First-century Jewish Use of Scripture: Evidence from the Life of Jesus

R. Steven Notley

Date First Published: January 01, 2004

Through the window of a single New Testament episode we can gain insight into how Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries employed sacred texts with creative ingenuity to grapple with the complex issues of their day.

A great deal has been written about the importance of Jewish sources for our understanding of Jesus and the Early Church. Unfortunately, there remains a lack of corresponding recognition regarding the contribution of the New Testament to our knowledge of Jewish life and thought during the closing days of the Second Commonwealth. The New Testament serves as an invaluable historical witness, because it often is our earliest written record.

I cite only a couple of examples to illustrate. For archaeologists and historical geographers the New Testament provides seminal information because it possesses the earliest written references to the Jewish cities and villages founded in Galilee during the Hellenistic and Roman period —e.g., Tiberias, Capernaum, Chorazin, Bethsaida. On the other hand, Jewish and Christian students of the history of Jewish tradition rarely recognize that the earliest evidence for the common Jewish practice to name one's son at his circumcision on the 8th day is the Lukan birth narrative about John the Baptist (Luke 1:63) and Jesus (Luke 2:21). Outside of the New Testament, the next mention in written Jewish sources appears in the seventh-century A.D. work, *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer*:

The parents of Moses saw that his appearance was like that of an angel of God. They circumcised him on the eighth day and called him Yekutiel (chap. 48).[1]

For this study I want to investigate another primitive testimony preserved in the Third Gospel. Luke's story of Jesus in Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30) is the oldest account of the Jewish custom to follow the public reading of the Torah in the synagogue with a reading from the Prophets (the *Haftarah*). Apart from Luke's writings

(cf. Acts 13:15ff.), the earliest Jewish reference to this practice is the third-century A.D. compilation of oral traditions in the Mishnah.

On a Festival [the Law] is read by five [readers], on the Day of Atonement by six, and on the Sabbath by seven. They may not take from them but they may add to them, and *they close with a reading from the Prophets* (m. Megillah 4:2).

The verbal precision in Luke's account belies a haphazard report. Already the 17th-century Dutch scholar, Hugo Grotius, recognized the parallels between Jesus' actions (Luke 4:16) and the synagogue caretaker in *Tosefta Sukkah*: "He stood to read from the Torah" (Tosefta, Sukkah 2:11).[2] In recent years, Safrai has advanced the notion that the description that Jesus stood meant that he read first from the Torah:

The two Greek words translated "he stood up to read" strongly suggest that Jesus had read a portion from the Torah before reading from the scroll of Isaiah. One does not stand up in order to read from the Prophets.[3]

The Evangelist assumed that his readers would have firsthand knowledge of the Jewish world of the New Testament. He thus felt no need to detail what was already understood—that Jesus stood to read first from the Torah, and only then to read from the prophet Isaiah. In addition, Safrai observed that Luke's account—in which Jesus alone is reported to read publicly—accords with other ancient witnesses (e.g., m. Sotah 7:7-8; m. Yoma 7:1; Josephus, *Antiq*. 4.209; Philo, *Every Good Man is Free* 81-82). These indicate that Jewish practice prior to 70 A.D. allowed for only one public reader of the Torah in the synagogue, not seven readers as the Jewish community practiced soon after the destruction of the Second Temple and a custom that is continued until this day.[4]

Significant additional details in the report have been overlooked by modern readers. These shed light not only on the Jewish world of the first century, but how much Jesus was integrated with it. For most Christian readers the task is formidable. How are we able to read the Gospels with a first-century Jewish mindset? Difficult though the challenge may be, unless we take seriously the issues of language, culture and physical setting in our reading of the Gospels, we risk depreciating the Jesus of history. Equally important for Christian readers of our present episode, we are in danger of missing Jesus' poignant message intended for those present that fractious day in Nazareth.

For the most part, modern New Testament scholarship has assumed that the sources for our story about Jesus in Nazareth are thoroughly Greek. Traces of Hebrew influences underlying Luke's Greek are routinely dismissed as an artificial attempt by the Evangelist to Semiticize his Greek to imitate the style of the Septuagint (i.e., the second-century B.C. Greek translation of the Old Testament). While the New Testament scriptures are Greek, there are indications that Luke has drawn from earlier reports (Luke 1:1-3) that were written originally in Hebrew. Acknowledgement that the incident in Nazareth occurred in a Semitic milieu opens up new possibilities for Hebrew idioms and fresh cultural perspectives. Close attention to the linguistic evidence can ultimately provide insight into *how* Jesus and other first-century Jews used Scripture, and consequently to illuminate *what* Jesus intended to communicate to his hearers.

Let's look at the evidence. The first clue is Luke's introductory phrase, "and there was given to him *the book of the prophet Isaiah*" (Luke 4:17). Recently, while studying these words anew with my students, I asked them and myself a simple question. "What is the first occasion that Isaiah's work is called a 'book'"? Of course, in concrete terms Jesus was given a parchment scroll, not a book or codex. However, my interest here is not the physical shape of the document but the idiom, "the *book*" of Isaiah—whether couched in Greek βίβλος, βιβλίον (*biblos*, *biblion*) or Hebrew סֵפֶר (*sefer*). A quick survey finds that Isaiah is never referred to as a "book" in the Old Testament. So, we apparently have here a post-biblical or intertestamental expression.

What we were surprised to discover was that the expression, "the book of Isaiah," never occurs in Second Temple Period Jewish literature composed in Greek—e.g., the Septuagint, Greek Pseudepigrapha, Josephus

or Philo. Not only is Luke the only writer in the New Testament to preserve this idiom, his is the only occurrence in the entire Greek corpus of the Jewish Second Commonwealth.

On the other hand, seven times in the Hebrew portions of the Qumran library we hear citations from Isaiah with the prefaced phrase, הנביא ישעיה בספר כתוב אשר "as it is written in *the book of Isaiah the prophet*" (e.g., 4Q174 3:15; 4Q177 1:5; 4Q265 f1:3)—the exact Hebrew equivalent of the Greek phrase recorded by Luke. In other words, the only time in first-century Jewish literature that we hear the work of Isaiah referred to as a "book," it appears in Hebrew. While this point seems like so much insignificant minutiae, it should signal to the modern reader the need to approach the words and actions of Jesus in Luke's report from a Hebraic perspective. The implications of this shift in perspective will soon become apparent.

Luke records that Jesus "opened the book [i.e., scroll] and found the place…." (Luke 4:17). Evidence from the Cairo Genizah indicates that already in first-century Judea designated weekly portions from the Torah were read in the synagogue in consecutive order on a triennial cycle (i.e., the Pentateuch was read through entirely in three years). By contrast, selections from the Prophets were not fixed. They were often chosen at the discretion of the reader to complement the Torah reading on the basis of parallel themes, verses or even individual words. Whereas the Torah portions were required to be read consecutively, such was not the case with the Prophets. Passages from different prophetic books could even be combined: "One may skip among the Prophets, but one may not skip in the reading of the Torah" (m. Megillah 4:4).

Jesus read from Isaiah 61:1-2, but even the casual observer can detect that Luke's citation differs considerably from the wording of Isaiah in the Hebrew Scriptures. Fitzmyer is typical of scholars who assume that these differences are explained by Luke's borrowing from the Septuagint for his quotation.[5] Even Fitzmyer admits, however, that this explanation is difficult to prove. The Septuagint's translation of these verses follows closely the Hebrew text. Thus, it is difficult to know with certainty whether the similarities between the Septuagint and Luke's citation are because the Evangelist is relying upon the Septuagint, or because both are faithfully rendering the Hebrew Scriptures.

Moreover, Fitzmyer acknowledges that at times Luke's citation adheres even more closely to the Hebrew text than the Septuagint upon which Luke is presumed to depend.[6] Coupled with the non-Septuagintal Hebraisms witnessed in Luke's narrative (e.g., "the *book* of Isaiah"), the evidence seems to suggest that Luke has drawn his citation not from the Septuagint but another source that was marked with strong Hebraisms. For example, see Luke 4:21: "fulfilled in your *hearing*" [lit. "ears"] (cf. Gen. 23:10); Luke 4:22: "words…*proceeded out of his mouth*" (cf. Num. 30:2).

The Feast of the Rejoicing of the Law at the Synagogue in Leghorn, Italy, oil on canvas, Solomon Alexander Hart (1850).

Whatever one's opinion concerning the language of Luke's source(s), it is beyond question that Jesus read from a Hebrew text of Isaiah. Buth has brought my attention to the lack of any reference in our story to the reading of an Aramaic translation (*Targum*) in Nazareth. This absence coincides with the near non-existence of Aramaic Targums among the Dead Sea Scrolls.[7] With the exception of the Targum of Job (11Q10 and 4Q157)—notorious for its difficult Hebrew—they do not exist in the Qumran library. Their lack at Qumran and Nazareth challenges the almost universally accepted notion that first-century Jews did not know Hebrew and needed the Aramaic translation to understand the Hebrew Scriptures. Instead, it seems more likely that if the Aramaic Targums were read in first-century synagogues, they served not as literal translations but as a type of simultaneous commentary on the Hebrew Scriptures—a repository of Jewish interpretation.[8] So, we hear: "He who translates a verse literally falsifies it" (t. Megillah 4[3]:41). At their

earliest stage of usage, the Targums were preserved and read in the synagogues in languages other than Hebrew in order to distinguish them from Holy Scripture. A parallel to this practice exists. In the Babylonian Talmud block citations from the Mishnah are recorded in their original Hebrew, and thus distinguished from later deliberations (i.e., the Gemara) upon the Mishnah that are routinely preserved in Aramaic.

Returning to our passage, the most obvious deviation from Isaiah 61:1-2 is the final phrase recorded in Luke 4:18. Jesus interjects Isaiah 58:6: "to let the oppressed go free," and then returns to Isaiah 61:2 with the conclusion, "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." As we will demonstrate, Jesus' fusion of Isaiah 61:1-2 and Isaiah 58:6 presents the clearest evidence that Jesus read from the Hebrew Scriptures and that Luke's source for the citation was not the Septuagint.

Jesus' creative reading from Isaiah is neither haphazard nor coincidental. It betrays his intimate familiarity with the Hebrew Scriptures and contemporary Jewish methods of interpreting them. Fitzmyer suggests that the combination of the two Isaianic verses is because of the Greek catchword ἄφεσις (*aphesis*, "release") that appears in the Septuagint's translation of both verses (*NIV* free: Isa. 58:6; freedom: Isa. 61:1). His instincts are correct, but because of his presumption that Luke is relying upon the Septuagint, Fitzmyer is mistaken concerning the verbal thread that enabled Jesus to combine these two passages. The Greek term *aphesis* in the Septuagint translates two entirely different Hebrew words in the respective Old Testament verses. Indeed, the Greek term *aphesis* occurs fifty times in the Septuagint and translates eleven different Hebrew words.

Nevertheless, we do have in Luke's Nazareth episode a good example of the Jewish interpretive technique known as *gezerah shavah* (t. Sanhedrin., end; Avot de-Rabbi Natan, Version A, chap. 37 [ed. Schechter, p. 110). According to this method two otherwise unrelated verses may be combined because of the appearance in Hebrew of similar words or clusters of words. The early implementation of this technique seems to have been based upon exact word forms. Jesus was familiar with the hermeneutical method and used it elsewhere (e.g., Luke 19:46: Isa. 56:7/ Jer. 7:11; Matt. 11:10: Exod. 23:20/Mal. 3:1). It is not a childish word game, but a sophisticated technique applied with purpose.

So what are the verbal links that allow Jesus' creative fusion? First, it is important to remember that in Jewish interpretive method the intended message of a speaker could be conveyed by words not even uttered. An elliptical biblical quotation was intended to direct the hearers to a larger block of scripture which itself might contain the intended message. Thus, in the reports of rabbinic exegesis the most important words may not even be those actually cited. The original hearers/readers—with a full knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures and rabbinical methods of interpretation—would have followed the technique of the sage to the implicit message. Unfortunately, on the lips of Jesus this implied message may be missed by the uninformed Christian reader.

To my knowledge no notice has been given to the fact that in the entire Hebrew Scriptures only in our two blocks of scripture (Isa. 58:1-9; 61:1-4) do we find the phrase רצון ליהוה *ratson le-YHWH* ("the Lord's favor"). New Testament scholars have overlooked the verbal bridge between these two verses because they presume that the Septuagint is the source of the citation. Yet, the Hebrew phrase, "the day of the Lord's favor," is omitted in the Septuagint's truncated Greek translation of Isaiah 58:5b—thus eliminating the vital verbal link. In other words, Jesus' creative genius is possible only if he is working in the Hebrew Scriptures.

Isaiah 61:2a speaks of "the Year of the Lord's favor," whereas Isaiah 58:5-6 designates the time of the hoped-for redemption as "the Day of the Lord's favor." The difference between these two passages, however, is more than a temporal distinction (i.e., *year* and *day*). The content of the redemptive expectations in these two passages represents starkly divergent hopes in Jesus' day regarding both the timing and the nature of God's future redemption of His people. It certainly is no accident that Jesus stops short in his quotation of Isaiah 61:2, eliminating the final phrase: "The day of the vengeance of our God" (Isa. 61:2b). Jesus did not want to identify the day of the Lord's favor with a time of divine vengeance.

Before we proceed further, some background on contemporary Jewish thought is needed. Flusser has illuminated the diverging redemptive expectations that existed in the first century.[9] The Qumran Congregation and John the Baptist shared an expectation that their present day would be followed soon with the advent of a heavenly Redeemer who would bring vindication for the righteous and punishment for the wicked. The immediacy of this time of judgment is reflected in John's proclamation, "The axe is *already* at the root of the trees" (Matt. 3:10; Luke 3:9).

On the other hand, Jesus and his rabbinic contemporaries embraced a three-part view of redemptive history. In the opinion of Jesus and Israel's Sages, between the present era and the future End of Days—which would include resurrection for the righteous and judgment upon the wicked—they understood the need for an intermediate period. As Flusser explained, this intermediate period resembles what is called in rabbinic sources, "the days of the Messiah." Nevertheless, Jesus borrowed another rabbinic term and designated the ensuing redemptive era "the kingdom of Heaven." In the opinion of Jesus, the beginning of that intermediate era began during the ministry of John the Baptist: "The law and the prophets were until John…." (Luke 16:16). "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of Heaven forcefully advances" (Matt. 11:12).

It is John and Jesus' differing opinions concerning the stages of redemption that led to the Baptist's question, "Are you the One Who Is to Come, or shall we look for another?" (Matt. 11:3). John defined the hoped-for Redeemer with notions belonging to the eschatological judge introduced in Daniel 7:13 ("I saw One…Coming"). John's question from the prison of Herod Antipas pondered, "If the Redeemer-Judge has truly come, why are the righteous still suffering at the hands of the wicked?" Jesus' response to John affirms his own high self-awareness, but it also corrects John's mistaken understanding of God's redemptive timetable. Not surprisingly, Jesus uses a combination of Isaianic passages—Isa. 29:18; 35:5; 42:7, 18; 26:19—that included Isaiah 61:1. Among the discoveries in the Dead Sea Scrolls was a work (4Q521) built around a similar compilation of Isaianic passages describing the messianic age.

Jesus' collection of biblical passages in his answer to John's disciples would have been familiar to them. Nevertheless, Jesus reshapes the verses to serve as a retort to John's question. In essence Jesus counters, "The redemptive era *is* here and judgement *will* come, but in the present age the righteous and the wicked continue to coexist." Jesus' opinion concerning delayed judgment and the present coexistence of good and evil is repeated as the central theme to a number of his parables (e.g., Matt. 13:24-40; 13:47-50). Indeed, it is likely no coincidence that his "Parable of the Weeds among the Wheat" uses the same agricultural imagery (wheat, separation, burning) as John's messianic preaching (Luke 3:17). In rebuttal to John's proclamation of imminent judgment upon the wicked, Jesus' parable reiterates the necessity for a delay in the time of division and punishment.

In another work (11Q13) the Qumran Congregation described their expectation of a priestly Redeemer identified with the biblical Melchizedek. The Qumran sectarians—like others of their contemporaries (e.g., *Testament of Levi* 17:1-18:2)—expected the advent of that Redeemer to coincide with the Jubilee year. Since the Jubilee was inaugurated on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 25:9), their hope was that God would atone the sins of the nation and consequently redeem His people. One of the important proof texts for this redemptive Jubilee framework was the passage read by Jesus in Nazareth—Isaiah 61:1-2.

Elsewhere, I have tried to show that these ideas form the background for John's proclamation of "a baptism that would lead to a (Jubilee) remission of sins" (see Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3). It seems that John (like his Qumran contemporaries) expected the Redeemer to appear in the year of Jubilee. John hoped that repentance and righteous initiative signified by the act of ritual immersion would bring forward the day of God's redemption. Space does not allow us here to explore fully the implications of this expectation. Yet, it should not be missed by the reader that in Jesus' first public statement in the Synoptic Gospels after submitting to John's baptism, he chose a passage of scripture that complemented fully John's (Jubilee) redemptive expectation. Jesus punctuated his reading of Isaiah 61:1-2 with the bold declaration—"Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (Luke 4:21).

I have taken time to look at Jesus and John's difference of opinion because I think it lies at the heart of the tension that day in Nazareth. The Baptist—like the congregation in Nazareth—found Jesus' innovations difficult. On that Sabbath morning, Jesus intentionally nuanced the redemptive presentation in Isaiah 61:1-2. He eliminated Isaiah's mention of divine vengeance, because this is not the time of judgment. He put forth his own understanding of the present redemptive period with the inclusion of Isaiah 58:5-7. The role of the righteous is not to exact divine vengeance upon the wicked (cf. 1QS 9:21-24), but to live righteously in the midst of this present wicked age. His opinion is similar to that heard from another first-century rabbi, Yose Ha-Gelili: "Repentance brings redemption near" (b. Yoma 86^{b}). According to both Galilean sages, the commitment to righteous living serves as a catalyst for God's redemptive intervention. Or, in the words of Isaiah 58:5-8:

Is not this the fast that I choose.... Is it not to share your bread with the hungry, and bring the homeless poor into your house; when you see the naked, to cover him, and not to hide yourself from your own flesh? *Then shall your light break forth like the dawn, and your healing shall spring up speedily; your righteousness shall go before you, the glory of the Lord shall be your rear guard.*

How did the audience react to Jesus' creative reading that day in Nazareth? Most readers assume that the point of provocation was Jesus' sharp comments in Luke 4:23-27. However, there are clear indications that the audience was already taken aback by the message of Jesus' conflated reading from Isaiah. Unfortunately, most English translations gloss over these indicators. They are consequently overlooked by modern readers. The *RSV* translates that the crowd "spoke well of him." Yet, the literal translation of the Greek sentence is, "They all witnessed (against) him." I have rendered the attitude of the crowd negatively because of the unusual Greek construction (i.e., dative case) of the pronoun "him" with the verb μαρτυρειν (*martyrein* "to witness"). The Greek phrase reflects an underlying Hebrew idiom (see Deut. 31:19; Jer. 32:44) with the sense "to witness *against*."

Jeremias already recognized our suggestion of immediate congregational discontent over Jesus' interpretive reading:

Both verbs are ambiguous: *martyrein* with the dative can mean either "give witness for" or "give witness against," and *thaumazein* can mean either "be enthusiastic about," or "be shocked at." The continuation of the pericope shows that the words must be interpreted *in malam partam*. In that case, the interpretation of ["concerning the words of grace"] (v. 22) must be: the people of Nazareth are shocked that Jesus quotes the words of grace from Isaiah 61 to preach about, and omits the mention of vengeance, although it occurred in the text.[10]

Although we may disagree with Jeremias' later description of the content of Jesus' "words of grace," his sensitive reading of the Greek text is correct about the initial negative reaction of the Congregation in Nazareth towards Jesus' citation. Unfortunately, Jeremias overlooked the fact that Jesus' "gracious" citation of Isaiah 61:1-2 was reinforced by his creative fusion of this passage with its exegetical pair from Isaiah 58:5-6.

We now understand more clearly the bafflement of the crowd, "Is this not Joseph's son?" In other words, "Has he not lived and been taught among us?" Jesus' creative reading that Sabbath day in Nazareth challenged their rigid narrowness regarding God's redemptive designs. Jesus embraced the pioneering trends in first-century Jewish thought. Those innovations took to task the older ideas of divine justice. Contemporary recognition of universal human frailty brought into question the community of faith's ability to determine in simplistic, black-and-white categories the identity of the just and the unjust. According to this new "sensitivity it (was recognized that) there are no perfect righteous and no completely wicked men—for in every human heart the noble and the base impulse are vying with each other."[11]

The effect of this new thinking bore consequences on the ethics of Jesus. In his estimation one was in danger judging from a position of self-righteousness: "Do not judge, or you too will be judged. For in the same way you judge others, you will be judged, and with the measure you use, it will be measured to you"

(Matt. 7:1-2). In the same spirit, Jesus' creative reading of Isaiah tempered his hearers' eagerness for harsh and precipitous judgment.

The biblical illustrations of the widow of Zarephath (Luke 4:25-26; 1 Kgs. 17:8-16) and Naaman (Luke 4:27; 2 Kgs. 5:1-27) were intended to underscore his challenge to the Nazareth congregation's impatience for divine vengeance upon the unrighteous. Can it be a coincidence that both of these biblical figures were non-Israelites, and thus reckoned outside the covenant God established with His people Israel? Yet, among the vast array of human needs existing in their day, God focused his attention and divine care on these—the unrighteous. Jesus demonstrated that even in the biblical past the simplistic categories of righteous and sinner (or deserving and undeserving) could not withstand the weight of God's mercy. So also in the present era of God's redemptive economy, "He makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust" (Matt. 5:45). Jesus exhorts his family and friends in Nazareth—just as we hear more succinctly later—"Be merciful even as your father is merciful" (Luke 6:36).

Through our circuitous study, I have tried to illuminate not only *what* Jesus said, but *how* he structured his provocative ideas. I hope that the reader has seen that these two aspects of Jesus' teaching are inextricably linked. Through the window of a single New Testament episode we have gained insight into how Jesus and his Jewish contemporaries employed sacred texts with creative ingenuity to grapple with the complex issues of their day. Yet, we should not be naïve. Fresh ideas are rarely welcome. Entrenched biases die hard. Flusser conjectured, "(these new trends) would have drawn much contemporary criticism and even charges of heresy."[12] His estimation aptly describes the response in Nazareth.

The conflict in Nazareth, therefore, is not a "rejection of Jesus" per se. His was only one voice. Instead, we witness within first-century Jewish society the internal struggle with the revolutionary ideas being advocated by Jesus and Israel's Sages. It is the weakness of human nature to want to hold on to the old, simple categories. Our easy identification of "the sinners" reassures us that we are numbered among "the righteous." Jesus soundly condemned that easy comfort (Luke 18:9-14).

The dissolution of our simple categories means that we must now examine more intently our own desperate need for God's mercy and forgiveness. The spiritual challenges of the first century are both timeless and human—they remain with us. Let us hear afresh Jesus' caution to the people of God, to remain vigilant against our own ungodly prejudices and comfortable gravitation to easy categories. At the same time, let us draw courage from Jesus' assurance of heavenly blessing: "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" (Matt. 5:7).

- [1] See Shmuel Safrai, "Naming John the Baptist," *Jerusalem Perspective* 20 (May 1989): 1-2.
- [2] Grotius, Hugo, *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*. 9 Volumes (reprint; Groningen: W. Zuidema, 1826-1834), 3:225.
- [3] Shmuel Safrai, "Synagogue and Sabbath," *Jerusalem Perspective* 23 (Nov./Dec. 1989): 8-10.
- [4] See David Bivin, "One Torah Reader, Not Seven!" *Jerusalem Perspective* 52 (Jul.-Sept. 1997): 16-17.
- [5] Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*. The Anchor Bible. 2 Volumes (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 1:530-539.
- [6] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:533.
- [7] Randall Buth, "Aramaic Targumim: Qumran," *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (eds. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter; Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP, 2000), 91-93.
- [8] See Steven D. Fraade, "Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third-Sixth Centuries," in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992), 253-286.
- [9] David Flusser, *Jesus* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997, 1998, 2001), 258-275.
- [10] Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1987), 206-207.
- [11] David Flusser, "A New Sensitivity in Judaism and the Christian Message," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 480.
- [12] Flusser, "Sensitivity," 482.