

The Hermeneutical Dilemma behind ‘Anti-Judaism’ in the New Testament: An Evangelical Perspective

Philip du Toit¹

Abstract

In this contribution the hermeneutical problem of ‘anti-Judaism’ in relation to the New Testament is approached from an Evangelical perspective. The term ‘anti-Judaism’ is especially problematic in the light of the hermeneutical distance between the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament and contemporary Judaism. The main questions asked are whether the New Testament can be free of ‘anti-Judaism’ and whether there is room in prevalent New Testament scholarship for an Evangelical approach to this topic. The concepts of both fulfilment and replacement, which play an integral part in attempting to answer these questions, are identified as integral to the New Testament. The latter conclusion is reached from an overview of various New Testament texts with a focus on the Pauline literature. The conclusion is reached that there are instances in the New Testament where a stand is taken against Ἰουδαῖοι, yet not as distinct from other people, but as part of an element of judgment against all sinful people, which is inherent in the gospel.

¹ The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the beliefs of the South African Theological Seminary.

1. Introduction

Although the concept 'anti-Judaism' is usually understood as opposition against Jews' religious convictions or customs, while the concept 'antisemitism' would refer to prejudice against race or ethnicity (Langmuir 1971; Murrell 1994; Anti-Semitism 2007),² there exists a trend to relate these two concepts with each other (e.g. Gager 1983; Nichols 1993:314; Hoet 2001:187–188; Byford 2006). The rationale behind this trend is that 'anti-Judaism' is seen as a prerequisite for antisemitism (Langmuir 1971; cf. Gager 1983) on the basis that historically, a negative view of Judaism has often led to antisemitism. The holocaust, which is understood as resulting from antisemitism, still has a profound influence on the way Jews and Judaism is perceived today. It influences how the way of life and the customs of the Ἰουδαῖοι ('Jews' or 'Judaean', see below) of the New Testament are understood, as well as how their relationship with those who accepted Jesus as Messiah is perceived.

In the past few decades, New Testament scholarship has progressively been characterised by the avoidance of 'anti-Judaism', in order to nip in the bud any rise to antisemitism. The avoidance of 'anti-Judaism' is especially characteristic of the so-called *New Perspective on Paul*, which on the deepest level has to do with a positive valuation of the faith and customs of the Ἰουδαῖοι at the time of the Second Temple. The latter approach is a reaction against the traditional approach to see the faith and practices of the Ἰουδαῖοι at the time of the Second Temple as legalistic and meritorious, which especially was the approach of Martin Luther. Hoet (2001:187–188) contended that any statement from the

² This distinction is evident in Catholic education before the Second Vatican Council wherein 'anti-Judaism' was seen as an integral part of the defence of the Christian faith (Carroll 2002:40).

New Testament that could give rise to antisemitism should be avoided out of respect for contemporary Jews. To interpret the New Testament in a way that impinges on the interest of contemporary national Israel, became for Kim (2010:329) a ‘theological shibboleth’ that determines whether one is antisemitic. According to Kim, the fear of being mistaken for an antisemite could hinder one from interpreting someone like Paul’s theology objectively.

The main objectives of this article are to determine whether an Evangelical approach to the New Testament can be free of ‘anti-Judaism’, and if there is room within prevalent New Testament scholarship for an Evangelical approach to ‘anti-Judaism’. But before these questions can be answered, the hermeneutical difficulties around the concept Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament will be identified: who exactly are they, and can one equate today’s Jews with them? Subsequently, contemporary approaches to the question whether the Christian faith is inherently ‘anti-Jewish’ will be assessed, as well as the question whether ‘anti-Judaism’ is engrained within the New Testament. Lastly, an Evangelical perspective of the hermeneutical questions around ‘anti-Judaism’ in the New Testament will be presented by way of an overview of prominent New Testament texts with a focus on the Pauline literature, followed by an attempt to attend to the main objectives mentioned above.

Although an Evangelical approach does not constitute a homogeneous approach, and thus includes a wide spectrum of approaches, Fitch (2011:13) pointed out at least three central points of focus in this approach: (1) a high view of the authority of the Bible, (2) a strong belief in a personal conversion experience and (3) an activist engagement with culture in ways peculiar to evangelicalism itself (cf. Olson 2004:9; Pierard and Elwell 2001:406). It is especially a high view

of the unity and authority of scripture (1) that applies to this article. Naturally, the evangelical approach taken in this article is not intended to be representative of all evangelical approaches, but is presented as *an* evangelical approach to the questions at hand.

2. The Hermeneutical Distance between the Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament and Contemporary Jews

One of the areas where strong sentiments about 'anti-Judaism' are in evidence is the way in which the term Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament is perceived and translated. Judaism only started to develop into a full scale religious system after the fall of the Second Temple in CE 70 (Neusner 1984:1–5; Mason 2007:502). For Mason (2007:481–488), a 'religion' is a Western category with no counterpart in ancient culture. He saw the Ἰουδαῖοι in the time of the Second Temple, therefore, as an *ethnos*³ rather than a 'religion' and proposed that the term Ἰουδαῖος in the New Testament should be translated with 'Judaean' rather than 'Jew' (so Malina and Rohrbaugh 1992:32; BDAG, s.v. Ἰουδαῖος; Esler 2003; Elliott 2007) in order to account for this *hermeneutical distance* between today's Jews and the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament. Underneath this translation lies the sentiment that incalculable harm has been caused by translating Ἰουδαῖος in the New Testament by 'Jew' and thereby fostered 'anti-Judaism' through Biblical texts (BDAG, s.v. Ἰουδαῖος). For Esler (2003:62–63), not to distinguish the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament from contemporary Jews encourages the antisemitic notion of "the eternal Jew" who, it is alleged, killed Christ and is still

³ Mason (2007:484) defined an *ethnos* as having a distinctive nature or character expressed in unique ancestral traditions, which reflected a shared ancestry, charter stories, customs, norms, etc. This fundamental category or *ethnos* includes important elements of what we know today as a 'religion', but the political-ethnographic category of *ethnos* cannot be equated with 'religion'.

around, to be persecuted if possible'. Esler argued that the translation 'Judaean' does more justice to the territorial connotations inherent in the designation Ἰουδαῖος, which only started to disappear after about the third to even the fifth century CE (pp. 66–69).

Miller (2014:255–259) followed a more fluid approach and showed that a *concept* of what is known as a 'religion' was already present with many of the Ἰουδαῖοι in the time of the Second Temple. He argued that there exists an overlap in what ancient people perceived as akin to the Ἰουδαῖοι and that which is usually understood under the concept 'religion'. He therefore did not restrict the Ἰουδαῖοι of the Second Temple to an *ethnos*. Notwithstanding the reasons stated above for translating the designation Ἰουδαῖοι by 'Judaean', he reasoned that such a translation evokes another kind of antisemitism, namely, depriving contemporary Jews of their biblical heritage and in so doing perceiving them to be in discontinuity with the Ἰουδαῖοι of the Bible. For Miller the translation 'Judaean' could create the idea that the Bible is 'purified' of Jews (cf. Levine 2000:160–165). Miller prefers the translation 'Jews' for, in his view, it does more justice to the complexity of the term Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament, which carries both ethnic and religious connotations.

Any translation for the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament is thus problematic for two main reasons: (1) there exists a hermeneutical distance between the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament and today's Jews (acknowledged by Miller 2014), and (2), both the translations 'Jew' and 'Judaean' can be interpreted as 'anti-Jewish'. The inevitable question that flows from this is whether 'anti-Judaism' is inherent in Christianity or the New Testament. A problem that is embedded within this question, which relates to the same hermeneutical difficulty, is one's understanding of the term 'anti-Judaism'. If a form of opposition or

antagonism towards the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament can be identified, could such a notion be equated with 'anti-Judaism'? It is because of this inherent hermeneutical difficulty that the concept 'anti-Judaism' stays enclosed in quotation marks throughout most of this article.

3. Is the Christian faith inherently 'anti-Judaist'?

Gager (1983:13) argued that the responsibility of Christianity towards antisemitism is 'not simply whether individual Christians had added fuel to modern European anti-Semitism, but whether Christianity itself was, in its essence and from its beginnings, the primary source of anti-Semitism in Western culture'. According to Ruether (1974) 'anti-Judaism' is engrained in the heart of the Christian message. Ruether (1974:228–229) analysed and reconstructed the basic dualisms that are inherent in the Christian message, which do not acknowledge Judaism and are deeply engraved in Christian language and doctrine. She considered 'anti-Judaism' as the tragic left hand of Christology (pp. 116, 246–251). In the introduction of Ruether's book, Baum (1974:12–13) argued that what has to be examined, is the sense in which eventually all dichotomies of salvation between spirit and flesh, light and darkness, truth and falsehood, grace and damnation, life and death, trust and self-righteousness, were projected on the opposition between church and synagogue until the Jewish people became the embodiment of all that is unredeemed, perverse, stubborn, evil, and demonic in this world.

For Baum (1974:18), only extensive and probing critique of Christian teaching on Judaism would be sufficient to raise the consciousness that is required 'to redeem Christianity from its anti-Jewish virus and its absolutizing trend' (cf. Taylor 1995:193–196).

In the same line of interpretation, Farmer (1999:49) described ‘anti-Judaism’ as a specifically Christian attitude which is theologically driven and includes concepts of divine rejection and punishment of Jews, as well as Christian supersessionism and triumphalism. ‘Supersessionism’ or ‘replacement theology’ implies that Christianity *replaced* the religious tradition of the Old Testament people of God. The problem is that any form of replacement theology can be perceived as ‘anti-Judaist’, as it would not acknowledge contemporary Jews’ continuity with Israel of the Old Testament, and thus deprive them of their Old Testament heritage (cf. Hakola 2005:239–240; Zoccali 2010:3; Johnson 2013:567–568). The question is whether ‘anti-Judaism’ can be completely avoided without forfeiting the heart of Christianity. A question that coheres with the latter is whether ‘anti-Judaism’ can be completely avoided in an evangelical approach to scripture.

4. Is ‘anti-Judaism’ Inherent in the New Testament?

There is difference of opinion on whether the New Testament is ‘anti-Judaist’ or not. Although many parts of the New Testament normally feature in this discussion,⁴ the two verses where the question about inherent ‘anti-Judaism’ is probably most pressing, are Matthew 27:25 and John 8:44.

According to Matthew 27:25, ‘all the people’ who were present after Pilate washed his hands in innocence, answered: ‘His blood on us and our children!’ If that were to mean that the Jews are to be held

⁴ Passages that are mentioned often are for example where Jesus attacked the Scribes and Pharisees and referred to them as ‘hypocrites’, ‘blind leaders’, ‘whitewashed tombs’, ‘brood of vipers’, and so on. (e.g. Matt 23:1–39 and similar utterances in the gospels).

responsible forever for Christ's death, it is perceived by many as 'anti-Judaist' and even as antisemitic. According to John 8:44, Jesus said to the Ἰουδαῖοι (see John 8:22, 31, 48, 52, and 57) that they had as their father the devil, who was a murderer from the beginning and the father of lies. The question about 'anti-Judaism' is especially pertinent with those who stress continuity of today's Jews with the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament. In the Fourth Gospel, the authorities of the Ἰουδαῖοι are not mentioned in the passion narrative (except 18:3) and οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ('the Judaeans' or 'the Jews') are responsible for Jesus' death by implication (see Hoet 2001:191).⁵

5. Attempts to Avoid 'anti-Judaism'

There are several ways in which New Testament scholars handle the above kind of texts. One approach is to explain away 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament (see Johnson 2013:546–547). Gager (1983:112–117) proposed that the texts in the New Testament that sound 'anti-Judaist' are not aimed at true Jews, but at gentile 'Judaizers'. Falk (1983:148–161) reasoned that Jesus was not antagonised by good Pharisees from the School of Hillel, but by evil Pharisees of the School of Shammai. Vermes (1983) and Crossan (1995) argued that no Ἰουδαῖοι were involved in Jesus' death, but only Romans. Those who think that the 'anti-Judaist' texts were later redactional additions also belong under this group (e.g. Charlesworth 2001:509). Then there are those who acknowledge 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament, but who apply censorship by translations or lectionaries used in worship services (Johnson 2013:547). Ruether (1974:116, 246–251) who saw 'anti-

⁵ cf. John 12:42–43 where it is described how some of the Pharisees believed in Jesus but did not want to confess it in fear of being banned from the synagogue, loving the glory of people more than the glory from God. cf. also Revelation 2:9 and 3:9 where the Ἰουδαῖοι are described as a 'synagogue of Satan'.

Judaism' as the left hand of Christology, insisted that one must discard Christology, implying that new ways must be found to formulate Jesus' messiahship. Eckhardt (1986) went so far as suggesting that the canon should be dissolved, and that the New Testament must lose its status as Holy Scripture.

Another approach is to acknowledge a form of 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament, but to distinguish the kind of 'anti-Judaism' therein from contemporary 'anti-Judaism' by contextualising it. Under this approach falls that of Dunn (2001:59), who pointed out the anachronistic nature of the methodology which juxtaposes 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' in the New Testament with each other as if they were two monolithic religions at the time (cf. Mason 2007). For Von Wahlde (2001:426) the conflict between those who followed Christ and the Ἰουδαῖοι has to be understood against the background of a literary topos wherein 'a stereotyped pattern of argument where two alternative ways of life and their characteristics and consequences are described within the categories and worldview of apocalyptic dualism'. The latter implies that one has to understand the conflict within the gospels in the light of the literary conventions of the time. In a similar approach, the belittling language aimed at the Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament is understood as part of the ancient rhetoric of vilification (Johnson 2013:560–564) or otherness (Siker 2005:306–307). The idea behind these approaches is that it was standard practice in ancient times to rhetorically categorise opponents in this manner. Johnson (2013:564) understood this rhetoric as part of 'the polemic used against those regarded as deviant within the messianic movement'. Related to the latter is the approach that 'anti-Judaism' was part of an 'intra-Jewish' polemic and therefore not 'anti-Judaist' in the full sense (e.g. Hoet 2001:188; Van Henten 2001:116).

Another approach that falls in this group—although it lies at the other end of the spectrum—is the approach explaining 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament on the basis of the conflict between the Ἰουδαῖοι and the believers in Christ. De Boer (2001:276) argued that the Ἰουδαῖοι in the Gospel of John were responsible for the exclusion of the Christ-believers, for the discipleship of Jesus could not be reconciled with the discipleship of Moses, specifically when the latter rejected Jesus as Messiah. A similar approach is followed by those who attribute the depiction of the Ἰουδαῖοι in Revelation 2:9 and 3:9 as 'a synagogue of Satan' to the distance and growing conflict between those who accepted Christ as the Messiah and those (Ἰουδαῖοι) who rejected Jesus as the Messiah. That the Ἰουδαῖοι persecuted the believers in Christ forms part of this interpretation (cf. Roloff 1993:61, 78; Mayo 2006:68; Patterson 2012:139–140).

Bieringer, Pollefeyt and Vandekastele-Vanneuville (2001:27–29) rightly argued that the Christology in the Gospel of John poses an unparalleled challenge to the unity of the Ἰουδαῖοι, which can even be derived from the earlier Pauline tradition (see below). A commonsense reading of the Johannine material leads one to the conclusion that a 'Jewish-Christian' conflict was at play (cf. Culpepper 2001:70–71), even if it was in an early form. According to Tomson (1986:282) the designation οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is an expression used by those who were not Ἰουδαῖοι (outsiders). The conflict could thus not have been 'inner-Jewish'. The Johannine writings can be seen as 'a historical record of the beginning of Christianity and Judaism as separate and opposed religions' (Bieringer *et al.* 2001:29). The conflict can be understood as 'a growing social and theological tension and distantiation between the disciples of Jesus and those Jews who did not accept him' (p. 29). The Gospel of John 'leaves no doubt that the major issue of the conflict is expressed by John in christological terms' (p. 29). Bieringer *et al.* (2001:31–33) acknowledge with Culpepper (2001:77–78) that the

Gospel of John's Christology implies a form of supersessionism. Even the idea of fulfilment, which occurs more broadly in the New Testament, is difficult to disconnect from the idea of replacement.

The question is, if one could acknowledge a form of 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament, which includes the idea of replacement, how should it be understood? Brown (1979:41–42) described the problem as follows: 'It would be incredible for a twentieth-century Christian to share or justify the Johannine contention that "the Jews" are the children of the devil, an affirmation which is placed on the lips of Jesus'. He added: 'I cannot see how it helps contemporary Jewish-Christian relationships to disguise the fact that such an attitude once existed'. Bieringer *et al.* (2001:38–39) came to three conclusions about the Gospel of John: (1) It contains 'anti-Judaist' elements; (2) 'Anti-Judaism' is part of the 'intrinsically oppressive' dimensions in Scripture and not part of divinely inspired revelation, and thus 'totally unacceptable from a Christian point of view'; (3) Elements of 'anti-Judaism' cannot be removed from the canon by ascribing them to later redactions, for it would imply 'a canon within the canon'. Because they thought that the idea of replacement should be avoided at all costs, Bieringer *et al.* insisted that one must seek ways of developing a Christology and Christian theology that does not imply replacement or exclusion, and is thus free of supersessionism. They proposed an alternative hermeneutical approach to scripture where the theology of revelation is adjusted in a major way (cf. Henrix 2001; Hakola 2005:241; Hanson 2008). They understood 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament as part of human sinfulness, which would include the writers of the New Testament. God's revelation thus has to be redefined in such a way that it constitutes a dialectical relationship between God and people which is not solely dependent on the written text. In their approach scripture is understood as a witness of people's interpretation

of God's self-communication to them in which the writers of the New Testament are simultaneously virtuous and sinful. Scripture thus does not need to be inerrant, for God 'can write straight on crooked lines' (p. 40). Even texts that imply that no one will be saved except through Christ as Mediator of salvation (e.g. John 3:36; cf. 14:6) have to be seen as part of the authors' sinfulness. For Bieringer *et al.* the notion of all-inclusive love that includes the love of enemies should transcend 'anti-Judaism' in the Gospel of John (Bieringer *et al.* 2001:13, 15, 29, 32–44).

6. An Evangelical Perspective on 'anti-Judaism'

From an Evangelical perspective the question could, however, be asked whether the kind of approach of Bieringer *et al.* (2001:32–44) and others as mentioned above can be reconciled with an approach that acknowledges the sufficiency, reliability and authority of scripture. This is not to contend that everything in the New Testament can be neatly organised into a rigid scheme, but an evangelical approach would at least imply that the New Testament does not contain fundamental incompatibilities or elements carrying differing levels of authority. The question that flows from the acknowledgement of the authority of scripture is whether 'anti-Judaism' forms part of an evangelical approach to the New Testament in any way.

The most basic criticism that can be levelled at the conclusions of Bieringer *et al.* (2001:39) is that their second and third conclusions seem to be at odds with each other. Why should 'anti-Judaist' elements in scripture not be authoritative (2 above) while redaction-criticism would be wrong for it would imply 'a canon within the canon' (3 above)? If one considers parts of the Bible as not being authoritative (2 above), does one not have a canon within the canon again (3 above)? Their approach is thus inherently inconsistent. A further question is

whether one principle from the Gospel of John (an inclusive love that includes love for enemies) can be absolutised at the expense of other elements in the same gospel that includes God's judgment of unbelief (John 3:18; 9:39; 12:31, 48; 6:8, 11). Does the gospel in the New Testament contain only an element of love, or does it also contain an element of judgment, and if so, what is the nature of this judgment and how can it be reconciled with the principle of love? This is the question to which I now turn.

6.1. 'Anti-Judaism' in the context of God's judgment on all people and human depravity

Although according to critics, Matthew 27:25 and John 8:44 contain more explicit forms of 'anti-Judaism', the tension between believers in Christ and the Ἰουδαῖοι lies much deeper in the New Testament. The conflict between Christ-believers and the Ἰουδαῖοι can already be pointed out in the Pauline corpus, which forms part of the earlier writings of the New Testament (45–64 CE, Johnson 2013:545, 548–549; cf. Carson and Moo 2005).⁶ Paul referred to his former life in the Ἰουδαϊσμός in Galatians 1:13 (cf. Phil 3:6; 1 Cor 15:8; 1 Tim 1:12–13), which can be rendered as the 'way of belief and life' of the Ἰουδαῖοι (BDAG, s.v. Ἰουδαϊσμός). In 2 Corinthians 11:23–27 he mentioned his stoning and the lashes that he received from the Ἰουδαῖοι. Paul also referred to his continuous persecution because of his provision of access to salvation without circumcision (Gal 5:11), and to those who avoided persecution for the cross of Christ by advocating circumcision (Gal 6:12). Even Paul's reference to the cross of Christ as a 'stumbling block' for the Ἰουδαῖοι (1 Cor 1:23; cf. 1 Cor 1:18; Gal 5:11; Rom 9:32–33) has to be understood in the light of the conflict between Christ-believers and the Ἰουδαῖοι. Sanders (1999:276) argued that those

⁶ Paul's death is normally calculated at around 65 CE (Carson and Moo 2005:370).

who are sensitive to the question whether Paul broke with 'Judaism', have to see the 'anti-Judaism possibilities' in Paul's letters.

The strongest and arguably the most controversial indicator in Paul of conflict between the Christ-believers and the Ἰουδαῖοι is 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16, which reports the things that the congregation suffered from the Ἰουδαῖοι who killed both the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, displeased God and were against all people. Apart from these, Paul referred to the constant 'filling up [of] the measure of their sins' and God's wrath that 'has come upon them to the end'. That someone such as Best (1972:122) considered Paul's position as 'antisemitic' and therefore as unacceptable (cf. Simpson 1990) was probably the same underlying motivation for Pearson (1971) and Schmidt (1983) to consider this passage as a later interpolation. The latter allegation cannot, however, be supported from the available manuscript evidence (Smith 2000:703). To avoid this passage disrupting the narrative flow, it has to be understood as a kind of digression in the rhetorical build-up to establish a transition to the subsequent matter which Paul wanted to address (Wanamaker 1990:109). In context it seems as if the reference to the Ἰουδαῖοι (v. 14) points to the Ἰουδαῖοι in general rather than to specific Ἰουδαῖοι, although both are possible grammatically. Apart from Matthew 27:25, the idea that the Ἰουδαῖοι in general would crucify Christ (1 Thess 2:15), occurs elsewhere in the New Testament (Luke 24:20; John 5:18; 7:1; 8:59; 11:45–53; 18:14, 31; Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13–15; 4:10, 27; 5:30; 7:52; 10:39; 13:28). Related to the latter is the notion that God's people of the Old Testament killing their own prophets (1 Kgs 19:10, 14; 2 Chr 36:15; Neh 9:26; Jer 2:30) was transferred to the New Testament (Matt 5:12; 23:31–35, 37; Luke 11:48–51; 13:33–34; Acts 7:5), including Paul himself (Rom 11:3; 1 Thess 2:15). Paul thus adopted the Old Testament pattern of the rejection of God's own agents (Wanamaker 1990:115). That the Ἰουδαῖοι 'displeased God' (v. 15) is likely to be

connected to the fact that they did not accept Jesus as the Messiah or as the Mediator of salvation, and that, by the persecution of Christ-believers by the Ἰουδαῖοι resulted in preventing the gospel from spreading, they went against God's will (Wanamaker 1990:115, 118; Martin 1995:92; cf. Bruce 1982:47; Green 2002:145). That the Ἰουδαῖοι would 'oppose everyone' (v. 15) probably reflects the general 'anti-Judaism' of the Greco-Roman world where the Ἰουδαῖοι opposed others on the basis of their own exclusivity (Wanamaker 1990:115; cf. Bruce 1982:47; Green 2002:145).⁷

Other than the latter kind of antagonism, Paul's antagonism towards the Ἰουδαῖοι was directed more at their hindrance of Paul's mission to the Gentiles, whom he wanted to lead to salvation. His opposition was thus aimed more at people (in general) who attacked God's purposes than at the Ἰουδαῖοι as nation or ethnic group. It was therefore theological critique rather than social or ethnic critique (cf. Wanamaker 1990:115–116; Murrell 1994:174; Martin 1995:90–93; Malherbe 2000:170; Green 2002:146). The lashes that Paul received from the Ἰουδαῖοι (2 Cor 11:24) probably have to be understood in the same light (Wanamaker 1990:116). The opposing of the gospel stood for Paul in a greater apocalyptic framework of God's will, including the hardening of Israel in history and God's judgment of them (cf. Wanamaker 1990:116–117; Malherbe 2000:170, 176; Lamp 2003; Rom 9:11–23). The 'filling up' of 'the measure of their sins' (1 Thess 2:16) recalls the same theme in the history of God's people (Gen 15:16; Dan 8:23; cf. 2 *Macc* 6:14) where God's divine purpose was opposed (Green

⁷ Tacitus (*Histories* 5:5) wrote that the Ἰουδαῖοι were loyal to one another 'but toward every other people they feel only hate and enmity' (in Green 2002:145; cf. Philostratus in *Vita Apollonii* 5:33). Josephus (*Against Apion* 2:121) claimed that Apion falsely maintained that Ἰουδαῖοι swore to God to 'show goodwill to no foreigner, especially Greeks' (in Wanamaker 1990:115).

2002:147–148; cf. Bruce 1982:48; Wanamaker 1990:116). Although God's wrath had already broken through in the present for Paul (Rom 1:18), its completion lay in the future (Rom 2:5; cf. 2 Thess 1:7–10; cf. Murrell 1994:175–176; Malherbe 2000:171, 177; Green 2002:149; Fee 2009:102). In terms of the thrust of Paul's thought in 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16, there are noticeable similarities with Matthew 23:31–36,⁸ which possibly point to a pre-synoptic tradition (Bruce 1982:43, 49; Murrell 1994:176–177; Malherbe 2000:174–175; cf. Wanamaker 1990:116). Apart from the possibility that Paul linked to such a tradition, Paul's use of language might show signs of a stock feature of ancient rhetoric called *vituperatio*, which functioned in the context of social conflict between individuals or groups with competing interests or claims (Wanamaker 1990:118). These differences in values in turn helped to demarcate and define a new group while simultaneously casting doubt on the legitimacy of the rival group (cf. Punt 2007). Here, the question whether Paul was 'anti-Judaist' in this passage is not completely resolved. A deeper look at the rationale behind his thinking in the light of his gospel is required.

For Paul, faith in Christ is the confession of his lordship and the decisive criterion for salvation. This applied to both the gentiles and the Ἰουδαῖοι—'there is no distinction' (Rom 10:9–12; cf. Murrell 1994:179). According to Paul the 'gospel is veiled' for those who are perishing (2 Cor 4:3), including the 'children of Israel' (2 Cor 3:13). Regarding the gospel, Paul considered Israel as 'enemies of God for

⁸ In the Gospel of Matthew, the scribes and Pharisees are depicted as descendants of those who murdered the prophets (Matt 23:31; cf. 1 Thess 2:15a) and they are said to fill up the measure of their father's deeds (Matt 23:32; cf. 1 Thess 2:16b). This would lead them at the judgment to their condemnation in hell (Matt 23:33, and 35; cf. 1 Thess 2:16c). Both passages refer to opposition of the Ἰουδαῖοι to the gospel mission (Matt 23:34; cf. 1 Thess 2:15b). The latter is the most striking parallel (Wanamaker 1990:116).

your [believers in Christ] sake’ (Rom 11:28). Paul compared those who insisted on circumcision with ‘dogs’, which is a play on the pagan custom of mutilating oneself by cutting (Phil 3:2, κατατομή; Reumann 2008:462; Hansen 2009:220; cf. Johnson 2013:553). According to Romans 3:1, Paul specifically asked whether the Ἰουδαῖος enjoyed any ‘advantage’ (BDAG, s.v. περισσός, § 1) or ‘superiority’ (Zerwick and Grosvenor 1993:464; Abbott-Smith [1923] 1929:357–358), and if circumcision had any value. He answered the question affirmatively, but described this ‘advantage’ or ‘superiority’ as the entrusting of God’s oracles to them (v. 2). This probably points to the fact that they were carriers of the Old Testament. Paul possibly had all of God’s promises in mind (Moo 1996:182; Schreiner 1998:175), including the gospel in Christ (Kruse 2012:159). Yet Paul argued that ‘some’ of the Ἰουδαῖοι (v. 3), which he probably used euphemistically (cf. Moo 1996:184; Kruse 2012:160), became unfaithful. Although their unfaithfulness could be connected to God’s Word in general, it seems as if their rejection of Jesus as Messiah played an integral part in it (Murray 1960:94; Hall 1983:1986; Moo 1996:184–185; Schreiner 1998:177). In verse 3, Paul asked if their unfaithfulness would nullify God’s faithfulness, and answered: ‘By no means! Although everyone is a liar, let God be proved true, as it is written, “So that you may be justified in your words, and prevail in your judging.”’ (v. 4, NRSV).⁹ The ‘superiority’ of the Ἰουδαῖοι (rather than ‘advantage’) thus does not have so much to do with their position before God or their salvation as such, but ironically has more to do with a *responsibility* before God as carriers of his oracles to obey them. For Paul God’s faithfulness (v. 3) is confirmed in that ‘everyone is a liar’ (v. 4), which includes the

⁹ Although some translations translate κρίνεσθαι as a passive (‘when you are judged’, ESV; cf. GNB; REB), it is more likely a medium in correspondence with Psalm 51:4 which Paul quoted (Moo 1996:188; Kruse 2012:160–162; cf. Matt 5:40; 1 Cor 6:6).

Ἰουδαῖοι, because 'some' (most) of them were not faithful (not believing in Christ as their Messiah). This notion would correspond to the notion in 2:8–9 where the Ἰουδαῖοι are to be considered as 'first' in terms of God's 'wrath and fury' and 'anguish and distress' for those who were 'self-seeking' and did not obey the truth. Paul later asked a similar question as the one in 3:1, namely, 'What then? Are we any better off?' (v. 9, NRSV). His answer was telling: 'Not at all! For we have charged both Jews and Greeks before, that they are all under sin' (v. 9). Not only was God's judgment extended to the Ἰουδαῖοι, but they were also counted as being under sin, together with everyone else.

The expression 'under sin' (Rom 7:14; Gal 3:22) in Paul is similar to the expression 'under the law' (Rom 2:12; 3:19; 6:14, 15; 7:23; 1 Cor 9:20, 21; Gal 3:23; 4:4, 5, 21; 5:18) and points to more than sinfulness or being bound to law, but to an old (eschatological) era and way of existence *before* or *outside* of Christ (cf. Ridderbos 1959:154, 160, 162; Moo 1996:454, 465; Wright 2002:552). This notion is evident in Galatians 3:22–23 where Paul declared that Scripture 'imprisoned all people' (George 1994:268) 'under sin' so that the promise (to Abraham) could be given to those who believe. Before faith 'came' (vv. 23, 25) all people ('we', v. 23, Fung 1988:167) were imprisoned 'under the law' until 'the faith' (τὴν ... πίστιν, v. 23) was to be revealed. It is clear that the 'the faith' that was revealed points to a new eschatological era that broke through in the history of salvation in Christ where access to God's promise to Abraham is now obtained through faith in Christ (cf. Fung 1988:168; Fee 1994:385; Schreiner 2010; De Boer 2011:239). The designation 'before faith came' (v. 23) thus points to the old era before or outside of Christ. All people before or outside of Christ are therefore 'under sin' and 'under the law', including all Ἰουδαῖοι before or outside of Christ (cf. Lategan 1986:71; Hays 2000:269; Schreiner 2010). In a sense, Paul expanded the situation 'under the law' in that gentiles before or outside of Christ are included (Fung 1988:167;

George 1994:268). The same notion as in Galatians 3:22–23 occurs later in Romans 3 after Paul referred to the way of existence ‘under sin’ (v. 9), including Ἰουδαῖοι (see above). According to verses 25–26, God has set forth Christ as a ‘propitiation through faith’ to show his righteousness ‘in the present time’ so that Christ could be righteous and could justify those ‘of the faith in¹⁰ Jesus’. Thus the idea is that the era of faith represents a *new era that came with the first Christ advent* wherein all people are justified or saved through faith in Jesus Christ (cf. Moo 1996:240–241; Gal 4:4–5).

It can be derived from the above that Paul’s negative rhetoric directed at the Ἰουδαῖοι also has to be understood in the light of his view that *all people* before the Christ advent or those who do not accept Christ as the Messiah in faith are ‘under sin’ or ‘under the law’. They are therefore all subjected to an (eschatologically) old, incomplete way of existence that is only resolved in Christ. Paul’s rhetoric against *unbelieving Gentiles* is thus *just as harsh if not harsher* than against unbelieving Ἰουδαῖοι (cf. Johnson 2013:564). According to Romans 1:18, God’s wrath is revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of people who suppress the truth in unrighteousness. They did not glorify or thank God, but ‘they became vain in their reasonings, and their undiscerning heart was darkened’ (v. 21; cf. v. 22). They changed ‘God’s truth into a

¹⁰ Although many recent interpreters see the phrase πίστεως Ἰησοῦ as a subjective genitive (‘the faith/faithfulness of Jesus’; e.g. Hays 2000; Wright 2002), there are still many scholars who consider it more correct to take the phrase as an objective genitive (‘faith in Jesus’, e.g. Moo 1996; Schreiner 1998; Jewett 2007; Kruse 2012), especially because (1) native Greek speakers had no difficulty in understanding the phrase as an objective genitive; (2) the human response of faith in Jesus is prevalent in the New Testament (e.g. Matt 17:20; Mark 4:40; Luke 17:6); and (3) faith in Paul normally functions as an attribute of believers (Rom 1:5, 8, 12; 3:27, 28, 30, 31; 4:5, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20; 5:1, 2, and so on) and never *unambiguously* points to Christ’s faithfulness (Silva 2004:227–234).

lie' and 'worshipped and served the created thing more than the Creator' (v. 25). They 'received in their own persons the due penalty for their error' (v. 27, NRSV). God 'gave them up to a reprobate mind, to do the things that should not be done' (v. 28), and so on. These people are said to deserve death (v. 32; cf. 1 Cor 6:9–11). In 1 Thessalonians 4:5 the Gentiles are described as people who do not know God, and in 4:13 as people without hope. For Paul, Gentiles offer to idols (1 Cor 10:20; cf. 12:2). Where Paul wrote about the lashes that he received from the Ἰουδαῖοι (2 Cor 11:24) and the dangers from his own people (κινδύνους ἐκ γένους, v. 26) he also reported the dangers from the Gentiles (κινδύνους ἐξ ἐθνῶν, v. 26). In addition Paul utilised a standard rhetoric that considered Gentiles as sinners by default (Gal 2:15).

In the rest of the New Testament, the rhetoric against Gentiles is just as sharp if not sharper than against the Ἰουδαῖοι. Matthew 6:7 refers to the vain repetition of words among the gentiles when they pray. 1 Peter 4:3–4 describes the way of life of the Gentiles as 'living in licentiousness, passions, drunkenness, revels, carousing, and lawless idolatry' (NRSV), and of their 'excesses of dissipation' (NRSV). According to Acts 4:27, Herod and 'the peoples of Israel' were not solely responsible for Jesus' death, but included those who gathered against Jesus, Pilate and the Gentiles. Furthermore, the polemic tone against Christ-believers is sometimes just as harsh in the letters and Revelation (2 Cor 11:1–6, 14–21; Gal 3:1; 2 Tim 2:14–3:9; Heb 2:1; 4:1; 6:4–6; 10:26–29; 12:15; 2 Pet 2:1–22; Jude 5–19; Rev 2:13–29; cf. Johnson 2013:564). One of the clearest examples of the latter appears in Matthew 16:23 and Mark 8:33, where Jesus addressed Peter as Satan himself! The way in which Jesus addressed Peter was even sharper than how the Ἰουδαῖοι were addressed in John 8:44.

God's judgment on sin and unbelief is therefore just as integral a part of the gospel as God's love and grace. There is no distinction in respect of

God's *grace and love* for those who (1) accept Jesus as Messiah in faith (John 3:16; Rom 3:22, 29–30; 5:1–2; 10:9–12; Gal 3:28; Eph 2:18–22; Col 3:11), but neither is there any distinction in God's *judgment* on those who stay in sin and do not accept Christ in faith (John 3:18–19; 12:48; 16:9; Rom 2:16; 3:1–20; cf. Heb 10:29). The Ἰουδαῖοι can thus neither be singled out nor excluded from the latter two categories. From an evangelical perspective, a denial of either of these two categories would imply a denial of the heart of the gospel.

6.2. Fulfilment and replacement: continuity and discontinuity

The idea that all people who do not believe in Christ and belong to an eschatologically old way of existence before or outside of Christ, which can only be transformed by faith in Christ into a new way of existence, can be identified on an even deeper level in Paul's thought. This notion is related to the idea of fulfilment-and-replacement. Two of the areas where the idea of fulfilment-and-replacement occurs on a deeper level in Paul, is his thought on (1) the role and nature of the Messiah in God's kingdom, and (2) the 'Spirit' or 'spirit' that is juxtaposed to 'flesh'. These two areas will be examined more closely below.

6.2.1. *The role and nature of the Messiah and the kingdom of God in Paul*

Paul's eschatology stands in continuity with the prevalent eschatological expectations of his time. It can be assumed with reasonable certainty that a fairly widespread hope existed that a king would come by whom Israel's God would liberate his people (Wright 1992:308; Fitzmyer 2007).¹¹ The latter took on at least one explicitly

¹¹ Novenson (2009:364–365) showed that this was one of the things that messiah-language signified in what he called 'Roman-era Judaism'. The Roman writers of the

Davidic form in history in the person of *Simon bar Giora* in 66–70 CE (Horsley and Hanson 1985:120–122), which certainly was current at the turn of the millennium (Neufeld 1997; cf. Horsley 2001:244). This expectation was largely based on the scriptural promise that David's kingdom would be established forever (Wright 1992:310; Hays 2006:60; Fitzmyer 2007:7, 33–55; see 2 Sam 7:4–29; Psa 89:3–4; 132:11–12; cf. *4QFlor* 1:10–13).

Paul saw Jesus as the Messiah of the historical nation Israel (Rom 1:3–4, Moo 1996:46; Wright 2002:415–416; Rom 9:5, Moo 1996:565; Wright 1992:307–320; 2002:629). For Paul, Jesus' Davidic messiahship was confirmed by the title 'root of Jesse' (Rom 15:12; Moo 1996:880; Wright 2002:748; cf. Dunn 1988:850), which Novenson (2009:369) considered as 'full-fledged messianic exegesis [of Isaiah 11:10] by Paul' (cf. Hengel 1983:69). Johnson (2013:555) reasoned that the rejection of Jesus as Messiah by the synagogue was an important stimulus of the reinterpretation of the Torah, which at the time of the first Christian writings had already moved past this phase. The acceptance of Jesus' messiahship in Christ-believing communities thus converged with a gradual departure from messianic ideas by the Ἰουδαῖοι who did not accept Jesus' messiahship. With the latter it later developed into Rabbinic Judaism, where 'messiahship' became an ahistorical kind of system in which the 'anointed' became 'a species of priest' (Neusner 1984:18). Both Dahl (1992:382) and Charlesworth (1992:16, 30) left room for the idea that the understanding of a messiah as it developed in later Judaism was partly in *reaction* to the faith that Jesus is the Messiah (cf. Neusner 1984:12–13; De Boer 2001:276).

time would also be conscious of the idea of a prophesied universal rule by a king of the Ἰουδαῖοι.

Although messianic expectation in the time of the Second Temple was not uniform (being both royal and priestly),¹² it is probably safe to say that the fundamental hope of the *Ἰουδαῖοι* was for liberation from oppression, for the restoration of the land, and for the proper rebuilding of the Temple. These beliefs were grounded on the one hand in believing that Israel's one God was the king of the world, and on the other hand, facing the fact of Israel's present desolation. A central way of expressing this hope was the division of time into two eras: the *present age* (הַיָּמִים הַזֵּהִים) and the *age to come* (הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים). The present age was the time of Israel's misery while in the age to come Israel would be restored (Wright 1992:299; 2003:557; cf. Weinfeld 1997:218–219).¹³

In Wright's (1992:406–407; 2002:691; 2003:726; 2013:1061–1078) understanding of Paul, the exile has been undone in the Christ event, God's people's sins were forgiven and the covenant had been renewed in Christ and the Spirit. Israel's God had poured out his Spirit on all flesh and his Word was going out to the nations, calling into being a new unified people in Christ, including all nations. Understood in this way, the end *had come* and Israel's eschatological hope *had been fulfilled*, although redrawn and renewed. When Paul discussed the promises to Abraham (Gal 3; Rom 4), it is noteworthy that Paul neither mentioned anything about the inheritance of the land, which was part of the promise to Abraham and was part of Israel's expectation (e.g. Gen 12:7; 13:15–17; Isa 57:13; 60:21), nor of Israel's national reign over the nations (e.g. Isa 11:10–14; 42:1,6; 49:6; 54:3; Jer 4:2; 23:5) by way of a worldwide earthly dominion of the Messiah (e.g. Psalms 72:8–11; Isa 9:7;

¹² This is especially evident from the Dead Sea Scrolls (Knibb 2010:420–421).

¹³ The hope for Israel's restoration via a divine kingdom (e.g. Psalms 68:8–9, 16–18; Hab 3:3; cf. Dan 7:13–14; *Ps Sol* 17:21–32) can be traced back to God's dealings with Israel as a king (Deut 33, esp. vv. 2, 5; Exod 15:18; Num 23:21–22; 24:7–8; Weinfeld 1997:218–219).

Jer 23:5). Rather, believers now inherit the whole cosmos (Rom 4:13), which points to all of humanity (BDAG, s.v. κόσμος, §6a) which is Abraham's seed (Wright 2002:496), or points to the restoration of the whole created order that transcends a territorial understanding of the promise of the land to Israel (cf. Dunn 1988:213). The Messiah's reign is now of a different *kind* (Wright 2013:911, 1065) in that he reigns over the dead and the living (Rom 14:9; cf. 15:12).¹⁴ The promise to Abraham in terms of the one new family of believers in Christ from both the Ἰουδαῖοι and the Greek (Wright 2002:535; 15:8) is therefore fulfilled in a way different from prevalent messianic expectations in terms of (1) Abraham's seed, (2) the land and (3) the reign of God in and through his people. The transformation of the messianic expectation of the Ἰουδαῖοι is directly related to Jesus' bodily resurrection and transformation, which in turn vindicated His messiahship and transformed messianic belief (Wright 2003:562–563, 726–728).

According to Paul's understanding of messiahship, the expectation of the Ἰουδαῖοι is fulfilled in *another* way than they anticipated: God's rule and kingdom is not a physical, earthly rule in the sense that it involves political territory or a physical temple. Rather, God's rule is a spiritual (Witherington 1992:57; Fitzmyer 2007:183),¹⁵ cosmic rule (Rom 14:9; 15:12; Phil 2:9–11), where God's people enjoy heavenly citizenship (Phil 3:20) and cosmic inheritance (cf. Rom 4:13). God's people are now the new temple (1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; cf. Eph 2:21) and the Messiah's body in this world (Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 12:27; Eph 4:12; cf. Wright 2013:1073–1074). According to Romans

¹⁴ Wright (1992:408) and Danker (1989:81) interpreted οὐδένα οἶδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα in 2 Corinthians 5:16 to mean that the Corinthians did not know Jesus as a national Messiah any longer.

¹⁵ 'Spiritual' is here not necessarily meant as non-physical, but under the spiritual reign of Christ and the Spirit.

14:7; 1 Corinthians 4:20 and possibly 1 Thessalonians 2:12,¹⁶ God's kingdom points to a present, *fulfilled* reality in believers' lives, although it contains a future component of *completion*. Believers already share in and live by the eschatological, spiritual reality and power of God's kingdom. A fulfilment of current expectations about the Messiah, God's kingdom and eschatology, which involved the *redefinition* of such expectations, could not only be understood as fulfilment, but indeed implies *replacement* (cf. Bieringer *et al.* 2001:31).

6.2.2. The 'S/spirit' against the 'flesh' as two eschatological eras in Paul

The idea of fulfilment-and-replacement can clearly be identified from Paul's understanding of πνεῦμα ('S/spirit') and σὰρξ ('flesh'). For Paul the indwelling Spirit and Christ's resurrection can be understood as the first fruit (ἀπαρχή, Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15:20, 23) of the general bodily resurrection at the *eschaton*. The Spirit is the 'first instalment' (BDAG, s.v. ἀρραβών) to believers in their hope that they will be 'clothed' with a heavenly body and will live with God eternally (2 Cor 5:4–8). Christ's resurrection is therefore 'an innately eschatological event—in fact, the key inaugurating event of eschatology. His resurrection is not an isolated event in the past, but, in having occurred in the past, belongs to the future consummation and from that future has entered history' (Gaffin 1998:575; cf. Beker 1982:75). According to Beker (1982:40) the powers of the new age are already at work, of which the church is a sign. The essential characteristic of Paul's 'apocalyptic eschatology' is the dualism of two world ages: it is only through the disclosure of the *coming* age that the present age can be perceived as '*this* (evil) age' (Gal 1:4; De Boer 2011:393). It entails God's own eschatological,

¹⁶ Although the kingdom could point here to either a present or future reality, it probably carries the connotation of both (Weatherly 1996).

sovereign action of putting an end to this world-age and by replacing it with the new-world age (cf. Martyn 2000). Paul thus connected to the prevailing idea under the Ἰουδαῖοι who divided time in two eras: the 'present age' (עוֹלָם הַהִיּוֹרָה) and the 'age to come' (עוֹלָם הַבָּא, see above). For Paul the 'age to come' was already inaugurated.

The dualism of two eras, *before* and *after* the Christ-event, can also be derived from Paul's juxtaposition between σάρξ and πνεῦμα in their extended application. Although σάρξ and πνεῦμα and their cognates (e.g., σαρκικός, πνευματικός) have a wide semantic range in Paul (see esp. Bruce [1985] 2000:48–59), the deepest, most extended meaning of the contrast they represent, is arguably best expressed in passages such as Romans 7:5–6; 8:4, 5, 8–9 and Galatians 5:16–17, 25. In Romans 7:5–6, the existence 'in the flesh' where 'sinful passions' come 'by the law' is stated in the past (imperfect) tense (ἤμεν, v. 5), and is contrasted with the new (νυνὶ, v. 6) existence where the believers are 'discharged from the law', 'died to' it, and now serve God 'in newness of S/spirit, and not in oldness of letter'. In Romans 8:4–9 the concepts σάρξ and πνεῦμα are mainly contrasted as two exclusive ways of existence: those in the 'fleshly' state mind the 'things of the flesh' (v. 5), 'death' (v. 6), and 'enmity toward God' (v. 7). They who are in the 'flesh are not able to please God' (v. 8). The state in the 'flesh' here points to the old existence before or outside of Christ, for verse 9 states: 'you are not in flesh'. In contrast, those who walk after the 'Spirit' mind 'spiritual things' (v. 5), 'life and peace' (v. 6). Believers are now in the Spirit if the Spirit dwells within them, whereas those without the Spirit do not belong to him (v. 9). According to Galatians 5:16–17, believers who 'walk by the Spirit... will not fulfil the lust of the flesh', where 'flesh' and 'Spirit' are set in juxtaposition. Those who live according to the 'flesh' point to the old existence before or outside of Christ, for those who do the 'works of the flesh' (v. 19) will not inherit God's kingdom

(v. 21). Those who belong to Christ, however, have ‘crucified the flesh with its passions and lusts’ (v. 24; see esp. Fee 1994:469–470, 553).

In the above passages, σάρξ and πνεῦμα carry a distinctive eschatological meaning within the framework of salvation history, which can be summarised as follows: (1) Σάρξ in its extended application denotes an era and way of existence in Adam before or outside of Christ, which is determined and is controlled by the Mosaic law, sin¹⁷ and death (cf. Moo 1996:49–50). Σάρξ therefore stands for a *mode of identity* that is marked off by the external, visible, human marks of identity, including things such as law and circumcision. (2) Πνεῦμα in its extended application denotes an eschatological era and way of existence in Christ and the Spirit that is determined by and under the control of the indwelling Spirit, which is a result of the new creation (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15). Πνεῦμα therefore stands for a *mode of identity* that is marked off by the inherent work of the Spirit, which represents adoption as children. The above understanding of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in their extended meaning, including the interpretation of Romans 7:5–6; 8:4–9 and Galatians 5:16–17, 25 largely corresponds to the approaches of Ridderbos (1959:145–147, 174–180), Fee (1994:469–470, 553), Moo (1996, esp. pp. 49–50) and Hansen (2009:221), which I argue and substantiate in more depth elsewhere (Du Toit 2013:242–68, 277–79).

The Christ-event can thus be understood as a new era and a new way of existence in the Spirit which *fulfils*, *completes* and *replaces* the previous era. In the new era in Christ, identity is not partly marked off by

¹⁷ Although Paul used σάρξ often in connection with sin (e.g., Rom 7:14; 8:3; Gal 5:19), it is not as if σάρξ so much points to inherent sinfulness (‘sinful nature’), but rather that σάρξ denotes a way of existence under the power of sin (see Fee 1994:30 with respect to Gal 5:16, 19).

external marks such as the law (including circumcision), which can be described as the sphere of 'flesh' (cf. Gal 3:2, 3, 5, De Boer 2011:336).¹⁸ In the new era which was inaugurated by Christ, childhood is marked off by God's indwelling Spirit, which witnesses together with the human spirit (Rom 8:16, Du Toit 2013:277–279). The deepest contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα in Paul thus represents both a *salvation-historical contrast* and a *contrast of identity*. Paul's contrasts between the 'new life' (Rom 6:4), the 'new creation' (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15) and the 'new testament/covenant' (1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6) against the 'old person' (Rom 6:6), the 'old things' (2 Cor 5:17) and the 'old testament/covenant' (2 Cor 3:14), have to be understood in the same light. Although there is continuity in salvation history between the old and the new, one can hardly avoid the notion of a *replacement* of the old by the new (cf. Kruse [1987] 1998:97–99; Wright 1991:181, 192; Fee 1994:307–308; Thrall 1994:421, 423, 424; Moo 1996:365, 373; Harris 2005:424, 433, 434; Meyer 2009:73–94).

6.2.3. *The idea of fulfilment-and-replacement in the rest of the New Testament*

The idea of *fulfilment-and-replacement* can be found on a broader level in the New Testament than only with Paul. This idea is probably engrained much deeper in the New Testament than is generally acknowledged. This includes some of the oldest traditions of the New Testament (e.g. Mark and Heb).

The Gospel of Mark (late 50s to 60s CE, Köstenberger, Kellum and Quarles 2009:298; Carson and Moo 2005:182) is the only Gospel

¹⁸ Although De Boer (2011:336–337) draws this connection between 'flesh' and the 'works of the law', he does not understand 'flesh' so much as a salvation-historical category, but rather as a superhuman power which stands in an apocalyptic struggle with the Spirit, leading to an evil impulse.

containing the saying ‘the time is fulfilled’ (1:15) in the mouth of John the Baptist. This saying is followed by the words: ‘the kingdom of God draws near. Repent and believe in the gospel’ (1:15; cf. Matt 4:17). The time that is ‘fulfilled’ is similar to the notion in Galatians 4:4–5 where the ‘fullness of time’ came where the adoption as children was received by God’s Son (Edwards 2002:47). In the context of Mark, the time that is ‘fulfilled’ probably points to the dawn of salvation (Edwards 2002:47; Vickers 2004:15; cf. 5:23, 34; 8:35; 10:26, 52; 13:13, 20; 15:31). According to Brooks (1991:46) the ‘kingdom of God’ in Mark (1:15; 4:11, 26, 30; 9:1, 47; 10:14, 15, 23, 24, 25; 12:34; 14:25; 15:43), with the possible exception of 14:25 and 15:43, points to a present, spiritual dimension of the kingdom on the basis of God’s promises.¹⁹ The idea of scripture that is fulfilled in respect of Jesus’ ministry occurs in both 14:49 and 15:28. In the Gospel of Matthew there are fourteen explicit references to scripture that is ‘fulfilled’ in Jesus’ ministry (1:22; 2:15, 17; 2:23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14, 35; 21:4; 26:54, 56; 27:9, 35), six in Luke (1:1; 4:21; 18:31; 21:22; 22:37; 24:44) and seven in John (12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36).

Isaiah 6:9–10 reports the blindness of God’s people that prevents their own repentance. According to Mark 4:10–12 Jesus said to his disciples that it was given for them to know the mystery of the kingdom of God, but for those ‘outside’ everything came through parables. In Mark’s account, Jesus incorporated Isaiah 6:6–10 and by implication applied it to the Ἰουδαῖοι who did not repent. While the use of this text in Mark constitutes an element of continuity with God’s people of the Old Testament, it equally contains an element of discontinuity with them. In

¹⁹ There has been quite a debate in the twentieth century on whether the kingdom had already come for Mark, or if it was still to come. An ambiguity was probably at play, which implies that the kingdom was both a present and future reality (Black 1995; Vickers 2004).

Matthew's version (Matt 13:14–16) the same prophesy of Isaiah was fulfilled in 'this people' (λαοῦ τούτου, v. 15) who did not understand Jesus' teaching, by contrast to those who did understand. In Acts 28:25–28 the same prophesy of Isaiah is quoted and is applied to the unbelieving Ἰουδαῖοι. Verse 28 states: 'Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen' (NRSV). Mark 12:1–11 contains the parable of the tenant farmers who, after they abused several servants and killed them, eventually killed the owner's son in an attempt to obtain his inheritance. Eventually the owner would destroy the tenants and give the vineyard to another (v. 9). Psalm 118:22–23 is then quoted in the context of the rejection of Jesus: 'The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone' (v. 10). This quotation from Psalm 118 played an important role in explaining the rejection of Christ by the Ἰουδαῖοι (Edwards 2002:360; cf. Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; Rom 9:33; 1 Pet 2:6–8). The parable in Mark ends with the gospel-writer's remark: 'they knew that He spoke the parable against them'. In Luke's narrative of the same parable (Luke 20:1–18) there is also a reference to Psalm 118, and although the hearers protested the announcement that the tenants would be destroyed and the vineyard given to another (v. 16), Luke wrote that 'they knew that He told this parable against them' (v. 19; cf. Matt 21:45). According to Matthew 21:43 Jesus said: 'the kingdom of God will be taken from you, and it will be given to a nation producing its fruit'. Faith in Christ in all of these passages in the gospels stands in the context of the *fulfilling* of prophecy, is connected to the unbelief of the Ἰουδαῖοι, and implies a form of *replacement* (Blomberg 1992:361; Johnson 2013:565; cf. France 1985:310; Hagner 1993).²⁰ From all the accounts of the owner and his vineyard, it is noteworthy that the

²⁰ Although some interpreters avoid the idea of replacement by pointing to a change of ownership (e.g. Carson 1984:454; Osborne 2010:791), it leaves unanswered the question about the Ἰουδαῖοι who did not believe in Jesus.

vineyard belongs to God (e.g. Edwards 2002:359) and that he determines who would enjoy its inheritance. The inheritance only applies to those who receive what God gives. These passages thus underscore the discontinuity between Israel of the Old Testament and those who believe in Christ.

In the Gospel of John the concepts πνεῦμα and σὰρξ are juxtaposed in a similar manner to that in Paul, although they do not carry exactly the same meaning. These concepts are presented as two mutually exclusive ways of existence or sources of origin, where σὰρξ pertains to that which is natural or human, and πνεῦμα pertains to that which comes from God (Ridderbos 1997:131; cf. Carson 1991:196–197). Christ who was not born of the will of the ‘flesh’ or the will of a ‘man’, but of God (1:13), has to be understood in this way. According to 3:3 someone must be born ‘from above’ or ‘again’ (ἄνωθεν) in order to enter the kingdom, for ‘what is born of the flesh is flesh, and what is born of the Spirit is spirit’ (3:6). Birth ‘of the flesh’ points to natural birth and the mode of existence of the natural person (Bruce 1983:85; Carson 1991:196; Ridderbos 1997:128). By implication, any claim on God’s kingdom on the basis of things such as nationality, ethnicity or even religious tradition (all pertaining to natural existence) cannot assure entrance into God’s kingdom. Every person, including both Ἰουδαῖος and Gentile, has to receive the Spirit as ‘eschatological gift’ (Ridderbos 1997:127; cf. Bruce 1983:110; Carson 1991:224–225). There exists a close relationship in John 3 between spiritual birth (3:5–6) and faith (3:15–18). In John, worship is not bound to an earthly tradition or location (4:21). The hour that has come ‘now’ when worshippers worship God ‘in Spirit and in truth’ (4:23–24) points to a time of salvation that has come with Christ and the new relationship in which God is with human beings (Ridderbos 1997:163). As the gospel later indicates, the judgment of the Pharisees, however, is described as being

'according to the flesh' (8:15). The only valid source of life and entrance into the kingdom of God is God's Spirit whom he gives as eschatological gift, and not anything coming from the natural person ('flesh'). The birth and new life of the Spirit can thus be understood as a new, heavenly way of existence in God's Spirit which transcends and *replaces* the old existence in the 'flesh' (cf. Hakola 2005:240).

Lastly, the letter to the Hebrews, which can also be regarded as one of the earlier writings of the New Testament (CE 65 or earlier, Köstenberger, Kellum and Quarles 2009; Johnson 2013:545) probably displays the strongest signs of discontinuity concerning the 'new' *replacing* the 'old' (cf. Johnson 2013:567): the 'new covenant/testament' (8:8, 13; 9:15; 12:24) or the 'new living way' (10:20) is contrasted with the 'old/former [time]' (πάλαι, 1:1) or the 'first [covenant]' that is described as being made 'old', as 'growing aged' and as 'near disappearing' (8:13). The most pertinent notion of replacement is probably stated in 8:6–7 where Jesus is depicted as having 'obtained a more excellent ministry', being 'the mediator of a better covenant, which has been enacted through better promises'. It is stated that 'if that first covenant had been faultless, there would have been no need to look for a second one' (NRSV).

7. Conclusion

In the light of the hermeneutic distance between today's Judaism and the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament, it remains problematic to equate the opposition of the Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament with a contemporary definition of 'anti-Judaism', let alone 'antisemitism'. This hermeneutic distance is especially constituted by the opposition against the Ἰουδαῖοι, which can be identified in the earliest New Testament texts (CE 45–65), in comparison with 'Judaism', which only became a full-scale religion after CE 70 (cf. Dunn 2001:59), making it problematic to identify 'anti-

Judaism' as such in all of these texts, especially those predating CE 70. The hermeneutical distance is widened if it is accepted that there was development in the conception of messiahship of the non-believing Ἰουδαῖοι, especially if it is acknowledged that such a development is partly based on a reaction to a claim on Jesus' messiahship. Can the development of the Judaist identity thus not be considered to involve an 'anti-Christian' element? Yet, even in the New Testament this dynamic was at work, which can especially be derived from the Johannine literature. The identification of 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament remains entangled within this complex hermeneutical dilemma. Part of this dilemma is the tendency in contemporary scholarship that identifies 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament to *understate* this hermeneutical distance. This seems to be done because in *overstating* the hermeneutical distance, it is perceived that the danger would be lurking that today's Jews would be deprived of their ancient heritage, which, in turn, could be perceived as 'anti-Judaist'.

From an Evangelical approach to the New Testament, where the unity and authority of Scripture is acknowledged, there are indeed parts of the New Testament that seem to be opposed to the Ἰουδαῖοι, even though such opposition does not necessarily imply that *all* of the Ἰουδαῖοι are always in view. Yet this understanding does not only lie on the surface as if it only has to do with isolated events. The position against the Ἰουδαῖοι lies much deeper, and is especially noticeable in the idea of *fulfilment*, which, in turn, implies *replacement*. Paul contrasted the new era 'under the law' and 'under sin' with the new eschatological era in Christ and the Spirit, where identity is solely marked off by faith and the Spirit and not by anything external. The way in which the new replaced the old is, however, not set against the Ἰουδαῖοι as ethnic or social entity, but is directed against their old mode of existence, unbelief and their rejection of the Messiah. From an evangelical

perspective this opposition is therefore not blindly directed at Ἰουδαῖοι as if only they were unbelievers. Apart from Paul's notion that Christ-believers now consist of people from both the Ἰουδαῖοι and gentiles *without distinction*, God's judgment and wrath is also aimed against both unbelieving Ἰουδαῖοι and gentiles *without distinction*.

In the light of the total depravity of all people, the Ἰουδαῖοι are nowhere *exclusively* held responsible for Jesus' death, although some texts might focus on their involvement. Osborne (2010:1021) is probably right in his interpretation of Matthew 27:25 that all people are in a sense responsible for Jesus' death. Christ's death is after all one of the building blocks of the Christian faith. From an evangelical perspective the New Testament can thus not be 'anti-Judaist' in the sense that any one of the New Testament writers would not want Christ to be crucified or that they would be *against* the people who caused his death, even if the Ἰουδαῖοι or their leaders played a prominent role therein. At heart, the gospel in the New Testament is not against the Ἰουδαῖοι *as distinct* from other people. The element of judgment in the gospel against unbelief or disobedience is just as sharply directed against gentiles or even those who are already believers in Christ. That which critics label as 'anti-Judaist' in the New Testament must therefore be discounted against an element of judgment in the gospel *against all people*.

Regarding the hermeneutical dilemma around 'anti-Judaism' from an evangelical perspective, it seems as if those who identify 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament are by definition against retaining the *overall* authority of Scripture as well as against an element of *judgment* within the gospel (see esp. Bieringer *et al.* 2001). If the latter notion can be considered as integral to an evangelical perspective, it leads to the unavoidable conclusion that the identification of full-scale 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament is related to an aversion to an evangelical approach to the New Testament as such. The latter can

especially be derived from Ruether's (1974) suggestion that one should do away with Christology and the questioning by Bieringer *et al.* (2001) of the authority of a verse such as John 3:36, which implies the evangelical notion that Christ is the only Mediator in salvation. It thus seems that there is no room within approaches such as that of Ruether and Bieringer *et al.*—an approach that is arguably much more prevalent in New Testament scholarship—for an evangelical approach. From an evangelical perspective it is precisely the latter tendency that constitutes the heart of the dilemma behind 'anti-Judaism'. The bigger question is, however, whether the avoidance of the overall authority of the New Testament, the avoidance of the idea of replacement therein, the avoidance of Christ being the only mediator in salvation or the avoidance of an element of judgment in the gospel do not threaten to destabilise the heart of the Christian faith. If so, could the emphasis on the avoidance of 'anti-Judaism' not lead to a form of 'anti-Christianity'?

One of the underlying problems that is related to the above dilemma is the different ways in which 'anti-Judaism' is defined:

1. The tendency among Evangelicals to 'anti-Judaism' would be to place more emphasis on the hermeneutic distance between the Ἰουδαῖοι of the New Testament and today's Jews, as well as to accentuate the salvation-historical development and fulfilment of the Old Testament identity. The anachronistic nature of the designation 'anti-Judaism' in reference to the New Testament is thus emphasised more sharply.
2. In many contemporary approaches to 'anti-Judaism' in the New Testament, especially in the *New Perspective on Paul* and its variants, the hermeneutical distance between today's Jews and the Ἰουδαῖοι is diminished, constituting stronger continuity with

Old Testament Israel. Certain texts in the New Testament are therefore understood as 'anti-Judaist'.

The hermeneutical approach to the Ἰουδαῖοι in the New Testament therefore has a decisive influence on how 'anti-Judaism' is defined. The question that has to be asked of both of the above approaches is who must determine the definition of 'anti-Judaism', the evangelicals (1) or those who by implication are against an evangelical approach (2)? A related question is what determines one's hermeneutical point of departure. Is it ethical or moral values that originate from scripture, or is it values that come from society or extra-biblical history? This is not to say that the history of the past two millennia has to be ignored, or that things such as the crusades or the holocaust must be denied. But must ethical problems stemming from such events acquire a higher authority status than certain parts of the Bible itself (cf. Bieringer *et al.* 2001; Henrix 2001; Hakola 2005) or cause us to rewrite the Bible (Hanson 2008:219)? Must the inhumane deeds committed against the Jews in history be ascribed only to anti-Judaism or antisemitism, or are such actions not related to the total depravity and sinfulness of *all people*? Or must the crimes against the Jews enjoy a hermeneutically higher status above other crimes against humanity? Any approach to 'anti-Judaism' has to take these questions seriously.

Reference List

- Abbott-Smith G [1923] 1929. *A manual Greek lexicon of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Anti-semitism 2007. *Palgrave MacMillan dictionary of political thought*. Basingstoke: Macmillan. Online Article. Accessed from http://search.credoreference.com.ez.sun.ac.za/content/entry/macpt/anti_semitism/0, 28/10/2014.

- Baum G 1974. Introduction. In R Ruether, *Faith and fratricide: The theological roots of anti-semitism*, 1–22. New York: Seabury Press.
- Beker JC 1982. *Paul's apocalyptic gospel: the coming triumph of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Best E 1972. *The first and second epistles to the Thessalonians*. London: Adam and Charles Black.
- Bieringer RD, Pollefeyt D, and Vandekastele-Vanneuville F (eds.) 2001. *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Black A 1995. *Mark*. The college press NIV commentary. Joplin: College Press.
- Blomberg CL 1992. *Matthew*. New American Commentary. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group.
- Brooks JA. 1991. *Mark*. New American Commentary. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group.
- Brown RE 1979. *The community of the beloved disciple*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Bruce FF 1982. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. Word Bible Commentary. Waco: Word Books.
- Bruce FF 1983. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bruce FF [1985] 2000. *Romans*. Tyndale New Testament Commentary. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Byford J 2006. Distinguishing 'anti-Judaism' from 'antisemitism': Recent championing of Serbian bishop Nikolaj Velimirović. *Religion, State and Society* 34(1):7–31.
- Carrol J 2002. *Constantine's sword: the Church and the Jews*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Carson DA 1984. *Matthew*. In FE Gæbelein (ed.), *The expositor's Bible commentary* (vol. 8), 3–602. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

- Carson DA 1991. *The Gospel according to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Carson DA and Moo DJ 2005. *An introduction to the New Testament* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Charlesworth JH 1992. From messianology to Christology: Problems and prospects. In JH Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: developments in earliest Judaism and Christianity*, 3–35. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Charlesworth JH 2001. The Gospel of John: Exclusivism caused by a social setting different from that of Jesus (John 11:54 and 14:6). In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 479–513. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Crossan JD 1995. *Who killed Jesus? Exposing the roots of anti-semitism in the Gospel story of the death of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Culpepper RA 2001. Anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel as a theological problem for Christian interpreters. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 68–91. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Dahl NA 1992. Messianic ideas and the crucifixion of Jesus. In JH Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in earliest Judaism and Christianity*, 382–403. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Danker FW 1989. *II Corinthians*. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- De Boer MC 2001. The depiction of 'the Jews' in John's Gospel: Matters of behavior and identity. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 260–280. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

- De Boer MC 2011. *Galatians: A commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Dunn JDG 1988. *Romans* (2 vols.). Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word.
- Dunn JDG 2001. The embarrassment of history: Reflections on the problem of 'anti-Judaism' in the Fourth Gospel. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 47–67. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Du Toit PlaG 2013. *Paul and Israel: flesh, spirit and identity*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stellenbosch University. Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- Eckhardt AR 1986. *Jews and Christians: The contemporary meeting*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Edwards JR 2002. *The Gospel according to Mark*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Elliott JH 2007. Jesus the Israelite was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian': On correcting misleading nomenclature. *Journal for the study of the historical Jesus* 5(2):119–154.
- Esler PF 2003. *Conflict and identity in Romans: The social setting of Paul's letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Falk H 1985. *Jesus the Pharisee: A new look at the Jewishness of Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Fee GD 1994. *God's empowering presence: The Holy Spirit in the letters of Paul*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Fee GD 2009. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Farmer WR (ed.) 1999. *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press.

- Fitch DE 2011. *The end of Evangelicalism? Discerning a new faithfulness for mission towards an Evangelical political theology*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- Fitzmyer JA 2007. *The One who is to come*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- France RT 1985. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Tyndale New Testament Commentary. Leicester: IVP; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Fung RYK 1988. *The epistle to the Galatians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Gaffin RB 1998. 'Life-giving Spirit': probing the center of Paul's pneumatology. *Journal of the evangelical theological society* 41:573–589.
- Gager JG 1983. *The origins of anti-semitism: attitudes toward Judaism in pagan and Christian antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- George T 1994. *Galatians* (ePub ed.). New American Commentary. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group.
- Green GL 2002. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos.
- Hagner DA 1993. *Matthew* (2 vols). Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books.
- Hakola R 2005. *Identity matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hall DR 1983. Romans 3:1–8 reconsidered. *New Testament studies* 29:183–197.
- Hansen GW 2009. *The Letter to the Philippians*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hanson KL 2008. 'His blood be upon us': A textual exegesis for popes and filmmakers. *Journal for Christian scholarship* 44(3):203–219.

- Harris MJ 2005. *The second epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hays RB 2000. The letter to the Galatians. In LE Keck (ed.), *The new interpreter's Bible* (vol. 11), 181–348. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Hays RB 2006. The canonical matrix of the gospels. In SC Barton (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to the Gospels*, 53–75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hengel M 1983. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the earliest history of Christianity*. Translated by J Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Henrix HH 2001. Canon–revelation–reception: Problems of a biblically orientated theology in the face of Israel. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 533–548. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Hoet H 2001. ‘Abraham is our father’ (John 8:39): The Gospel of John and Jewish-Christian dialogue. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 187–201. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Horsley RA 2001. *Hearing the whole story: The politics of plot in Mark's Gospel*. Leiden: Westminster John Knox.
- Horsley RA and JS Hanson 1985. *Bandits, prophets and messiahs: popular movements at the time of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Jewett R 2007. *Romans: A commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Johnson LT 2013. *Contested issues in Christian origins and the New Testament: Collected essays*. Leiden: Brill.

- Kim D 2010. Reading Paul's καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται (Rom 11:26a) in the context of Romans. *Calvin theological journal* 45(2):317–334.
- Knibb MA 2010. Chapter 17: Apocalypticism and messianism. In TH Lim and JH Collins (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 403–432. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Köstenberger AJ, Kellum LS and Quarles CL 2009. *The cradle, the cross, and the crown: an introduction to the New Testament* (ePub ed.). Nashville: B & H Publishing Group.
- Kruse CG [1987] 1998. *The second epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Kruse CG 2012. *Paul's letter to the Romans* (Kindle ed.). Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lamp JS 2003. Is Paul anti-Jewish? Testament of Levi 6 in the interpretation of 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16. *The Catholic biblical quarterly* 65(3):408–427.
- Langmuir G 1971. Anti-Judaism as the necessary preparation for anti-semitism. *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 2:383–389.
- Lategan BC 1986. *Die brief aan die Galasiërs*. Cape Town: N G Kerk-Uitgewers.
- Levine A-J 2006. *The misunderstood Jew: the Church and the scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Malherbe AJ 2000. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.
- Malina BJ and Rohrbaugh RL 1992. *Social-science commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Martin DM 1995. *1, 2 Thessalonians*. New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Martyn JL 2000. The apocalyptic gospel in Galatians. *Interpretation* 54:246–266.

- Mason S 2007. Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of categorization in ancient history. *Journal for the study of Judaism* 38:457–512.
- Mayo PL 2006. *‘Those who call themselves Jews’: the Church and Judaism in the Apocalypse of John*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.
- Meyer JC 2009. *The end of the law: Mosaic covenant in Pauline theology* (ePub ed.). Nashville: B & H Academic.
- Miller DM 2014. Ethnicity, religion and the meaning of Ἰουδαϊσμός in ancient ‘Judaism’. *Currents in biblical research* 12:216–265.
- Moo DJ 1996. *The epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Murray J 1960. *The epistle to the Romans* (vol. 1). New International Commentary on the New Testament. Edinburgh: Morgan & Scott.
- Murrell NS 1994. The human Paul of the New Testament: anti-Judaism in 1 Thess 2:14–16. *Proceedings* 14:169–186.
- Neufeld D 1997. ‘And when that One comes’: aspects of Johannine messianism. In CA Evans and PW Flint (eds.), *Eschatology, messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 120–141. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- Neusner J 1984. *Messiah in context: Israel’s history and destiny in formative Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Nichols W 1993. *Christian antisemitism: a history of hate*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Novenson MV 2009. The Jewish messiahs, the Pauline Christ, and the gentile question. *Journal of biblical literature* 128:357–373.
- Olson RE 2004. *The Westminster handbook to evangelical theology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Osborne GR 2010. *Matthew*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

- Patterson P 2012. *Revelation* (ePub ed.). New American Commentary. Nashville: B & H Publishing Group.
- Pearson BA 1971. 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16: A deutero-Pauline interpolation. *Harvard theological review* 64:79–94.
- Pierard RV and Elwell WA 2001. Evangelicalism. In WA Elwell (ed.), *Evangelical dictionary of theology* (2nd ed.), 405–410. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Punt J 2007. A politics of difference in the New Testament: identity and the others in Paul. In C Breytenbach, J Thom, and J Punt (eds.), *The New Testament interpreted: essays in honour of Bernard C. Lategan*, 199–225. Leiden: Brill.
- Reumann J 2008. *Philippians*. Anchor Bible. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
- Ridderbos H 1959. *Aan de Romeinen*. CNT. Kampen: Kok.
- Ridderbos H 1997. *The Gospel according to John: a theological commentary*. Translated by J Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Roloff J 1993. *The Revelation of John: a continental commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Ruether RR 1974. *Faith and fratricide: The theological roots of anti-semitism*. New York: Seabury.
- Sanders EP 1999. Reflections on anti-Judaism in the New Testament and in Christianity. In WR Farmer (ed.), *Anti-Judaism and the gospels*, 265–286. Harrisburg: Trinity.
- Schmidt D 1983. 1 Thessalonians 2:13–16: Linguistic evidence for an interpolation. *Journal of biblical literature* 102:269–279.
- Schreiner TR 1998. *Romans* (ePub ed.). Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Schreiner TR 2010. *Galatians* (Kindle ed.). Zondervan Exegetical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Siker JY 2005. Anti-Judaism in the gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John and Mel. *Pastoral psychology* 53(4):303–312.

- Silva M 2004. Faith versus works of law in Galatians. In DA Carson, PT O'Brien, and MA Seifrid (eds.), *Justification and variegated nomism: the paradoxes in Paul* (vol. 2), 217–248. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Simpson JW 1990. The problems posed by 1 Thessalonians 2:15–16 and a solution. *Horizons in biblical theology* 12(1):42–72.
- Smith A 2000. The first letter to the Thessalonians. In LE Keck (ed.), *The new interpreter's Bible* (vol. 11), 671–737. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Taylor MS 1995. *Anti-Judaism and early Christian identity: a critique of the scholarly consensus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Thrall ME 1994. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the second epistle to the Corinthians* (vol. 1). International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Tomson PJ 1986. The names 'Israel' and 'Jew' in Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. *Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie* 47:120–140, 266–289.
- Van Henten JW 2001. Anti-Judaism in Revelation? A response to Peter Tomson. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 111–125. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Vermes G 1983. *Jesus and the world of Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Vickers BJ 2004. Mark's good news of the kingdom of God. *Southern Baptist journal of theology* 8(3):12–35.
- Von Wahlde UC 2001. 'You are of your father the devil' in its context: Stereotyped apocalyptic polemic in John 8:38–47. In RD Bieringer, D Pollefeyt, and F Vandekastele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, 418–444. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

- Wanamaker CA 1990. *The epistles to the Thessalonians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Weatherly JA 1996. *1 Thessalonians*. The College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin: College Press Publishing.
- Weinfeld M 1997. Expectations of the divine kingdom in biblical and postbiblical literature. In HG Reventlow (ed.), *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian tradition*, 218–232. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Witherington III B 1992. *Jesus, Paul and the end of the world: a comparative study in New Testament eschatology*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Wright NT 1992. *The New Testament and the people of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright NT 1991. *The climax of the covenant: Christ and the law in Pauline theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wright NT 2002. The letter to the Romans. In LE Keck (ed.), *The new interpreter's Bible* (vol. 10), 394–770. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Wright NT 2003. *The resurrection of the son of God*. London: SPCK.
- Wright NT 2013. *Paul and the faithfulness of God* (2 vols.). London: SPCK.
- Zerwick M and Grosvenor M 1993. *A grammatical analysis of the New Testament* (4th ed.). Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Zoccali C 2010. *Whom God has called: The relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline interpretation, 1920 to the present*. Eugene: Pickwick.