Nevertheless, Wengst's proposal for the geographical setting of the formative (perhaps not the final) stage of the Fourth Gospel is attractive. He proposes the southern part of the kingdom of Agrippa II, especially the western portion around Bathyra in Batanaea. The factors present in the larger towns of Lower Galilee would be present there as well.

Whichever of these three possibilities we prefer—Galilee, Batanaea, or some small *polis* elsewhere with a relatively large presence of Judaean, Galilean, and Samaritan immigrants—the Johannine Christians had formed their lives in a society dominated by the Jewish community. In response, they had taken on the characteristics of a *sect* in the modern sociological sense.[27] Significantly, the social formation which they developed by the time the Johannine letters were written depended upon that institution so characteristic of Christianity in its early spread through the cities of the Mediterranean basin, as of other migratory cults: the Graeco-Roman household.[28] Traumatically divorced from the synagogues, Johannine Christians made a new life for themselves within private houses, starting anew just as Jewish or Samaritan immigrants in Diaspora cities had often done when they first arrived.

PAULINE CHRISTIANITY AND THE JEWS

In contrast with the Fourth Gospel, the Pauline letters provide us with a wealth of specific information about the places and social settings where existed the Christian groups founded by Paul and his co-workers.[29] I have called the setting "urban" for convenience, but that adjective may tempt us to commit anachronisms. It is important to distinguish the village and rural setting presupposed by most of the gospel stories about Jesus from the culture of the Graeco-Roman towns, but we must not confuse the latter with our post-industrial notion of a city. I mean by the term "urban" that Pauline Christianity was at home in the Greek *poleis* of the eastern Roman provinces.

One characteristic of that setting was "pluralism," if I may be permitted yet another deliberate anachronism. There was no officially sanctioned "religion" of the empire.[30] Both the hellenistic and the Roman cultures tended to be quite tolerant of different kinds of religious practices—so long as they did not endanger public order or infringe upon common decency, and so long as they seemed to have some ancient pedigrees. Specifically, the national cult of the resident aliens was ordinarily not only tolerated but even protected—even if it was a little bizarre in Roman eyes, as was the case with Judaeans. But a new superstition without any national basis, like the Christians', was something else again, and likely to attract suspicion or disdain.[31]

This pluralist context which is so strikingly absent from the Fourth Gospel is always lurking at the edges of the Pauline letters. Take, for example, the characterization of the converts in 1 Thessalonians 1:9 as those who "turned from idols to serve the living and true God," or Paul's concern about interaction between the Christian community and pagan culture as he answers questions about eating "meat offered to idols" in 1 Corinthians 8–10, or his warning not to let charismatic phenomena get out of hand, lest outsiders think the Christians were indulging in a Dionysiac orgy (1 Cor 14:23). Paul not only recognizes, as does the fourth evangelist, that it is not possible to "go out of the world" (1 Cor 5:10); he also is concerned that "the outsiders" should think well of the Christians' behavior (e.g. 1 Thess 4:11f.).

In further contrast to the Fourth Gospel, we hear very little about "the Jews" or "the Judaeans." The only place where Paul sounds like John is in 1 Thessalonians 2:14–16, and a number of commentators have suggested that all or part of that passage is an interpolation.[32] There is otherwise remarkably little in the Pauline letters to suggest any continuing contact between the Christian groups and the organized Jewish communities in their cities. Paul himself ran into conflict with Jewish authorities from time to time (2 Cor 11:24f.), but the real and potential conflicts he treats and anticipates in the congregations he addresses are either internal or between the Christian groups and the pagan society of the city.

This state of affairs is surprising on two counts. First, the book of Acts would have us believe that Paul always began his mission in the synagogue. That, however, is clearly a later idealization, although it cannot be entirely false in view of Paul's reported conflict with synagogue authorities, just mentioned, and his statement in 1 Corinthians 9:20. Nevertheless, his retrospective accounts of his missionary career assert that he saw himself commissioned entirely as "apostle of the gentiles" (Gal 1–2; Rom 15:15–21; cf.11:13f.). Accordingly, we have to set aside the Acts picture of the earliest mission in order to understand the separation of Pauline Christianity from the synagogues.

The second reason why the rarity of allusions to the Jewish commu-

nities in Pauline letters is surprising, however, has to do with a central element in Paul's theology. The question of the continuing validity in the Christian groups of such *miṣvot* as circumcision and *kashrut,* and the broader issue of the relation between Israel's hopes and traditions and Christianity (between "Jew and Greek") were vigorously debated in the Pauline circles. Paul and some of his disciples made them the touchstone for understanding the radical innovation entailed in accepting the gospel of the crucified Messiah. Furthermore, there are several indications in Paul's letters that his relationship to his own past and to "Israel according to the flesh" continued to exercise his deepest feelings (e.g. Rom 9:1–5). Nevertheless, the locus of these conflicts is altogether different from that reflected in the Fourth Gospel.

The main difference is this: the great issue in Pauline Christianity is not between "the synagogue" and the sect of the Christians, but within the Christian movement. The social context of Pauline groups is the private household provided by various patrons in each city. That form of organization does not become visible in the Johannine communities until the later phase marked by the Johannine letters. The household may have served as the location of those Christian cells, too, by the time the Fourth Gospel was written, but the Gospel provides no evidence for it. Instead, the identity of the groups is largely determined by their reaction to the synagogues and the synagogues' attitudes toward them. For Pauline Christians the case is quite different. Like the fourth evangelist, Paul wants to claim the name and hopes of Israel for the followers of Messiah Jesus.[33] *Theologically* it is correct to say that the scriptures and traditions of Judaism are a central and ineffaceable part of the Pauline Christians' identity. *Socially,* however, the Pauline groups were never a sect of Judaism. They organized their lives independently from the Jewish associations of the cities where they were founded, and apparently, so far as the evidence reveals, they had little or no interaction with the Jews.

Paul's own reflection on Israel's "disbelief" and destiny in God's plan is unique in early Christian literature (Rom 9–11). Even this discussion, however, does not arise from any active engagement between either the Pauline groups or the various Christian groups in Rome and the Jewish communities. This homily by Paul is the climax of the entire letter, as commentators in the past few years have belatedly recognized.[34] It belongs to Paul's reflection on the purpose and meaning of his own mission, and that, in turn, is an integral part of his protreptic discourse on the nature of the Christian life by which he introduces himself to the Roman Christians.[35] It is thus, again, the Christian community's internal dynamics and beliefs, rather than real interaction with Jews, that evokes this discussion.

At least some of Paul's disciples understood the significance of his preoccupation with unity of Jew and gentile in "the Israel of God." The encyclical letter we know as Ephesians develops the grand idea of one "household of God" uniting Jew and gentile (2:11–22). This can be regarded as a kind of cosmic projection of an idealized Pauline house church.[36] Yet in this letter there is no hint of any relation a Christian might have with the majority of the Jews meeting in the synagogue down the street. Ephesians' sublime disregard of that issue is testimony that Pauline Christians in Asia Minor had gone their own way without much contact with the strong, well placed Jewish communities which existed in the cities of that region. The pseudonymous but more particular epistle to the Colossians points in the same direction, despite the fact that it attacks a syncretistic movement among the Christians which seems to involve a Jewish festival calendar, sabbath observance, some dietary rules (2:16), and perhaps Jewish mystical practice of some kind (2:18).[37] Even here the author does not say anything about contact between the Christians and the Jewish community of Colossae.

There is thus a certain paradox about Pauline Christianity. The apostle himself was deeply concerned about the relation between Christianity and "the Israel of God." Yet he and his associates had created an organized movement that was entirely independent of the Jewish communities in the cities of the northeastern Mediterranean basin. The scriptures and traditions from Judaism played a major part in the beliefs and practices of Pauline Christianity, yet the identity of the Pauline groups was not shaped by having once been within a Jewish context. However much Paul's own identity may have been formed by the trauma of what we call his conversion, there was no comparable trauma for the communities which he founded. Unlike the Johannine groups, the Pauline congregations were not composed of people who had become *aposynagōgoi.*

MATTHEW AGAINST THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEES

The combination of strong Jewish traditions with rejection of Jewish institutions is as fiercely ambivalent in Matthew as in John. The terms of the argument, however, are quite different. It is not always easy to determine exactly what is at issue in Matthew, and scholarly opinions have diverged widely on the question of the Matthean community's relationship to Judaism. Only in rather recent years have scholars recognized the full import of the question of precisely what kind of Judaism confronted the Matthean Christians and in what way. The recent comment by Graham Stanton is accurate: "Scholarly interest in many aspects of first-century Judaism is considerable and significant advances are being made, especially by J. Neusner and his pupils. Few Matthean specialists have yet taken these advances sufficiently seriously."[38] What would it mean for our three questions if we did take those advances seriously? First, it would mean keeping constantly in mind the diversity of both the forms of Judaism and the forms of Christianity in the first century. That point, however, is now generally conceded, at least in principle. Second, we would have to try more rigorously than has usually been the case to avoid anachronisms when comparing first-century documents with those produced by the rabbinic schools of the second century and later. Third, we would have to acknowledge that the means by which groups of Jews and Christians established their own cohesion, identity, and boundaries were not always the same. Christian scholars tend to think of group identity in terms of theological systems or "confessions," and in spite of our best intentions, we almost inevitably ask Christian theological questions of Jewish documents.[39] As a corrective, when we look through Matthew's eyes at the Jewish groups he opposed, it will be well to begin with clues to more external aspects of the groups' life, which do not imply a systematic theology.

The opponents in Matthew are preeminently "the scribes and the Pharisees," and Pharisees are particularly odious to the writer. There are other groups, too, which are mentioned as Jesus' opponents, but for the most part they seem to be relics of the remembered tradition and no longer to have sharp contours.[40] Matthew can, for example, simply merge the Sadducees with the Pharisees, even though he knows from Mark, if nowhere else, that they were distinct sects (Matt 3:7; 16:1,6,11,12 and Mark 12:13, 18). The Pharisees and scribes of Matthew's acquaintance

"like . . . to be called 'Rabbi' " (23:6f.), and the prohibition of this and other titles in the Christian community identifies "rabbi" with "teacher" (23:8–10). All of this fits admirably Neusner's reconstruction of the institutionalization that occurred at Yavneh, in which leaders from the sect of the Pharisees joined with members of the professional guild of scribes to create a new thing: the rabbinic academy and, eventually, the rabbinic court.[41] It has long been recognized that the issues at stake in the Matthean controversy stories have more similarity in both form and substance with parallels in rabbinic literature than do pre-Matthean forms. W. D. Davies especially, in his pioneering work on the Sermon on the Mount, argued eloquently for seeing the work of the Christian scribes in Matthew's community as "a parallel task" to that of the rabbis at Yavneh.[42] Neusner's work requires revision of Davies' at many points, but it tends to reinforce this fundamental insight.

Even if we accept the proposition that Matthew's "scribes and Pharisees" refer to the emerging rabbinate of Yavneh, however, a number of puzzles remain. Where and in what form did the Christian community encounter Yavneh's rabbis? From the typical setting of the controversy stories, we may gather that the main location was in "their [i.e., the Jews'] synagogues." There the rabbis have or want to have "the first seats" (23:6). That they also are said to like wide phylacteries and long "hems" (presumably *şişit* 23:5) does not help us to be more specific, but the whole passage implies that the rabbis enjoy considerable prestige in public (in the *agorai,* at banquets) as well as in the synagogues. The problem is the more difficult because we know so little about the extent of the Yavneh academy's power and prestige outside its immediate circle. Because the majority of Matthean scholars think, though without absolutely convincing evidence, that Matthew was written in Antioch on the Orontes, we would like very much to know whether representatives of the Yavneh school, or a diaspora equivalent similarly constituted, could have exercised power in that metropolis at so early a date. Unfortunately, the prospects are slim for answering these questions definitively.

We turn then to our second question. What connections were there between the Christian groups out of which and for which Matthew was written, and the emerging new form of rabbi-led Judaism? Scholars who have pursued this question in recent years have come to dismayingly opposite conclusions. Either Matthew's Christians were a "Jewish-Christian" sect which, however alienated from the rabbinic leadership, still

belonged to the "union of synagogues" (as Hummel puts it),[43] or they had no connections at all and existed in a purely pagan environment (Van Tilborg, for example). What leads serious scholars to such incompatible conclusions is a real ambivalence in the evidence in the First Gospel itself. We must decide how the "Jewish" elements in Matthew are to be reconciled with the "anti-Jewish" elements, a problem similar to that in the Fourth Gospel. The "redaction-historical" method that has come to prevail in such studies, despite the discouraging lack of agreement in results, does give promise of a solution along lines similar to those found in recent Johannine scholarship. A consensus is emerging that the Matthean community went through several stages of interaction with the Jewish communities close to it, and that these stages have left fossils in the strata of tradition and redaction.[44] A quick summary of the evidence will show the direction in which an answer to our question must be sought.

There is much in Matthew that sounds like intra-Jewish, sectarian debate. To begin with, there are the learned arguments from scripture which have led Von Dobschütz and others to identify the evangelist with the "scribe discipled to the Kingdom of Heaven" of 13:52. Then there is the concern with "commandments" that crops up throughout Matthew, culminating in the "Great Commission" of 28:20. The Sermon on the Mount reads like the ethic of a Jewish sect. Jesus speaks here as the authoritative teacher of Israel. The crowds are astonished at his teaching for he has authority, unlike *their* scribes (Matthew has added the pronoun to the Marcan phrase; 7:29). Here and elsewhere in this gospel we could say that Jesus is the authoritative interpreter of *halakha* (for example, in the Sabbath controversies of chapter 12). Yet only rarely does the form of these controversies approximate the forms typical of the debates transmitted in rabbinic tradition's early strata.[45] The Matthean debates are much broader and less stylized, and they question more fundamental issues of Jewish identity.

Jesus' authority in Matthew is that of the Messiah of Israel, the son of David, who has come to "save his people" (1.21). In illustration of this, the crowds repeatedly bring their sick to Jesus for healing, for, as Messiah, he "bears away" the diseases of Israel (8:17; citing Isa 53:4). Matthew inserts one of his summaries to this effect into the Temple Cleansing pericope: "They brought him blind and lame *in the Temple,* and he healed them" (21:14). In these passages and elsewhere, Jesus is

well received by the "crowds" *(ochloi),* but rejected by the formal leaders of Israel.[46] In Mark it was the leaders of Israel—there identified as the high priests and scribes and elders (Mark 11:27)—who "recognized that it was against them that he spoke the parable" of the vineyard; Matthew connects this remark with the parable of the two sons also, and changes the leaders to "the high priests and the Pharisees" (Matt 21:45).

From such texts we get the impression that the Matthean prophets and disciples were an integral part of one or more of the Jewish communities in Matthew's environment, challenging the leaders on their own ground. In support of such a reading, one could observe that 23:2f. seems to accord some authority to the teaching of the scribes and Pharisees, even while sharply challenging their integrity and sincerity (contrast 16:5–12!). This sounds indeed like a sectarian dispute between two schools, both of which construe the faithful life in similar terms, but which disagree about the locus of authority and the form of internal community life. So also, Matthew retains the Q-saying that the disciples will "sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (19:28). It is easy to imagine a time when Christian missionaries actually believed that they could win over the allegiance of masses of Jews from their constituted leaders. Perhaps, adopting part of W. D. Davies' suggestions in *The Background of the Sermon on the Mount,* we could even think of an active competition between representatives of the new "rabbinic" academy at Yavneh and missionaries of the Jesus movement.

Yet there are many indications in the First Gospel that the connections with organized Jewish communities cannot have been so close when the gospel was written. If the Matthean Christians once held such an optimistic view of their mission to the organized Jews in their town, they have long since become disillusioned. In a remark that betrays a distance quite as complete as that in John, they can speak of a story about the disciples' faking the Resurrection, a story "spread among the Jews until this day" (28:15). This gospel contains a rising theme, climaxing in the trial and passion narrative, of the alienation of "the whole people" from Jesus, their appointed Messiah. The theme is clearly sounded in the healing of the centurion, for "in no one in Israel" has Jesus found such faith (8:10), and he adds that "many will come from East and West and recline at dinner with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, but the sons of the Kingdom will be cast into outer darkness." The implication of this

dark saying works its way through the rest of the gospel: through the judgment pronounced in 10:14f. on towns of Israel which did not receive the apostles (emphasized by Matthew's placement of the judgment pericope from Q in 11:20–24 and the saying that no one can know the Father but the Son in 11:27); through the parables of Two Sons, the Vineyard, and the Banquet. Despite the modified Marcan statement in 21:45f. (quoted above), these parables speak not merely of judgment on Israel's leaders, but of replacing Israel by another *ethnos* (21:41, 43). Looking back, we see that this replacement is foreshadowed by the curious story of the "Canaanite" woman of 15:21–28, for Jesus' disclaimer that he is sent only to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" is but the counterpoint to his receiving the faith of this gentile, just as the identical phrase in the sending of the twelve (10:6) is prelude for judgment on those who reject their message.[47] Thus not only is "the whole sanhedrin" responsible for Jesus' condemnation (26:59), but "all the people" confirms it by the saying which would have such terrible and unforeseeable consequences: "His blood be on us and on our children" (27:25).

Like the Johannine community, then, the Matthean was shaped to a very large extent by the attempt to define the Christian groups' relation to Jewish traditions, Jewish expectations, and the organized Jewish communities. Unlike John, but rather like Paul, Matthew sees the Jewish self-definition primarily in terms of law and commandments and, more broadly, in the question of what it means to "do the will of God." Like Paul personally, but unlike the Pauline churches, Matthew's community has had to wrestle with that issue in a way central to its own development. However, all three are alike, finally, in seeing the ultimate issue and crisis to be defined by christology. Although the christologies of John, Paul, and Matthew are different from one another in many respects, the breaking point for each is in the question of Jesus' role as Messiah vis-à-vis Israel (and the world).

The Judaism from which Matthew has separated looks much more like that taking shape in the academy of Yavneh around the same time than does the Judaism from which the Johannine Christians were expelled. The "rabbis" who represented the Yavnean (or some analogous but otherwise unknown) merging of scribal profession with Pharisaic piety were important and prestigious people in Matthew's environment. Unfortunately there are few clues that would enable us to describe that

environment with any specificity. "Their synagogues" and "banquets" and *agorai* sound like an urban setting, and Matthew's Greek and the knowledge of the LXX he presupposes speak for that as well. The early mission to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" described in chap. 10, however, sounds like itinerancy among villages on Palestinian soil[48] (though some of Matthew's redactional touches make the scenery less rural; e.g. addition of *polis* in vss. 11,14,15). Did the Christian groups for which Matthew wrote, or some significant number of their members, originate as a sect of Galilean Jews before the war, later to join the already existing Christian household communities of Antioch? It is probably not possible to advance beyond conjecture. It is not even possible to say very much about the internal organization of the Christian groups, even though such passages as 16:18–20 and 18:15–20 imply a high degree of sectarian self-consciousness and self-discipline.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The three major witnesses from early Christian literature which we have considered show us three quite different circles of the movement, each profoundly shaped by its Jewish heritage and by the trauma of separation from Judaism experienced either by the sect as a whole or by some of its leaders. The path of separation, then, was not single or uniform. Taking these three paths as representative, it may yet be useful to ask, now, where were they leading for the future of Christianity and of Judaism? On the one hand, they were leading to a Christianity that could not allow itself to forget its origins in Judaism. That meant, preeminently, that in order to define itself, Christianity would always in some way turn to the Jewish scriptures. Moreover, it inherited some of the Jewish ways of interpreting them. If Marcion's movement had endured, Christianity would have become a very different thing.

Nevertheless, by the end of the first century, and much earlier than that in the Pauline groups, the Christian movement was socially independent of the Jewish communities in the cities of the empire. That had little or nothing to do with formal measures like the *birkat ha-minim,* but much to do with the internal dynamics illustrated by the three corpora of documents we have surveyed and with the social setting of Jews and Christians in the Greek cities. There would continue to be interactions between Jews and Christians in various places; there would continue to

be followers of Jesus who remained within synagogues here and there, down through at least the fifth century, despite disapproval by leaders on both sides; there would be Christians of pagan origin who continued to be attracted to the synagogue until at least the same period. These, however, were the exceptions. By and large the separation was complete by the beginning of the second century. For example in Antioch, the first bishop, Ignatius, betrays hostility toward "Judaism" but little evidence of any knowledge of the Jews. A later successor, Theophilus, could simply take for granted that the scriptures and central traditions of Israel now belonged to the Christians.[49]

To Jews, claims like those of Theophilus must have seemed so preposterous and the Christian movement so remote or so minuscule that, save for a few local exceptions, they could ignore it altogether. That accounts for the sparse evidence about Christianity in Mishnah, Talmuds, and early midrashim. Too late, the Jewish leaders would be forced to recognize how dangerous the Christian movement was. Not even the post-Constantinian changes of the fourth century seem to have alerted them, portentous as those changes seem in retrospect. In places like Antioch, Sardis, and Aphrodisias, the Jewish communities remained secure and powerful, hardly troubled even as the legal and political mechanisms of Christian dominance were put into place. Yet what survives from those communities' glory is only what has lately been uncovered by the archaeologist's spade. In time, the Christians would dominate the cities and, in ways partly obvious and partly obscure, would choke off the growth of those Jewish communities. The living Judaism that survived, which we see taking shape as a "utopian" vision in the Mishnah and more practically in the two talmuds,[50] seems rather to have been a rural and small-town phenomenon. Thus the massive confrontation between "apostolic Christianity" and "normative Judaism," which even now haunts the imagination of students of Christian origins, never happened.

NOTES

1. See Wayne A. Meeks, " 'Am I a Jew?'—Johannine Christianity and Judaism," in Jacob Neusner, ed., *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 1:164–185; for more recent literature, see F. F. Segovia, "The Love and Hatred of Jesus and Johannine Sectarianism," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 258–272.
2. J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (2nd ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1979).
3. Most recently, see U. C. von Wahlde, "The Johannine 'Jews': A Critical Survey," *NTS* 28 (1982) 33–60; cf. my "Am I a Jew?" cited above, n.1.
4. Against C. J. Cuming, "The Jews in the Fourth Gospel," *ExpT* 60 (1948–49) 290–292; M. Lowe, "Who were the IOUDAIOI?" *NovT* 18 (1976) 101–30; see criticism by Klaus Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu seiner Interpretation* (Biblisch Theologische Studien 5; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981) 40.
5. See Ramsay MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven and London: Yale, 1982) 113–115.
6. Cf. my remarks in "Am I a Jew?" 182, and note the comments by Alf Thomas Kraabel, "Judaism in Western Asia Minor under the Roman Empire" (unpublished Th. D. dissertation, Harvard: 1968) 30f. An inscription of benefactors of Smyrna, ca. 125 C.E., includes a group called *hoi pote Ioudaioi;* Kraabel argues this refers to recent immigrants from Judaea, recalling Dio Cassius 37.16.5–17.1.
7. Von Wahlde, "The Johannine 'Jews'," passim.
8. Jouette M. Bassler, "The Galileans: A Neglected Factor in Johannine Community Research," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 243–257.
9. Ibid. 253.
10. These "Greeks" may of course have been Jewish proselytes or *theosebeis,* as most of the commentaries suggest, but that requires that John observed a rigorous distinction between *hellēnes* and *hellēnistai,* of which we cannot be sure. Hans Windisch observes that *hellēnes* can sometimes refer to "Hellenized Orientals" but insists that it cannot refer to Greek-speaking Jews (*TDNT* 2:509f.). Were the latter not "Hellenized Orientals"? In any case, if the *hellēnes* in John were meant to refer to a mission to gentiles, the passages in question are a strangely muted way to do so.
11. See "Am I a Jew?" and the literature referred to there.
12. See W. A. Meeks, "The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel," in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, ed., *Aspects of Religious Progaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976) 43–67.
13. Pace J. A. T. Robinson, "The Destination and Purpose of the Johannine Epistles," *NTS* 7 (1960–61) 56–65.
14. See the literature discussed in "Am I a Jew?" and note the remarks by Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962) 1:17f.
15. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (rev. ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1979) 30.

16. B. Lifshitz and J. Schiby, "Une synagogue samaritaine à Thessalonique," *RB* 75 (1968) 368–378.
17. Philippe Bruneau, " 'Les Israélites de Délos' et la Juiverie délienne," *BCH* 106 (1982) 465–504.
18. Ibid., 488; some caution is necessary, for the Jewish inscriptions discovered so far are dated to the first century C.E. The Samaritan and Jewish evidence does not therefore overlap in time, and it is a conjecture, though a reasonable one, that both communities were continuous over a long period. See Bruneau's careful discussion, 495–499.
19. Whether the temple on Gerizim destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 128 B.C.E. (Josephus, *Ant.* 13.256; the parallel in *B. J.* 1.63 mentions Hyrcanus' defeat of the "Cuthaeans," but not the destruction of the temple) was subsequently rebuilt, ancient sources do not reveal. That Mt. Gerizim remained a cultic center for the Samaritans, however, is clear.
20. This point has now been repeatedly made; Kraabel's observations are exemplary. See, besides his dissertation cited above, A. T. Kraabel, "Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence," in André Benoit et al., eds., *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme . . . Melanges offerts à Marcel Simon* (Paris: Boccard, 1978) 13–33; "The Diaspora Synagogue: Archaeological and Epigraphic Evidence since Sukenik," *ANRW* II.19.1 (1979) 477–510; "Social Systems of Six Diaspora Synagogues," in Joseph Gutmann, ed., *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research* (Brown Judaic Studies 22; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981) 79–91.
21. On local traditions in John, see the recent article by C.H.H. Scobie, "Johannine Geography," *SR* 11/1 (1982) 77–84.
22. E. M. Meyers, J. F. Strange, and Dennis E. Groh, "The Meiron Excavation Project: Archaeological Survey in Galilee and Golan, 1976," *BASOR* 230 (1978) 1–24; Eric M. Meyers and James F. Strange, *Archaeology, the Rabbis, and Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981). See also the impressive collection of literary evidence in Sean Freyne, *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian; 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.* (Wilmington and Notre Dame: Michael Glazier and Univ. of Notre Dame, 1980) and Freyne's observations in "Galilean Religion of the First Century C.E. against its Social Background," *PIBA* 5 (1981) 98–114. Freyne gives very short shrift to archaeological evidence, ignores the Meyers-Strange thesis of Galilee's two cultural regions, and asserts that "the overall Galilean ethos was rural and peasant," with no significant hellenistic influence, "despite the circle of the cities" (1981, 107f.). The statement seems a priori rather than a conclusion from evidence.
23. See above, n. 4.
24. The foundations of Jacob Neusner's position were laid in his studies of traditions associated with particular named sages, especially *Eliezer ben Hyrcanus: The Tradition and the Man* (SJLA 3,4; Leiden: Brill, 1973), built up through the long series of historical and redactional studies of Mishnaic traditions by Neusner and his students (most of them published in the Brill SJLA series), and confirmed in his *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago, 1981).

25. Against Wengst's analysis on p. 63, which is not altogether self-consistent. Wengst cites Severino Pancaro's observations about "Law" as center of controversy (*The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity according to John* [NovTSup 42; Leiden: Brill, 1975]). However, Pancaro may have misled Wengst, for *nomos* in John usually refers to the books of Moses or scripture in general, i.e., "Torah," not *halakha*. See further my review of Pancaro in *JBL* 96 (1977) 311–314.
26. Reuven Kimelman, *"Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity," in E. P. Sanders, ed., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol.2: *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress and London: SCM, 1981) 226–244.
27. I proposed this interpretation in "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *JBL* 91 (1972) 44–72, and it is now widely accepted. See, e.g., the recent article by F. F. Segovia (above, n.1).
28. See A. J. Malherbe, "The Inhospitality of Diotrephes," in Jacob Jervell and Wayne A. Meeks, eds., *God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977) 222–232; reprinted with an addendum in *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 92–112. See also W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven and London: Yale, 1983), esp. chap. 3. For a massive collection of evidence on the use of households in the establishment of Jewish, Christian, and other Graeco-Roman cults, see L. Michael White, "Domus Ecclesiae, Domus Dei" (Ph.D. Diss. Yale Univ., 1982).
29. I have analyzed the sociographic information of the Pauline letters in *The First Urban Christians* (see previous note). For the evidence underlying the following summary, I refer the reader to that work, and to the large literature cited there.
30. MacMullen, *Paganism;* emphasized by also Nikolaus Walter, "Christusglaube und heidnische Religiosität in paulinischen Gemeinden," *NTS* 25 (1979) 422–442, and Gerd Theissen, *Psychologische Aspekte paulinischer Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) 46.
31. Cf. the comments by E. A. Judge, "Christian Innovation and its Contemporary Observers," in Brian Croke and Alanna M. Emmett, eds., *History and Historians in Late Antiquity* (Sydney et al.: Pergamon, 1983) 13–15, and Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1984).
32. Birger A. Pearson, "1 Thessalonians 2:13–16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation," *HTR* 64 (1971) 79–94; Daryl Schmidt, "1 Thess 2:13–16: Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation," *JBL* 102 (1983) 269–279; other literature cited by both. The case for interpolation has been rebutted, most recently by Karl Paul Donfried, "Paul and Judaism: 1 Thessalonians 2:13–

16 as a Test Case," *Interp* 38 (1984) 242–253, though I find his construal of the text strained. If commentators would stop to ask whether *hypo tōn ioudaiōn* in 2:14 should be translated "by the Jews" or not rather "by the Judaeans," I believe it would be obvious that vss. 13–14 fit quite well into the pattern of the letter and of Paul's thought elsewhere. Vss. 15–16, on the other hand, require the word to refer to "the Jews" in a global sense and import into the letter the kind of anti-Jewish polemic found in later Christian literature, especially in interpretations of the fall of Jerusalem. Donfried would make these verses an older tradition quoted by Paul; it seems to me more likely they were added later by a reader whose conception of Paul's mission was rather like that of the author of Acts. Cf. *First Urban Christians* 227, n. 117.

33. Much has been written about the phrase, "The Israel of God," in Gal 6:16. I think myself that Paul uses it here with deliberate ambiguity. It certainly includes the addressees, the Christian groups of Galatia, and it certainly is not limited to "Jewish Christians." Yet, in the light of Paul's fuller exposition of his thinking about Israel not too many years later in Rom 9–11, we are justified in thinking that "Israel" here includes not only the "remnant" who follow Messiah Jesus (Rom 11:5), but also the entire people, "all Israel," which would be reconciled in Paul's eschatological vision (Rom 11:26).
34. See especially Nils A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 137–158. Also Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 4.
35. Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981).
36. On Ephesians' idealization of the church, see N. A. Dahl, "Cosmic Dimensions and Religious Knowledge (Eph 3:18)," in E. Earle Ellis and Erich Grässer, eds., *Jesus und Paulus; Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 72f.
37. See the various proposals represented in Fred O. Francis and Wayne A. Meeks, eds., *Conflict at Colossae: A Problem in the Interpretation of Early Christianity Illustrated by Selected Modern Studies* (rev.ed., SBLSBS 4; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975).
38. Graham Stanton, *The Interpretation of Matthew* (Issues in Religion and Theology 3; Philadelphia: Fortress and London: SPCK, 1983) 17.
39. Jacob Neusner's criticism of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, *HR* 18 (1978) 177–191, is valid at precisely this point, though I think that on the whole he treats Sanders' important contribution rather too severely.
40. Sjef van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: Brill, 1972) has sorted out the evidence conveniently, although his analysis is not particularly illuminating.
41. Elaborated in many places, Jacob Neusner's reconstruction is conveniently summarized in "The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100," *ANRW* II/19.2 (1979) 3–42; cf. " 'Pharisaic-Rabbinic' Judaism: a Clarification," *HR* 12 (1973) 250–270.
42. *The Background of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964) 315.
43. Reinhart Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Matthäusevangelium* (BEvT 33, 2nd ed; Munich: Kaiser, 1966).
44. For example, W. G. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community* (Analecta Biblica 44; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971); summarized in "An Historical Perspective in the Gospel of Matthew," *JBL* 93 (1974) 243–262; Douglas R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution in the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (SNTSMS 6; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); John P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel* (Theological Inquires; New York, Ramsey, Toronto: Paulist, 1979).
45. A number of important points are still to be found in Morton Smith, *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* (JBLMS 6; Philadelphia: SBL, 1951); for more extended analysis of the early rabbinic forms, see Jacob Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).
46. See Van Tilborg 142–165.
47. Cf. Meier 104.
48. For a wide-ranging and suggestive discussion of the "ecology" of the early mission, see Gerd Theissen, "Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum," and "Legitimation und Lebensunterhalt: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie urchristlicher Missionare," both reprinted in *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums* (2d. ed., Tübingen: Möhr [Siebeck], 1983) 79–105, 201–230.
49. Ignatius, Mag 8:1-9:2; 10:3; Philad 6:1, 8:2; see also William R. Schoedel, "Ignatius and the Archives," *HTR* 71 (1978) 97–106, and Paul J. Donahue, "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch," *VC* 32 (1978) 81–93; Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* 2.33 et passim.
50. Jacob Neusner, *Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1981; *Judaism in Society: The Evidence of the Yerushalmi* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).