ISAAC W. OLIVER

Torah Praxis after 70 CE

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 355

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

355

Isaac W. Oliver

Torah Praxis after 70 CE

Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts

Mohr Siebeck

Isaac W. Oliver, born 1980; 2012 PhD in Near Eastern Studies, University of Michigan; currently assistant professor at the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies of Bradley University (Illinois, USA).

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152840-8
ISBN 978-3-16-152723-4
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To my Father, Benoni Batista de Oliveira ז"ל

Sou caipira, Pirapora
Nossa Senhora de Aparecida
Ilumina a mina escura
E funda o trem da minha vida
("Romaria" by Renato Teixeira de Oliveira)

Preface

This monograph is a revised version of my PhD thesis, which was submitted to the Department of Near Eastern Studies of the University of Michigan in June 2012. I revised a considerable portion of this dissertation, incorporating and interacting with additional primary and secondary sources when I worked as a post-doctoral fellow at the Frankel Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies (University of Michigan) during the fall of 2012.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Gabriele Boccaccini, for his support in so many endeavors as well as for his original and sophisticated input that led to the creation and fruition of this project. I have learned much about Middle Judaism (we both include the Jesus movement under this rubric) by sitting at the feet of this Italian maestro. His charisma and ability to create bridges between different academic communities at the international level through his tireless efforts in founding and facilitating the various activities related to the Enoch Seminar continually inspire and remind us all not only to explore texts but also to foster positive human relationships.

I thank Daniel Boyarin for serving as a member of my dissertation committee. As I embarked on this project, I was unaware that Boyarin was writing a book about the canonical gospels – read as Jewish texts. This turned out to be the most serendipitous of events. His feedback has been invaluable. Professors Ray Van Dam, Ellen Muehlberger, and Rachel Neis from the University of Michigan provided me with great suggestions and important corrections about my presentation, style, and argumentation. I thank them for their professional and academic support that reaches far beyond this project.

I am also greatly indebted to Mark Kinzer for encouraging me to select and pursue this topic. Kinzer, who also earned his PhD at Michigan under the tutorship of Jarl Fossum and Gabriele Boccaccini, introduced me to the writings of Jacob Jervell. Indeed, a special story about Luke runs deep in the history of the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Michigan. Kinzer tells me that Fossum, a student of Jervell, taught the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles at Michigan from his professor's perspective, which in turn was handed down and accepted by Kinzer and now me. May this chain of tradition continue to be transmitted!

Many others need to be thanked. I am indebted to professor Jörg Frey for accepting this monograph for publication. William Loader shared encouraging words during and after my visit to the Department of Theology of Murdoch University (Perth, Australia) and found time in his busy schedule to look through my dissertation. Aharon Shemesh kindly agreed to read my chapter dealing with the Apostolic Decree in the Acts of the Apostles and provided useful comments and references. Richard Kalmin looked at a draft of my paper, "Breaking Passover to Keep the Sabbath: The Burial of Jesus and the Halakic Dilemma as Embedded within the Synoptic Narratives," presented at the Midwest Society of Biblical Literature in 2011 and now part of chapter 5 of this book. He greatly assisted me with comments on halakic discussions and my usage of rabbinic literature related to this matter. Of course, I bear full responsibility for the interpretation of this material and any other shortcomings.

The Faculty of Theology of the University of Copenhagen honored me with an invitation to share my research in Denmark on April 9 and 10, 2013. I especially thank Kasper Dalgaard for initiating and organizing this event as well as professors Heike Omerzu, Mogens Müller, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Ingrid Hjelm, and many others, for their kind and honest feedback. I should not fail to thank the participants of the Fourth Graduate Enoch Seminar at the University of Notre Dame for reading and discussing my chapter on food laws in Acts chs. 10–11 as well as the participants of the Unit of Sabbath in Text and Tradition of the Society of Biblical Literature for their input on my research on the Sabbath in Luke-Acts. Many stimulating conversations with various members of the Enoch Seminar, especially Lutz Doering, Daniel Stökl, Andreas Bedenbender, and Anders Klostergaard Petersen, have helped me in more than one way.

The Rackham Graduate School (University of Michigan) provided me with two fantastic fellowships, the Rackham Merit Fellowship and the Rackham Predoctoral Fellowship, which allowed me to devote my time and energy to research and completing my dissertation within a reasonable time frame. The Jean & Samuel Frankel Center for Judaic Studies granted generous funding during the summers for study and sharing my research in Europe and Israel. I also thank the Department of Near Eastern Studies of the University of Michigan for supplying additional funding during the summers. I cherish the advice and reactions to my work shared by the members of the Frankel Institute for Advanced Judaic Studies of 2012. Finally, Bradley University provided me with a Research Excellence and Development (REC) Summer Stipend to finish revising and editing this book during the summer of 2013.

Colleagues, friends, and family have provided immense wisdom and support. I thank Luca Marulli (University of Strasbourg) as well as Jason

Zurawski, Deborah Forger, Jason von Ehrenkrook, Rodney Caruthers, and James Waddell from the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Michigan for the friendly, critical, and extended conversations. My colleagues, Daniel Getz, Robert Fuller, Jason Zaborowski, Andrew Kelley, Vlad Niculescu, and Michael Greene at the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies of Bradley University have been incredibly supportive. Marc Gottlieb has been a guardian angel and a personal mentor. I also extend a special thanks to my mother, Susan. Matteo Silvestri and Hervé Gonzalez from the University of Lausanne greatly assisted me with accessing and using the excellent library for biblical studies of their institution during my annual summer stays in France and Switzerland. Last but not least, Ségolène, thank you for your patience and support throughout our six-year stay in Michigan during which three kids were born and raised!

October 16, 2013

Isaac W. (de) Olive(i)r(a)
Bradley University

Table of Contents

Preface VII

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

Introduction 1

Who Was Jewish Anyways? Two Jews, Three Opinions 5

Torah Practice and the Problem with "Jewish Christianity" 10

The Judaization and Gentilization of Matthew and Luke-Acts 18

Present State of Research 22

Matthew and Luke, Why not Mark? 32

Methodological Considerations 33

Thesis and Summary of Chapters 39

Part I

Sabbath Keeping in Matthew and Luke-Acts

Chapter 2: Non-Controversial Sabbath Episodes 45

The Sabbath in Antiquity 45
A Marker of Jewish Identity 45
Did Jews Treat Minor Diseases on the Sabbath? 47

Introduction to the Non-Controversial Sabbath Episodes 53

An Unclean Spirit in the Synagogue of Capernaum 54
Literary Context 54
Analysis 56

Going out of the Law for an In-Law? Healing Peter's Mother-in-Law 61
Literary Context 61
Analysis 61

Healing the Masses after Sunset 65
Literary Context 65
Analysis 66

Rejection in Nazareth 69
Literary Context 69
Analysis of Luke 4:16–30 70
A Lukan Sabbath Theology and Praxis in the Sermon Delivered in Nazareth? 74

Conclusion 78

Chapter 3: Plucking Grain on the Sabbath 80

Matthew 12:1–8 80
Introduction 80
Literary Context 81
Determining the Controversy 87
The Nob Incident 92
Additional Matthean Arguments 95

Luke 6:1–5 99
Literary Context 99
Analysis 102

Excursus: Why Is Mark 2:27 Missing in Matthew and Luke? 105

Conclusion 112

Chapter 4: Healing on the Sabbath 114

Introduction 114

Healing the Withered Hand: Matt 12:9–14 114
Literary Context 114
Analysis 115

Healing the Withered Hand: Luke 6:6–11 124
Analysis 124

Excursus: Luke 6:11 in Modern Translation 127

Healing the Crippled Woman: Luke 13:10–17 130
Literary Context 130
Analysis 132

Healing on the Sabbath in Pharisaic Space: Luke 14:1–6 138

Literary Context 138
Analysis 139

Conclusion 145

Chapter 5: Burying on the Sabbath 147

Introduction 147

Breaking Passover to Keep the Sabbath? 148

Do Joseph and the Women Perform Work on the Sabbath? 161

When Do the Women Visit Jesus' Tomb? 163

Matthew's Polemics against the Pharisees and their Sabbath keeping .. 165

Conclusion 166

Chapter 6: Traveling on the Sabbath 170

Introduction 170

Literary Context and Analysis 170

Matt 24:20 and Modern Scholarship 177

Conclusion 182

Conclusion on Sabbath Keeping in Matthew and Luke 182
Matthew's Sabbath Repertoire 182
Luke's Sabbath Repertoire 184
Matthean and Lukan Sabbath Theologies Compared 186
Matthean and Lukan Sabbath Praxis 188

Chapter 7: The Sabbath in the Acts of the Apostles 194

Introduction 194

Respecting the Sabbath Limits: Acts 1:12 194
Literary Context 194
Redactional Analysis 197
Interpretation 199

Visiting the Synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia 204
Key Verses 204
Literary Context 204
Interpretation 209

Reading Moses on the Sabbath: Acts 15:21 211
Literary Context 211
Redactional Analysis 212
Interpretation 213

Worshiping Outdoors on the Sabbath: Acts 16:12–15 216
Literary Context 216
Analysis 216

More Sabbath Services in the Synagogue: Acts 17:2 and 18:4 220
Literary Context 220
Redactional Analysis 221

When Do the Followers of Jesus "Break Bread"? Acts 20:7–12 222
Literary Context 222
Analysis 222

Conclusion 233

Part II

Food Laws in Matthew and Luke-Acts

Chapter 8: Food Laws in Matthew 241

Food Laws and Jewish Identity in Antiquity 241

Food Laws in Matthew and Luke-Acts: Preliminary Observations 251

Hand Washing before Eating: Matt 15:1–20 255
Literary Context 255
Literary Structure 257
Halakic Analysis: Hand Washing before Meals 257
Redactional Analysis 264

Pigs, Dogs, Gnats, and Camels: Matt 7:6 and 23:24 276
Key Verses 276
Literary Context 276
Analysis 278

Non-Kosher Food in Impure Vessels: Matt 23:25–26 288
Literary Context 288
Interpretation 288

Conclusion 292

Chapter 9: Food Laws in Luke 294

Introduction 294

Perfecting Pharisaic Purity: Luke 11:37–41 294
Literary Context 294
Redactional Analysis 296
Interpretation 298

The Commission of the Seventy-Two: Luke 10:1–11 304
Literary Context 304
Redactional Features 306
Interpretation 309

Conclusion 319

Chapter 10: The Cornelius Episode 320

Introduction 320

Literary Context 321

Literary Structure 323

Redactional Analysis 325

The Insignificance of Simon the Tanner 327

Cornelius: Righteous Gentile among the Nations 337

Peter's Vision: A Story about Gentiles, Not Food 340

Distinguishing between Gentile Impurity and Profaneness 345

Entering and Lodging in a Gentile House 357

The Baptism of the Sacred Spirit 360

The Jerusalem Report 362

Conclusion 363

Chapter 11: The Apostolic Decree 365

Introduction 365

Literary Context 366

The Moral and Ritual Scope of the Decree 368

Lev 17–18 and the Apostolic Decree 370

Idolatry 371
Porneia 375
Strangled Meat 380
Blood 390
Conclusion 394

Part III

Circumcision in Matthew and Luke-Acts

Chapter 12: Circumcision in Matthew and Luke-Acts 401
Introduction 401
Matthew and the Circumcision Debate in Recent Scholarship 403
The Circumcision of John the Baptist and Jesus 410
Introduction 410
Passage 412
Redactional Analysis 412
Naming and Circumcising Jewish Boys 414
The Importance of Eighth-Day Circumcision 416
The Purification of the Parturient and Her Child 417
The Presentation and Redemption of the Firstborn 421
Circumcision in Acts 7:8 427
Paul's Circumcision of Timothy: Acts 16:1–3 430
Conclusion 435

Chapter 13: Conclusion 439

Bibliography 453

Index of Ancient Sources 487
Index of Modern Authors 513
Index of Subjects 521

Chapter 1

Introduction to Matthew and Luke-Acts

Introduction

These are exciting times for exploring any topic relating early Christianity to its original Jewish matrix. How fortunate we are to lie far away from those days when many Christian theologians and historians felt anxious about the Jewish heritage embedded in their Christian tradition. From the historical Jesus to the apostle Paul, many are the scholars of Christian provenance who have affirmed in positive terms the Jewishness of these two foundational figures. This tendency has also been reciprocated among several Jewish scholars, first with the historical Jesus, and eventually even with Paul who had previously been viewed, and still is by some, as a Jewish apostate and the first "Christian."[1] Ever since the publication of E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*,[2] many Christian scholars have finally heeded to George Foot Moore's prophetic cry against Christian misrepresentations and stigmatizations of rabbinic Judaism.[3] The fascinating discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the new intellectual and ecumenical atmosphere reigning after World War II have only encouraged and accelerated the process of recovering the diversity of Second Temple Judaism, which in turn has brought the early Jesus movement, at least some of it, back to its original Jewish pastures.

All of these commendable acts and formative events highlight the scholarly achievements made during the second half of the twentieth century in the fields of biblical studies, ancient Judaism, and early Christianity. But new frontiers of exploration and methodological considerations are

[1] Jewish scholars who have affirmed the Jewishness of Jesus or Paul include Claude G. Montefiore, Joseph Klausner, David Flusser, Samuel Sandmel, Alan F. Segal, Geza Vermes, Daniel Boyarin, Paula Fredriksen, and Mark Nanos, to name a few. Further references can be found in the ever-expanding www.4enoch.org, created by Gabriele Boccaccini (2009). For the "older," less favorable view of Paul as the inventor of Christianity, seen as a religion in radical discontinuity from Judaism, see Hyam Maccoby, *The Mythmaker, Paul and the Invention of Christianity* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1986).

[2] E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress, 1977).

[3] George Foot Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism," *HTR* 14 (1921): 197–254.

constantly emerging in the world of academia. The beginning of the third millennium has already generated its share of new proposals concerning Jewish-Christian relations in Late Antiquity that open fresh opportunities to revisit the documents now incorporated in the New Testament. Thus, the many articles compiled in the volume, *The Ways That Never Parted*, propose moving away from pinpointing an early date when Judaism and Christianity became distinct, autonomous entities everywhere throughout the Greco-Roman and Near Eastern worlds of Late Antiquity.[4] While popular opinion continues to imagine that Jesus almost immediately founded a new religion upon his arrival on the earthly scene, specialists of early Judaism and Christianity have traditionally issued the bill of divorce between Jews and Christians at a slightly later time. As mentioned earlier, some blame Paul as the primary culprit for initiating this process of separation. Others, however, turn their gaze toward 70 CE and consider this date as the watershed moment when Jews made their way to Yavneh and developed what eventually became "rabbinic Judaism," while one of the last remnants of Christians firmly attached to Judaism settled in Pella never again to reincorporate themselves into Jewish society.[5] Until recently, the

[4] Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways That Never Parted* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); cf. Daniel Boyarin, *Borderlines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004). Cf. Cf. Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011); Judith Lieu, *Neither Jew nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; London: T&T Clark, 2002), 11–29. "Late Antiquity" normally refers to a period after the composition of the documents included in the New Testament. The point is that if no definitive separation between the entities we are accustomed to calling Judaism and Christianity occurred everywhere during the third, fourth, or even fifth centuries of the Common Era, then a reassessment of the emergence and development of the nascent Jesus movement during the first century of its existence is certainly warranted.

[5] By no means does this constitute an antiquated view about the relations between Jews and Christians after 70 CE. On the contrary, it is very much alive at the beginning of the third millennium. See, for example, Donald A. Hagner, "Paul as a Jewish Believer – According to His Letters," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (eds. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik; Peabody, Mass.; Hendrickson, 2007), 118–20: "Two questions are debated by scholars today. First, when can we speak of Christianity? And, second, when did the church break with the synagogue? As for the first, the answer depends on what we mean by the word.… As for the second question, it would seem wise not to think in terms of a specific date for the break of the church from the synagogue. We undoubtedly have to reckon with a process taking place in different locations at different rates of speed. Dating the supposed break circa 85–90 C.E., during the work of the Yavneh rabbis and the adding of the 'benediction' of the *minim* to the Eighteen Benedictions, to my mind is much too late. Tensions were great virtually from the start, and only increased with the passing of time. Paul knew the reality of Jewish opposition to the message he preached (cf. 2 Cor 11:23–25). There were clear points of vital im-

Second Jewish Revolt (c.132–35 CE) was considered the *terminus ad quem* for any ongoing and meaningful overlap between Jews and Christians.[6]

More recently, the proposals offered in *The Ways That Never Parted* herald a fresh approach for understanding Jewish-Christian relations, denying any real and complete separation between Jews and Christians everywhere during the first three or four centuries of the Common Era.[7]

---

portance, especially, the destruction of Jerusalem in 70, but it is likely, in my opinion, that the church and the synagogue were obviously separate entities before the end of the first century." Even in the prestigious Hermeneia series, similar perspectives on the breach between Judaism and Christianity continue to thrive. Thus, Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), 685: "Judaism and Christianity began to emerge as clearly distinct entities c. 90 CE. A generation later, Luke was engaged in retrojecting this separation to the 'primitive' period. This is a normal tactic of an established body that wishes to maintain and protect its boundaries by dating its foundation as early as possible. The separation of 'Christians' from 'Jews' is an accomplished fact." Menahem Mor, *The Bar-Kochba Revolt: Its Extent and Effect* [in Hebrew] (Israel Exploration Society; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1991), 187–90, treats "Jewish Christians" as part of the *non-Jewish* population during the Second Revolt. See also his later article, "The Geographical Scope of the Bar Kokhba Revolt," in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered: New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome* (ed. Peter Schäfer; TSAJ 100; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 108.

[6] James D.G. Dunn in his *The Partings of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2d ed.; London: SCM, 2006), advocates this position, but the preface to the second edition of his book (xxii–xxiv) provides a corrective in response to the views proposed in the book, *The Ways That Never Parted*. On Jewish followers of Jesus during the Bar Kokhba Revolt and the question of the "parting of the ways," see Isaac W. Oliver, "Jewish Followers of Jesus and the Bar Kokhba Revolt: Re-examining the Christian Sources," in *The Psychological Dynamics of Revolution: Religious Revolts* (vol. 1 of *Winning Revolutions: The Psychology of Successful Revolts for Freedom, Fairness, and Rights*; ed. J. Harold Ellens; Santa Barbara, Calif.: Praeger, 2014).

[7] From an intellectual point of view, one could argue that Christianity *never* parted from Judaism, since it represents until this day one of the many possible outcomes and developments of the Jewish genius in the aftermath of 70 CE. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 BCE. to 200 CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 17–18, notes: "Among the many possible Judaisms, Christianity is one of those which has been realized in history. It did happen at the beginning of the Common Era that a particular multinational Judaism called Christianity – which through its faith in Jesus as the Messiah gave a different meaning to obeying the law – became highly successful among Gentiles, that the gentile members very soon composed the overwhelming majority of this community, and that the strong (and reciprocal) debate against other Jewish groups gradually turned, first into bitter hostility against all other Jews (that is, against all non-Christian Jews), and then against the Jews *tout court* (including the Christian Jews) in a sort of *damnatio memoria* of their own roots. However, neither a different way of understanding the law nor a claimed otherness nor the emergence of anti-Jewish attitudes does away with the Jewishness of Christianity.… For a historian of religion, Rabbinism and Christianity are simply different Judaisms."

This new framework, despite its critics,[8] invites scholars to revisit the relationship of the Jesus movement of the first century with its Jewish environment. If there was no complete and final separation between Judaism and Christianity before the fourth century CE, then certainly the boundaries between the two remained fluid even after the destruction of the temple in 70, the period when Matthew and Luke most likely composed their works.[9] It is therefore misleading and anachronistic to speak of the Jewish "background" or Jewish "roots" when relating early "Christian" (also an anachronism for the first century) texts of the New Testament to the Judaism of that time. From a historical point of view, there is no Jewish background of the New Testament because this literary corpus contains what were originally Jewish documents.

The experiment throughout this monograph involves reading three texts from the New Testament, the Gospel of Matthew along with the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles "simply" *as Jewish* texts. This experiment, though rather novel in the case of Luke, is not unprecedented in the history of research.[10] Moving beyond the widespread, by now, almost superfluous recognition of the Jewishness of the historical Jesus, Paul, or even Matthew, the latter so often perceived as the most "Jewish" of all gospels, I am wondering how far the boundaries of Jewishness can be

[8] Marius Heemstra, *The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways* (WUNT 2.277; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), points to the important yet overlooked dimension in the discussion on the "parting of the ways," that is, the Roman perspective on Jews and Christians. Heemstra looks at how the *fiscus Judaicus* played an integral role in the process of the formation of Jewish and Christian identities. I full heartedly agree with Heemstra's call to pay closer attention to this third dimension. Nevertheless, perhaps he overstates some of his findings when he concludes that "the decisive separation between Judaism as we know it today and Christianity as we know it today, took place at the end of the first century, as the combined result of a decision by representatives of mainstream Judaism…and the Roman redefinition of the taxpayers to the *fiscus Judaicus*" (189). A closer treatment of the gospel of Matthew could prove worthwhile, given the likely indications that the "Matthean community" paid the *fiscus Judaicus.* See Anthony Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 144–45. Heemstra dismisses this possibility in a footnote with no argumentation (p. 63 n. 125). Leonard V. Rutgers, *Making Myths: Jews in Early Christian Identity Formation* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009) mounts a stirring critique against the *Ways That Never Parted*, but his comments address more the period of Late Antiquity and need not deter us.

[9] By employing the names "Matthew" and "Luke" I do not imply that these historical figures actually wrote the (anonymous) documents attributed to them in subsequent Christian tradition. I simply use these names out of convenience and convention to designate the final authors of these writings.

[10] As I revised this work, a stimulating session on Acts and the Parting of the Ways in light of Second Temple Judaism was held at the Society of Biblical Literature on November 18, 2012.

pushed in order to include texts that have normally and normatively been considered to be "Gentile Christian" documents. Do the bounds of pluriform Early Judaism even need to be stretched so far to accommodate writings ascribed to an author such as Luke, the Gentile Christian *par excellence* in Christian imagination and tradition, into a Jewish environment? Or have terminological epithets and conceptual presuppositions created an artificial embryo that enables Luke's works to subsist continually as the single non-Jewish documents in the Jewish hall of fame of New Testament writings, coloring and governing the interpretation of themes such as Torah observance in Luke-Acts? What would happen if we would temporarily suspend ascribing terms such as "Gentile Christian" to Luke-Acts and begin with the assumption that these two works are just as Jewish as the gospel of Matthew?

Who Was Jewish Anyways? Two Jews, Three Opinions

Ascribing the epithet "Jewish" to any ancient document or author requires clarifying what is meant by such terminology.[11] Just as in our day Jewishness remains a contested category, with various Jewish groups continually and vigorously debating the definition(s) of Jewish identity, so in antiquity Jewishness could be perceived in a variety of ways by both outsiders (i.e., those non-Jews who did not belong to or identify with a particular Jewish community) and insiders (those Jews who were affiliated with and re-

[11] Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512, pleads with historians to discard the usage of the term, "Jew(s)," in their treatments of ancient history. He writes: "According to both insiders and outsiders, the Ἰουδαῖοι (just like Egyptians, Syrians, Romans, etc.) were an *ethnos* with all of the accoutrements" (484). Using the term "Jews" or even "Judaism" for describing ancient Jewry can be misleading as these words may, among other things, convey the impression that Jewish identity in antiquity should be understood primarily from a religious perspective, that ancient "Judaism" constituted a "religion" much like Christianity. Being a Judean in antiquity, however, was not simply a matter of religion, education, or even geographical provenance, as Mason notes, but involved the representation of an entire local culture in a manner similar to being Egyptian, Libyan, or Greek (490). In fact, Mason, Boyarin, and others assert that the phenomenon of religion, as a discrete category of human experience, disembedded from a local culture, is foreign to the ancient civilizations of the Greco-Roman world and the product of the Christianization of the west. During the first two centuries of the Common Era, we should speak of a Judean culture or civilization rather than of a Judaism, especially if by the latter a religion is primarily in view. Cf. Boyarin, *Borderlines*, 224–25. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this inquiry, I still use the terms "Jew(s)," "Jewish," or even "Judaism," since their usage is so deeply entrenched in the history of research and in order to encourage new readings of Matthew and Luke-Acts.

mained attached to a local Jewish community). As Cohen in his work on Jewish identity claims, "uncertainty of Jewishness in antiquity curiously prefigures the uncertainty of Jewishness in modern times."[12] Jewishness, then, was and will always remain, for better or for worse, a variable, non-constant category, open to different definitions and vulnerable to appropriations by various groups of people who wish to declare themselves in some sense as being legitimately "Jewish."

We might begin with the "ethnic" criterion as a means of exploring Jewish identity in antiquity: "The Jews (Judaeans) of antiquity constituted an *ethnos*, an ethnic group. They were a named group, attached to a specific territory, whose members shared a sense of common origins, claimed a common and distinctive history and destiny, possessed one or more distinctive characteristics, and felt a sense of collective uniqueness and solidarity."[13] The ethnic criterion, however, posed several challenging questions for defining Jewish identity in antiquity. Special borderline cases (e.g., Gentile converts, children of only one Jewish parent, etc.) required further clarification and highlighted certain Jewish anxieties over the vulnerable permeability and inevitable trespassing of Jewish-Gentile borders. Hayes highlights the views shared by certain groups of the Second Temple period who held onto the notion of what she dubs "genealogical purity." The authors of Ezra-Nehemiah, the book of *Jubilees,* and 4QMMT only recognized the Jewishness of those individuals whose parents were *both* Jewish (father and mother). For such Jews, to qualify as a Jew (or a Judean), a person had to stem from a pure genealogical tree undefiled by Gentile ancestry: "Groups that defined their Jewishness mostly or exclusively in genealogical terms established an impermeable boundary between Jews and Gentiles. Not only was it impossible for Gentiles to become Jews, but also violations of the genealogical distinction between the two groups (i.e., interethnic sexual unions) were anathema."[14]

Thiessen has recently pointed to the importance of genealogical purity in conjunction with the timing of *eighth-day* circumcision for Jewish male infants as a means for certain Jewish groups throughout the late Second Temple period to demarcate more clearly their Jewish identity. Not only were Jews supposed to belong to a pure Jewish genealogical stock, but they also were to circumcise their sons on the eighth day. The belief in and

---

[12] Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1999), 346. Cf. Martin Goodman, *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations* (London: Allen Lane, 2007), 168.

[13] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 7.

[14] Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 8–9.

practice of eighth-day circumcision allowed these Jews to distinguish themselves from other non-Jewish peoples from Syria and elsewhere who also practiced circumcision. The exclusive affirmation of eighth-day circumcision also denied the possibility for conversion to Judaism even if Gentile males would be willing to undergo circumcision.[15] Jewish circumcision had to occur on the eighth day, not earlier or later. In the eyes of such Jews, any other type of circumcision was deemed worthless for establishing Jewish identity.

Not all ancient Jews held on to this stringent notion of genealogical purity and narrow timeframe for performing circumcision. They tolerated a certain permeability that enabled Gentiles to cross over and become fully Jewish by converting to Judaism. They also accepted the Jewishness of individuals who did not have an impeccable genealogical record, but were children of only one Jewish parent, either the mother (the matrilineal principle) or the father (the patrilineal principle), depending on the Jewish circle.[16]

The ethnic criterion has recently been used as a means for discussing the Jewishness of members who belonged to the Jesus movement. This is essentially the path adopted by Skarsaune and Hvalvik in the volume, *Jewish Believers in Jesus*:

> In this book, by the term "Jewish believers in Jesus" we mean "Jews by birth or conversion who in one way or another believed Jesus was their savior." We have chosen to focus on the criterion of ethnicity rather than the criterion of ideology. Many, perhaps most, histories of "Jewish Christianity" or the like, have done the opposite. The basic definition of who is a Jewish Christian is derived from the definition of which theology and praxis the person in question embraces. One can then either disregard the question of ethnic origin completely, or restrict the term "Jewish Christian" to those Jews who believed in Jesus, and at the same time continued a wholly Jewish way of life.[17]

The application of the criterion of ethnicity allows Skarsaune and many of his colleagues to appreciate the Jewish provenance of a number of "Christian" authors and texts from antiquity. On the other hand, this approach completely diminishes the importance of Torah observance as a marker of

---

[15] Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[16] The rabbis eventually championed the view that Jewishness was transmitted through the mother, while other Jews believed it was transmitted through the father. More on this topic in chapter 12 of Part III dealing with circumcision, particularly the section on Timothy's circumcision in Acts 16:1–3.

[17] Oskar Skarsaune, "Jewish Believers in Jesus in Antiquity – Problems of Definition, Method, and Sources," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, 3–4. Martin S. Jaffee, *Early Judaism* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1997), also highlights the Jewish ideal of belonging to a people stemming from the same physical ancestors (at least in the Jewish imagination) as a meaningful criterion for defining Judaism.

Jewishness for "Christian" and non-Christian Jews alike. Moreover, many of the collaborators of this volume work under certain commonly held assumptions concerning the ethnic origins of a number of authors of the New Testament: Matthew and to a certain extent John are the only canonical gospels discussed in the volume as possibly written by ethnic Jews. Missing are treatments of Mark and Luke. Is this because most of the authors of this volume assume that these gospel writers were ethnically Gentile?[18] In the same volume, the Acts of the Apostles is brought to the reader's attention only in so far as it can provide information about the Jewishness of the historical Paul rather than Luke himself. In the end, despite its splendid resourcefulness, the volume perpetuates the traditional understanding about "Jewish Christians." Authors and writings of the Jesus movement considered as probable Jewish candidates essentially and unsurprisingly amount to Paul, the Jerusalem Church, the gospel of Matthew, segments from the *Pseudo-Clementine* writings, Ebionites, Nazoreans, and other little, insignificant "heretical" sects.[19]

The importance of Jewish Law and its observance, therefore, cannot be underestimated in assessing the potential Jewishness of any author or text from antiquity. Of course, I wish not to reduce exploring or establishing Jewish identity according to the criterion of the observance of the Mosaic Torah. There were certain Jews, such as the so-called Hellenizers, who sought to break away from what was perceived by other Jews as the fundamentals of Jewish observance: keeping the Sabbath, food laws, and circumcision, among other things. Despite their break away from these practices, these Hellenizers, Maccabean propaganda notwithstanding, may have continued to view themselves as Jewish.[20] Schäfer and others would have us think that such Jews did not evaporate from the historical scene once the Maccabean revolt was over, but survived well up until Bar Kokh-

[18] It is indeed curious that a treatment of Mark is left out of this volume, since according to Christian tradition the author of the second canonical gospel was a Jew. I obviously do not claim that the Christian tradition is historically reliable on this point, only that a treatment of Mark's Jewishness deserves attention.

[19] One of the exceptions and more interesting chapters in the book would be Torleif Elgvin's consideration of many of the so-called Old Testament Pseudepigrapha as "Jewish Christian." See his "Jewish Christian Editing of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, 278–304.

[20] Gabriele Boccaccini, *The Roots of Rabbinic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 162: "The Maccabean propaganda presents Antiochus's measures in Judah not as the result of intra-Jewish conflicts but as the last chapter and inevitable outcome of the opposition between Hellenism and Judaism (1 Macc 1:1–10)"; Jaffee, *Early Judaism*, 40: "From the perspective of hindsight…it is clear that the debate was not between Judaism and Hellenism as opposed forces, but really over the degree to which an already Hellenized Judaism would self-consciously conform even further to international cultural norms."

ba's day and might have even been partly responsible for triggering the Second Revolt against Hadrian.[21] Boccaccini also notes that the Mosaic Torah remains conspicuously absent from earlier strata of Enochic literature, although he acknowledges changes occurred in post-Maccabean times when, thanks to the book of *Jubilees,* Moses emerged as an important figure in the Enochic movement. In the end, then, "Enochians," like the Essenes, would have observed the Torah, though they certainly would have felt that the Mosaic tradition needed a supplement both to understand and repair this world.[22] In a similar vein, even *if* Paul did view the Torah as having in a real sense met its end after the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, this would not imply that he ceased to view himself as a Jew.[23] Other Jews, such as the so-called allegorizers, whom Philo condemns for abandoning the literal observance of Jewish customs, might have nonetheless viewed themselves as living out the true intent of the Torah and remaining in a real sense "Jewish." We could also speculate with Kraemer and others about the archaeological evidence and to what extent Jews in Palestine and elsewhere had assimilated into their "pagan" environment and no longer observed some of the central tenets of the Mosaic Torah,[24] though positing, as Schwartz does, that Judaism with its core unifying ideology centered on God-Torah-Temple essentially disappeared after 70 and especially 135 CE, only to remerge some two centuries later thanks to the successful rise of Christianity and the Christianization of the Roman Empire, probably exaggerates the decline of keeping Jewish customs persisting throughout antiquity.[25]

Despite these important caveats, the literary evidence available thus far shows that many Jews (and many non-Jews) considered the observance of central Mosaic commandments such as the Sabbath, kashrut, or circumcision as fundamental markers of Jewish identity and expression.[26] In fact,

---

[21] Peter Schäfer, *Der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand: Studien zum zweiten jüdischen Krieg gegen Rom* (TSAJ 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981).

[22] Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 167.

[23] Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1994), 2.

[24] David Kraemer, "Food, Eating, and Meals," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine* (ed. Catherine Hezser; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 403–19.

[25] Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001). For one review critiquing Schwartz's diachronic reconstruction of early Judaism, see Yaron Z. Eliav, review of Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, Prooftexts* 24 (2004): 116–28.

[26] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 62: "The observance of Jewish laws was perhaps a somewhat more reliable indicator of Jewishness than presence in a Jewish neighborhood or association with known Jews, but it was hardly infallible."

even the *selective* or eclectic appropriation and observance of certain Jewish customs by Gentiles could in principle lead other Greeks and Romans to labeling or even libeling such non-Jews as "Jewish."[27] Any affirmation, then, on the part of Christians of the observance of Jewish custom could at least insinuate to non-Jews their affiliation or at least proximity to Judaism. Consequently, it is through the lens of Torah practice that I have chosen to explore the Jewishness of the works penned by both Matthew and Luke, even though there exist many other ways, not discussed here, of assessing the Jewish character of an ancient author or text, including ideology (eschatology, messianic expectations, "apocalypticism," attitude toward Gentiles, etc.), literary genre, or usage of Jewish scriptures (e.g., Luke's appropriation of the Septuagint). Indeed, Matthew's positive attitude toward the Torah (e.g., Matt 5:17–20) has often served as a cornerstone for establishing the Jewishness of his gospel. But if Luke's writings affirm the observance of the Torah and display an equally remarkable expertise on Jewish legal matters, do they not provide a perspective that in the end is just as Jewish as Matthew's?

Further Terminological Considerations: Torah Practice and the Problem with "Jewish Christianity"

Any study of the history of research on "Jewish Christianity" or "Jewish Christians" reveals a long and confusing debate about what is really meant by the usage of such terminology.[28] The label "Jewish Christian(ity)" has been ascribed to multiple texts and groups, becoming a "rubber bag term, applied to a host of phenomena yet saying nothing with any clarity about the phenomena that would warrant this specific label."[29] Like the terms

[27] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness,* 58–62.

[28] On the history of research and the terminological problems, see Daniel Boyarin, "Rethinking *Jewish Christianity*: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (To Which is Appended a Correction of My Borderlines)," *JQR* 99 (2009): 7–36; Matt Jackson-McCabe, "What's in a Name? The Problem of 'Jewish Christianity,'" in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 7–38; James Carleton Paget, "The Definition of the Terms Jewish Christian and Jewish Christianity in the History of Research," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, 22–48; Simon Claude Mimouni, *Le judéo-christianisme ancien: essais historiques* (Paris: Cerf, 1998), 40–42; 68–71; 458–93; Carsten Colpe, *Das Siegel der Propheten: historische Beziehungen zwischen Judentum, Judenchristentum, Heidentum und frühem Islam* (Arbeiten zur neutestamentliche Theologie und Zeitgeschichte 3; Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1990), 38–42.

[29] Bruce Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a Hypothetical Definition," *JSJ* 7 (1976): 46.

"gnostic" or "Gnosticism," the label "Jewish-Christian" has often been equated unfavorably with heresy, syncretism, or sectarianism by ancient heresiological discourse and even modern scholarship.[30] Mimouni's description of German scholarship on "Jewish Christianity" during the nineteenth and much of the twentieth century is quite sobering:

> Starting from the 19th century, German theology did not stop extracting Christianity from its Jewish roots, even throwing back all of the period of the emergence of the Christian movement to the fringes of heresy – except for Paul and the Pauline trend. The closure of this process, loaded with consequences at the epistemological and methodological level, would be the approach of W. Bauer, for whom heterodoxy precedes orthodoxy, this latter giving birth to *Frühkatholizismus* only toward the end of the 2nd century. As for Jesus, following Hegel, the German theologians of this period extracted him more and more from his Jewish world, along with R. Bultmann going as far as to make him a being almost completely ahistorical – the "Jesus of faith" in opposition to the "Jesus of history." All of these historical constructions of Christianity in its beginnings rest essentially upon a negation of Judaism, on an extraction of the movement of the disciples of Jesus from its life setting, falling neither on Judaism nor paganism, but on a philosophy, the Christian philosophy, as if this latter had been a religion.[31]

Up until the second half of the twentieth century and even beyond, it was crucial for many to sanitize Paul from his Jewish element, to posit the Jewish-Christian ideology of Peter or James, the brother of Jesus, against the emerging (and superior) Greek-Christian and Hellenistic-universal branch of the church,[32] or, finally, to reduce the phenomenon of Torah

---

[30] See Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), who discusses the ways in which early Christian polemicists' discourse of orthodoxy and heresy have been intertwined with twentieth-century scholarship on Gnosticism and has distorted our understanding of ancient texts. The story of "Jewish Christianity" seems painfully similar.

[31] My translation: "À partir du XIXe siècle, la théologie allemande n'a eu de cesse d'extraire le christianisme de ses origines juives, renvoyant même toute la période de l'émergence du mouvement chrétien aux franges de l'hérésie – à l'exception de Paul et du courant paulinien. L'aboutissement de ce procédé, lourd de conséquences sur le plan épistémologique et méthodologique, sera la démarche de W. Bauer, pour qui l'hétérodoxie est antérieure à l'orthodoxie, cette dernière ne donnant naissance au *Frühkatholizismus* que vers la fin du IIe siècle. Quant à Jésus, suivant Hegel, les théologiens allemands de cette époque l'ont de plus en plus extrait de son monde juif, allant jusqu'à en faire, avec R. Bultmann, un être presque totalement ahistorique – le "Jésus de la foi" en opposition au "Jésus de l'histoire." Toutes ces constructions historiques du christianisme en ses débuts reposent essentiellement sur une négation du judaïsme, sur une extraction du mouvement des disciples de Jésus de son milieu de vie, ne reposant plus alors ni sur le judaïsme ni sur le paganisme, mais sur une philosophie, la philosophie chrétienne, comme si cette dernière avait été alors une religion" (Mimouni, *Le judéo-christianisme ancien*, 463 n. 1).

[32] Ferdinand Christian Baur especially confronted Jewish Christianity with Pauline Christianity. For Baur, Pauline Christianity stood for the superior and universal Christian ideals in contrast to the particularism of Jewish Christianity, imprisoned in its national-

observant Jewish Christians in the aftermath of 70 CE to the marginal and insignificant heretical pockets of "Ebionites" and "Nazoreans."[33]

However, the period after World War II witnessed important shifts in the study of Jewish Christianity, as many Christian specialists now seemed ready to acknowledge the Jewish heritage of their Christian tradition. The cardinal Jean Daniélou went the furthest in this acclamation, placing all of Christianity until the middle of the second century CE under the rubric of Jewish Christianity.[34] In his loose usage of the concept and the term, Daniélou did not imply that all early Christians belonged to the Jewish community and observed the Torah. Rather, Christians at this time expressed themselves within a literary and ideological framework that borrowed from Jewish patterns of thought and expression. His rather vague definition of Jewish Christianity, therefore, was comprehensive enough to include virtually all authors of the first one hundred years or so of Christian history, since most Christian writers of this period used Jewish categories and concepts to express their thoughts and beliefs.

---

ism and legalism. True to his application of Hegelian philosophical principles to the study of church history, Baur believed that Christianity made its entrance into human history at a time when Judaism and "paganism" had long fallen into decay. His views on Judaism represent nothing more than a refined Protestant "Hegelian supersessionism" of the traditional Christian teaching on replacement theology. Nevertheless, his serious appreciation of the phenomenon of Torah observant "Jewish Christians" cannot be underestimated in any historical inquiry on the history of the Jesus movement. See Ferdinand Christian Baur, *The Church History of the First Three Centuries* (trans. Allan Menzies; 2 vols.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1878), especially volume 1. On the roots of the study of ancient Jewish Christianity in the Enlightenment in early eighteenth-century England and its impact on German scholars of the nineteenth century such as Baur and the so-called Tübingen School, see F. Stanley Jones, ed., *The Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur* (History of Biblical Studies 5; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012).

[33] These heretical groups are often presented as *the* official representatives of "Jewish Christians" in standard introductions to the New Testament. Thus, for example, Bart D. Ehrman's *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 205–8, includes under the rubric of "Jewish Christian Gospels," only the extra-canonical writings known as "The Gospel of the Nazareans," "The Gospel of the Ebionites," and "the Gospel of the Hebrews." I argue that other gospels such as Matthew and Luke should also be labeled as such, if we mean by this term that they represent "Jews who had converted to belief in Jesus as the messiah but who nonetheless continued to maintain their Jewish identity, keeping kosher food laws, observing the sabbath, circumcising their baby boys, praying in the direction of Jerusalem, and engaging in a number of other Jewish practices" (Ehrman, *The New Testament,* 206). Since so many still employ the term "Jewish Christian" in a way that excludes canonical authors such Luke and even Matthew from this category, I prefer to discard the term altogether.

[34] Jean Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme* (2d ed.; Histoire des doctrines chrétiennes avant Nicée 1; Tournai: Desclée, 1991).

In some ways, Daniélou anticipated the "The Ways That Never Parted" model by globally affirming the Jewish dimension of nascent Christianity, at least during the first century of its existence. Some, however, criticized the arbitrariness of his chronological schematization of church history, which he artificially divided into three periods: Jewish, Greek, and Latin.[35] Why did the Jewish Christian phase suddenly cease in the first half of the second century to make place for a Greek period of church history? What happened to the afterlife of Jewish Christianity in the subsequent centuries after Bar Kokhba until Constantine and beyond? Most strikingly, Daniélou omitted from his volume on Jewish Christianity the treatment of any New Testament text! These documents, after all, were all written during the timeframe he labeled as Jewish Christian. As Robert Murray astutely states, "the supreme monument of Jewish Christianity is the New Testament itself."[36]

Nonetheless, we retain from Daniélou's research a sincere desire to affirm in a comprehensive way the pervasive Jewish fabric encompassing all of early Christianity during its formative stages. More than Daniélou, however, I feel the need to signal the ongoing importance of the question of the observance of the Torah during the formative stages of the Jesus movement after 70 CE Torah praxis was not important only for James and the church of Jerusalem or, later on, the so-called Ebionites and Nazoreans, as Daniélou presumed, but for other members of the Jesus movement as well such as Matthew and Luke.[37] On the other hand, like Daniélou, I fully agree that Jewishness should not be reduced to the criterion of Torah practice. Once again, there were Jews, whether followers of Jesus or not, who might not have viewed the observance of the Torah as the primary index for measuring their Jewishness. Nevertheless, employing the criterion of Torah observance remains an efficient and practical way for concretely assessing the Jewishness of many ancient authors and texts. It is no historical accident that the decline of the observance of the Sabbath, kashrut, circumcision, and other Jewish customs among followers of Jesus coincides with the disappearance of a visible, corporate body of Jewish disciples of Jesus from the historical scene.[38]

---

[35] The criticisms against Daniélou's work are best summarized by Robert A. Kraft, "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and its 'Theology': Problems of Definition and Methodology," *RSR* 60 (1972): 81–92.

[36] Robert Murray, "Defining Judaeo-Christianity," *HeyJ* 15 (1974): 308.

[37] Daniélou, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, 35–37.

[38] On the observance of Jewish customs among *Gentile* Christians see Michele Murray, *Playing a Jewish Game: Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries CE* (Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme 13; Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2004).