

Torah Observance and Radicalization in the First Gospel. Matthew and First-Century Judaism: A Contribution to the Debate*

ÉLIAN CUVILLIER

Faculté de théologie protestante, Montpellier, France

email: Elian.Cuvillier@univ-montp3.fr

L'article analyse la tension, repérable dans quelques passages du premier Évangile, entre l'obéissance aux commandements se situant à l'intérieur du cadre donné par la Loi, et la radicalisation à laquelle invite le Jésus matthéen. L'enquête débute par une exégèse détaillée de Mt 5, 17–20. Dans un second temps, elle s'intéresse à trois épisodes où la tension entre obéissance et radicalisation est apparente: les antithèses du Sermon sur la Montagne (5, 17–48); la controverse sur le divorce (19, 1–9); l'épisode du jeune homme riche (19, 16–22). Dans une troisième partie, l'interrogation porte sur la cohérence des passages analysés avec la déclaration de Jésus en Mt 23, 2–3. Il résulte de l'enquête le constat que le référent du premier Évangile s'est déplacé: la colonne vertébrale structurant la théologie de Matthieu—et donc son identité religieuse—n'est plus prioritairement la Loi et l'obéissance aux commandements, mais le Messie et son enseignement.

Keywords: Gospel of Matthew, Law, Jewish-Christianity, Sermon on the Mount

The fact that the First Gospel is rooted in the traditions of first-century Judaism is obvious. Introductory texts and commentaries typically mention the literary characteristics of Matthew's Gospel only to come to the unanimous conclusion that 'the humus of the First Gospel is Semitic, Old Testament-oriented and Palestinian'.¹ As a counterpart, they similarly highlight the sharpness of his polemical questioning of the Jewish religious leaders of his time.² This goes along with Jesus' numerous controversies with Jewish authorities, especially the

* Main paper read, in French, at the SNTS General Meeting at Lund, Sweden, in 2008. I would like to thank colleagues for their questions and critical remarks during and after the Meeting. I would also like to express my warmest thanks to Mireille Hébert who translated my French manuscript into English and to Douglas Nelson who read it through.

1 B. Rigaux, *Témoignage de l'Évangile de Matthieu* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967) 40.

2 An issue much commented upon. See, for example, U. Luz, 'Le problème historique et théologique de l'anti-judaïsme dans l'Évangile de Matthieu', *Le déchirement. Juifs et chrétiens au premier siècle* (ed. Daniel Marguerat; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1996) 127–50;

Pharisees,³ the polemical use of some passages in the OT,⁴ the invective of chap. 23, as well as some specific Matthean traditions in the story of the Passion intended to heighten the culpability of Israel in the death of Jesus.⁵ Scholars widely agree in their interpretation of this twofold phenomenon. Matthew, who writes his Gospel in the late first century, bears witness to an interpretive conflict which brought him into opposition to the Pharisaic Judaism of his time. It then raises the question as to whether his critiques are *intra muros* or *extra-muros*, i.e., within the walls of Judaism or outside them. In other words, does he interpret himself and his community as still belonging to Judaism or is he consciously assuming a rupture?⁶

The best place to explore the debate concerning Matthew's identity and that of his community is his interpretation of the law. This question is a well-known *crux interpretum* in studies of Matthew's Gospel and whoever studies it takes a place in an extended interpretive tradition.⁷ Contemporary interpretation often formulates

Élian Cuvillier, 'Matthieu et le judaïsme: chronique d'une rupture annoncée', *Foi et Vie* 92 (1993) 41–54.

3 Matt 9.9–17; 12.1–14, 22–32, 38–42; 15.1–20; 16.1–4; 19.1–9; 21.23–27; 22.15–22, 23–33, 41–45.

4 See, for example, Matt 13.14–15; 15.8–9; 23.38; 27.9–10.

5 See, for example, Matt 27.24–25 and 28.11–15.

6 See a rather complete treatment of this issue in Warren Carter, 'Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?', *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (ed. M. Jackson-McCabe; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007) 155–79. Carter holds that Matthew belongs to Judaism, along with A. J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994), and J. A. Overman, *Church and Community in Crisis. The Gospel According to Matthew* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996). The more classical stance is taken by U. Luz, 'L'évangéliste Matthieu: un judéo-chrétien à la croisée des chemins', *La mémoire et le temps. Mélanges offerts à Pierre Bonnard* (ed. D. Marguerat and J. Zumstein; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1991) 77–92; G. N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992); D. A. Hagner, 'Matthew: Apostate, Reformer, Revolutionary?', *NTS* 49 (2003) 193–209. Concerning the tension between particularism and universalism which is evident in Matthew and can be linked to this issue, see Élian Cuvillier, 'Particularisme et universalisme chez Matthieu: quelques hypothèses à l'épreuve du texte', *Biblica* 78 (1997) 481–502; see also *idem*, 'Mission vers Israël ou mission vers les païens? À propos d'une tension féconde dans le premier Évangile', *Analyse narrative et Bible. Deuxième colloque international du RRENAB, Louvain-La-Neuve, avril 2004* (ed. A. Wélin and C. Focant; Leuven: University Press, 2005) 251–8. These two contributions have been reprinted in Élian Cuvillier, *Naissance et enfance d'un Dieu. Jésus-Christ dans l'Évangile de Matthieu* (Paris: Bayard, 2005) 165–78.

7 Among numerous authors dealing with this subject – apart from commentaries on the First Gospel of course—see G. Barth, 'Das Gesetzesverständnis des Evangelisten Matthäus', *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (ed. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1960) 54–154 (English translation: 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law', *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* [London, SCM, 2nd ed. 1983] 58–164); E. Schweizer, 'Matt 5.17–20. Anmerkungen zum Gesetzesverständnis des

the point as follows: In his relationship to the law, does Matthew's Jesus remain within all or part of Jewish tradition and more specifically that of the Pharisees, or does he break with it? Presented in these terms, the question infers that one must explore the understanding of the law in first-century Jewish writings in

Matthäus', *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1963) 399-406; *idem*, 'Noch einmal Mt 5,17-20', *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde* (Stuttgart: KBW, 1974) 75-85; G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Matthäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd ed. 1966) 143-54; B. Corsani, 'La posizione di Gesù di fronte alla legge seconde il Vangelo di Matteo e l'interpretazione di Mt 5,17-20', *Ricerche Bibliche e Religiose* 3 (1968) 193-230; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, 'Attitudes to the Law in Matthew's Gospel: A Discussion of Matthew 5.18', *Biblical Research* 17 (1972) 19-32; R. Banks, 'Matthew's Understanding of the Law: Authenticity and Interpretation in Matthew 5.17-20', *JBL* 93 (1974) 226-42; *idem*, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1975) 204-26; J. P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel. A Redactional Study of Matt. 5.17-48* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976); J. Zumstein, *La condition du croyant dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu* (Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977) 107-27; J. Zumstein, 'Loi et Évangile dans le témoignage de Matthieu', *Miettes exégétiques* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1992) 131-50; L. Sabourin, 'Mathieu 5, 17-20 et le rôle prophétique de la Loi (cf. Mt 11, 13)', *Science et Esprit* 30 (1978) 303-11; U. Luz, 'Die Erfüllung des Gesetzes bei Matthäus (Mt 5,17-20)', *ZThK* 75 (1978) 398-435; D. Wenham, 'Jesus and the Law: An Exegesis on Matthew 5.17-20', *Themelios* 4 (1979) 92-6; N. J. McLeleny, 'The Principles of the Sermon on the Mount', *CBQ* 41 (1979) 552-70; D. Marguerat, *Le jugement dans l'Évangile de Matthieu* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1st ed. 1981, 2nd ed. 1995) 110-41; *idem*, "'Pas un iota ne passera de la Loi..." (Mt 5, 18). La Loi dans l'Évangile de Matthieu', *La Loi dans l'un et l'autre Testament* (ed. C. Focant; Paris: Cerf, 1997) 140-74; H.-D. Betz, 'Die hermeneutischen Prinzipien in der Bergpredigt (Mt 5.17-20)', *Synoptischen Studien* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 111-26 (1st ed. 1982; English trans., 'The Hermeneutical Principles of the Sermon on the Mount', *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985] 37-54); *idem*, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5.3-7.27 and Luke 6.20-49)* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 166-97; P. Beauchamp, 'L'Évangile de Matthieu et l'héritage d'Israël', *RSR* 76 (1988), 5-38; F. Vouga, *Jésus et la Loi selon la tradition synoptique* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1988), 189-301; M. Stiewe and F. Vouga, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne. Un abrégé de l'Évangile dans le miroitement de ses interprétations* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2002), esp. 59-71; M. Dumais, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne. État de la recherche. Interprétation. Bibliographie* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1995), esp. 171-80: 'L'accomplissement de la Loi (Mt 5, 17-20)'; R. K. Snodgrass, 'Matthew and the Law', *Treasures New and Old. Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (ed. David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 99-127; D. A. Hagner, 'Balancing the Old and the New: The Law of Moses in Matthew and Paul', *Interpretation* 51 (1997) 20-30; Élian Cuvillier, 'La Loi comme réalité avant-dernière: Mt 5, 17-20 et son déploiement narratif dans l'Évangile de Matthieu', *Raconter, interpréter, annoncer. Parcours de Nouveau Testament* (ed. Y. Bourquin and E. Steffek; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2003), 81-91; P. Foster, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel* (WUNT 2.177; Tübingen: Mohr, 2004); R. Deines, *Die Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias. Mt 5, 13-20 als Schlüsseltext der matthäischen Theologie* (WUNT 177; Tübingen: Mohr, 2004); C. Focant,

the same way as one does in the First Gospel.⁸ Such an enquiry is largely beyond the scope of this study, so I will restrict my investigation to the examination of the tensions that can be traced in the narrative between obedience to commandments within the framework of the law and the radicalization suggested by the Matthean Jesus, which shatters that framework. What is to be shown in the passages to be studied is the way in which Matthew constructs the relationship between Jesus and the law.⁹

I begin my investigation with a detailed exegesis of Matt. 5.17–20, a key pericope as far as the Matthean interpretation of the law is concerned. Then, I will analyse three passages where the tensions between observance and radicalization can be observed. First, and most naturally, the Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount (5.17–48); second, the divorce controversy (19.1–9); and finally the rich

“D’une montagne à l’autre”. L’accomplissement de la loi et des prophètes dans le Sermon sur la montagne’, *L’unité de l’un et l’autre Testament dans l’œuvre de Paul Beauchamp* (Paris: Facultés jésuites de Paris, 2005) 119–40; W. Reinbold, ‘Das Matthäusevangelium, die Pharisäer und die Tora’, *BZ* 50 (2006) 51–73; M. Konradt, ‘Die vollkommene Erfüllung der Tora und der Konflikt mit den Pharisäern im Matthäusevangelium’, *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament. Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag* (ed. D. Sänger and M. Konradt; Göttingen/Fribourg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006) 129–52. For a helpful summary of the question, see G. N. Stanton ‘The Origin and Purpose of Matthew’s Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945–1980’, *ANRW* II.25.4 (1985) 1889–951; D. Senior, *What Are They Saying about Matthew? A Revised and Expanded Edition* (Mahwah: Paulist, 1996) 62–73. For a more complete bibliography (up to 1992), see M. Dumais, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne*, 171–3.

⁸ On this, see the now classic E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977; German trans., *Paulus und das palästinische Judentum. Ein Vergleich zweier Religionsstrukturen* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985]). Sanders’ theses are questioned today, and the fact that ‘covenantal nomism’ cannot account for the diversity of first-century Jewish trends is particularly stressed; cf. C. L. Quarles, ‘The Soteriology of R. Akiba and E. P. Sanders’ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*’, *NTS* 42 (1996) 185–95; *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Vol. 1: *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (ed. D. A. Carson, P. T. O’Brien and M. A. Seifrid; Tübingen: Mohr, 2001); also, D. Steinmetz, ‘Justification by Deed: The Conclusion of the Sanhedrin-Makkot and Paul’s Rejection of Law’, *HUCA* 76 (2005) 133–87 (on Sanders in particular, see 173–5). For a wider study of the law in Second Temple Judaism, see A.-M. Denis, ‘La place de la loi de Moïse à Qumrân et dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple’, *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*. Part 2. *The Teacher of Righteousness: Literary Studies* (ed. J. Z. Kapera; Kraków: Enigma, 1991) 149–75; H. Lichtenberger, ‘Das Tora-Verständnis im Judentum zur Zeit des Paulus. Eine Skizze’, *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. J. D. G. Dunn; Tübingen: Mohr, 1996) 7–23; H. Hoffmann, *Das Gesetz in der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999); S. Burkes, ‘“Life” Redefined: Wisdom and Law in Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch’, *CBQ* 63 (2001) 55–71.

⁹ I do not discuss here the accuracy of Matthew’s presentation of the Pharisaic understanding of the law—a highly controversial debate which is beyond the scope of this study.

young man episode (19.16–22). The third and final part of my investigation will examine how these passages are consistent with what Jesus declares in Matt. 23.2–3. My conclusion will offer some reflections about Matthew’s relationship with the Judaism of his time.

1. Matthew 5.17–20: Obedience to the Commandments and Superior Righteousness

Matthew 5.17–20¹⁰ is central, not only within the Sermon on the Mount, but more widely in the Gospel as a whole. It is, indeed, Jesus’ very first declaration about the meaning of his coming (v. 17: ἦλθον).¹¹ It is significant in that it concerns his relationship to the law and the prophets. The argumentation which is used must therefore be analysed very carefully.

Verse 17

The beginning deserves attention. The very way in which the misunderstanding about Jesus’ coming is formulated (τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας) shows that Matthew gives Jesus authority over the most basic Jewish traditions: Jesus is superior to the law and the prophets, since his coming raises the issue of whether they are permanent or coming to an end. His coming provokes a new definition of the current religious traditions and becomes the standard for re-evaluating them.¹²

In opposition to those who hold that his coming implies the abolishment of the law and the prophets (μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον) the Matthean Jesus actually repudiates this idea. He has not come to ‘abolish’ (καταλύσαι), but to ‘fulfil’ (πληρῶσαι). The idea of fulfilment is typically Matthean. The verb πληρῶσαι is never used for the disciples,¹³ but is exclusively applied to the interpretation of

10 My choice is to interpret the text in its final redaction. For the traditions used by Matthew and his redactional activity, see Meier, *Law and History*. It is generally held that Matthew altered the traditional form of vv. 18–19, wrote v. 17 and entirely composed v. 20. Of course, scholarship has discussed at length the details of this consensus.

11 In the remainder of the narrative, Jesus pronounces three declarations, all starting with ἦλθον: they stress an important element of the Matthean reflection on the work of the Messiah. Besides 5.17 (Jesus fulfils the law), see 9.13 (Jesus calls the sinners), 10.34 (Jesus is the cause of discord), and 20.18 (Jesus as servant). According to Zumstein (*La condition du croyant*, 117), ‘les paroles en ἦλθον décrivent [...] de manière rétrospective et synthétique le sens de la mission du Christ’.

12 Jesus is the ‘didascalie eschatologique’, as Daniel Marguerat puts it (‘Pas un iota’, 146).

13 C. Focant, ‘Eschatologie et questionnement éthique dans l’Évangile de Matthieu’ (to be published in *Actes du Colloque ‘Eschatologie et Morale’, Paris 15–17 mars 2008* [Paris: Desclée] 7), aptly notes that the disciples are ‘invités à produire (ποιεῖν) du fruit (3, 8.10; 21, 43), à

Jesus' coming in connection with the traditions of Judaism. Should the verb be interpreted in the sense of 'observing' the commandments of the law and the prophets, or of 'fulfilling the promises' they contain?¹⁴ To answer this question one must take into account Matthew's other uses of the verb as well as the immediate context (5.21–48). First let us note that in v. 17 the opposition is not between 'abolishing' and 'obeying' but between 'abolishing' and 'fulfilling'. And in Matthew, the verb πληρόω is used in the context of fulfilment (see the phrase ἵνα πληρώθῃ or equivalent) in order to express the conviction that the Scriptures, i.e., the law and the prophets, are accomplished in Jesus (see 1.22–23; 2.15, 17–18, 23; 4.14–16; 8.17; 12.17–21; 13.14–15, 35; 21.4–5; 27.9–10; also 26.54, 56).¹⁵ It is not therefore primarily the law understood as commandments which is at stake here—that will be the case in the next verse—but the 'law and the prophets' as an expression of the will of God and hope for Israel.¹⁶ The verb 'fulfil' has a meaning here which goes beyond the simple issue of observance of the commandments: for Matthew Jesus fulfils the hope of Israel by giving the law and the prophets' promises their real meaning.¹⁷ This will be confirmed by the Antitheses (5.21–48) in which Jesus goes far beyond the demands of the law (see below 2.1).

pratiquer (ποιεῖν) les commandements (5, 19), leur justice (6, 1) ou la volonté de Dieu (7, 21; 12, 50; voir aussi 7, 12.24.26; 23, 3; 24, 40.45), à chercher (ζητεῖν) la justice du Royaume (6, 33) et enfin à garder (τηρεῖν) les commandements (19, 17; 23, 3) ou tout ce que Jésus a prescrit'. I am very grateful to the author for having made his text available to me.

- 14 This is a rather compressed way of dealing with a more complex debate. On the various interpretations of the verb (nine in total), see W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew, I–VII* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988) 485–6.
- 15 On this see J. Miler, *Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile de Matthieu. Quand Dieu se rend présent en toute humanité* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1999).
- 16 The phrase 'the law and the prophets' can be found in Matt 7.12, which results in a long inclusion starting with 5.17. So the Sermon on the Mount is indeed an illustration of the way Matthew's Jesus fulfils them. And as we shall see, this fulfilling goes beyond simple legal obedience.
- 17 So also Dumais, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne*, 175: 'Jésus est venu accomplir l'Écriture, cela veut dire qu'il la porte à son achèvement, à sa perfection, à la signification complète; il la réalise, non pas en "exécutant" ses demandes telles quelles, mais en la dépassant, en lui faisant porter un sens nouveau'; Focant, 'D'une montagne à l'autre', 139: 'Jésus ne se présente ni comme un transgresseur de la loi dans son action concrète, ni comme un strict observant toujours prêt à étendre le champ de la loi. Son interprétation de la Torah d'Israël ne vise certes pas à l'annuler. Il veut plutôt la conduire à sa plénitude'; also Zumstein, *La condition du croyant*, 119–20; Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel*, 224–6; Davies and Allison, *Matthew, I–VII*, 486–7. For the opposite viewpoint (i.e. by obeying its commandments Jesus 'fulfils' the law), see Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 179: the verb πληρόω 'describe[s] a process of legal interpretation'.

Verses 18–19

It is the status of the law as letter (ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραία) and commandment (ἐντολή) which is now exposed in vv. 18–19. The scope of reflection is reduced compared to v. 17 (18: ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου versus 17: τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας).

Verse 18 bears witness to the importance attached by the evangelist to the observance of the commandments of the law. The claim corresponds to numerous texts in contemporaneous Judaism which stress the immutability of the law.¹⁸ Matthew agrees with the majority of the Jewish trends of his time. Yet, the way he constructs the verse is quite significant. The assertion of the permanence of the law—starting with the word ‘Amen’, which emphasizes its authoritative character—is actually framed by two clauses introduced by ἕως which indicate its limits and ‘moderate [its] absoluteness’:¹⁹

ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν
 For truly, I say to you,
 ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ
 until heaven and earth pass away,
 ἰῶτα ἐν ἡ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου
 not an iota, not a dot will pass from the law,
 ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται
 until all has happened.

As regards the meaning of the two clauses beginning with ἕως ἂν the debate is largely open. Some scholars contend that the phrase ‘until heaven and earth pass away’ stands for ‘never’,²⁰ whereas for others it refers to the end of time.²¹ The debate concerning the second clause is more complicated: does ‘until all has happened’ mean ‘until all the commandments are observed’ (the ethical

18 Cf. Bar. 4.1: ‘This is the book of the commandments of God, and the law, that is for ever (ὁ νόμος ὁ ὑπάρχων εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα); all they that keep it, shall come to life: but they that have forsaken it, to death’; Wis. 18.4: ‘the incorruptible light of the law (τὸ ἀφθαρτον νόμου φῶς)’; 2 Bar. 77.15: ‘And though we depart, yet the law remains’; Pseudo-Philo, LAB 11.2: ‘an everlasting law’; Josephus, *Apion* 2.277: ‘for though we be deprived of our wealth, of our cities, or of the other advantages we have, our law continues immortal (ὁ νόμος ἡμῖν ἀθάνατος διαμένει)’; 4 *Ezra* 9.36–7: ‘For we who have received the law and sinned will perish, as well as our heart which received it; the law, however, does not perish but remains in its glory’.

19 Dumais, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne*, 177: ‘[Qui] viennent nuancer [...] le caractère absolu de l’affirmation’. Cf. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 183: ‘The authority of Scripture is temporally limited’.

20 U. Luz, *Matthew 1–7* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1989) 266.

21 Meier, *Law and History*, 164; Zumstein, *La condition du croyant*, 121.

interpretation)²² or ‘until Christ accomplishes the Scripture through his death and resurrection’ (the Christological interpretation)?²³ Or must we understand the second statement as repeating and clarifying the first one, thereby eliminating the possibility of interpreting it as ‘never’?²⁴ It seems to me that the second hypothesis best corresponds to the textual data. It takes into account the specific structure of the verse: the two statements starting with ἕως ἄν echo each other and stand as a counterbalance to the affirmation of the validity of the law. On the other hand, they are to be heard in contrast with another of the Matthean Jesus’ sayings in Matt 24.35:

ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται
 Heaven and earth will pass away
 οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν
 but my words will certainly not pass away.²⁵

If the idea that the law will exist as long as heaven and earth do can be found in Judaism (see in particular a similar phrase introduced by ἕως ἄν in Philo, *Vita Mosis*, 2.14)²⁶ the affirmation that the Messiah’s words will not pass away even if heaven and earth do seems unique to Matthew’s Gospel when compared to the Jewish literature of the time. He considers that the Messiah Jesus’ sayings are absolutely permanent whereas the permanence of the law is relative.²⁷ Matt

22 Zumstein, *La condition du croyant*, 122; Marguerat, *Le jugement dans l’Évangile de Matthieu*, 130.

23 Meier, *Law and History*, 61–5; Banks, *Jesus and the Law*, 213–18.

24 Davies and Allison, *Matthew, I–VII*, 495.

25 Matt 24.34–35 as a whole is indeed close to Matt 5.18 as far as vocabulary and phrasing are concerned. This can be clearly seen in the synoptic table below:

Matt 5.18 <u>ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἕως ἄν παρέλθῃ</u> <u>ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἴωτα ἔν ἡ μία</u> <u>κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου,</u> <u>ἕως ἄν πάντα γένηται</u>	Matt 24.34–5 <u>ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ</u> <u>αὕτη ἕως ἄν πάντα ταῦτα γένηται.</u> <u>ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσεται, οἱ δὲ</u> <u>λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσιν</u>
---	--

This might point to a Matthean rewriting of 5.18 (// Luke 16.17) on the pattern of Matt 24.34–35 (// Mark 13.30–1). Furthermore, it should be noted that in 24.34 Mathew uses ἕως ἄν instead of Mark’s μέχρις.

26 ‘But the enactments of this lawgiver are firm, not shaken by commotions, not liable to alteration, but stamped as it were with the seal of nature herself, and they remain firm and lasting from the day on which they were first promulgated to the present one, and there may well be a hope that they will remain to all future time, as being immortal, as long as the sun and the moon, and the whole heaven and the whole world shall endure ὡσπερ ἀθάνατα, ἕως ἄν ἥλιος καὶ σελήνη καὶ ὁ σύμπας οὐρανὸς τε καὶ κόσμος ᾗ (*Vita Mosis* 2.14).

27 On this point, the stance of U. Luz (*Matthew 21–28* [Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005] 208) is rather surprising: ‘Many readers probably will also have seen here a (perhaps

24.35 is an indirect confirmation of the above observations about the meaning of ἡλθον: Jesus does have authority over the law.

Verse 19²⁸ stresses, however, that the permanence of the law, though relative, implies that no one can be exempted from submitting to it. Moreover, there is a qualification (κληθήσεται) inside the kingdom which depends on the quality of obedience, thus establishing a hierarchy (ἐλάχιστος 'least' or μέγας 'great').²⁹ It should be noted however that this hierarchy will be minimized in the remainder of the narrative (see Matt 11.11³⁰ and 20.16³¹). In this verse the difficult point is to interpret the phrase 'one of these commandments' (μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων [emphasis added]): they could be either the commandments of the law or the new commandments formulated by Jesus, especially in the Antitheses (see Matt 7.24.26: 'these words of mine', μου τούς λόγους τούτους; and 28.20: 'teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you').³² I personally see nothing to support the latter. On the contrary, as Davies and Allison put it, 'the

intentional) reference back to 5.18. As in the case with the words of the Torah, Jesus' words [...] are eternally valid.' Also n. 15: 'Since "until heaven and earth pass away" most likely means "never" [...], we hardly have here the case that the words of Jesus surpass the Torah'. This is in contrast with Davies and Allison's commentary on Matt 24.35 (*Matthew, XIX-XXVIII* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997] 368): 'That the world will pass away—already stated in 5.18...was common conviction...and ours is not the only text to contrast the passing of heaven and earth with something of greater endurance (cf. Isa 51.6). But here that something is Jesus' speech, which therefore sets him above Torah...and makes his words like God's words (cf. Ps 119.89; Isa 40.8): they possess eternal authority'. In the same way, cf. D. C. Sim ('The Meaning of παλιγγενεσία in Matthew 19.28', *JSNT* 50 [1993] 3–12): 'If we take together Matt 24.35 and 5.18, and the similarity in wording suggests that we should, then the Evangelist makes the overall point that while the Law is not eternal, the words of Jesus are. One set of teachings will survive the eschatological destruction of the cosmos and the other will not' (9); on 8–9 n. 12, Sim points out that Luz had initially defended the view of Matt 5.18 meaning that the law remains valid until the end of the world (cf. Luz, 'Die Erfüllung der Gesetzes', 417–18). Sim adds: 'Luz has since rejected this exegesis and now holds the alternative view that the passing of heaven and earth is a roundabout way of saying "never"; the law thus remains valid forever... This understanding of the expression runs against its normal apocalyptic meaning in Matthew's day...and makes nonsense of the contrast in 24.35.'

28 This verse is a typically casuistical formula that belongs to the vocabulary of sacred law (Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 184).

29 An idea that can be found in rabbinic literature, in which a difference is made between 'light' (*gallin*) and 'heavy' (*hamarin*) commandments, and grades in the kingdom defined according to obedience (see H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* [6 vols.; Munich: Beck, 2 unveränderte Auflage, 1954–56] 1.249–50).

30 'Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he'.

31 'So the last shall be first, and the first last'.

32 Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 186–7; Dumais, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne*, 178–80.

οὖν and the flow of thought are decisive. Beyond this, where is the Matthean parallel to applying “lesser” and “greater” to the sayings of Jesus? Or to calling Jesus’ words ἐντολαί [...]? And does not the λύω in 5.19 take the reader’s mind back to the καταλύω in 5.17, where the Torah is indisputably the subject?³³

Verse 20

If the transgression or the observance of commandments leads to the establishment of a hierarchy within the kingdom, only ‘righteousness’ (δικαιοσύνη) can attain it. More precisely, to enter the kingdom requires a righteousness superior (περισσεύση ... πλεῖον) to that of the scribes and Pharisees, namely, a way of understanding the law different from theirs. The Antitheses which follow (5.21–48) will make this plain. In Matthew’s Gospel, righteousness has been ‘accomplished’ beforehand (3.15, πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην) by Jesus when he showed solidarity with those who needed the baptism of repentance proclaimed by the Baptist. In Matt 5.20, Matthew gives the term a polemical dimension: to the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees, he opposes the superior righteousness to which the disciples bear witness.³⁴ How then must we understand the ‘surpassing’ required by the Matthean Jesus? Is it characterized by *quantity* or by *quality*? A close reading of the Antitheses should allow us to answer this question.

When comparing v. 17 and vv. 18–19, we have noted the first shift of language: leaving the fulfilling of the law and the prophets, we have come to reflect on the permanence of the Torah. There is a new shift between vv. 18–19 and v. 20: passing from the idea of law to that of ‘superior righteousness’ which this time denotes a wider scope. The Torah seen as a collection of commandments is replaced by ‘superior righteousness’. This shift in language explains the tension which may be felt in this passage:³⁵ transgressing even one of the least of these commandments of the law, and therefore being called the least in the kingdom (v. 19), assumes that one has already been admitted. Therefore a righteousness surpassing that of the Pharisees, which alone gives access to the kingdom (v. 20) must have been at work. For Matthew it is not literal obedience to the

33 Davies and Allison, *Matthew, I–VII*, 496.

34 The fact that this righteousness is identified as the disciples’ righteousness (‘your righteousness’; see also 6.1) does not contradict the sense of the word δικαιοσύνη, where it points to what the Matthean Jesus has come to accomplish. Indeed, because of Matt 3.15 it appears that for Matthew, the ‘superior righteousness’ originates from Jesus’ practice. Quite different is the issue of whether the righteousness required is given to the disciples by God, a point that is widely disputed by scholarship.

35 According to Luz (*Matthew 1–7*, 270), Matthew ‘does not sense’ this tension, and members of his community ‘were not able to see’ it.

law which is primary, but the achievement of a righteousness which the evangelist considers superior to that of the scribes and Pharisees.

Conclusion. From Matthew's point of view, Jesus is the one who fulfils 'the law and the prophets', i.e., the promises of the Scriptures (v. 17) and so gives them their real meaning. As regards observance of the commandments, the Matthean Jesus, while underlining its importance, introduces a twofold discrepancy. First, the permanence of the law is relative (vv. 18–19); second, obedience to commandments is not the criterion for entering the kingdom of heaven. Access to the kingdom assumes the practice of a righteousness surpassing that of the scribes and Pharisees (v.20). The Antitheses will show that this righteousness must exceed the ordinary observance of the Torah.

2. Observance of the Law and Radicalization in Three Passages of the Gospel

2.1 *The Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5.21–48)*

The Antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount provide a direct illustration of the understanding of the law as it is displayed in 5.17–20. In each antithesis, the leading strand is a 'not only but also' logic. Not only murder but also hatred, not only adultery but also the lustful look, and so on: they are all contrary to the will of God. The interpretation of the law proposed by Matthew's Jesus surpasses simple obedience to commandments, which is the rule which enables human beings to live together.³⁶ Jesus proposes an attitude which the law does not demand: he proposes to go beyond the usually required obedience to the law (5.18–19) to gain access to a righteousness which exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees (5.20), a righteousness based on excess.

However, it is interesting to note that what was formerly 'told to the elders' (ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, 5.21, 27, 33, see also 5.31, 38, 43) is the basis of the Matthean Jesus' interpretation. Indeed, the old interpretation must be assumed in order to receive the new one. Not getting angry with one's brother (5.22) implies observance of the commandment not to kill him (5.21). Not looking with lust at a woman (5.28) implies the commandment not to commit adultery (5.27). Non-resistance to the wicked supposes the previous acknowledgment of the principle of the *lex talionis* (5.38). The twofold demand to love one's neighbour and to hate one's enemy (5.43) must have been heard before the call also to love one's enemy (5.44). Insofar as the validity of the law is acknowledged, Jesus comes as a messenger whose sayings go beyond its traditional interpretation. Obedience to commandments implicitly assumed is therefore not

³⁶ Obviously, the fact that for Matthew Torah observance guarantees good relationships within the community underlies the evolution of the narrative when Jesus affirms: 'And because iniquity (τὴν ἀνομίαν) shall abound, the love of many shall grow cold' (Matt 24.12).

primary—although it is not secondary either—when compared with a righteousness which goes beyond the traditional understanding of the law and can even be in tension with it.

By inviting his audience to acknowledge a relationship between humans and with God which surpasses³⁷ the usually admitted rules, Jesus actually appears as the one who fulfils the law and the prophets, and not as the one who abrogates them (5.17). This fulfilling is then characterized by *quality* not *quantity*.³⁸ Jesus' radicalization of the law seeks to awaken his hearers to a new way of understanding God, oneself and others. In the remainder of the narrative, the divorce controversy (Matt 19.1–12) and the episode of the wealthy young man (Matt 19.16–30) operate as a confirmation of the Matthean hermeneutics of Jesus' attitude to the law.

2.2 *The Divorce Controversy (Matthew 19.1–12)*

Jesus' sayings about divorce, addressed to the Pharisees, go beyond the commandment, just as they do in the Antitheses (see 5.31–32). To the letter of

37 This is close to what P. Ricœur (*Lectures III. Aux frontières de la philosophie* [Paris: Seuil, 1994] esp. 277ff.) calls the ethics of 'surabondance', which for him is 'supra-éthique' or even 'méta-éthique', namely, beyond ethics. Indeed, we can talk of an ethics close to what could be called common morality, i.e., the law. It is ruled by the golden rule (Matt 7.12): be concerned by the other as another self. On the other hand, there is what could be called an ethics of the subject, which is always singular and which diverts the logic of reciprocity only to replace it by a different principle—Ricœur's logic of overabundance – which implies giving for the sake of giving, and which then seems to surpass ethics. For Ricœur, loving one's enemies (Matt 5.44) is a good example since that kind of love can never be normalized by ethics; it can only be a suspension of ethics due to excess or overabundance. In other words, loving enemies can never become common law; it can only be a possible possibility for the subject to break up the logic of reciprocity to let another logic take place. For Ricœur, there is no question of choosing or mixing up the two fields – ethics or supra-ethics—but rather of articulating them or keeping them in a permanent dialectic tension which must never be settled. In a similar way, cf. also J.-D. Causse, 'Le Sermon sur la Montagne: critique freudienne et redéploiement éthique', *Revue d'éthique et de théologie morale* 250 (2008) 9–21 (21): 'On se tromperait à...lire [le Sermon sur la Montagne] comme un nouveau code moral, même une morale plus haute ou supérieure, faisant appel au surpassement de soi-même. La performativité du récit, pour parler le langage de la pragmatique de la communication, réside dans la naissance d'une subjectivité qui donne forme à un être et à un agir.'

38 The use of hyperbolic rhetoric indicates that Matthew's Jesus' speech does not aim at a precise depiction of practices, except to render excess reasonable and to bring superior righteousness (5.20) back into strict obedience to commandments which would be those of the Messiah. As Focant notes ('Eschatologie', 8) a radicalizing tendency 'est certes à l'œuvre dans les divers courants du bas-judaïsme. Toutefois, la radicalisation juive de la Loi à cette époque est plutôt quantitative et elle se développe de manière extensive dans la halakha, tandis que celle du Jésus de Matthieu s'éloigne de la casuistique et est plutôt qualitative.' On this, see H. Braun, *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2nd ed., 1969); also G. Theissen, *Le mouvement de Jésus. Histoire sociale d'une révolution des valeurs* (Paris: Cerf, 2006).

the law proclaimed by Moses (see 19.7: Μωσῆς ἐνετείλατο) Jesus opposes God's original purpose (19.4: ὁ κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and 19.8: ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως). In his initial plans God never envisaged the separation of a man and his wife (19.4–6), so that if the Pharisees do obey the commandment when they write certificates of divorce, they do so because of the hardness of hearts (19.18). Therefore, when they obey the commandments of the law they disobey the will of God!³⁹

By putting the will of God back into the foreground, Jesus' radicalization contests a patriarchal vision of divorce which gave husbands liberty to divorce their wives.⁴⁰ Jesus' stance protects de facto the weak (the wife according to the representations of the time), whereas the Pharisaic interpretation of the commandment, although more liberal, favours the powerful (the husband).

The disciples' reaction (in 19.10–12 Matthew develops Mark 10.10–11) expresses one of the inferred effects of Jesus' radicalization: according to them it is better not to get married (19.10: οὐ συμφέρει γαμήσαι)! Jesus' answer, especially in 19.12 about those who made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom, confirms this logic of radicalization: if the law allows Pharisees to order their lives according to the world, Jesus invites his audience to order theirs according to the kingdom of heaven which is situated quite differently. Similarly, superior righteousness (5.20 and 21–48) gives access to the kingdom of heaven, and goes beyond the observance of the commandment which regulates life in a worldly community.

2.3 *Dialogue with the Rich Young Man (Matthew 19.16–30)*

This episode is an extension of the perspective opened by the pericope about divorce. Matthew once again deals with the question of observance of Torah observance, but this time in a nonconflictual way. Jesus answers the young man seeking eternal life (19.16), inviting him to obey the commandments (19.17: τήρησον τὰς ἐντολάς) and gives him some examples (19.18–19). When the young man replies that he has observed them since he was a child (19.20), Jesus adds a double demand: he should sell all his possessions and follow Jesus (19.21) in order to achieve 'perfection' (τέλειος; cf. 5.48: τέλειοι). The sorrowfulness of the young man (19.22) shows that it is impossible for him to fulfil the

39 In keeping with 5.31–32, Matthew undoubtedly limits the radicalization: see the use of πορνεία (19.9). However, the Matthean Jesus does part from Moses' more liberal rule. D. C. Allison ('Divorce, Celibacy and Joseph', *JSNT* 49 [1993] 3–10) interpreted this double restriction in connection with the figure of Joseph the 'righteous' who, suspecting adultery, chooses to leave Mary (Matt 1.18–25).

40 See also W. Carter, *Households and Discipleship. A Study of Matthew 19–20* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994) 63: 'Against a patriarchal understanding of marriage concerned with what a man may do to end the marriage, Jesus asserts the original divine purpose for marriage of unity and permanence'. Later, he adds that Jesus in fact limits 'the use of male power' (71).

demand: he cannot renounce his possessions. Jesus then qualifies the initial quest for eternal life (19.16): it is difficult for the rich to enter the kingdom of heaven (see 19.23: εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν // 5.20: οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν; see also 18.3). Then comes the question of the disciples about ‘salvation’ (19.25: τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι). Jesus stresses that what is impossible for humans is possible for God. It is interesting to note that what is impossible for humans is not observing the commandments of the law (as it is said in 19.18, they are adapted to the hardness of human heart) but following Christ’s demands. This confirms that the Torah is secondary compared to Jesus’ sayings, which display a logic of radicalization similar to that analyzed in 5.17–48.⁴¹ As in the previous episode, the reaction of the disciples—which in this case comes from Mark’s Gospel—confirms the hermeneutical frame of Jesus’ speech. The disciples claim that they have left everything to follow Jesus. They will therefore be rewarded when the Son of Man comes: their stance situates them squarely in the logic of the kingdom of heaven and of the radicalizing words of Jesus, and not in that of the world and the law. Once again Jesus’ sayings are primary with regard to the law.

A last point is to be noted here. If the polemical dimension of the divorce controversy is clear cut, the rich young man episode does not present him as an adversary of Jesus. Jesus’ radicalization as it is presented by Matthew is thus not only in reaction to the Pharisaic tradition. More basically, it is constitutive of its relation to the law.

3. Radicalization Put to the Test: Matthew 23.2–3

The results of our investigation should now be confronted with other passages in Matthew, in particular those which seem to follow another direction.⁴² The one I have selected is probably the most difficult to relate to the passages we have studied. It concerns Jesus’ statement about the authority of scribes and Pharisees who ‘sit on Moses’ seat’ (v. 2): one must listen to their words but not replicate their deeds (23.3: πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε, κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε). The passage is typically considered as an illustration of the deep rootedness of the First Gospel in Jewish traditions. It is the

41 The viewpoint of Davies and Allison (*Matthew, XIX–XXVIII* [Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1997] 62–3) is completely different. Having stressed the various parallels between the story of the rich young man and the Sermon on the Mount, they conclude (63): ‘In sum, both the SM and Matt 19.16–30, affirm the Torah’. On the contrary, it seems to me that the pericope 19.16–30 and the Antitheses alike go beyond the Torah, at least in their traditional interpretation. In both cases Jesus’ speech carries out a kind of radicalization.

42 What I have in mind here are all the controversies which must be taken into account to sharpen or modulate the matter. Moreover, a passage such as 11.18–20 seems to lead in a direction opposite to that of radicalization.

articulation with the passages studied above which is difficult: the Matthean Jesus seems to be clearly in continuity with the Pharisees as far as the law is concerned, and in opposition to the radicalization through excess which we have analyzed.

In a very suggestive article, Mark Allan Powell⁴³ exposes the problem and proposes a solution to resolve it. According to him, the passage must be interpreted as follows: The scribes and Pharisees ‘sit on Moses’ seat’ because in the first-century context they guard the scrolls of the Torah and are the only ones allowed to read them in public. Those who want access to the original texts are therefore completely dependent on them. In spite of this, one must not do as they do—which must be understood in a wider sense as their interpretation. In other words, Matthew’s Jesus affirms that they possess the texts (one could say the ‘letter’), yet they do not know how to interpret them (they are incapable of revealing the ‘spirit’).

The episode where Herod consults the scribes in Matt 2.4–6 illustrates this hypothesis. In order to confirm the birthplace of the ‘King of the Jews’, Herod must consult the scribes: they alone possess the texts and are able to read them publicly. Yet this scriptural competence does not change their attitude: they remain unmoved in Jerusalem while essential events take place in Bethlehem. Scribes can read the text but cannot interpret it. One must then listen to their reading and do as the letter of the text requires (that is what the Magi do in Matt 2.1–12), but one must not follow their actions, which reveal their interpretation (for instance, their immobility in Matt 2.1–12).

Listening to the reading of the law by the scribes and Pharisees does not mean that one must follow their understanding of the way in which the commandments should be observed. Jesus invites his audience to listen to the reading of the written law given by the scribes and Pharisees, but not to their interpretation. In the Sermon on the Mount, and more generally in the entire narrative, Jesus ceaselessly opposes his own interpretation to theirs. This solution finds support earlier in the narrative, in Matt 16.5–12, where Matthew’s Jesus warns the disciples against the teaching of the ‘Pharisees and Sadducees’⁴⁴ (see 16.12: τότε συνήκαν ὅτι οὐκ εἶπεν προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν ἄρτων ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων).

4. Conclusion

If Matthew’s Gospel bears witness to a deep rootedness in first-century Judaism, various elements in the narrative suggest however that it advocates a Messianism which can be characterized as radical. The way in which Matthew envisions Jesus’ stance to the law is a good illustration of this. Though the law

43 M. A. Powell, ‘Do and Keep What Moses Says (Matthew 23.2–7)’, *JBL* 114 (1995) 419–35.

44 The different identity of the opponents (‘scribes and Pharisees’ in Matt 23, ‘Pharisees and Sadducees’ in 16.5–12) is minor and insignificant in this case.

remains at the heart of Matthew's religious world, it is no longer obedience to its commandments that regulates the life of the disciples, but rather Jesus' teaching which is characterized by the logic of excess. That logic confronts Jesus' audience not with general rules but rather with their own individual responsibility as creatures before God and the neighbour.

Matthew develops what I propose to call a radical form of Jewish Messianism—which will later be called a Christology.⁴⁵ His reflection is an important element in the reconfiguration of the religious landscape at a time of complete transformation. However, when he writes his Gospel, boundaries between different groups are not yet what they will be in the second century. It may well be anachronistic to call him a 'Christian', but the evangelist is nonetheless in conflict with the post-70s 'synagogue across the street',⁴⁶ i.e., the Judaism whose Pharisaic identity is unquestionable. The First Gospel's referent has been displaced: the pillar which sustains Matthew's theology—and therefore his religious identity—is no longer primarily the law and obedience to its commandments, but the Messiah and his teaching. The radicalism of this teaching will become the issue of a hermeneutical debate which is as complex as the debate about the law; Jesus' sayings actually raise the question of their practicability. Throughout the history of Christian theology one of the answers will be to interpret this radicalization as the impossibility for human beings to justify themselves through Torah observance.⁴⁷

45 On this, one may follow Marguerat who contends ('Pas un iota', 166) that in Matthew's Gospel, 'de bout en bout, la Loi est pensée à partir de la christologie'.

46 G. N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 122. The expression is usually attributed to K. Stendahl, *The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament* (Lund: Gleerup, 1954 [Philadelphia, Fortress, 2nd ed., 1968]).

47 See, for example, Martin Luther. In a sermon on the fifth commandment as it is interpreted by Jesus in the Antitheses, he wonders about the significance of such a radicalization and answers: 'Il [Jésus] place le but si haut que personne ne l'atteint'. From that he infers: 'Où y a-t-il quelqu'un qui ne se met jamais en colère? Le cinquième commandement est interprété là de façon à mener à la mort et dans le feu infernal et à ne laisser monter personne au ciel.' Indeed, this commandment cannot be observed but 'sous l'ombre de la grâce' (cited from Stiewe and Vouga, *Le Sermon sur la Montagne*, 151).