Although her interpretation allows her the vivid title for the essay, Paul was a blameless Pharisee, not a perfect one, if Pharisee he was.

In her blowing away a great deal of the dusty accretions of post-Pauline pro-Pauline Christian exegesis, which made Paul a model Christian and no kind of Jew, Fredriksen, in her essay for *The Pharisees,* continues the life-project represented by a stack of books and a thumb-drive of other scholarly papers. She succeeds here in uncovering the essentials of the Pauline text. In her reasking the question "What made Paul a Pharisee?," she has walked back along a familiar path, to discover wrong turnings and right, and it has been a pleasure to walk along with her. Her essay is only one of the gems of this magnificent collection.

PETER ZAAS
Siena College, USA
zaas@siena.edu

An Appreciative Response

As the editors of *The Pharisees*, we appreciate the careful reading and helpful observations made by the participants in this symposium. We also appreciate the opportunity to continue the conversation. The following brief comments address the articles in order.

Robert Cathey begins with a citation of Sydney Carter's 1963 hymn, "Lord of the Dance," which one of us discussed already in 2007.[12] The song, set to an adaptation of the Shaker tune "Simple Gifts," was not intended to sound "anti-Jewish," but that is the impression it leaves. The song thus serves as an excellent introduction to approaching the Pharisees in the gospel texts: we doubt that Matthew "intended" to write words that would inculcate or reinforce antisemitic views, but the meaning of the text always outstrips the authorial intent; we also think that most Christians who have sung this very popular hymn do not realize its anti-Jewish implications. Neither did most white people who, until about twenty years ago, sang "My Old Kentucky Home" or "Dixie" realize the inculcation or reinforcement of racist views.

[12] Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (New York: HarperOne, 2004), 221. In September 2020, the Committee on Doctrine of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops published "Catholic Hymnody at the Service of the Church: An Aid for Evaluating Hymn Lyrics," which cites the third verse of "Lord of the Dance" as an example of how "Application of the Guidelines here will rule out hymn verses that imply that the Jews as a people are collectively responsible for the death of Christ" (6).

https://doi.org/10.1017/hor.2022.57 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The response to the essays in *The Pharisees* should thus be one not of guilt but of recognition and, ideally, change to how Christians teach and preach about the Pharisees and, by extension, Jews.

Following an excellent (thank you, Bob!) summary of the contents, Cathey wonders about the problem of moving "cutting-edge" scholarship into the pews. We agree. To facilitate this move, we are now, together with Jens Schröter, working on a German translation of this volume that rewrites the articles to make them more accessible to a nonspecialized readership; we are also speaking with Eerdmans about doing such a volume for English-speaking readers. Perhaps as readers—especially those who teach and preach—approach these review articles, they might consider what moves they make in order both to prevent the inculcation or reinforcement of these negative stereotypes. Biblical studies and homiletics faculty have known of the problems for years; that problems persist is not only the result of problematic statements in the New Testament itself, it is the result of failures in teaching, preaching, gatekeeping for books and articles, and a tone-deafness on the part of congregants.

Finally, to his well-taken point about how conservative Christians may respond: we have already received some pushback from this audience (indeed, an interview set up by Eerdmans with Moody Radio was canceled because the host was not willing to engage a non-Christian who, in agreement with Roman Catholic teaching, recognizes the gospels as human products designed to strengthen belief in Jesus as lord).

Jennifer Kaalund's response helps us in locating places where greater clarity is needed. For example, she argues that "violence can also be the result when we do not allow silence and gaps in our texts and historical understandings to stand." The claim needs nuance. The greater problem, as we see it, is when those gaps are filled in with negative comments. More, violence can also arise from the proclamation of select New Testament texts in cases where auditors are unaware of any gaps. Here we return to Robert Cathey's point about the conservative reader.

Professor Kaalund helpfully mentions the dangers of speaking of "the …" group, and with the definite article's eliding distinction, and her phrasing also reminds us of the power of our labels. For example, she notes that "Modern readers … may read Paul's letters to the Corinthians with a slightly different lens, one that is attempting to make sharp distinctions between this nascent Christian community and those outside this community." We can expand on this quote because it is the modern reader who thinks about Paul as having brought into being a "nascent Christian community": Paul never uses the term "Christian," and the term itself presupposes, for most

https://doi.org/10.1017/hor.2022.57 Published online by Cambridge University Press

modern readers, a secure bifurcation between the "religions" (another complicated term) known as "Christianity and Judaism."

We do have gaps in historical knowledge: we cannot be certain how, when, or why the Pharisees originated; we do not know if they retained the political clout Josephus accords them during the Hasmonean era; we cannot know if Josephus had accurate information. Yet we do know what the reception history of the Pharisees has been in both Jewish and Christian contexts. *The Pharisees* moves from historical reconstruction to reception history precisely to show how their negative presentations in the gospels coupled with a reading of Paul that removes him from his Jewish context has led to the violence that Professor Kaalund mentions. Thus, even if we cannot be certain of the history, we can be certain of the reception, and it is in the reception that the work has to be done.

Finally, we fully agree with Professor Kaalund that more work needs to be done in the seminary classroom, and to her point, "Scholarship must be extended beyond the echo chambers of academia, where we talk only among ourselves. For it is both inside and beyond these walls where language still has material implications." Her comments made us wonder: What happens, for example, when she and the other contributors to this symposium "mind the gap" in the classroom? What do they do to help educate their students?

Malka Simkovich's opening comment about her Turkish student's use of the term "Pharisee" shows how pervasive the negative stereotypes are. Some of our students, from across the globe, hold similar views not only of Pharisees but of all Jews. The problem is severe in Matthew 23, as Professor Simkovich notes, and elsewhere in the New Testament. For example, in the Gospel of John, Pharisees are often depicted as opposed to Jesus. They are involved in plans to arrest him (7:44-48) and in his actual arrest (18:3). Yet even more disconcerting and with far-reaching consequences is the fact that, as Harold Attridge puts it "In [John] chapter 8, the opposition morphs from Pharisees to *Ioudaioi*" (189), which gives way to the later identification of Pharisees and "all Jews." In Acts, we find more nuanced views, including the presentation of Paul's teacher Gamaliel and Paul himself proclaiming "I am a Pharisee" (Acts 23:6). Although some Pharisees who have become believers oppose Paul's teaching (15:5), there is no identification between the Pharisees and the Jews who later seek to thwart Paul's mission, often through deceitful and violent means. Although we agree that "Christian theologians have not yet … developed a meaningful understanding of Judaism outside the allegorizing framework of Christianity," we do see progress in this endeavor, with *The Pharisees* one of several steps. In our view, good theology requires a good historical basis, which includes a historical-critical

https://doi.org/10.1017/hor.2022.57 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approach to Scripture. Good theology, on the subject of Jewish-Christian relations, also requires communication between Jews and Christians. We see our volume as contributing to this process.

Peter Zaas wonders whether Pope Francis, whose remarks to the 2019 conference are printed in the volume, will repeat earlier, negative, references to Pharisees in his homilies and other public remarks. The short answer is that, as far as we know, he has not done so since 2019. Our volume does not cite any of these earlier remarks; our goal is to move forward rather than critique individual writers for unfortunate (or worse) phrasing. Our goals for improving Jewish-Christian relations, and so for improving church-based teaching and preaching on the Pharisees, is to look at institutional products, including annotated Bibles, published volumes, church-based art, and other products that show investment beyond an individual.

Zaas asks why Craig Morrison's contribution on interpreting the name "Pharisee" (chapter 1) is presented as a prelude outside the historical framework of the volume. We foregrounded this essay because Morrison's remarks serve as an introduction that alerts the reader to how problematic the term "Pharisee" can be in any context at any time.

We thank Peter Zaas for his insightful observations on various parts of the volume. Especially appreciated is his detailed critical discussion of Paula Fredriksen's chapter on Paul, which he considers "one of the gems" of this collection.

If we can learn from the negative ways Christians—and as Professor Simkovich reminds us, not only Christians—have understood Pharisees and by extension Jews, we can backtrack to our homilies and sermons, lectures and blogs, books and articles, and begin or continue the process of correction. We can begin with Craig Morrison's article and stop promoting the idea of Pharisees as "separating" from other Jews because, as Morrison shows, we neither know the etymology of the name nor, if we did, can we neatly move from etymology to identity. We can show how, as Professor Zaas points out, Jesus often sounds almost like a Sadducee, even to his rejection of Pharisaic moves toward extending priestly privileges to all Israel. We can recover the named Pharisees, as Joseph Sievers has documented, and note that not one of the dozen or so named Pharisees in ancient texts fits the negative stereotypes.[13] We have known about these problems for decades. The time has come to use our scholarship to take action. When you read or hear a negative comment about Pharisees or Jews, say something. If the comment is made in a newspaper or blog, ask for a retraction; if the

[13] Joseph Sievers, "Who Were the Pharisees?," in *Hillel and Jesus*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 137–55.

https://doi.org/10.1017/hor.2022.57 Published online by Cambridge University Press

comment is made in a sermon or homily, ask for a public correction from the pulpit. If the comment is made in passing, do not let it pass. If the hymn has problematic lyrics, change the words. And if the textbook you are using repeats negative stereotypes, write to the editor and, next time, choose another textbook.

JOSEPH SIEVERS
Pontifical Biblical Institute
AMY-JILL LEVINE
Hartford International University for Religion and Peace

https://doi.org/10.1017/hor.2022.57 Published online by Cambridge University Press