17 // Mat 5:17-19 (lacking in Mark). "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one dot of the law to become void." (Lk 16:17). "For truly I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished. Whoever then relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of Heaven; but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Mat 5:18-19). See also "Excursus 2 Tithing" below (Q: Lk 11:42 // Mat 23:23).

- 1 **Divorce** (heightened norm). Luke 16:18 [Q 繆; Mark 10:1-12; Matt 5:31-32; 19:1-9). Texts differ (see Excursus 1 below) and Paul adds another important variant (1 Cor 7:10-16). Also all the NT texts differ from Deut 24:1-4.
- 2 **Oaths** (heightened norm). "The prohibition of oaths, doubly attested in Matt 5:34-37 and Jas 5:12, derives from Jesus and has no parallel in Judaism of the time" (Loader 2010): "Again you have heard that it was said to the men of old, 'You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform to the Lord what you have sworn [Lev 19:12; Deut 23:22] But I say to you, Do not swear at all....Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'; anything more than this comes from evil" (Mat 5:33-34, 37). "But above all, my brethren, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or with any other oath, but let your yes be yes and your no be no, that you may not fall under condemnation" (→ Jas 5:12).. This is Meier's second piece of evidence that Jesus "presumed to revoke some institution or command of the Mosaic Law" (205). Loader questions Meier's term "revoke" and says Jesus rather raises laws "to a higher level of strictness, which necessarily sets some provisions aside" (2010). The last article of "The Thirty-Nine Articles" of the Anglican/Episcopal church (1571 A.D.) reflects the common Christian "reinterpretation" of Jesus' prohibition: "As we confess that *vain and rash* Swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ and James his Apostle [and brother!], so we judge, that Christian Religion doth *not* prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching in justice, judgment, and truth." A similar but more detailed reinterpretation is found in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter XXII, which points out that the Apostle Paul himself took oaths and vows (2 Cor 1:23; Acts 18:18; see 21:23; Rom 1:9; Gal 1:20; Phlp 1:8; Heb 3:11, 18; 4:3; Peter in Mat 26:72, 74; Mk 14:71. The diversity of biblical teaching leads Alan Mitchell to conclude: "The attitude of NT authors on swearing oaths depends on whom one consults" ("Oath". *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000:979).
- 3 **Sabbath** (discontinuity; see Excursus 4 below). "There is no hint anywhere in the ministry of Jesus that the first day of the week is to take the character of the Sabbath and replace it" (D.A. Carson 1982:85, cited by Gerhard F. Hasel 1992 V:856). There is no theological connection between Sabbath and Sunday. The Sabbath was a day of rest more than a day of worship, and Sunday became a day of worship but was not initially a day of rest (but see Sabbath worship, Psalm 92; Isaiah 56:1-8; Luke 4:16, 31-33; Acts 16:13). "There are hints in the NT that the first day of the week was set aside for evening worship, including the Lord's supper (Acts 20:7; 1 Cor 16:2 [the collection]; Revelation 1:10 refers to 'the Lord's Day'" (A. G. Shead 2000:749-750; see Jesus' Sunday resurrection appearances). Note how the poor slaves had to arrive late from their work and suffered discrimination in the Lord's Supper (→ 1 Cor 11:17-34). In Paul's writings the few Sabbath references are all negative. "For the Galatians to observe it... would be to descend into gospel-denying slavery (Gal 4:9-11); for the Colossians to observe it as part of a syncretistic system would be equally fatal (Col 2:16)...Even Sabbath observance 'for the Lord' was tolerated only for the sake of those whose faith was weak (Rom 14:1-12)!" (Shead 2000:749).

Of the five controversy episodes in Mark 2:1-3:6, the last two involve Sabbath interpretation (2:23-28; 3:1-6). The first has its parallels in Mat 12:1-8 and Luke 6:1-5. Matthew and Luke, however eliminate the apparently mistaken reference to Abiathar as high priest (Mk 2:26; NJB note) and Jesus' argument that "The Sabbath was made for man/humans, not man/humans for the Sabbath (Mk 2:27), leaving only the conclusion "So the Son of man is lord even of the Sabbath" (Mk 2:28 // Mat 12:8 and Lk 6:5). Some would see Mk 2:27 as a significant reference to the creation narrative (Gen 2:1-3), indicating that the Sabbath is not just for the Jews (as the 4<sup>th</sup> of Moses' 10 commandments; Ex 20 // Deut 5) but for all humanity (Adventist scholar Hasel 1992:855). In recent

years, scholars commonly agree that Jesus should not be seen as dispensing with the Sabbath command but only as insisting on its proper interpretation that prioritizes human need (hunger, 2:25), over legalism (2:27) and Jesus' authority to properly interpret the Law (2:28 // Mat 12:8; Lk 6:5), just as he has authority to forgive sin in Mk 2:10. Similarly, in the following Sabbath controversy (Mk 3:1-6 // Mat 12:9-14 // Lk 6:6-11), the Gospels do not present Jesus as breaking the Sabbath law or dispensing with it but as insisting on its proper interpretation: "Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?" (Mk 3:4), a question ironically directed to the Pharisees precisely when they are beginning to plot with the Herodians to kill Jesus (Mk 3:6).

The prayer in Matthew 24:29 that the community's flight may not occur on the Sabbath might at first appear to be Matthew's addition to Mark's earlier version (which refers only to winter; 13:18). However, since Mark's version is directed to non-Jewish believers, possibly Mark eliminated Jesus' Sabbath reference as irrelevant to those believers.

"Remarkably, the Johannine Jesus concedes that he 'works' on the Sabbath (Jn 5:17)—precisely what the law prohibits—but claims that he is merely acting as God his Father does. The charge that Jesus breaks the Sabbath is thus conceded (Jn 5:18)" (Westerholm 2000:1034). Comparably Paul first critiques male-male anal sex as against nature (Rom 1:27), but then deconstructs the rhetoric by indicating that God also acts against nature by engrafting non-Jewish believers into the olive tree that symbolizes God's covenant people (→ Rom 11:24).

- 4 **Purity** (discontinuity; see Excursus 3 below): Mc 7:19c ("declaring all *foods* clean") represents Mark's summary of the import of Jesus' words in 7:1-23, which comes between three narratives with a Jewish setting (6:30-65) and three set in Gentile territory, 7:24-30, 31-37, 8:1-19 (Loader 1997:66-68, 125-25). This explicit sweeping elimination of two chapters of Hebrew Bible food laws (Lev 11; Deut 14) is lacking but implicit in Mat 15:1-20 and Luke 11:37-41. Cf. Paul (Rom 14:14, "all *things* clean").
- 5 **Temple and temple cult** (discontinuity). Since a major portion of Torah was dedicated to commands regarding the Tabernacle construction (Ex 25-30, 35-40), types and procedures for temple sacrifices (Lev 1-7) and priestly ordination (Lev 8-10), the discontinuity implicit in Jesus' actions and teaching regarding the Temple and its cult would have been obvious first-century Jews: "Mark's Jesus supersedes Torah and, with regard to the temple and its cult abrogates it. In Mark's time [69-70 A.D.] the destruction is at hand, if not already recent history [see Mark 13]....The temple is a major theme underlying the whole section [of Mark 11:1-13:37]. By intercalating the temple incident [purification/cleansing] with the cursing of the fig tree Mark [11:12-25] had Jesus declare God's judgment on the temple. Mark has linked the issue of Jesus' authority with the replacement of the old temple by the new community of faith....The new temple is one build on the cornerstone which the builders rejected....[Jesus'] radical reworking of Torah, according to which at the centre of God's will is the call to love God and neighbor, not as a summary of all laws, but as a criterion for all of life. The heritage of Israel, its vineyard, is now in the hands of a new community [of believing Jews and non-Jews]" (Loader 1997:116-117).
- 6 **Tithing** (continuity): **Q (Lk 11:42 // Mat 23:23)**. For details, see Apéndice 2 below.

<p>But woe to you Pharisees!  For you tithe mint and rue and every herb,  And neglect justice and the love of God;</p> <p>These you ought to have done,  Without neglecting the others (Lk 11:42)</p>	<p>Woe to you, <i>scribes and</i> Pharisees, ¡hypocrites!  for you tithe mint and dill and cumin,  and have neglected <i>the weightier matters of the law,</i>  <i>justice and mercy and faith;</i>  these you ought to have done  without neglecting the others (Mat 23:23).</p>
---	---
- 7 **Love commandments** (highly selective continuity). "The juxtaposition of Deut 6:4-5 and Lev 19:18b word for word in Mark 12:28-34...is without precedent and parallel in Jesus' world and has a strong claim to reflect Jesus' own creative exposition of Torah" (Loader 2010, agreeing with Meier). The Golden Rule predates Jesus, it is uncertain that Jesus ever used it, and it falls short of his teaching on love. The terse "Love your enemies" (Mat 5:43-46 // Lk 6:27-28, 32-36; ver Rom 12:14-20; 13:8-10) has its closest antecedent in the Hebrew Bible in the common advice to leave vengeance to God (Loader 2010, agreeing with Meier).

## Summary: Diversity in Sources (the historical Jesus and the canonical Christ):

- 1 Q source (Mat // Lk, not in Mark), ca. 60 A.D. For Q see Lk 16:16-17 // Mat 5:17-19. “16:17 makes an assertion about the Law’s abiding validity....Q then understands 16:18 as applying this strictness to the matter of divorce for remarriage....This, too, is related indirectly to the theme of greed [16:13] (especially in the sense: divorcing in order to obtain another)....16:17 does not stand in isolation in Q, but coheres with the ethos of heightened demand which comes with God’s kingdom and with the conflict which that brings” (Loader 425-426; Lk 11:42 // Mat 23:23, tithing).
- 2 Mark, 69-70 A.D. Contains no explicit reference to Law. “Mark’s Jesus calls for compassion and has authority to dispense with parts of Torah.” [purity laws regarding clean/unclean foods, Mk 7:19; although the Sabbath is properly observed, its interpretation is disputed].
- 3 Luke-Acts, ca. 80 A.D. “Luke is much closer to Matthew but from a less authoritarian allegiance.”
- 4 Matthew, ca 85 A.D. “seeks to uphold the authority of the entire Torah, interpreted by central commands of love”
- 5 John, ca. 90 A.D. “will dispense with Torah altogether; [Jesus replaces the Law]; obedience is an aspect of personal allegiance” (citations in 2-5 from Loader 1997:272). “John’s Jesus refers to the Law as the Jews’ Law (“your Law”; “their Law”; 8:17; 10:34; 15:25; cf 7:19, 22) since it has ceased to be the Law of Jesus and the community, except in its Christological function [of bearing witness to Christ]” (Loader 1997:489). “At the level of ethics, instruction is not Torah based, but derived from Jesus and the example he set. Some of the values enshrined in the Decalogue...continue to have validity, but without recourse to the Law as authority. The same is true of the command to love God....The command of mutual love, urged on the disciples as Jesus prepares his disciples for his departure, is based on the example of Christ’s love and is new solely because of the new situation they are to face [13:34-35]” (Loader 1997:490)

## Bibliography (Jesus)

Loader, William (1997/2002). *Jesus’ Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

------(2010). RBL 04/2010 review of Meier: “Steering between Sander’s positive assessment and those claiming that Jesus rejected Torah, Meier argues for a differentiated approach that explains how Jesus could both affirm the law “and yet in individual cases or legal areas (e.g. divorce and oaths) teach and enjoin what is contrary to the Law” (3).

Meier, John P. (2009). *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Vol 4: Law and Love*. New Haven: Yale. “Every other book or article on the historical Jesus and the Law has been to a great degree wrong” (2).

## Bibliography (Sabbath-Lord’s Day-First Day)

Carson, D.A., ed (1982). *From Sabbath to Lord’s Day*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

De Lacey, D.R. (1993). “Holy Days”. *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 402-404.

Hasel, Gerhard F. (1992). “Sabbath”. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. David Noel Freedman, ed. New York: Doubleday, V 849-856.

Schuele, Andreas (2009). “Sabbath”. *The New Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*. Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, V, 3-10.

Shead, A. G. (2000). “Sabbath”. *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 745-750.

Westernholm, S. and C. A. Evans (2000). “Sabbath”. *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1031-1035.

## **Diversity in Sources (the historical Jesus and the canonical Christ):**

### **1 Q source (Mat // Lk, but not in Mark), ca. 60 A.D.**

#### **1.1 Q: Mat 5:17-19 (The Law's continuing validity) // Luke 16:17 (lacking in Mark)**

For truly I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished. Whoever then relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of Heaven; but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.

But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one dot of the law to become void.

Luke 16:16 contrasts the time of the Law and the Prophets including John and Baptist with the time of the good news of God's Kingdom. Next, "16:17 makes an assertion about the Law's abiding. Q then understands 16:18 as applying this strictness to the matter of divorce for remarriage....This, too, is related indirectly to the theme of greed [16:13] (especially in the sense: divorcing in order to obtain another)....16:17 does not stand in isolation in Q, but coheres with the ethos of heightened demand which comes with God's kingdom and with the conflict which that brings" (Loader 425-426). Regarding Jesus' heightened norm for divorce, texts differ (see Excursus 1 below). Paul adds another important variant (1 Cor 7:10-16) and all the NT texts differ from Deut 24:1-4.

#### **1.2 Q Lk 11:42 (Tithing (continuity) // Mat 23:23).**

But woe to you Pharisees!  
For you tithe mint and rue and every herb,  
And neglect justice and the love of God;

These you ought to have done,  
Without neglecting the others (Lk 11:42)

Woe to you, *scribes and Pharisees*, hypocrites!  
for you tithe mint and dill and cumin,  
and have neglected *the weightier matters of the law*,  
*justice and mercy and faith*;  
these you ought to have done  
without neglecting the others (Mat 23:23).

"This is an important indicator of an attitude towards the Law on the part of Q's Jesus....A profile emerges of the ethical values of Q's Jesus: justice, love of God and generosity, rather than greed; control, rather than lack of control....Q's Jesus thus champions the Law but with a distinctive basis for interpretation which, while inclusive, sees clear priorities on attitudinal and ethical values" (Loader 415, 417). See below Appendix 2 on Tithing. Matthew's version apparently reflects the Pharisees' common practice in Jesus' time, while Luke addition of "rue and every herb" may indicate an ironical description that ridicules an exaggerated scrupulousness far exceeding common Jewish practice (Loader 1997:414-415 and his citation of Kloppenborg, note 69; cf the Pharisee's prayer in Lk 11:12). In a related text where Jesus acknowledges that the Pharisees have the "key to knowledge" (Lk 11:42 // Mat 23:13) Jesus does not dispute the right of the Pharisees to interpret the Law, nor to apply it to the whole of life. The criticism is preoccupation with the minutiae and with externals in contrast to concern with attitudes and behaviors which flow from caring for people....A twofold value system emerges: internal, attitudinal, in contrast to external, ritual; and ethical, moral purity, in contrast to ceremonial, ritual purity" (Loader 419).

**1.3 Jesus' Temptations (Q: Mat 4:1-11 // Lk 4:1-13; cf. Mk 1:12-13).** The temptation story confirms that "Being Son of God does not mean departing from divine Law" (Loader 402).

**1.4 The Sermon on the Mount/Plain (Mat 5-7 // Lk 6:17-49).** See under Matthew below (the six contrasts)

**Conclusions** "Q's treatment of the Law belongs within a strongly Jewish ethos....also in its eschatology. It assumes that Jesus will return to Jerusalem (Q [Lk] 13:35)....speaks of the disciples enthroned to rule the twelve tribes (Q [Lk] 22:28, 30). Future salvation is to dine with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Q [Lk]13:28-29)....Q's interpretation of God's will...is primarily oriented towards loving attitudes and behaviour....Q assumes the Law's validity, but within a theological perspective...of God's continuing activity. It is neither replaced nor surpassed nor modified, except by addition....For Q the contrasts [external ritual or attitudinal/ethical] are inclusive, not exclusive" (Loader 429-431).

**2 Mark, 69-70 A.D.** Unlike Q, Matthew and Luke, Mark contains no explicit reference to Law nor any systematic treatment of theme. “Rather, Jesus is the authority for Mark, which relativises the authority of the Law. Jesus exercises authority in interpreting the Law, nullifying parts of it and going beyond its demands with demands of his own” (Loader 12, citing H. Sariola 1990). “Mark’s Jesus calls for compassion and has authority to dispense with parts of Torah.” [purity laws regarding clean/unclean foods, Mk 7:19].

**2.1** J.H. Neyrey (1992, pp. 107-109) “notes where Mark’s **Jesus crossed Jewish purity boundaries** with regard to people: touching the leper (1:41), the corpse (5:41), being touched by the menstruating woman (5:24-28), calling a sinner to be an intimate (2:13-14), traveling extensively in gentile territory (4:35-42; 7:31), having commerce with unclean people (7:24-30), having contact with the possessed, blind, lame, deaf (cf. Lev 21:16-24); with regard to bodily orifices or emissions: disregarding dietary restrictions (7:19c), sharing meals with unclean sinners (2:15), not washing hands before eating (7:2), using spittle (7:33; 8:23), showing no regard for purity issues at the feedings of the 5000 and 4000 [6:30-44 Jewish territory; 8:1-10 Gentile territory]; with regard to time, unlawful action on the sabbath (2:23-28; 3:1-6); with regard to space: disrupting the temple system (11:15-17), critique of temple space (12:33), and ...the temple (14:58; 15:29)” (cited in Loader 11). However, Jesus is not anti-purity, but a limit breaker who establishes a new purity system where rules are concentrated in the core law, the Ten Commandments and focused on the heart, on guarding against uncleanness from within (Loader 11-12; cf Paul in Rom 1:24 and 6:19). Moreover, in Mark’s order, the setting aside of Torah’s purity code comes between episodes of ministry to Jews and to Gentiles; thus for Mark the barriers between Jew and Gentile have fallen (Loader 71; see the two feedings above). “Jesus’ sending the leper to observe the Law’s provisions appears in Mark [1:44] incidental and probably more to be understood in terms of social reintegration” (Loader 55)

**2.2** In addition to the dispute over purity laws in Mark 7:1-23, commentators commonly conclude that Mark’s Jesus abrogates Torah in his conduct and teaching about **the Sabbath** (2:23-28; 3:1-6) and in his teaching about divorce (10:2-12; Loader 9, citing Hans Hübner 1973). Loader, however, concludes that for Mark, Jesus “stands beside the Torah as someone with new authority” (37). “Mark’s Jesus does discard major portions of the Law (food laws, purity laws, the cultic system)” (38). However, the Sabbath is properly observed and only its interpretation is disputed: “Jesus abrogates to himself the right to determine what is appropriate on the Sabbath and enunciates the principle that the Sabbath is primarily gift (2:27; 3:4)” (Loader 132).

**2.3** In Mark 10:2-12 Jesus treats **divorce**, not as a permission from Moses, but as a command, but the command relates not to divorce itself but to the document the man should give to the woman he sends away (Deut 24:1-4; Loader 88-89). Only Mark’s version provides for a woman to take the initiative and divorce her husband (10:12), perhaps reflecting Roman law rather than Jewish tradition. All three synoptics add “and marries another” indicating that the divorce referred to was motivated by covetousness. In this area of sexuality Mark also mentions in 6:18 that John had declared Herod’s new marriage illegal. We may assume that Mark shares John’s assessment: Herod acted contrary to God’s Law, not only by an act of adultery, but by marrying his sister-in-law (Lev 18:16; 20:21 [prohibiting relations considered incestuous])” (Loader 69).

**2.4 The Ten Commandments.** “It is clear...that Mark represents Jesus as at least espousing the moral commandments of the Decalogue (Loader 129):

**Mk 7:10, 21 (purity controversy).** 10 For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’ [#5, Ex 20:12 // Dt 5:16] and ‘He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die’ [Ex 21:17]...21 For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, *porneia*, theft [#8], murder [#6], adultery [#7]covetousness [#10], wickedness, deceit [#9], licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness....

**Mk 10:19 (rich young ruler):** You know the commandments: ‘Do not kill [#6], Do not commit adultery [#7], Do not steal [#8], Do not bear false witness [#9], *Do not defraud*, Honor your father and mother [#4]

“All are ethical; none, ritual or cultic. These are moral values, including a faint echo of the Decalogue...They are not a summary of the Law, as if they imply adherence to the whole Law...since Mark’s Jesus dismisses ceremonial and cultic law as irrelevant...To love others means to live morally in accord with the principles enunciated in the Decalogue....Mark sees the command to love as providing he fundamental ethical principle to be applied in concrete situations...Mark’s Jesus differentiates within Torah. Food laws, purity laws...the sacrificial cult...are no longer accepted as Torah...they are denigrated as useless.” (Loader 129-130, 132).

**3 Matthew, ca 85 A.D.** “Matthew has taken hold of Mark’s account of Jesus, which portrays him both as rejecting and as disparaging parts of Torah, purified the tradition of all such implications and, using the more strongly Torah favorable traditions found in Q and in independent material, has fashioned a gospel which primarily sets forth the authority of Jesus, but does so in a way which still holds place for Torah. He has done so for a Christian community....Matthew’s Jesus upholds Torah and sees his ministry in terms of both fulfilling the hopes of the Law and the Prophets and making sure that Torah is rightly understood and fully obeyed. Matthew and his community lean heavily in the direction of interpreting Torah in accordance with the command to love and of subordinating ritual and cultic law to this priority, while not abandoning it” (Loader 1997/2002:271).

“For truly I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished. Whoever then relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of Heaven; but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven (Mat 5:18-19 // Luke 16:16-17: “But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one dot of the law to become void.” (lacking in Mark, = Q ca 60 A.D.). Loader comments: “One could hardly have a clearer statement about Jesus’ attitude towards the Law than what we find here in 5:17-20. They appear to be stating that the entire Torah, inclusive of ritual, ceremonial, food, circumcision laws, is to be continued until the end of time” (171). Mat 5:20 then adds: “Unless your righteousness/justice exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of Heaven,” which introduces a series of six contrasts, each beginning with “You have heard that it was said...But I say to you....” This prepares us to understand that in the contrasts to follow Jesus is not relaxing or eliminating the demands of Torah but elevating them, making them more demanding, encompassing just and loving attitudes as well as God-like actions:

- 3.1 Not only murder is prohibited (#6) but anger and insults, while positively Jesus commands reconciliation with brothers and even legal accusers (Mat 5:21-26);
- 3.2 Not only adulterous acts are prohibited (#7), but lustful thoughts and looks (5:27-30);
- 3.3 Not only are women to be protected with certificates of divorce (Deut 24:1-4), but the traditional male right of divorce is limited to cases of the wife’s sexual immorality (5:31-32; cf 19:9, divorce to remarry);
- 3.4 Not only are false oaths to God prohibited (Deut 23:22; Lev 19:12; Num 30:3)—all oaths are prohibited and to be replaced with simple truthful speech at all times (Mat 5:33-37);
- 3.5 Instead of retaliation and revenge against oppressors being limited to the “eye for an eye” of the *lex talionis* (Ex 21:24), Jesus commands nonresistance, generosity and collaboration (Mat 5:38-42).
- 3.6 Instead of love for neighbor being accompanied by hate for an enemy, Jesus commands love for enemies and prayer for persecutors that manifests divine perfection (5:43-48).

“The position taken by the Matthean Jesus fall within the range of debate about Torah interpretation in his time and should not be seen as abrogating Old Testament Law” (Loader 181). In the preceding chapters (1:1-4:22) “The focus is strongly on judgement to come: hope for those who repent, wrath for those who do not....Joseph exemplifies the principle that interpretation of Law should favour the compassionate option [1:19]. John makes clear that outward ritual (baptism) and claims to election on the basis of ethnicity without corresponding behavior count for nothing [3:1-12] (Loader 160). In Jesus’ temptation [4:1-11] he wards off “the wiles of the tempter with words of Torah....Fasting is affirmed, as in 6:16-18. Wonders are noted as at least ambiguous, as in 7:21-23. The quest for power is eschewed, as in 20:24-28. Again Matthew is allowing us to see important criteria for discerning God’s will” (Loader 159). In the beatitudes (5:1-12) some describe plight (people on the margin, as in the genealogy) and some promote solidarity with the persecuted and oppressed (Loader 163). The salt image (5:13) appropriately portrays goodness as proactive, while with the image of light (5:14-16) Matthew lays claim to Israel’s self-understanding (Isa 49:6) for his community from which God’s Torah would be proclaimed (Isa 2:2-5; Loader 164).

Matthew 23:1-39 with Jesus’ seven woes pronounced against the scribes and Pharisees (23:13-36) is also significant for its indications of the matthean Jesus’ teaching regarding Torah (the 8<sup>th</sup> woe in 23:14 is a later textual addition derived from the parallel in Mark 12:40 or Lk 20:47). However, as in the case of the six elevations of demands in the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew prefaces the strong negative tone of the seven woes with a surprisingly strong affirmative introductory comment: “The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses’ seat, so practice and observe what they tell you, but not what they do; for they preach but do not practice”

(23:2-3; see Mat 5:17-20; cf Paul's qualified acceptance of Roman imperial authority in Rom 13:1-7). This strong contrast has led many commentators to argue that Matthew is contradictory, incoherent or confused, but more likely the diversity reflects the diversity in Judaism when Matthew wrote and the dialectical tension Matthew struggled to maintain in opposing the two extremes of Pharisaic legalism and Gentile antinomianism (see *anomia*, lawlessness/iniquity, in Mat 23:28; Loader 237-245). Matthew presents Jesus as recognizing the legitimate authority of the scribes and Pharisees in the synagogues of Jesus' day (as principle possessors and interpreters of the treasured Torah manuscripts) but prefaces the critique (of their false priorities and their hypocrisy in not practicing what they preached) with Jesus' teaching on the Great Commandment (Mat 22:34-40), his supreme authority (22:41-46; see 28:16-20 and his replacing of the traditional hierarchy of "vineyard keepers," with assemblies of his egalitarian followers; 21:33-46; 23:8-11). For modern readers, accustomed to think of Jesus as a "Christian," forgetting that he was a practicing Jew, it will be surprising to think of him as approving phylacteries and tassels, so long as they are not of exaggerated size (23:5; see 9:20), and tithing mint and dill and cumin (23:23). The text also reflects the strongly Jewish nature of Matthew's community ("sages and scribes" in addition to "prophets," 23:34; Loader 242). The chapter contains no hint of cult critique and ends with a note of hope centered on Jerusalem (23:37-39).

Regarding the two preceding chapters Loader writes: "In 21:1-22:46...Matthew has consistently deleted or changed items which in Mark served to criticize the cult and to suggest that it was to be replaced by the community of faith....The image of the rejected stone [Ps 118:22-23] no longer suggests a new temple; it symbolizes the change of vineyard keepers [Mat 22:42-43]....In this section Matthew focuses strongly on the Jewish leaders....In Matthew's view Jesus is not in competition with Torah; he upholds and expounds it as part of his total task to proclaim the kingdom, call for repentance and teach God's will" (Loader 236-237).

In Matthew's great center block (chapters 8-20; Loader 187-228), most significant regarding Torah is Jesus' teaching about purity in 15:1-20 where the Evangelist omits Mark's radical comment that Jesus declared all foods clean (Mk 7:19:c). He also makes numerous changes that would maintain Jesus' approval of Torah (Loader 213-216) and "has trimmed the list of what comes from within and defiles, bringing it more into line with the Decalogue categories" (Loader 215). "The healing of the centurion's servant (8:5-13) entails an encounter with a Gentile....he declares himself unworthy to receive Jesus under his roof. Jesus then agrees to healing at a distance, just as he will with the Canaanite woman's daughter (15:21-28)....The centurion is sensitive to the purity issues involved....The centurion's statement is not a gesture of humility, but an acknowledgement of the purity issue" (Loader 188, citing also Peter and the centurion in Acts 10:28). Matt 11:28-30 ("all who labor...I will give you rest....my yoke is easy and my burden is light") "understood in the light of 5:17-20...is Jesus appeal to submit to his teaching, which Matthew sees as upholding and rightly expounding God's will expressed in Torah" (Loader 199). In the Sabbath controversy about plucking grain (Mark 2:23-28 // Matt 12:1-8 // Lk 6:1-5) Matthew, as well as Luke, omit Jesus' statement that "The Sabbath was made of man, not man for the Sabbath" (Mk 2:27) but all three preserve the claim that "the Son of Man is lord [+ "even," Mark] of the Sabbath! (Mat 12:8 // Lk 6:5 // Mk 2:28). With his claim to be greater than the Temple (Mat 12:6) and Lord of the Sabbath "Jesus is claiming authority to interpret Sabbath Law. It is not a claim against the Law" (Loader 202, dealing similarly with the other Sabbath episode in Mat 12:9-14, where Jesus argues that "it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath" (12:12b). Thus compassion (9:36), mercy (12:7), doing good (12:12) determine Torah interpretation and characterize Jesus' approach (Loader 209).

In the final apocalyptic discourse "Matthew 24 follows Mark 13 closely, but with significant variations" (Loader 245). Matthew's Jesus adds "nor on the Sabbath" (24:20) to Mark's exhortation that the disciples should pray that their flight not take place "in winter" (Mk 13:18), probably indicating the Sabbath-keeping character of Matthew's community. Matthew 24:14 alludes to the expansion of the original Jewish mission (10:5-6) to include Gentiles, decisively expanded in 28:16-20, but Matthew's Jesus nowhere indicates that male Gentile converts would be incorporated without circumcision (cf → Acts 10 and 15 and Paul in Galatians and Romans; Loader 252-253). However, in the parable of the sheep and goats (Mat 25:31-46), the climax of Jesus' public ministry, the final universal judgment is conducted with no reference to cultic qualifications (either circumcision or baptism) but solely on the basis of good works of solidarity with the poor and oppressed (hungry, thirsty, naked, persecuted, sick and imprisoned; Loader 248) and thus in continuity with Hosea's emphasis that God desires "mercy and *not* sacrifice" (Hos 6:6, cited both in Mat 9:13 and in 12:7), indicating that mercy expressed in solidarity with the needy is *much more important* than any cultic activity (Loader 192).

**4 Luke-Acts, ca. 80 A.D.** While Matthew obviously wrote for a community dominated by Torah-observant Jews, Luke addresses largely non-Jewish communities. Nevertheless, like Matthew, Luke-Acts struggles to combine elements of Q's pro-Torah perspective (continuity) with Mark's selective critique and distancing of Jesus from Torah conformity (discontinuity). However, unlike Matthew, Luke undoubtedly planned from the beginning to resolve the problem of incorporating Law-free gentiles into the churches in his second volume (Acts). This left Luke free to incorporate intact into his Gospel some of the Q-Jesus' most emphatic pro-Torah teachings (see above under Q), which Mark--also writing for Gentiles but without the projected escape hatch of a second volume--would not have touched with a 10-foot pole.

As Loader explains: "Luke has much in common with Matthew in affirming the place of the Law. This has a lot to do with their common heritage in using Q....But they appear to operate in very different settings. Matthew is in a Jewish setting, Luke in a primarily gentile setting. Matthew is concerned to claim Jesus as the best Judaism....From a Gentile perspective Luke claims legitimacy and continuity. Gentiles uphold all that Luke sees the Law asking of them....Within the gospel Luke mostly presents Jesus' teaching without specific relation to Torah....Luke's value system, his theology, operated with assumptions which inevitably put the priority on ethical rather than ritual and cultic demands, and then less on commands as command and more on attitude. He stops short of Mark's radical break, although not far short" (388-89). In Acts, following Jewish usage, Luke often refers to the Law as "the customs" of the Jews (Acts 6:14; 15:1; 21:21; 28:17). And, as Loader explains, "God-given customs of Israel are not to be imposed on the Gentiles, not primarily because Gentiles are from different cultures, but because the Law itself does not require it. In this way Luke combines an assertion of total faithfulness to Torah on the part of both Gentiles and Jews with a sense of cultural differences which justifies the separation which has come about....Luke is making a claim to heritage, continuity and Torah faithfulness on the part of Jesus and the Church" (389).

Before entering into the complexities of Luke's treatment of Torah in his Gospel, it will best clarify matters if we review briefly how he solved the problem of Gentiles and Torah in his "escape hatch" (**Acts**). The first disciples remain Torah observant Jews, gathering in the Temple, but in the account of Stephen's martyrdom (6:6-7:60) his opponents accuse him of speaking against the Law in the Temple (6:13-14), charges Luke seeks to show are false (Loader 361-363), since Stephen's speech is not anti-temple but only "critical of an attitude towards the temple" (387). "For Luke the coming of the Spirit on Cornelius and his friends is what makes all the difference. Circumcision can be left aside" (385; Acts 10:1-11:18), even though it had been commanded in Torah. Acts 13:38-39 clumsily echoes Pauline tradition, identifying forgiveness of sin as the substance of the gospel and understanding justification primarily as forgiveness (371). "The contrast made by Paul in Acts 13:38-39 rests on Luke's understanding of the Law as burdensome" (273; see Peter in 15:10).

By the time of the Jerusalem Council, Christian Pharisees are demanding circumcision as part of observance of Mosaic Law (15:9) but "Luke can let circumcision [for the Gentiles] go, just as he portrays Peter doing so earlier" (386; cf Paul's circumcision of Timothy, who had Jewish mother, Acts 16:1-5). Luke thus allows for two groups in the church: Jews who remain Torah observant, but are freed to mix with Gentiles because God has declared them clean and are not obliged to insist on their circumcision; and Gentiles (15:20, 29) who must abstain (1) from meat offered to idols, (2) meat of carcasses which have been strangled (3) or have not been drained of blood, and (4) *porneia* (probably illicit marriage relations). These four requirements appear to be based on Lev 17-18 where they are characterized as issues which justify exclusion of sojourners from the community" (174). In Paul's final visit to Jerusalem (21:17-26) James tells Paul about the huge numbers of Torah observant Judean believers (21:20) and Paul himself is carefully law-observant, making sacrifices and intending to undergo purification (24:17-18), so his arrest was based on a misunderstanding (21:28-29; 24:6).

Luke's projected solution of the Law problem in Acts thus enabled the Evangelist to incorporate more of Q's tradition of a Law-observant Jesus in his Gospel (see above on Q) and avoid Mark's portrayal of a Jesus often using his authority to subvert key elements of the Law (see above on Mark). Thus Mark's major anti-Law text (7:1-23) is barely represented in Luke (11:37-41), who, like Matthew (15:1-20) eliminates the phrase about Jesus declaring all foods clean (Mk 7:19c). Both in Luke's gospel and Acts, Jesus and his disciples (even Paul) are faithful to Torah (379).

**5 John (ca. 90 A.D.)** “will dispense with Torah altogether; [Jesus replaces the Law]; obedience is an aspect of personal allegiance” (citations in 2-5 from Loader 1997:272). “John’s Jesus refers to the Law as the Jews’ Law (“your Law”; “their Law”; 8:17; 10:34; 15:25; cf 7:19, 22) since it has ceased to be the Law of Jesus and the community, except in its Christological function [of bearing witness to Christ]” (Loader 1997:489). “At the level of ethics, instruction is not Torah based, but derived from Jesus and the example he set. Some of the values enshrined in the Decalogue...continue to have validity, but without recourse to the Law as authority. The same is true of the command to love God....The command of mutual love, urged on the disciples as Jesus prepares his disciples for his departure, is based on the example of Christ’s love and is new solely because of the new situation they are to face [13:34-35]” (Loader 1997:490).

Following the *magnum opus* of S. Pancaro on *The Law in the Fourth Gospel* (1975), Loader writes: “John treats the Law as a norm which the Jews vainly try to use against Jesus....In the first direct confrontation John deliberately portrays Jesus as sanctioning a breach of Sabbath law by commanding that that the [healed] man carry his mat (5:8)....Similarly John shows Jesus also working on the Sabbath in the second Sabbath healing by making clay (9:6), and flags the fact by his use of ‘work’ in 9:4” (433). These acts are not counted as breaches of Sabbath law because Jesus is the Son of God....He is above the Law and therefore has the right to set it aside, which he does....On the charges of blasphemy (5:17-18; 8:58; 10:24-38; 19:7)...for John equality [with God] consisted in Jesus’ being completely dependent on the Father....John has Jesus reject the accusation that he is a false teacher (7:45-49; 9:24-34; 18:19-21). Jesus’ teaching is new revelation; it supersedes the Law...so that those who truly know the scriptures should follow Jesus....Accordingly, John presents Jesus as the one who is faithful to the Law and the Jews as failing to keep it....John portrays the Law as testifying against the Jews and for Jesus....In using the argument about circumcision on the Sabbath (7:22-23), John appears to reflect a Jewish understanding which also sees circumcision as healing....John also has Jesus appeal to the Law to defend the charge of blasphemy (10:34-36...) and of false teaching (5:31-47...)....John sees no opposition between Moses and Jesus, Torah and gospel. ‘Torah is absorbed into this higher reality represented by Christ’ [citing Pancaro, p. 262]....Because this is the case, when separation occurs and the [johannine] community is cut off from the national religious community, its epistles [1-2-3 John] can lack all reference to Torah, Jews, Israel, scriptures, Abraham, Moses, the prophets, the Sabbath, circumcision and fulfillment of the Old Testament....[In the Gospel] keeping the word and keeping the commandments now describe response to Jesus....’The Law has fulfilled its function with the coming of Jesus; it has been neither destroyed nor preserved intact, but transformed by being transcended’ [citing Pancaro 450]. Similarly symbols associated with Torah have been transferred to Jesus....,the symbols of bread, living water, light and life....The Sabbath is the only precept of the Law discussed....John does not portray Jesus as abrogating Sabbath or Torah, but rather as acting with a legitimacy which warrants his overriding the Sabbath....The issue of the Law is so central that...John must have a Jewish audience in mind....For John, Jesus does not oppose the Law, but claims to show its true meaning....In John’s community Christian Jews keep the Law. They are expelled from the synagogue not for transgression of Torah, but because they confess Christ. [John] 1:17 should not be seen as in tension with its context.....John’s Jesus effectively replaces the Law. In doing so he does not engage in critique of the Law; rather it testified to his coming and apart from that has ceased to apply since God’s Son has appeared (433-436): [“For the Law was given (by God) through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ”, 1:17]....[The use of both the word ‘given’ and ‘grace’ in 1:16-17 suggest that the author saw the Law in fundamentally positive terms. He is not a paulinist contrasting Law and grace; Loader p. 449].

The Law plays no role in ethics in John. The only command cited is the command to love, but even then it is not set in relation to the Law but introduced as a ‘new’ law (13:34)....John’s community is not claiming a place within Israel besides others; it is Israel (1:31,50; 3:10; 12:13), though it still holds hope for the redemption of Israel (11:52)....Johannine Christianity locates its self identify within, not outside Judaism and affirms that salvation is of the Jews (4:22)....John hails Jesus as ‘the lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world’ (1:29,35)....not in direct antithesis to the old system of sacrifices, although this may be a secondary implication...[see the stone jars for purification in 2:6]. [In John 14 the silence about Torah shows that] a new set of loyalties is being established, based on the community of disciples who are devoted to Jesus and who are to follow the Spirit which he shall send....[In] John 15...the image of the true vine [is] a clear allusion to the image used of Israel, but now claimed by Jesus and his community....With the abandonment of Jewish Law...John’s community can include Gentiles without controversy....Hence the paradox of the fourth gospel, which...reflects the strongest Jewish ethos of all the gospels and the sharpest break from Judaism” (432-491).

**II Paul's teaching (50-58 A.D., complex, controversial).** Since Jesus' ministry occurred before Paul's, we commonly allow the New Testament canonical order to affect our interpretation and treat the four gospels before Paul's letters. However, we should remember that Paul's seven unquestioned letters were penned 50-58 A.D. and thus even before "Q" (the hypothetical gospel source, ca 60 A.D.) as well as the four gospels (Mark, ca 70, Matthew and Luke, ca 80, and John ca. 90). Hence Paul's law-free Gospel, teaching believers' freedom from the Law (Gal 5:1; Rom 7:1-6; 8:1-2), circulated before any of our Gospels were written and may have influenced their interpretation of Jesus' teachings about Torah, either positively (as in the case of Mark and John) or as a reaction against Paul's teaching or influence (Matthew). And if Luke is the beloved physician who accompanied Paul, the Apostle's influence, especially in Acts may be evident (although Paul's letters and later sources are remarkably silent regarding the conclusions of the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15). The teaching of the seven unquestioned Pauline epistles may be summarized as follows (cf Dunn 1998:128-161):

1 The Law originally was given to a recently liberated Israel (Ex 20) **to guide** their walk/behavior and as the terms on which Israel's covenant status and long life (in the promised land) were to be *maintained* (Lev 18:5; Gal 3:12; Rom 10:5; Deut 30:15-20; Dunn 150-155). Paul's positive references to the Law include Rom 3:21, 31; 7:12, 14; 8:4; 13:8-10; Gal 5:14. Such Torah-positive texts do not refer to the Law as a means of *obtaining* life (which is by God's gracious election, not human effort). They do not show how one may "enter" the covenant relationship with God and his people but rather how to maintain ("stay in") such a relationship. Nor is the "life" promised eternal (as promised to New Testament believers but only once clearly in the Hebrew Bible, Daniel 12:2; Dunn 152, note 125). In his positive texts Paul takes for granted the primary teaching in the Hebrew Bible (Ex 20; Deut 5; Psalm 19; 119) even though his own emphasis is largely negative (see #2-5).

2 The Law has a role in **convicting of sin**, identifying, measuring, bringing it to consciousness as transgression, and condemning that transgression: "Through the Law comes the knowledge of sin" (Rom 3:20; see 4:15; 5:13; 7:13; Dunn 133-137; see 1 John 3:4: "sin is lawlessness"). All humanity, Jew as well as Gentile, is guilty before God because all have fallen short of what God intended humanity for and have transgressed the commandments of God known to be such (Rom 1:18-3:20).

3 The law is manipulated by the power of sin to **entrap the flesh** (human weakness), making the law serve as an ally of sin and death; 1 Cor 15:56; Rom 5:20-21; 7:5-10; Dunn 155-161). As sin turns 'desire' into 'lust,' so sin transformed the law into *gramma*/letter (2 Cor 3:6-11) for Israel. However, the law as ally and instrument of the powers of sin and death should not be regarded as itself a cosmic power (Dunn 161).

4 The Law had a special relationship with Israel as *paidagogos* (Gal 3:23-25, providing the kind of protective oversight slaves gave to sons of patriarchal households, conducting them to and from school) to **protect and discipline Israel** in the period from Moses to Christ (a temporary role; Dunn 140-143).

5 Israel's inability to recognize the temporary nature of this role of the law is reflected in its continued assumption of privileged relationship to God. The fulfillment of God's purpose in Christ's coming, the eschatological shift in the ages, means that Israel now is 'behind the times' and mistaking the significance of the law as Israel's law (Gal 3-4; Rom 2-3; 2 Cor 3:1-18; Dunn 143-150). In this context we should interpret Paul's phrase "**the works of the law**" (*erga nomou*), which occurs 8x in his letters and has been widely debated in modern Pauline scholarship (Dunn 354-359, 366-371; cf "a law of works," Rom 3:27).

**1-3 Gal 2:16 (3x)** We by nature [=birth] Jews, knowing that a man is not justified by *works of the law* but by faith/fulness of/in Christ Jesus, even we believed in Christ Jesus in order that we might be justified by faith/fullness of/in Christ Jesus and not by *works of the law* because by *works of the law* no flesh will be justified.

**4 3:2** The Galatians received the Spirit, not by *works of the law* but by hearing of faith

**5 3:5** God gives the Spirit and works miracles not by *works of the law* but by hearing of faith

**6 3:10** All who are of [rely on] *works of the law* are under a curse for not continuing to do all the things written in the scroll of the law (Deut 27:26 + 28:58)

**7 Rom 3:20** By *works of the law* no flesh will be justified for by the law is full knowledge of sin

**8 3:28** We reckon a man to be justified by faith apart from *works of the law* (cf 3:27).

Since the pioneering study of E.P. Sanders (1977) many argue that “works of the Law” (*erga nomou*) in Paul refers particularly to those portions of the law that distinguished Jews from Gentiles and create barriers between Jews and non-Jews: circumcision, food laws and the observance of special festivals and holy days, such as the Sabbath, which are termed “ethnic markers” (Dunn, Wright, Watson). Such ethnic markers distinguished Jews from non-Jews and do not constitute the *meaning* of *erga nomou* but simply what Paul primarily *referred to* in particular contexts. Thus Dunn acknowledges that phrase “works of the law” *means* Torah as a whole but argues that the *focus* is on the works that distinguish Jews from Gentiles (1990:208-13, 237-41). According to Dunn (1998:356), in Gal 2:16 “a person is not justified by *works of the law*,” 3x), the works of the law are not moral good works but *ethnic markers*, the living like a Jew, the separation from “Gentile sinners” (Gal 2:11-15; similarly N.T. Wright, *Justification*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2009:117). See “the fruit of the Spirit” (love, joy, peace....) in Gal 5:22. Paul’s eight references to “works of the law” thus refer to ethnic markers should not be confused with the Reformation polemic against “self-achieved righteousness.”

Schreiner acknowledges that especially since the Reformation much biblical scholarship has been infiltrated with a caricature of Judaism as always legalistic, which Sanders properly criticized (1977); but Schreiner argues that Sanders and his followers go to the other extreme when they deny any legalistic tendencies: “We need not conclude that *all* Jews were legalistic, only that some strains of Judaism were [so] inclined” (1988:174) and he recognizes that the same could be said of many in the Christian tradition. Thus Rom 1:18-3:20 indicts both Gentiles and Jews for transgressing the law. Paul contends that the failure to obey the law explains why justification cannot be obtained by “works of the law” (Rom 3:20, 28). Moo points out that in Romans 4:1-5 Paul says much the same thing about the “works” of Abraham (before Moses) as he does in chapter 3 about the “works of the law” of the Jews after Moses (2002:76). Moreover, the Reformation polemic against human effort is clearly anticipated in one deuteropauline text (Eph 2:8-9, which uses “salvation” as a past experience, where Paul commonly referred to “justification” as past and “salvation” as future; Dunn 354, 366-371).

We should thus distinguish between the *meaning* of “works of the Law,” which is simply a synonym for “works” and what the phrase *erga nomou* (mainly) *refers to* in particular contexts. Thus, James Barr (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961) pointed out that in some biblical contexts “place” may refer to a “tomb” but “tomb” does not thereby become a definition of “place” but simply indicates what it may refer to in a particular context: “behold the *place* [=tomb] where they put him” (Mark 16:6). Therefore, in a particular context a “place” may refer only to a tomb but “tomb” does not thereby becoming a definition of “place.” Much of the controversy and debate between Pauline scholars over the interpretation of “the works of the Law” in Paul may be due to a failure to maintain this distinction between the *meaning* / “definition” of the term (Torah generally) and what it may refer to in the particular contexts in Galatians and Romans (ethnic boundary markers: circumcision, Sabbath, clean/unclean foods, etc.). In Romans 3:28-30 Paul clearly refers to those elements of Torah, such as circumcision (3:30) that distinguish Jews from Gentiles (3:29); similarly, in Galatians Paul particularly refers to circumcision (2:1-5; 5:2-12; 6:12-16), food laws (2:11-16) and observance of special days (4:10). Each use of *erga nomou* is associated with either justification or the reception of the Spirit.

Traditional reformation interpretation of Law in Paul interpret the Apostle as referring to Torah generally and mainly emphasizing universal sinfulness (both Jews and non-Jews) of humanity failing to keep the Law and in need of Christ’s redemptive work to be appropriated by faith. Many recent interpreters acknowledge the importance of this Pauline teaching but insist that in certain letters (Galatians, Philipians, Romans) the Apostle addresses churches divided regarding the terms for including non-Jews into the covenant people and thus refers to those “works of the Law” (circumcision, clean/unclean food laws, and observance of Sabbath and other holy days) that traditionally distinguished Jews from non-Jews. In these letters Paul appeals to the churches to “accept/welcome” one another, forming communities inclusive of both Jews and non-Jews and not to divide over issues such as circumcision, kosher food and Sabbath observance. Thus in → Romans Paul exhorts the five house churches to “receive/welcome” one another, forming *inclusive* communities with both Jewish and non-Jewish members—and to avoid divisions based on Jewish ethnic markers such as circumcision, *kosher* food and Sabbath observance. With this perspective we can understand that the emphasis that “*all* have sinned” (Rom 3:23) has as its ultimate purpose the creation of these *inclusive* churches (14:1-15:13), with memberships largely consisting of poor slaves, under the leadership of women and with a majority of their members various types of sexual minorities. The negative rhetoric of Rom 1:18-32 must then be interpreted in the light of Paul’s final positive purpose in the letter (see III Conclusions below).

**Summary of Pauline contextual teaching in each book** (Westerholm, Stephen (2008). "Law in the NT". *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, III, 594-602)

**1 1 Thessalonians** "Of the 119 occurrences of *nomos* [law] throughout the Pauline corpus, 72 are in Romans and 32 in Galatians" (Dunn 131 note 18), indicating the contextual character of Paul's teachings on Law. Although 1 Thes 4:1-12 and 5:4-27 exhort believers to holiness and love with *no reference to law*, Paul does allude to specific commands: avoiding *porneia* (4:3=#7), coveting (4:5=#10), adultery (4:6), brotherly love (4:9= Lev 19:18; Jn 15:12), work (4:11-12, 14=#4).

**2 Galatians** contains 32 of the 119 Pauline references to Law and six of his eight references to "the works of the Law" (Gal 2:16, 3x; 3:2, 5, 10), which occur in the context of the Jewish ethnic markers of circumcision (2:3; 5:1-6, 11-12; 6:12-17), table fellowship (2:11-14) and holy day observance (4:10). For the Jews the Law's temporal role had been as *paidagogos* (3:23-25). Gentile believers are free from the Law, which commanded Jews males to be circumcised and imposed dietary restrictions and observance of Jewish holy days. The entire law is summed up in the single command to love your neighbor as yourself (5:14). Therefore, Peter gravely erred when he refused table fellowship with non-Jewish (uncircumcised) believers (2:11-21)

**3 Philippians** 3:2-11 warns against demanding that non-Jewish believers obey the Law and be circumcised; cf the list of virtues in 4:8-9: "whatever is true, noble, just...."

**4 Philemon:** Paul urges Philemon to follow him (not the Law) and treat the slave Onesimus as a brother,

**5 1 Corinthians** Law 8x + textually dubious 14:34. Continuity: prohibits *porneia* (5:1-13=#7 + Deut 17:7), idolatry (8:4=#1-2); history of Israel's failure (10:11); ministerial financial support (9:8-9); the Law of Christ (9:19-23); tongues in worship (14:21, 23). Discontinuity: ethnic aspects of the Law (circumcision, dietary observance) are no longer binding. Paul adds an important variant permitting divorce (1 Cor 7:10-16); 7:19 *contrasts* "the commandments of God", with circumcision, which God commanded in Gen 17:10-14 and Leviticus 12:3).

**6 2 Corinthians** 3:6-11 The ministry of Moses was one of the *gramma*/letter that kills; the Spirit gives life. Continuity: 2 Cor 8:15 with Ex 16:18, manna; 2 Cor 13:1 with Deut 19:15, two or three witnesses; Discontinuity: the new covenant (2 Cor 3:1-18 with Ezek 36:26-27 and Jer 31:33), contrasted with Moses (2 Cor 3:7-18), not the eternal covenant established with Abraham (Rom 4; Gen 15 & 17).

**7 Romans** contains 72 of the total 119 references to Law in the Pauline letters; also two of his references to "works of the Law" (3:20, 28 + "a law of works" in 3:27) in a context referring to Jewish ethnic markers (circumcision, 2:25-29; food laws and observance of holy days, 14:1-23). Four times Romans uses *nomos* in the sense of "order" or "principle" (3:27; 7:21, 23; 8:2; Dunn 133).

2:12-29 Final judgment by Law; Gentiles do not have the Law by nature (by birth);

3:19-31 "Through the Law comes the knowledge of sin" (3:20); justification upholds the Law.

4:13-15 The promise to Abraham and the Law, which "brings wrath" (15)

5:1-5, 20-21 "The Law was added so that the trespass might increase" (20);

6:15-18 "Shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means" (15);

7:1-25; 8:1-4 Free from the Law....dead to the Law.... the Law deceives, produces death, 7:10-11. Is the Law sin? No, the just requirements of the Law fulfilled in us who live...according to the Spirit.

13:8-10 Love fulfills the Law...no harm to neighbor; Rom 14:14, 20 ("all *things* clean"; see Titus 1:15; therefore, welcome one another as members in the diverse house churches, 15:1-13).

In Romans and Galatians Paul thus repeats his law-free Gospel, but the main question he addresses is not "How can I be saved/justified?," but "With whom may we have table fellowship? (including for the Lord's Supper).

**8-10 Deuteropaulines** **Colossians** 2:14, 16 [a Sabbath day]-17;

**Ephesians** Jesus "has destroyed the barrier [between Jew and non-Jew], the dividing wall of hostility, by abolishing in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations" 2:14-15; 1-10 saved by faith;

**2 Thes** 2:3, 7-8 "man of lawlessness" seated in God's Temple, v. 6; 3:6-13 work vs. idleness, see #4).

**11-13 Pastorals (Titus, 1-2 Timothy)**

1 Tim 1:3-11 "The Law is good if a man uses it properly...law is made for lawbreakers" (1:8)

2 Tim 3:14-17 all Scripture divinely inspired, to teach the man of God justice...good works;

Tit 1:15 ("all *things* clean"; see Rom 14:14, 20).

## Paul: Perspectives

Old	and	New
1 A Christian, <i>converted</i> from Judaism (forgets 1 <sup>st</sup> -century Christianity = Jewish sect)		Always a Jew, but <i>called</i> to preach to non-Jews Gal 1:15; Acts 9, 22, 26, Phlp 3:4b-6
2 Judaism = caricatured Legalism Salvation by works (merit)		Judaism = God's covenant people Divine election and grace to <i>get in</i> Good works necessary to <i>stay in</i>
3 Justification by faith = Present: <i>Declared just</i> (law court language)		Context: covenant theology Present: <i>Declared just</i> (law court language) Future: final judgment by works (Rom 2:5-16; Mat 25:31-46)
4 Romans theme: Justification by faith		Rom 1-8, Justification by faith Rom 9-16, Jew-Gentile relations in inclusive house churches
5 Romans problem: How individuals can get to Heaven		God's project for world and cosmos, Ch 1-8 House churches inclusive of Jews-Gentiles, 9-16
6 "Works of the Law" (8x: Rom 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16 (3x); 3:2, 5, 10 + "law of works," Rom 3:27) = Good works generally		Ethnic markers distinguishing Jews from Gentiles: circumcision, food laws, Sabbath observance
7 Faith <i>in</i> Christ (6x: Gal 2:16, 16, 20; 3:22; Rom 3:22, 26; Phlp 3:9; + Eph 3:12 [of/in him])		Faithfulness <i>of</i> Messiah
8 Christ's <i>imputed righteousness</i> : affirmed (1 Cor 1:30; Rom 5:17; Phlp 3:9; 2 Cor 5:21 = "embody God's covenant faithfulness")		Denied (N.T. Wright 2009:158-167)

N.T. Wright	vs.	James Dunn
First to introduce phrase of the "new perspective" on Paul (1978) ( <i>Tyndale Bulletin</i> 1978:61-88)		Popularized phrase, became identified with it 1983 and 1988
Emphasizes covenant context of justification		Deemphasizes covenant language and concept
Emphasizes Jesus as messiah in Paul		Deemphasizes Jesus as messiah in Paul
For Paul Jews were still in Exile (Dan 9)		Questions this interpretation

Dunn, James D. G. (1998). *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 128-161, 631-669.  
 Thielman, F. (1993). "Law". *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 529-542.  
 Schreiner, Thomas R. (1993). "Works of the Law," *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 975-979

For more on "the new perspective on Paul" see especially [www.thepaulpage.com/Bibliography.html](http://www.thepaulpage.com/Bibliography.html)

### III Conclusions and Relevance for Sexual Minorities

1 Traditionally, Roman Catholic and Reformed/Presbyterian theologians emphasized Jesus' *continuity* with the Hebrew Bible and his obedience to its laws, while Lutheran and Baptist theologians emphasized Jesus' *discontinuity* with the Hebrew Bible, a Gospel/Law hermeneutic and Christian freedom from the Law. Since James Sander's pioneering study (1972), modern scholars have portrayed Jesus as a law-abiding Jew and tended to question the authenticity of gospel strands that portray him as rejecting Torah.

2 Presbyterian Biblicist Robert Gagnon and others who seek to employ the Bible in homophobic attacks on sexual minorities argue for Jesus' continuity with the Hebrew Bible and the authority of its commands, whose strictness Jesus even augments, especially in the sexual area, as seen in the divorce prohibitions (2001:196-209). Only two texts (Lev 18:20 and 20:13) prohibit male-male anal sex but in the same chapters two texts also prohibit intercourse during menstruation (Lev 18:19; 20:18). Gagnon argues incoherently that the prohibitions against male-male anal sex are binding today, while heterosexuals need not consider the prohibitions against intercourse during menstruation binding (Gagnon 2001:120-122). Moreover, Rom 1:26 is first *misinterpreted* as referring to lesbian sex and then seen as an example of making more strict the prohibitions of male-male anal sex in Leviticus (extending them to females, not included in the two Leviticus prohibitions). Such traditional homophobic interpretations of Paul's rhetoric regarding male-male anal sex in Rom 1:27 do not permit any employment of reason to qualify what might first appear to be the extremism of an apparently absolute prohibition (cf above the use of reason to qualify Jesus' prohibition of oaths and divorce).

3 Those who seek to support sexual minorities and defend their rights tend to follow the Lutheran and Baptist emphases on Jesus' *discontinuity* with the Hebrew Bible and Christian *freedom* from the Law, while stressing the centrality of the love-commands and avoiding harm to the neighbor (Rom 13:8-10). "Mark, like Paul and Hebrews, has crossed the line....This move sanctions the jettisoning of much of Torah....The move doubtless also reflects the story of Mark's community. Inclusiveness has become a hermeneutical criterion, as it had for Paul. It stems from the love which Mark affirms [and] ...offers a fascinating model for interpreting scripture in the cross-cultural context in any age, where established, even divinely sanctioned, categories of exclusion are called into question. One can extend a Markan perspective on scripture from inclusion of Gentiles to inclusion of many others, excluded on grounds of their social status (slaves), gender, race, age **sexual orientation** or disability" (Loader 1997/2002:136). Thus in Romans 14:1-15:13 Paul urges churches to glorify God by welcome a great diversity of members free from Jewish ethnic markers, who would share table fellowship—an exhortation that may reasonably be extended to sexual minorities.

4. The Jewish Torah (Pentateuch) began with the account of God's creation (Gen 1-2), the covenants with the patriarchs (Gen 12-50) and the story of Israel's liberation from slavery in Egypt (Exodus 1-19). The laws included not only the Ten Commandments and other norms essential for community survival but also many Jewish "customs" (male circumcision, clean/unclean distinctions, observance of Sabbath and other holy days,) that distinguished Israel from non-Jews/Gentiles (Exodus 20-24, 30-32; much of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy). We may compare such modern national customs as national holidays and traffic rules, on which side of the road to drive, which vary from country to country, but do not constitute "ethics" or "morals." The Protestant Reformers referred to three uses of the Law: first, as a guide to society in promoting civic righteousness; second, to convict sinners and drive them to Christ; third, the Law directs Christians in holy living. The third use, emphasized in the Calvinistic tradition, became controversial in Lutheran circles. The diversity and complexity of Biblical teaching regarding Law in the Gospels and Paul need not be considered "incoherent" (Heikki Räisänen 1987), unless we mistakenly understand the Bible to present a timeless philosophical or theological "system" of abstract universals. Rather, the complexity stems from the different historical contexts and communities addressed and the diversity of pastoral needs in each community and period that different authors sought to address with a variety of terms and emphases. As always, some individuals and groups have tended toward legalism and need the emphasis in Mark's Jesus, Paul, and John regarding Christian freedom from the Law, while others have gone to the other extreme of "antinomianism" (lawlessness) and need to be reminded that God's Holy Spirit produces the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22), above all sacrificial love, not egotistic indulgences that harm the neighbor and dishonor God (Rom 13:8-10).

## Appendix 1 → Mark. Divorce to Remarry as Adultery

Jesus condemned men who had sent their wives away in order to marry a more attractive spouse. However, it proves to be impossible to extract an “absolute ethic” (a Greek philosophical concept) against all divorce from his words, since (a) important variations exist (diversity) in the preserved teachings in the Gospels (Luke 16:18 [Q?]; Mark 10:12; Matthew 5:31-32; 19:1-9), (b) Paul adds another important variant (1 Corinthians 7:10-16), and (c) the Hebrew Scriptures contain other more radical differences: not only the Deuteronomic law (24:1-4, permitting males to divorce), but also the divorce of Abraham (paradigm of faith and father of all believers), the divorces mandated by Ezra, and the teachings of Isaiah, Hosea and Jeremiah that even God had to “divorce” Israel!

Although the traditional teachings of the churches (dominated by Greek philosophical concepts) seek to establish an ethic and a legal code (not only for the churches but for all of society), if we take the Bible seriously, the texts should teach us to think and pray, asking for DISCERNMENT to be sensitive to each person and relationship in its individuality. Perhaps it is for this purpose that the greatest variant among the Gospels concerning this theme is the Gospel of John, which omits all prohibition against divorce and limits Jesus’ teaching about the conduct of his followers to the New Commandment of mutual love (John 13:34-35).

1 Luke (16:18; Q?). Luke’s version of the Sermon “on the Mount” (6:17-49) does not include Jesus’ teaching about divorce and his Gospel has only one isolated verse on the subject. In this context Jesus teaches against economic oppression and points out the dangers of riches (16:10-15, 19-31). Although the attribution to Q is still debated, Luke 16:18 may represent the most original version:

“Anyone divorcing his wife and marrying another commits adultery, and the man who marries a divorced woman commits adultery.” Thus in Luke:

- only the man has the right to divorce (cf. Mark);
- what Jesus condemns as “adultery” is not the divorce itself but the act of remarriage (cf. Mark);
- there are no exceptions (see Mark; but also cf. Matthew 5:19 and 1 Corinthians 7);
- Jesus adds that even a man not divorced, who marries a divorced woman also commits adultery (without parallel in Mark and Matthew).

2 Mark (10:1-12). “Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; and if *she* divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery” (10:11-12). Because they are stricter versions, Luke and Mark appear to be the earliest. In Mark, however:

- the woman also has the right to divorce (in accord with Roman law but not with Palestinian Jewish law); with this right the woman also shares the responsibility and becomes guilty of adultery if she remarries;
- the man who divorces a woman and marries another commits adultery against her (the first wife), not against the husband of the other woman, which was common in patriarchal societies, including in Hebrew Scriptures;
- the sin of “adultery” is committed only by remarriage, not by the act of divorce alone. Only in Mark and Luke does Jesus appear to condemn all divorce accompanied by a new marriage as “adultery” without exception. Consequently, many understand this as hyperbole, such as “cut off your hand” (Matthew 5:29-30), “sell what you own” (Mark 10:21), etc.

3 Matthew (5:31-32; 19:1-9). In each of Matthew’s two versions Jesus includes an exception that deals with a case or situation where the act of divorce and remarriage is not considered “adultery,” but a case of *porneia*, originally meaning simply “prostitution” but later extended to cover other sexual misconduct: relations with unmarried persons or “incestuous,” illicit relations (Leviticus 18:6-18), or even as a synonym for adultery.<sup>5</sup>

Interpreters commonly conclude that Matthew’s exception (in any sense) represents his adaptation of Jesus’ teaching. The ambiguity of *porneia* is notable, since the law concerning divorce in Deuteronomy (24:1-4) also includes an ambiguous word (“something objectionable/ indecent”). If God inspired the Bible to give us raw material with which to construct a coherent legal code or an absolute ethic for the church and for society, how can we explain the use at key points of such ambiguous terms and the great diversity (each text says something different)?

4 1 Corinthians 7:10-16. Paul endeavors to transmit the teaching of Jesus (“not I but the Lord”), but he ends up adding another exceptional case where the act of divorce and remarriage is not considered adultery: when a believer is abandoned by an unbeliever he or she is free (to remarry). In his missionary context outside of Palestine, Paul follows Mark and recognizes the right of a woman to seek a divorce. And perhaps most significantly, Paul proposes another fundamental norm to take into account in such decisions: the “peace/total well-being” of the home (a norm that may reflect his personal experience of abandonment?).

5 Deuteronomy 24:1-4. To protect women from the arbitrary abuses of men in their patriarchal society, Moses’ Law requires giving a legal document to a woman who is “sent away” by her husband because of “something objectionable/indecent about her.” This ambiguity provoked the question to Jesus in Mark 10:2 and Matthew 19:3. Notably, Jesus insisted on discernment for the interpretation and application of the Scriptures, since he appealed to Genesis 1:27 and 2:24 (canonical context: the purpose of marriage) to indicate the correct interpretation of Deuteronomy 24:1-4. Deuteronomy 22:13-19 and 28-29 point out two other cases in which males had the right of divorce.

6 Even God commands divorce in certain cases. In Genesis 21:8-14 God commands that Abraham divorce Hagar, his slave-spouse and mother of his first-born son Ishmael, when the home’s peace is destroyed because of rivalries between Hagar and her mistress Sarai (see also Exodus 21:10-11).

7 Ezra (458 BC), ordered that the male Jews divorce their Canaanite wives (Ezra 9:1-10:17; cf. Nehemiah 13:23-31; Exodus 34:11-16; Deuteronomy 20:10-18; 23:3; 7:1-6).

8 Malachi 2:10- 16 (460 BC) may interpret marriage as a covenant between a couple, rather than as an arrangement between the man and the father of the bride, as was the prevailing custom. Malachi declares that “God hates divorce” (although the original Hebrew text in 2:16 is not clear). However, the prophet Jeremiah (3:1-8) taught that even God had to divorce God’s unfaithful, idolatrous people (see Isaiah 50:1; Hosea 2:2). This original Hebrew text in Malachi is quite obscure, and the interpretation of marriage as a covenant between the couple is much disputed (nowhere does the New Testament suggest that marriage is a covenant).

Conclusions concerning divorce. When we carefully compare the variations in Jesus’ teaching, and that of the entire Bible, we note that the texts always reflect concrete historical and cultural contexts, and hence never designated “ethics” or “morals” (Greek philosophical categories totally absent from the Bible). A similar diversity of teaching occurs in Jesus’ commissioning of the Twelve, where Mark’s version permits taking a staff and wearing sandals (6:8-9), while Matthew’s version forbids them (10:10; cf. Luke 9:3). Although scholars offer different explanations for this diversity (Mark’s longer international journeys, but on paved Roman roads vs. Matthew’s mission within Palestine but on rocky local paths), they agree that local conditions led to the adaptation of Jesus’ instructions to specific historical contexts.

Similarly, Mark’s divorce text may reflect his eventual location in Rome or Antioch, where women were more liberated than in Palestine. The Bible thus portrays God as Lord of history who wisely adjusts guidelines for praxis in accord with varying historical contexts and human situations. To take an extreme case, it is difficult to imagine that Jesus would have wanted to condemn a woman as an “adulteress” who initiates a divorce to protect her life against her husband’s violence or to rescue her daughters from their father’s sexual abuse. In such a case, divorce would rather be an act of courage and solidarity with the weak (the daughters)--divine liberation, not sin. Some churches thus now include liturgies of blessing for divorced persons, seeking to minister positively in times of personal crisis and need, instead of heaping up false guilt with unjustifiable and cruel condemnations. However, Jesus’ explicit words about divorce make it difficult to understand how so many churches now often accept divorced persons without condemnation (including their divorced pastors) but continue condemning other sexual minorities, citing only texts by Paul and the Hebrew Scriptures (misinterpreted) but without any basis in Jesus’ own teaching. In addition, many of these same churches accept the equality and ordination of women, even though two patriarchal Pauline texts appear much clearer than the texts cited against sexual minorities. Such churches obviously misinterpret the Bible with a selective literalism (common in fundamentalisms of all sorts) to support an ideology predetermined on other grounds. The diversity of divorce texts make clear that what may appear to be an absolute prohibition in one text clearly permitted reasonable exceptions, as reflected in other texts.

## Appendix 2 Tithing (continuity): Q (Lk 11:42 // Mat 23:23)

But woe to you Pharisees!  
For you tithe mint and *rue and every herb*,  
And neglect justice and the love of God;

These you ought to have done,  
Without neglecting the others (Lk 11:42)

Woe to you, *scribes and Pharisees*, hypocrites!  
for you tithe mint and dill and cumin,  
and have neglected *the weightier matters of the law*,  
*justice and mercy and faith*;  
these you ought to have done  
without neglecting the others (Mat 23:23).

Matthew's version apparently reflects the Pharisees' common practice in Jesus' time, while Luke addition of "rue and every herb" may indicate an ironical description that ridicules an exaggerated scrupulousness far exceeding common Jewish practice (Loader 1997:414-415 and his citation of Kloppenborg, note 69; cf the Pharisee's prayer in Lk 11:12).

Patriarchal precedents to the legal texts include Abraham to Melquisedek (Gen 14:20, probably a pre-exilic text; Heb 7:4-10) and Jacob (Gen 28:20-22, probably the earliest text, from the E source ca. 850 B.C.; see also Amos 4:4 ca 750 B.C.).

(1) Deuteronomy 12:6-7, 11,17; 14:22-29; (ca. 650 B.C.) commands the tithe both of agricultural produce and the firstlings of herds and flocks to be brought to the place chosen by God (Jerusalem) and consumed in a sacrificial meal by each patriarchal household with a Levite as invited guest (since they had neither land nor tithe of their own (14:27). In cases where the distance to Jerusalem was too great, the tithe could be sold for money to be used for purchasing the meal in Jerusalem (14:24-26). The households were to thus enjoy the use their tithes in a feast in Jerusalem for two consecutive years, but every third year it was to be kept within their town and given to the Levite, the sojourner, the orphan and the widow (who had no land; Deut 14:28-29; 26:12).

(2) Lev 25:2-7; 27:30-33 (from the priestly source, ca. 550 B.C.) stipulates a tithe from seed, fruit of trees and every tenth animal of the herds and flocks, considered sacred, with priests exercising a role in valuations for exchange;

(3) Num 18:21-32 (also from P) stipulates that the Levites are to present to Yahveh a tithe of the tithes they receive for the support of priests. P thus differs from Deuteronomy (1) designating all tithes to be given to the Levites (not just those of every third year) and (2) making no provision for the sojourners, orphans and widows.

The Hebrew Bible laws on tithing thus reflect the annual responsibility of landholders with their harvests in an agricultural milieu. In addition to the tithes, other offerings were stipulated (see the sacrifices in → Lev 1-7). The prophet → Malachi (ca. 400 B.C.) protested that his contemporaries were robbing God by not bringing their full tithes into the temple storehouse and were suffering poverty as a result of their failure to tithe faithfully. Other late texts provide further incidents and details (differing from the laws):

2 Chr 31:2-12, Hezekiah's restructuring of the role of priests and Levites;

Neh 10:32-39 and 12:44-45, the Levites go to the towns to collect the tithes to support themselves and the priests)

Paul says nothing to his churches about tithing but provides a flexible weekly norm for members of his urban house churches in Corinth (1 Cor 16:1-4) so that they might contribute to his offering for the needs of the poor saints in Jerusalem (2 Cor 8-9; Gal 2:10; Rom 15:26-28; Acts 24:17).

In the *Didache* (13:7, late first or early 2d century A.D.) and in all subsequent Christian writings tithes are extended to include money. Origen (185-254 A.D.) initiated the trend to make Christian priests the beneficiaries of the tithes in place of Israelite Levites and priests. The Apostolic Constitutions (ca. 350-80 A.D.) then took the next step, equating the Hebrew Bible priestly order with church order: bishops replace the high priest, elders replace the priests and deacons replace the Levites (ANF 7:410, cited by Wilson 1992:580).

## Bibliography (Tithe)

Kugler, Robert (2009). "Tithe". *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, V, 607-609.

Wilson, J. Christian (1992). "Tithe". *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. David Noel Freedman, ed. New York: Doubleday, VI, 578-580.

### Appendix 3 Mark: Law, 10 commandments

#### Purity Controversy:

##### Mk 7:10, 21

10 For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’ [#5, Ex 20:12 // Dt 5:16] and ‘He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die’ [Ex 21:17]....

21 For from within, out of the heart of man, come evil thoughts, *porneia*, theft [#8], murder [#6], adultery [#7] covetousness [#10], wickedness, deceit [#9], licentiousness, envy, slander, pride, foolishness....

// **Mat 15:4, 19** (closer to the order of the 10 Commandments; extraneous items eliminated)

4 For God commanded, ‘Honor your father and your mother’ [#5, Ex 20:12 // Dt 5:16], and ‘He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die’ [Ex 21:17]....

19 For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder [#6], adultery [#7], *porneia*, theft [#8], false witness [#9], slander [#9]

#### To the Rich Young Ruler:

**Mk 10:19** You know the commandments: ‘Do not kill [#6], Do not commit adultery [#7], Do not steal [#8], Do not bear false witness [#9], *Do not defraud*, Honor your father and mother [#4]

// **Mat 19:18-19** And Jesus said, ‘You shall not kill [#6], You shall not commit adultery [#7], You shall not steal [#8], You shall not bear false witness [#9], Honor your father and your mother [#4], and You shall love your neighbor as yourself [Lev 19:18]. [Adds Lev 19:18; omits Mark’s *Do not defraud*]

// **Lk 18:20** You know the commandments: Do not commit adultery [#7], ‘Do not kill [#6], Do not steal [#8], Do not bear false witness [#9], Honor your father and mother [#4] [follows LXX commandment order]

**The death of John the Baptist:** “For Herod had sent and seized John, and bound him in prison for the sake of Herodias, his brother Philip’s wife; because he had married her. For John said to Herod, ‘It is not lawful for you to have your brother’s wife’” (**Mk 6:17-18 // Mat 14:3-4 (adultery #7 + incest, Lev 18:16; 20:21); cf Lk 3:19**, “for Herodias, his brother’s wife” (lacks specifics).

### Appendix 4 Westminster Confession of Faith (1647)

**VII.** As it is the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in His Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment binding all men in all ages, He has particularly appointed one day in seven, for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: [34. Exodus 20:8, 10, 11; Isaiah 56:2, 4, 6, 7] which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week: and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, [35. Genesis 2:2,3; 1 Corinthians 16:1,2; Acts 20:7] which in Scripture, is called the Lord’s Day, [36. Revelation 1:10] and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath. [37. Exodus 20:8,10; Mathew 5:17,18].

**VIII.** This Sabbath is to be kept holy unto the Lord when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest all the day from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations, [38] but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of His worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy. [39]

38. Exodus 20:8; 16:23, 25, 26, 29, 30; 31:15-17; Isaiah 58:13; Nehemiah 13:15, 19, 21, 22.

39. Isaias 58:13; Mateo 12:1-13.

## Notes:

James E. Milller: "I found the contrast between Sabbath - rest and Sunday - worship to be strange. Psalm 92, "A Psalm of the Sabbath", is a worship Psalm which just happens to use the Divine Name 7 times, and Isaiah 56 invites the foreigner and eunuch to join in the worship at the Temple on Sabbath. More specific to Jesus, Luke 4:16 has Jesus attending synagogue, "as his custom was," on the Sabbath. Again in verses 31-33 he was teaching on the Sabbath, incidentally it turns out he was in the synagogue. The primary function of the Synagogue was the study of Scripture, and that seems to me to be an act of worship in a place of worship. Then Paul & co, in Philippi, lacking a synagogue, chose to go to a nearby place of prayer on the Sabbath (Acts 16:13), where some God-fearers were already assembled. Assuming that synagogue means worship, the Sabbath was a day of worship for Jesus and Paul. Or perhaps Paul was merely opportunistic and uninterested in worship on the Sabbath, and Sabbath attendance in the synagogue was for him just an opportunity to evangelize. I prefer to think that Jesus and Paul sought a worship experience when they attended synagogue (or sought out fellow worshippers) on Sabbath. Revelation 1:10 does indeed mention the "Lord's day", but there is no reason to assume this has to be a reference to Sunday this early. There is no reason why it couldn't reference Sabbath. If that is not pleasing, it could reference the eschatological era of the New Covenant as well."

- 1 Nomistic Service (E. Lohmeyer (1929), J.B. Tyson (1973))
- 2 Jewish Nationalism (James D.G. Dunn (1983, 1985, 1988ab, 1990, 1998; E.P. Sanders 1977, 1983; F. Watson 1986; N.T. Wright 2009))
- 3 \*Legalism (Daniel P. Fuller 1975; H. Hübner 1985)
- 4 Subjective Genitive (L. Gaston, 1984, 1987)
- 5 \*Human Inability (S. Westerholm 1988:120-21; D.J. Moo 1983:91-00; 2002:76-77; Thielman 1989:61-65; Byrne 1996:118)
- 6 \*\*\*Human Inability, Legalism and Salvation History (T.R. Schreiner 1985, 1991, 1993; 1998:169-174)

Dunn on Rom 1:26-27 orexis indicating mutual attraction; hence not pedophilia