

**How the Divorce/Remarriage Tradition
in 1 Corinthians 7 Sheds Light on the
Interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels.**

**Daniel J. Webster
Master of Theology**

**December, 2020
Moore Theological College
Newtown, N. S. W.**

**Submitted in partial fulfillment for the degree
of Master of Theology.**

Declaration of Original Authorship

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own work and to the best of my knowledge contains no materials previously published or written by another person. It contains no material extracted in whole or part by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma. No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis. I also declare that any assistance received from others in terms of design, style, presentation and linguistic expression is acknowledged.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D. Webster', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

1st December, 2020.

Declaration of Primary Supervisor

I consider that this thesis is in a form suitable for examination and conforms to the requirements of Moore College for the degree of Master of Theology.

Rev. Dr. Lionel Windsor

Abstract

Divorce and remarriage is a controversial topic in relation to biblical interpretation. In seeking to interpret Jesus' teaching on the topic (as presented in the Synoptics), the exegete faces various interpretive uncertainties. The thesis of the present study is that an examination of Paul's use of the Jesus Tradition (JT) on divorce and remarriage in 1 Cor 7 can shed light on such interpretive uncertainties.

The study first outlines a model for the use and transmission of JT. This in turn leads to a method for identifying the stable core of a JT as well as the kinds of flexibility applied to it. This model is applied to four instantiations of the divorce/remarriage JT in the Synoptics (Matt 5:32; 19:1-12; Mark 10:1-12; Luke 16:18). As well as identifying a stable core and certain kinds of flexibility, this process also identifies seven interpretive uncertainties in relation to the Synoptic instantiations.

The study then turns to Paul. It first establishes that he is a faithful interpreter of the JT, legitimately developing JT for his audiences within his rhetorical purposes. It applies the above method (adjusted for genre) to Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7. In doing so, it identifies three particularities of Paul's understanding of divorce/remarriage that are not explicit in the Synoptics.

In the seventh chapter of the study, these particularities are used to shed light on the seven interpretive uncertainties identified in the Synoptics. The study concludes that the stable core of the JT could be clarified in the

following two ways.

1. The focus of the JT is neither divorce alone, remarriage alone, nor divorce in cases of πορνεία. Its primary focus is divorce *for* remarriage. It *probably* also relates to divorce and remarriage when reconciliation is still possible and *possibly* also to cases when reconciliation is not possible (excepting cases when the former spouse has remarried).
2. Illegitimate divorce does not end a marriage (hence the remarriage is adulterous), however such a remarriage ultimately dissolves the marriage union.

Copyright Declaration

I hereby grant Moore College the right to archive and make available my thesis in whole or part in the College Library in all forms of media subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. I retain all proprietary rights and the right to use in future works all or part of my thesis.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D. Webster', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

10th February, 2021.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge five groups of people.

First, I acknowledge my family. My lovely wife gave unwavering support, making space for me, encouraging me and listening patiently to my half-formed ideas. My children were also patient when daddy was unable to play.

Second, I would like to acknowledge the support of my supervisor. The title “supervisor” does not do justice to the help he gave me throughout.

Third, I would like to acknowledge my superiors at the seminary where I serve and at the agency that seconds me. They both willingly agreed to reduce my teaching load so as to allow me space to finish this work.

Fourth, I have come to appreciate to a greater extent the community of Christian theologians, lay and professional, past and present, known to me and unknown. Some have written helpfully centuries ago. Others asked me probing questions over a cup of tea. I am increasingly thankful for them all.

Finally, I am thankful to my Lord Jesus Christ who sustains, enables and reveals. I have come to appreciate more the apostolicity of my faith and the faithfulness of those Apostles.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 VALUE OF THIS STUDY	1
1.2 STRUCTURE	2
1.3 CONCLUSION.....	4
 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	 5
2.1. JESUS TRADITION	5
CONCLUSION (JESUS TRADITIONS)	17
2.2. PAUL AND JESUS TRADITION	18
2.2.1 FURNISH.....	18
2.2.2 EARLIER SCHOLARSHIP	18
2.2.3 MORE RECENT SCHOLARSHIP.....	23
CONCLUSION (PAUL AND JT)	33
2.3. PAUL'S USE OF THE DIVORCE/REMARriage JESUS TRADITION.....	34
2.4 CONCLUSION.....	37
 CHAPTER 3: IDENTIFYING JESUS TRADITION	 39
3.1. TWO POSSIBLE ROADBLOCKS	39
3.1.1 INSTABILITY	39
3.1.2 CIRCULARITY.....	41
3.2 QUESTIONING THE ROADBLOCKS.....	42
3.2.1 INSTABILITY	42
3.2.2 CIRCULARITY.....	47
3.3 WATSON'S MODEL	51
3.4 DUNN'S (ADJUSTED) MODEL.....	54
3.4.1 ORAL TRADITIONING.....	54
3.4.2 GOSPEL WRITING	56
3.4.3 DEFENDING DUNN'S MODEL	58
3.4.4 AUGMENTING DUNN WITH INDIVIDUALS.....	60
3.5 METHODOLOGY.....	63
3.5.1 STABLE CORE	64
3.5.2 FLEXIBILITY.....	66
3.6 CONCLUSION.....	71
 CHAPTER 4: THE DIVORCE/REMARriage JESUS TRADITION IN THE SYNOPTICS.73	
4.1 STABLE CORE	73
4.1.1 WORDING.....	74
4.1.2 NARRATIVE SETTING.....	80
4.1.3 GROUPINGS.....	82
4.1.4 CONCEPTUAL SIMILARITIES.....	88
4.1.5 CONCLUSION (STABILITY)	94

4.2 FLEXIBILITY.....	95
4.2.1 WORDING: LEGAL SAYINGS	95
4.2.2 NARRATIVE STRUCTURE: MATT 19/MARK10	107
4.2.3 CONCLUSION (FLEXIBILITY).....	111
4.3 CONCLUSION.....	112
 CHAPTER 5: PAUL AND JESUS TRADITION	 116
5.1 DID PAUL KNOW OF AND USE JESUS TRADITION?	117
5.1.1 KEY PASSAGES PURPORTEDLY AFFIRMING PAUL’S INDEPENDENCE/DISTANCE FROM THE HISTORICAL JESUS.....	117
5.1.2 PAUL’S DISTANCE FROM JEWISH CHRISTIANITY	118
5.1.3 PAUL’S INDEPENDENCE FROM THE TWELVE.....	119
5.1.4 THE PAUCITY OF JESUS QUOTATIONS IN PAUL.....	120
5.1.5 ARGUMENTS FOR PAUL’S KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF JT	122
5.2 FURTHER METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	124
5.3 EVIDENCE FROM 1 CORINTHIANS.....	126
5.3.1 MESSAGE AND STRUCTURE	126
5.3.2 HOW DID PAUL USE JT IN 1 CORINTHIANS?	127
5.4 CONCLUSION.....	134
 CHAPTER 6: THE DIVORCE/REMARriage JESUS TRADITION IN 1 CORINTHIANS 7	 137
6.1 STABILITY	138
6.1.1 WORDING.....	138
6.1.2 SETTING	140
6.1.3 CONCEPTS.....	142
6.1.4 CONCLUSION (STABILITY).....	146
6.2 FLEXIBILITY.....	146
6.2.1 AUDIENCE	146
6.2.2 RHETORICAL PURPOSE.....	151
6.2.3 CONCLUSION (FLEXIBILITY).....	173
6.3 CONCLUSION.....	174
 CHAPTER 7: HOW 1 CORINTHIANS 7 SHEDS LIGHT ON SYNOPTIC UNCERTAINTIES	 178
7.1 UNCERTAINTY #1: WHAT PRACTICE IS EQUATED WITH ADULTERY?	180
7.2 UNCERTAINTY #2: WHY, IN MATT 19:9; MARK 10:11–12; LUKE 16:18A, DOES JESUS EQUATE THIS PRACTICE WITH ADULTERY FOR THE FIRST MAN?.....	182
7.3 UNCERTAINTY #3: WHY DO THE LEGAL SAYINGS MAKE THIS EQUATION FOR THE SECOND MAN?	183
7.4 UNCERTAINTY #4: WHY DOES MATTHEW 5:32 OMIT “AND MARRIES ANOTHER”?	187
7.5 UNCERTAINTY #5: WHY DOES MATTHEW 5:32 INCLUDE “MAKES HER COMMIT ADULTERY”?	188

7.6 UNCERTAINTY #6: MATTHEW 19:9 – WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF THE EXCEPTION?	190
7.7 UNCERTAINTY #7: WHAT IS THE EXPLANATION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF MATTHEW’S EXCEPTIONS?	193
7.8 CONCLUSION	197
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION OF STUDY	200
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES CITED	203

List of Abbreviations

All abbreviations of ancient texts follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*. Second edition. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.

BDAG	Fredrick William Danker ed. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</i> . Third edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
ESV	<i>The Holy Bible, English Standard Version</i> . Fourth edition. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016.
THGNT	Dirk Jongkind ed. <i>The Tyndale House Greek New Testament</i> . Wheaton: Crossway, 2017.
TLG	M. Pantelia ed. <i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature</i> . Irvine, CA: University of California, 2014. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/

Chapter 1: Introduction

Divorce and remarriage is not only an emotionally charged and painful topic for many people, it is also a controversial one in relation to biblical interpretation. As Collins (1992, 1) notes, “There are few NT texts whose meaning has been as vigorously debated as those which contain Jesus’ sayings on divorce.” The thesis of the present study is that an examination of Paul’s use of the Jesus Tradition (JT) on divorce and remarriage in 1 Cor 7 can shed light on the interpretive uncertainties present in the Synoptic accounts of said JT.

1.1 Value of this Study

The value of this study is apparent from three considerations. First is the potential pastoral utility of having a clearer understanding of the meaning of the scriptural texts related to this topic.

Second is the scholarly uncertainty on the topic. This uncertainty can be demonstrated by a few examples. After co-authoring a defense of a minority interpretive view on this topic (Heth and Wenham 1984), Heth (2002) wrote again explaining that he had changed his mind. Even still, in his conclusion he notes (22) that he “could be wrong.” Knust (2012, 69) concludes that “it is impossible to determine precisely what Jesus intended,” given the Synoptic variations. Marcus (2009, 712–13), Murphy-O’Connor (1981, 606) and others can only conclude that Paul differed from the Synoptists on the topic. Why does he differ? For Wong (2002, 182) Paul “deradicalises” Jesus’ radical teaching “to fit into a new *Sitz im Leben*.” For Blount (1996) Paul knowingly contradicts the

JT. For Hays (1997, 360) Paul's teaching is "a daring revision that both extends and modifies" the JT.

The third consideration that supports the value of the present study is the scarcity of studies that follow the approach taken here. Several monographs on the topic (e.g. Collins 1992; Instone-Brewer 2002; Zhekov 2009) will assist the present study but none approach the complexity of the NT data on this topic in precisely the way the present study does, that is, utilizing Paul's use of the JT in order to shed light on Synoptic uncertainties. Again, many of the commentators connect Paul's words in 1 Cor 7:10–11 with the Synoptic JT and comment on the similarities and differences (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 291; Conzelmann 1975, 120; Fee 2014, 322–28; Fitzmyer 2008, 287–90). However they do not develop that connection to the degree or in the way that the present study does. Hiestermann (2016) draws close but ultimately asks a different question. He examines the relationship of Pauline parallels with Synoptic JTs but his aim (3) is to ascertain *which* of the Synoptics drew on tradition most like those that Paul drew upon. The studies of Dungan (1971) and Laney (1990) are closer to the present study and will be discussed in the Literature Review. However it will be shown that their methods are significantly different from that of this study.

These three considerations (potential pastoral utility, scholarly uncertainty and a scarcity of studies taking this precise approach) suggest that the present study is worth pursuing.

1.2 Structure

The goal of this study is to answer the following question: How might Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7 shed light on the interpretive uncertainties present in the Synoptic accounts?

Chapter 2 reviews the scholarly literature around JT and Paul's relationship to JT. A number of concerns are raised which, if legitimate, would stymie the present study.

Chapter 3 responds to the concerns related to JT. Can we actually identify JT from the Synoptics? What was the *nature* of such traditions and how did the church *use* and *transmit* them? Do we have any reason to think that the JT would have remained stable from the time Paul wrote until the time the Synoptics were written? This discussion will provide a method for identifying JT.

Chapter 4 applies this method to the Synoptic Gospels, seeking to identify the JT that Paul might have known. Seven interpretive uncertainties are also identified in the Synoptic material. This study aims to show how Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT can shed light on these particular uncertainties.

Chapter 5 turns to Paul and JT. It seeks to answer questions raised in the Literature Review. Is it legitimate to compare Paul's use of JT with the Synoptic accounts? Does Paul know and use JT? Does he maintain the integrity of JT? Answers are given from scholarship and from an application of our model to passages from 1 Corinthians.

Having demonstrated that Paul "legitimately develops" JT, Chapter 6 then applies the same model to the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7. It again concludes that Paul "legitimately develops" the JT and identifies three particularities in Paul's teaching on this topic.

Chapter 7 then takes those three particularities and demonstrates how they shed light on the seven interpretive uncertainties identified in the Synoptics.

1.3 Conclusion

To anticipate our conclusion, we will see that Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7 does indeed shed light on certain interpretive uncertainties in the Synoptic accounts.

- First, it indicates that the main focus of the Synoptic accounts is illegitimate divorce and prohibited remarriage rather than divorce or remarriage alone. Neither divorce nor remarriage alone are prohibited in every instance.
- Second, it suggests that the legal sayings (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18) equate illegitimate divorce and prohibited remarriage with adultery *because* illegitimate divorce does not truly end a marriage, but also that the adulterous remarriage does ultimately dissolve the former marriage union.

These conclusions depend on the groundwork provided by positive answers to the various questions noted in the “Structure” section above.

Chapter 2: Literature review

The present chapter reviews the major scholarly movements that impinge upon the present study as well as the views of particular scholars. Of necessity, this review will be representative rather than exhaustive, as our study spans two major disciplines, Jesus Tradition and Pauline Studies, both of which have voluminous literature. While some scholars cover both fields (most notably Baur, Wrede and Dunn), for the sake of clarity this review will deal with each field in turn before briefly touching two studies that share similarities with the present one.

Stability and flexibility in the JT will be of special interest in this review, as the present study requires both: stability such that the Synoptists and Paul are interpreting a stable tradition but also flexibility that allows for their particular interpretations.

2.1. Jesus Tradition

While the present study is not *primarily* interested in discerning the teachings of the Historical Jesus, any study of JT cannot help but intersect with this debate. Hence, what follows will interact with Historical Jesus research, but with a special focus on what scholars have said about the stability and flexibility/variation of JT.

2.1.1 Baur

Baur (1831) proposed a schism between Pauline and Petrine Christianity. He argued (1847) that Matthew and Mark applied a high level of flexibility to the JT as they sought to mediate this schism. This mediating position not only introduces flexibility, but also a circularity of dependence that is potentially problematic for this study. Mark and Matthew may represent Paul's view of divorce and remarriage, thus reversing the direction of the study.

2.1.2 Wrede

Highlighting this flexibility further, Wrede's understanding of Mark's Gospel (1901) suggests that JTs were invented by post-resurrection disciples who, for example, invented Jesus' claim to be the Messiah. In Mark "the person of Jesus is dogmatically [rather than historically] conceived" (Wrede 1971 [1901], 131).

2.1.3 Bultmann and Form Criticism

Bultmann perpetuated this division between "dogma" and "history." For him (1964, 17) it is "the Christ of the kerygma and not the person of the historical Jesus who is the object of faith."

The division is also apparent in Form Criticism, of which Bultmann was "the most influential exponent" (Mournet 2005, 56). This movement "finally gave significant attention" to research into oral traditions (Eddy 2013, 642).¹ It holds that a "series of layers" formed over the genuine accounts of Jesus' life and teaching (Bultmann 1935 [1926], 12–13; cf. Wright 2015, 39). These layers may include (often Hellenistic) faith statements or fresh words of the risen Lord. "The church drew no distinction between [such words] and the sayings of Jesus in the

¹ E.g. that of Westcott (1872, 203).

tradition,” since the Lord is “contemporary for the Church” in both (Bultmann 1963 [1921], 127). The Traditions were thereby flexible, “fluid and plastic, open to new additions and new shapes” (Bailey 1991, 36). For example (Bultmann 1963 [1921]), while Mark’s version of the divorce debate is “doubtless the original” (135), it “undergoes various editings” (148), including Matthew 5:31–32 and 19:1–12.

2.1.4 New Quest

Several of Bultmann’s students (e.g. Bornkamm and Käsemann) opposed him, insisting that “the Christ preached in the gospel [must be] firmly linked to the historical Jesus” (Barclay 1993, 496). However they generally maintained that “countless ‘I’ sayings” in the Synoptics were fresh prophetic utterances (Käsemann 1964, 60). Crossan (e.g. 1996, 22) and Watson (2013) take a similar approach, allowing for ongoing additions to the body of JT.

2.1.5 Scandinavian School

In reaction to Form Criticism, the “Scandinavian School” argued for greater stability of the JT. Representatively, Gerhardsson (1961) proposed that, “the process of oral transmission exemplified by the ‘school’ dynamic of later rabbinic Judaism provided the best comparative model by which to understand the early oral Jesus tradition” (Eddy 2013, 642). This involved strict rehearsal of memory within a student/teacher relationship (Gerhardsson 1961, 133). As a result, “When the Evangelists edited their Gospels ... they worked on a basis of a fixed, distinct tradition,” partly memorised and partly annotated (Gerhardsson 1961, 335). The Gospels are therefore identified as JT. Riesner (1981) and Byrskog (e.g. 1994) are more recent proponents of this model. Such an understanding

provides the stability in JT required for this study to be worth pursuing, but does not account for the flexibility apparent within the Synoptics (e.g. Bird 2014, 90; Bauckham 2006, 258; Dunn 2003, 198).

2.1.6 Orality

The field of oral studies will be important for this study as it offers a path between the rigid stability of the Scandinavian School and the strong literary flexibility of Form Criticism. Kelber (1983) applied the work of linguists (e.g. Ong 1982; Lord 1960) to the Gospels, arguing that Gospel studies had been shackled to literary assumptions which entailed “illusion, suppression, and death” (158). In contrast, orality meant “freedom, reality, creative potential, and life” (185).²

More recently, scholars have argued that orality need not: 1) be held over-against literary transmission; nor 2) be equated with unlimited “freedom.”

First, evidence suggests that orality and literacy exist side by side everywhere. For example, Kirk (2016, 2) argues that the Roman world was “a *mixed media* environment in which orality and writing interacted extensively.” Claire Smith (2012) identifies this pattern in Pauline communities, noting that the existence of the “traditioning” word groups “confirms the existence of a stable body of content, both as texts and traditions” (160). This speaks against the purely literary model of Form Criticism and the purely oral preference of Kelber.

Second, Finnegan (e.g. 1988; 2007) provides anthropological evidence that “exact memorization of oral texts ... and the concept of a correct oral text” are found alongside “free” oral compositions in many cultures (1988, 158). NT

² Kelber (2005) has since advocated for interaction between orality and memory.

scholars have also argued that oral traditioning has controls that limit flexibility in JT or the “layers” of Form Criticism. For example, Foley (1991, 6–13; cf. 2002; 1995) argues that “tradition referentiality” (the pool of language and ideas shared by performer and audience) constrains the flexibility of a performer.³ For Foley, sharing JT was primarily about “co-remembering and re-experiencing together through new, creative retellings, the already shared communal knowledge” (Eddy 2013, 646).

Similarly, Rodríguez (2010) argues that the JT exists beyond any given performance in the memory of the community in what he calls the “ambient tradition” (85). This “constrains the flexibility of ... subsequent performances” (112). Rodríguez’s model also acknowledges flexibility, noting that a performance may “transmit the same thing” as earlier performances with different “verbal and sequential structures” (85). Importantly, Rodríguez (37) argues that this same transmission dynamic continued in the inscribing of the Gospels.

2.1.6.1 Bailey

Bailey (1983; 1991; 1995) has also applied oral studies to Gospel writing. For Bailey (1991, 35–38; cf. Ingolfslund 2006, 188) the Synoptic Gospels are too diverse to be explained by a “formal controlled” transmission process as in the Scandinavian School. They are also too alike to be explained by an “informal uncontrolled” process like that described by Bultmann (Bailey 1995, 364). Bailey

³ Here “performance” refers to an individual instance in which JT is shared rather than signaling a “performance critical” approach. While the latter method makes some valid contributions, such oral hermeneutics seem to have a tendency to reduce the Evangelists’ contribution. E.g. Dewey (2013, 79–92) reduces Mark’s narrative to a series of “happenings.”

suggests an “informal controlled” process like that practiced in the modern, Middle-Eastern oral culture he studied.

Stories critical for the community’s identity can be repeated in public only by those deemed worthy to repeat them. ... These poems, proverbs and stories form their identity and so the correct telling of these stories is critical for that identity. If someone tells the story “wrong,” the reciter is corrected by a chorus of voices. (Bailey 1995, 364–65)

Bailey (1995, 367) suggests that this process, “with its flexibility and its stability,” explains the Synoptic Gospels well.

2.1.7 Dunn

Dunn also builds on insights from oral studies in his approach to JT, establishing a model with a combination of stability and flexibility.⁴ This study will make significant use of his work, both in relation to JT generally and Paul’s use of JT more particularly. Dunn’s model will be summarized here under three points and outlined in greater detail in section 3.4.

First, from the outset Christian communities had multiple variations of particular traditions due to the multiplicity of witnesses to a particular event, as well as Jesus’ repetition of teaching on multiple occasions.

Second, a community would share these traditions not only for the sake of transmission, but also in celebration, to give meaning to their existence (2013, 214; cf. 2011, 44). When a particular member performed a story or teaching of Jesus they were required to retain particular core elements (this was their identity forming story after all), or risk being corrected by the group (e.g. 2007,

⁴ By placing his work at this point in the review we do not intend to suggest particular lines of dependence or precise chronology.

192). However, around that stable core, oral traditioning allowed for some flexibility as deemed appropriate to the situations.

Third, when the Evangelists came to write, a variety of written and oral traditions, versions of traditions, and groups of traditions were available to them (2015, 309–10). The Evangelists understood themselves to be producing “a written version of an oral recitation of Jesus tradition” (2015, 214). As with oral traditioning, they would seek stability in the core of a JT but apply flexibility in order “to bring out its relevance to the situation of the particular audience addressed” (2015, 214) or to give their account “narrative movement and thematic emphasis” (2015, 225).

2.1.8 Responses to Dunn

The following three responses to Dunn agree with his model in large part but suggest that it underplays the role of particular individuals in the transmission process.

2.1.8.1 Bockmuehl

For Bockmuehl (2010), Dunn underplays the role of the Apostles. He (42) identifies in Dunn’s model,

...a tension between the seemingly slippery emphasis on an oral tradition’s “living performance” and, on the other hand, the recurring confident appeals to that tradition’s “stable core.” The only way to address this question, it seems to me, is by way of a closer analysis of the (largely personal) apostolic vehicles of that stability.

Elsewhere Bockmuehl (2007a, 352) notes “the extent to which the ancients were prepared to regard individual leaders as vital guarantors of collective memory and tradition.”

2.1.8.2 Byrskog

Second, Byrskog (2004) finds two related faults with Dunn.

First is Dunn’s prioritizing of corporate over individual memory. Negatively he argues (465–66) that “we do not have many texts from antiquity that clearly portray such a corporate activity, while we do have numerous texts picturing named individuals who seek out and try to remember and communicate persuasively information from other individuals.” Positively, from his Scandinavian School roots, Byrskog (466) suggests that an oral history model “gives a more helpful framework for how Jesus was remembered than the vague notion of corporate memory.” The notion of corporate memory is vague because it elides *memory* and *interpretation* (464). Byrskog seeks to hold these two apart in relation to the community. For him, communal identity is built not on bald memory alone, but on “memory as interpretation of the past within the frame of a shared symbolic universe” (464). Thus, while he agrees with Dunn that tradition forming is a communal process, the concrete memories must enter the communities via individuals before being interpreted communally.

Byrskog’s second point relates to the role of “teachers” and is closely related to the first. He questions the function of teachers in Dunn’s model and the lack of weight given them in preference for an almost exclusive focus on democratized communal performance (467). Perhaps in response, Dunn’s later work (e.g. 2005a, 49; 2008a, 115–16; 2010, 298; 2013, 312) gives greater

prominence to teachers within his model. For example, “I also emphasize the role of teachers, with the obvious implication that they *taught* the tradition for whose retention and transmission they would have had a primary responsibility” (2008b, 91).

2.1.8.3 Bauckham

Bauckham is the third scholar in this vein. He suggests that Dunn gives insufficient attention to eyewitnesses. Bauckham’s own model, as outlined in *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (2006), has many similarities to Dunn’s. For example, it assumes that the tradition had “key elements, which remain stable in all performances [including Gospels], and other elements, which are treated as flexible” (2006, 232). However, in contrast to Dunn, for Bauckham this flexibility existed within a formal transmission process involving formal offices of eyewitness and teachers (2006, 257–58).

For Bauckham (e.g. 2006, 231), the evidence suggests a more formal memorization process, including “recognized guardians of the tradition and careful memorisation (to an appropriate degree, not usually verbatim)” (2008, 246). Along with the Apostles, these “guardians” included teachers and eyewitnesses (2008, 243).

Bauckham’s model has four further controlling features (2006, 290):

- 1) Each tradition belonged in some sense to a particular eyewitness.
- 2) The tradition was transmitted in their name.
- 3) The eyewitness remained a living and active guarantor of that tradition.

- 4) Local gatherings had designated “teachers” who received the traditions first hand from the eyewitness, or through very few hands, each officially sanctioned.

In his review, Dunn (2008b): agrees with points 1 and 3 “whole heartedly”; sees little evidence for point 2; and gives qualified support to point 4 (105). He affirms eyewitnesses as travelling guarantors, but questions their ability to cover the geographical expanse of the church (105).⁵ More significantly, he affirms the role of eyewitnesses (99–100),

[not] in fixing a precise combination of material or sequence of words, to be repeated rote-like by subsequent teachers, but in establishing the form and substance of a story or teaching which remained stable, and often a core element of a story and key-note terms which did remain more or less fixed, in the varied retellings of the tradition thereafter, that is, in the manner still evident in the Synoptic tradition.

In response to Bauckham then, Dunn accepts a more significant role for eyewitnesses—a limited role as guarantors but a greater role in shaping the tradition.

2.1.9 Ehrman and Memory

Ehrman (2016b), amongst others (e.g. Allison 2010, 2–8; Hollander 2000, 353–54), has questioned the ability of a model like Dunn’s to deliver a stable JT due mostly to the weakness of human memory. He argues that “[a]ll memories are distorted” (291). Eyewitness memory is unreliable (88–100). Collective memory

⁵ Though Bird (2014, 60) argues that certain eyewitnesses travelled extensively.

tells us “more about who is doing the remembering in the present than about the actual persons and events they are recalling from the past” (241).

These observations serve Ehrman’s “ultimate point,” that the “invention of memories of Jesus ... has always been going on” (25). For Ehrman, “traditions in oral cultures do not remain the same over time, but change rapidly, repeatedly, and extensively” (183). Exacerbating the problems of human memory is the number of human hands the traditions would have passed through (2, 3, 4, 11, 14, 74 etc.). In another place Ehrman acknowledges a place for church leaders to instruct new converts in “some of the essentials of the faith” (2016a, 49). Beyond this however, Ehrman’s transmission model is something akin to the children’s game “telephones” (2016a, 50–51).

In summary, Ehrman’s uncontrolled transmission model has the Evangelists working with traditions “that had circulated by word of mouth decade after decade before being written down. These traditions were modified when they were told and retold and modified further when they were written down” or “even invented” (2016a, 51, 134). Such radical instability in JT would be problematic for this study.

2.1.10 Social Memory

Amongst various alternative understandings of memory and its implications for the transmission of JT, the field of Social Memory is worthy of mention.⁶ Social memory suggests that a community’s identity is bound up with their remembering, but that remembering of the past is shaped by their present. “Social memory theory asserts that the past informs identity construction in the

⁶ See e.g. Kelber and Byrskog, eds. 2009; Rodríguez 2010; Eve 2014.

present while the present provides the framework for how the past is viewed” (Keith 2007, 255; cf. Williams 2011, 190; Kirk 2017, 112).

According to social memory, any clear definition of the Historical Jesus is “ultimately unattainable” (Keith 2016, 426). This approach is not primarily interested in historical accuracy, but in “the development of the tradition” (Keith 2015, 357). It examines “the interpretations of the early Christians” and how and why they “came to view Jesus in the ways that they did” (Keith 2016, 426).

This is not to say that historical events have no bearing on what was remembered and transmitted as JT. The “commemorated past bore upon the traditioning activities of the early communities in a ... thoroughgoing manner” (Kirk and Thatcher 2005, 34). But more important for our study is social memory’s assertion that there “is continuity between earlier and later instances of memory” (Keith 2015, 539). That is, some level of stability. Memory establishes and reinforces social identity (e.g. Williams 2011, 192; Zvi 2017, 70). The Gospels can be considered to be “articulated social memories that gave (and continue to give) rise to particular social identities and group beliefs” (Williams 2011, 194). For this reason there is a limit to their flexibility.

2.1.11 Watson

While Francis Watson’s *Gospel Writing* (2013) touches on several issues apropos of this study he does so from a radical angle. Rather than focusing on *transmission*, Watson develops a model that emphasizes the process of *reception* (2–3).

Watson proposes that many “Gospels” were written, each contributing to “the ongoing process of interpreting Jesus’ significance,” each in “active

disagreement” with other “Evangelists,” seeking to replace them (e.g. 604, 16, 4). All the while each was accepted as articulating “prior tradition,” even if the “evangelist himself is the author of a story ... whatever the degree of creativity exercised” (352). However this does not undermine the theological value of the Gospels for Watson, as he reverses the dominant hermeneutical direction. Rather than interpretation having a backward movement towards “what Jesus really said,” he argues that our interpretation should follow the forward movement of reception, the direction of constant interpretation and reinterpretation. If this model represents the reality, then the JT would not be sufficiently stable for this study to proceed.

Conclusion (Jesus Traditions)

So far this review has focused on the broad topic of JT, its nature and transmission. A number of potential roadblocks to the present study have been raised. These can be summarized into two groups:

1. Those questioning the stability of JT due to intentional alterations or the weakness of human memory.
2. Those implying a circularity of dependence between Paul and the Synoptists.

We have also identified possible avenues for addressing such roadblocks. Most significantly, we noted Dunn’s model and the contributions of Bockmuehl, Byrskog and Bauckham. These potential roadblocks will be addressed in Chapter 3. It will be shown that Dunn’s model (with adjustments) provides a more satisfactory explanation of the data.

2.2. Paul and Jesus Tradition

This study also requires a review of the literature on Paul's use of JT. Did Paul use JT? If so, how? These questions, as Dunn observes, "have been a burning point in New Testament research for the last two hundred years" (1994, 155). As will become apparent, no consensus has yet emerged.

2.2.1 Furnish

Furnish, in his classic survey, "The Jesus-Paul Debate" (1989), established six categories for how scholars understand the relationship between Paul and the JT (47–48). They can be set forth as follows:

- 1) Paul *confirmed* Jesus' teaching;
 - 2) Paul was the best *interpreter* of Jesus;
 - 3) Paul was essentially an *innovator*;
 - 4) Paul developed Jesus' teaching *illegitimately*;
 - 5) Paul developed Jesus' teaching *legitimately*;
 - 6) Paul gave "an explication of the Kerygma of the Hellenistic church"
- (48).

These categories will be represented in the review that follows.

2.2.2 Earlier Scholarship

2.2.2.1 Baur

In his survey Furnish states that the Jesus-Paul debate was "prompted by the radical criticism of the Tübingen school" and chiefly by Baur (1989, 20).

Influenced by the Hegelian dialectical model of history, Baur (1831) identified a

tension between Pauline and Petrine Christianity (Porter 2016, 48). Petrine Christianity, the thesis, was “more influenced by, and more faithful to, the original teaching of Jesus” (Barclay 1993, 492). Pauline Christianity was antithetical to the Petrine, while early Catholicism formed the synthesis (Neill and Wright 1988, 25).

Under this model, Pauline use of JT is questionable. Baur’s Paul “was consciously independent of such traditions and differed widely from the teaching of Jesus” (Barclay 1993, 492). In Schweitzer’s words, Baur imagined Paul “in complete opposition” to the Petrine community (1912 [1911], 12). For example, Barrett (1982), expanding on Baur, suggests that 1 Corinthians 7 “represents the differing perspectives of Paul (a celibate) and Peter (who was married)” (Pate 2013, 120). Furnish labels Baur an “innovator,” his category three (1989, 48).

2.2.2.2 Early Resistance

Baur’s views did not initially hold sway. Paret (1858) pushed back with arguments still used today: the *a priori* likelihood that Paul would have to explain something of Jesus’ life to those who had never heard of him (1858, 8–9); the references to JT in Paul’s letters; and that the letters presuppose a common knowledge of JT (1858, 11).

Sturm (1900) added a fourth feature to Paret’s list, showing the consistency of the “leading ideas” in the Gospels and Paul (Furnish 1989, 22). Similarly, several scholars argued for a basic integrity between Jesus and Paul’s messages. For example, both Hilgenfeld and Hoyle proposed that, “Paul had simply developed what was present already in Jesus’ teaching in embryonic

form” (Furnish 1989, 21). This is Furnish’s fifth category of “legitimate development.”

2.2.2.3 Wrede

The tide changed with the publication of Wrede’s *Paulus* (1905). It “drove the sharpest and deepest wedge between Jesus and Paul” (Barnett 2008, 13).

Exemplifying Furnish’s fourth category (“Illegitimate development”), Wrede (1908 [1905]) saw Paul as rejecting Petrine Christianity and anything related to Judaism (126). For Wrede, Paul’s Christ was “metaphysically conceived” rather than being historically constrained (87). The “whole concrete ethical-religious content of [Jesus’] earthly life, signifies for Paul’s Christology – nothing whatever” (88–89).

Wrede acknowledges that “many precepts and rules of Jesus were traditionally known to Paul, and he assuredly regarded them as of standard authority,” including 1 Cor 7:10 (158). However for Paul, these belong “to the second rank of importance” (164). The kernel of the gospel lies elsewhere. Wrede’s oft-repeated conclusion is unavoidable: Paul was “the second founder of Christianity,” who “compared with the first, exercised beyond all doubt the stronger, not the better – influence” (180).

2.2.2.4 Heitmüller

Heitmüller (1912) developed Wrede’s views, emphasizing Paul’s disinterest in JT. He argued first that Paul was not in contact with The Twelve and did not know more JT than his letters indicate. Second, he suggests that Paul’s theology is indebted to the Hellenistic church rather than to JT. Third he cites 2 Cor 5:16 to support his position, that Paul “no longer knows” Christ in a “human way.” For

Heitmüller, Paul “quite decisively says here that the earthly Jesus ... has no meaning whatsoever for his religious life. ... And that means the tradition about Jesus is also irrelevant” (translated in Stout 2011, 75).

This verse became a key text in the debate. For example, Morgan (1917, 39) could say that in it Paul “cuts himself loose from the historical basis as to render every hypothesis of dependence precarious if not untenable.”

2.2.2.5 Bultmann

Bultmann followed Heitmüller’s lead, concluding that Paul “vehemently protests his independence from” the Twelve in Gal 1–2 (1952 [1948], 1:188). Bultmann is the exemplar of Furnish’s sixth category (“Hellenistic explication”) (1989, 48). He saw Paul’s theology as “mediated through Hellenistic Christianity” (Porter 2016, 60) like Heitmüller, but then translated into “specifically existentialist” categories (Neill and Wright 1988, 411). These categories meant that the “facts and events of Jesus’ life” were unimportant to Paul (Barclay 1993, 495). Bultmann finds no trace of “the influence of” JT in Paul (1952 [1948], 1:188). Indeed, “It is not possible to state sufficiently sharply the contrast in the NT Canon with the Synoptic Gospels on the one hand and the Pauline letters ... on the other” (Bultmann 1963 [1921], 303).

Were the proposals of Wrede, Heitmüller and Bultmann accepted, the present study, seeking to discern Paul’s use of JT, would be nonsensical.

2.2.2.6 Dodd

There were, however, contrary voices. Dodd suggested that Paul was interested in and knew a great deal about Jesus’ life (1938, 64–66). He identified JT in passages like 1 Cor 11:23–26 (64). First Corinthians 15:3–11 suggested to Dodd

that Paul saw himself as “the bearer of a tradition that was common to the whole apostolic body” (64). His article “Matthew and Paul” argues that “behind both writers lies some kind of common tradition,” even if not a literary dependence (1947, 296). Dodd states that Paul’s “ethical teaching” contains much “which indirectly or directly recalls the words of the Gospels,” from which he infers that “we must suppose that both [Paul] and his converts were acquainted with a collection of traditional sayings of Jesus, similar to those collections which have been used by the Evangelists” (1938, 65).

2.2.2.7 Davies

Soon afterwards, Davies wrote *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (1948) in which he compared Paul with Greek and Rabbinic literature, concluding that Paul was influenced more by Rabbinic Judaism than by Hellenism. Rather than Paul being opposed to JT then, it was “the words of Jesus Himself that formed Paul’s primary source in his work as ethical διδάσκαλος” (136). For Davies, “Paul is steeped in the mind and words of his Lord” (140; cf. Wright 2015, 19).

2.2.2.8 Gerhardsson

Similarly Gerhardsson (1961) suggests that Paul had a core corpus “containing sayings of, and about, Christ” (295). In 1 Cor 15:3–7 Gerhardsson understands Paul to be using and accepting the authority of “a logos fixed by the college of Apostles in Jerusalem” (297). Paul thereby accepted the Jerusalem apostles as “the supreme (human) doctrinal authority of the Church” (296). In support of this he also offered a different reading of Gal 1–2 from that of Bultmann (296–9).

Gerhardsson observes that Paul occasionally uses JT as an absolute authority in an argument (e.g. 1 Cor 11:23–25; 15:3–7), as *per* Furnish’s first

category (“confirmation”) (320–21). More often however Paul’s use of JT fits within category five (“Legitimate development”). Paul would apply the JT, assuming that “the basic authoritative tradition has already been passed on at an earlier stage” (291). For example, Paul bases his preference for chastity (1 Cor 7:7–8) and concession for “burning” believers (1 Cor 7:9) on Matt 5:28; 19:11, but does so without quoting either (312). Again, in 1 Cor 7:10 he does not quote the JT, but “draws from it a short *halakic* statement (with interpretation inserted)” (312).

2.2.3 More Recent Scholarship

The more recent history of this debate is difficult to review due in part to its volume of literature. The following review will summarise the conversation that has arisen from earlier scholarship under three headings: 1) studies expressing doubt as to Paul’s continuity with JT; 2) those affirming Paul’s *knowledge* of JT; and 3) those describing his *use* of JT.

2.2.3.1 Doubting Continuity

The following five studies are representative of the kinds of doubts raised concerning Paul’s continuity with JT:

1. Wilson (1984) follows Heitmüller (placing him in four – “Illegitimate development”), arguing that Paul was not interested in the historical Jesus.

2. Walter (1989, 64) is in category three (“Innovator”), saying that Paul was not able “to understand and assimilate these central ingredients of the Jesus- tradition.” With Wrede, he argues that the “central affirmations of Jesus’ preaching” did not influence his exposition of “the gospel of Christ” (163).
3. Crossan (also category three) is heavily influenced by Baur’s view of a schism, arguing that Paul had “so thoroughly broken with all of Palestinian Jewish Christianity that he is no longer representative of it” (Bockmuehl 2007b, 81).
4. Akenson concludes (category three) that Paul “is not entirely impressed with [Jesus] as a rabbi” (2000, 182). Concerning 1 Cor 7, Paul “has no hesitation in overruling” Jesus’ erroneous views on divorce (182–83).
5. Rothschild (e.g. 2014) takes Heitmüller’s conclusion as given, that Paul is “uninterested” in JT.

Chapter 5 will offer a general critique of these views, arguing that the NT evidence supports a more positive connection between Paul and JT. At this point, however, we turn to scholarly arguments for such positive connections between Paul and JT.

2.2.3.2 Affirming Paul’s Knowledge of JT

The second group of studies affirm Paul’s *knowledge* of JT. They generally explore the four areas of evidence noted by Paret (1858) and Sturm (1900).

- 1) *A priori* arguments.
- 2) Continuity of themes between Paul and the Gospels.
- 3) Biographical data from the NT regarding Paul's history and ministry praxis.
- 4) Possible quotations of and allusions to JT.

For the most part Dunn's work will form the backbone of this subsection, complemented by others. Dunn acknowledges that "Paul tells us next to nothing about the life and ministry of Jesus" (2008a, 105).⁷ Yet he still holds that "Paul must have known a substantial amount of the Jesus tradition which was later committed to the present Gospel form by the Evangelists" (1990, 205). That claim depends on these four groups of evidence.

2.2.3.2.a *A priori* arguments

For Dunn there is a "strong circumstantial case for the view that, from the beginning, new converts would have wanted to know about Jesus" (2005b, 183; cf. 2008a, 193), and that they would have received some basic instruction concerning Jesus' life and teaching as well as "the significance of his death and resurrection" (2008a, 103). Knowing and passing on JT was therefore "integral to the process" of mission (2015, 192).

Many similar arguments have been mounted. For example, early converts would not only *desire* JT but would *require* it in order to make sense of this crucified Lord (e.g. Bird 2014, 23–24; cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Hom Socr.* 4; Ehrman 2016b, 83). As Hengel asserts, "it was only possible to describe the exalted Jesus

⁷ What Paul does tell us has been listed numerous times. E.g. Barnett 2008, 18; Porter 2016, 98–99.

by telling of the earthly Jesus, his work and his death” (1979, 44; cf. 1983, 61).

The same arguments stand for Paul himself. As Allen (2013) argues, “It would be highly implausible that someone so passionate about the gospel message focused around the figure of Jesus ... would not have exercised some curiosity regarding the life and context of that figure” (67). Surely, with Luke as a companion, his curiosity would have been satisfied (Barnett 2008, 4).

2.2.3.2.b Continuity in themes

Against Wrede’s view that Paul preached a different gospel from that preached by Jesus, a number of studies have identified themes common to both (e.g. Schoberg 2014; Gathercole 2006; D. Wenham 1995). Schoberg is representative of these in seeking to demonstrate that Paul not only depends on JT for occasional ethical instructions, but that he and Jesus “shared a core commitment, even though they may have expressed their commitment differently” (2014, 14). Dunn notes five common themes, which we here complement with insights from others.

First is that of *The Kingdom of God*. Rather than seeing a sharp disjunction between Jesus’ kingdom preaching and Paul, Dunn observes that Paul spoke of the kingdom “as an obviously familiar concept when it was appropriate to do so” (1994, 165; cf. Barnett 2008, 196; D. Wenham 2002, 68). David Wenham agrees, suggesting that Paul’s preference for “righteousness” over “kingdom” is “due to his social context,” but that “the same underlying concept of God’s new day of salvation having arrived is present in both” (1995, 373–74).⁸

⁸ Barnett notes that Jesus uses both terms in Matthew 6:33 (2008, 195).

Second, is the continuity between Jesus' *inaugurated* kingdom and Paul's message of grace in the here and now. He observes an "uncomfortable tension" between the now and not yet in both Jesus and Paul in which the Spirit plays a vital role (2011, 98–115; cf. 1998, 191). Similarly, Schoberg argues that Paul's eschatological perspective was dependent on Jesus' own mindset (2014, 328).

Third is the similarity between Jesus' welcome of sinners and Paul's mission to Gentiles ("sinners" by definition) (1998, 192; cf. Simmons 1996; Yeung 2002, 9–10). Likewise, both had a place for the poor and the weak. "Jesus broke through the boundaries *within* Israel, Paul broke through the boundary *around* Israel" (Dunn 2011, 105; cf. Barnett 2008, 203–4).

Fourth, for Dunn, "Nowhere is the line of continuity and influence from Jesus to Paul clearer than in the love command" (2011, 114). For Wenham this is "the law of Christ" in both Paul and the JT (1995, 655).

Finally, Dunn (e.g. 1994, 169; 1998, 482–87) and Schoberg (e.g. 2014, 171) note that both Paul and the JT espouse and exemplify cruciform discipleship. For Schoberg, Paul's emphasis on participation in Christ's death was unique in ancient thought (2014, 241). It is also "fundamentally the same as ... Jesus' call to cross-shaped discipleship" according to Gorman (2012, 176). For Gorman, this congruence is highly significant, "for in dealing with the story of the cross ... in both the Gospels and Paul, we are engaging the Christian master story and thus also the very heart of Christian ethics" (2012, 173–74). This theme is seen not only in Paul's writing but in his cross-bearing lifestyle (Allen 2013, 71; Hurtado 2004).

2.2.3.2.c Biography and Mission

A third group of evidence for Paul's knowledge of JT is the NT data on Paul's biography and ministry praxis.

Biography: The "lack of consensus" on Paul's use of JT is due in part to disagreement as to "where Paul learned his JT" (Histermann, 2016, 90). On the one hand Barclay can say that, "It is generally accepted that if there is any 'bridge' between Jesus and Paul it must lie" with the Hellenistic church (1993, 498; e.g. Schoberg 2014, 118). On the other hand Barnett holds that, "Paul's basic theological convictions were formed in Damascus and underwent little change throughout the remainder of his life," thus discounting any significant role for the Hellenistic church (2008, 97). Dunn takes a *via media*, noting that "much of the groundwork" for Paul's theology and ecclesiology "must have been laid in Antioch," but the "most formative influence on Paul's theology" was his conversion experience (2008a, 321, 357–61).

Paul may have acquired knowledge of the JT itself in a variety of ways. Dunn argues that Paul spent time in Jerusalem during Jesus' ministry (1998, 188). Also, following Bruce's (1980) lead and the evidence of certain lexemes in Gal 1–2, Dunn argues for Paul's dependence on Peter (see 5.1.3).

Ministry Praxis: In terms of ministry praxis, Dunn is confident that Paul always and only established his churches "on a foundation of Jesus tradition. ... This tradition would inevitably have formed part of the regular diet of teaching and reflection in the gatherings of these churches" (2013, 339–40). Dunn gives two points of evidence for this view that will be introduced in 5.1.3.

2.2.3.2.d Quotations and allusions

Finally, Dunn argues that Pauline parallels with JT are “inescapable” in Rom 8:15–16 and chapters 12–15 (1990, 197, 200). Many others have joined this search for quotations and allusions, each scholar located somewhere along a spectrum.

From 1968–1982 only eight parallels were “generally accepted” (Wong 2001, 246). Closer to the minimalist end are scholars like Neirynck and Walter who only accept 1 Cor 7:10; 9:14 (Kim 1993, 475).

An early example from the “maximalist” end of the spectrum is Resch (2016 [1904]), who identified 1261 quotations of or allusions to JT in Paul.

David Wenham is perhaps a “middle maximalist.” While only admitting five instances in which JT is “explicitly referred to,” Wenham argues for many parallels, some of which appear to be original (e.g. 2011, 2041). In his 1982 study, Allison also took a “middle maximalist” position, concluding that Paul knew a good amount of JT (17). More particularly, he argued that Paul knew *collections* of JT, not simply isolated sayings (17). He defends this by noting that not only are the parallels found in clusters in Paul, but that the reverse is also true (13). That is, Paul uses JTs recorded in “a handful of relatively brief, well-defined sections [of the Synoptics] which are widely held to reproduce early blocks of tradition” (11). These are: Luke 6:27–38; Mark 6:6b–13; 9:33–50.

It has often been suggested that the disparity between maximalists and minimalists is due to the lack of a “criterion by which one might determine what is or is not a substantial parallel” (Allison 1982, 5; cf. Fiensy 2010, 92; D. Wenham 2011, 2044–45). At least two scholars have sought to amend this lack. Thompson proposes eleven criteria for identifying parallels (1991, 30–36).

Fiensy reduces the number to four (2010, 92). These criteria will be largely irrelevant to the present study since the reference to JT in 1 Cor 7:10–11 is generally accepted.

2.2.3.3 Describing Paul's Use of JT

The third aspect of discussion relates to Paul's *use* of JT. This includes the question, "Why did Paul not make more explicit use of JT?" As above, we will first review Dunn's position before adding the voices of others.

Dunn fits within Furnish's fifth option, that Paul develops the JT *legitimately*. However Dunn would not see Paul "developing" the JT in an original way. Development belonged to the nature of oral traditioning, which shaped Paul's literary practice (see 2.1.7). For Dunn, this explains Paul's sparing *verbatim* quotations of JT. To expect otherwise reveals "a crucial failure to appreciate how tradition works in a community and the function of allusion" (Dunn 1998, 651). JT was not simply preserved; it was a living and active entity, recounted and celebrated, thus giving identity to the church. It was "absorbed into the life-blood of Christian paraenesis" (Dunn 2015, 212; cf. Allison 2009, 65). Explicit quotation would have been "unnecessary and ham-fisted" (Dunn 2005a, 48–49). Instead he could "use a whole sequence of allusions to the community's store of tradition," and they would recognize Paul's teaching as being consistent with the whole (Dunn 2005a, 48). "A community which can communicate only by citing explicit chapter and verse has no depth to it" (Dunn 1994, 177; cf. 1990, 195).

A complementary explanation for Paul's sparing explicit reference to JT is that "Paul obviously did not regard his letters as the means of communicating Jesus tradition to his churches" (Dunn 1998, 189). JT had already been passed on and did not need to be repeated (e.g. Allen 2013, 49; Allison 1982, 22; Kim 1993, 489).

Once again Dunn is not alone in many of these arguments (as noted in the references above). Four additions will be mentioned below.⁹ However we first note that many scholars also hold a "legitimate development" option akin to Dunn's (e.g. Schoberg 2014, 335; Allen 2013, 64; Barnett 2008, 7; Garland 2003, 282; Kim 2002, 290; Lee 2016, 19; D. Wenham e.g. 1995, 409). Thompson is worth quoting at length (1991, 240).

Paul is free in his use of JT, but it is a freedom within limits. On a formal level, he shows great liberty in (unconsciously?) adapting the language to fit into the flow of his exhortation and shows no constraint to quote the tradition in a wooden fashion. ... On the other hand, the essence of Jesus' teaching had evident authority for Paul, and he plainly does not feel free to "create" JT.

We turn now to these four additional points.

First, Thompson (1991), after providing his criteria for legitimate parallels, asks a helpful question: How *should* we expect Paul to refer to the JT if he did value it? In answer to that question Thompson examines the use of JT in canonical and extrabiblical writings (37–63). He concludes (61–62) that:

⁹ Some scholars have also sought to explain Paul's sparing use of JT with reference to Paul's Christology and/or his self-understanding. E.g. Kim (1993), Hays (2008) and Jacobi (2015).

- 1) it is “unrealistic to expect more than a few explicit references to Jesus’ teachings in Paul”;¹⁰
- 2) we should not expect lengthy quotations, material from parables or reports of particular miracles; and
- 3) “We might expect a few references to the example of Jesus in Paul, but primarily to characteristics seen in his Passion.”

This accords with Paul’s use of the JT.

Second, Lee (2016) suggests that Paul used the LXX and the JT similarly. This usage paralleled the Qumran community’s use of the LXX. In each instance, authority, citation and creativity are evident.

The third and fourth studies relate to Paul’s use of JT in an oblique way. The third is Rosner’s study on 1 Corinthians 5–7 (1994). Rosner’s thesis is that “in spite of the relatively few quotations of Scripture in Paul’s ethics ... the Scriptures are nevertheless a crucial and formative source for Paul’s ethics” (24). Paul was “immersed” in an “ocean of Biblical moral teaching” (38). Thus, Paul uses Scripture not just in explicit ways, but also in “what might be called implicit or instinctive” ways (17). Rosner’s observations are similar to those concerning Paul’s use of JT.¹¹

Finally, Bauckham’s work on JT in James (1999) provides another analogical comparison. Bauckham compares James to Ben Sira. Both take

¹⁰ Murray Smith (2010) notes that the Fathers usually referred to Jesus’ words (about practical rather than theological matters) rather than his deeds.

¹¹ We could also add Hays’ work on Paul’s use of intertextuality (e.g. 2002; 1989).

traditional wisdom and “reformulate” it for “new contexts and ... fresh developments of thought” (79). James “has made the wisdom of Jesus his own. He does not repeat it; he is inspired by it” (82; cf. McKnight 2011, 27). Rather than showing James’ dependence on particular JTs, Bauckham argues that “James’ wisdom has been decisively shaped by the distinctive character and emphases of Jesus” (100). He lists five characteristics of Jesus’ ethical teaching (distinct from contemporary Jewish wisdom *paraneisis*) and shows how James shares these (97–106).

Conclusion (Paul and JT)

Following a review of earlier scholarship on Paul’s relation to JT, we have examined three groups of studies: those doubting Paul’s knowledge and use of JT; those affirming his *knowledge* of JT; and those describing his *use* of JT. This has raised another set of potential roadblocks to our study, now in relation to Paul’s use of JT. These can be summarized into four groups:

- 1) Key passages purportedly affirming Paul’s independence/distance from the Historical Jesus, in particular 2 Cor 5:16 and 1 Cor 2:2.
- 2) Paul’s distance from Jewish Christianity (especially from Gal 1–2).
- 3) Paul’s independence from The Twelve (again, focusing on Gal 1–2).
- 4) The paucity of Jesus quotations in Paul.

We have also reviewed a number of scholars who support Paul's knowledge and use of JT. In Chapter 5 these potential Pauline roadblocks will be examined. We will argue that the evidence supports a positive view of Paul's knowledge and use of JT.

2.3. Paul's Use of the Divorce/Remarriage Jesus Tradition

The final area of literature to review is that related to the more specific question of Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT. As noted in the introduction, it is common for scholars to recognize the connection between 1 Cor 7 and the JT.¹² There is a range of views on the relationship between the two, from harmonization (e.g. Köstenberger 2004) to contradiction (e.g. Knust 2012, 73). Many such studies will prove helpful to the present one.

However, despite an extensive search of the literature, the author was unable to find studies that gave sustained attention to the connection between the two following the precise approach taken here. The studies of Laney (1990) and Dungan (1971) perhaps draw closest, as they (at least purport to) use Paul to shed light on the meaning of the Synoptic accounts. Ultimately, however, Laney's line of argument and Dungan's methodological assumptions set them apart from the present study.

¹² For example, the monographs of Raymond Collins (1992), Instone-Brewer (2002) and Zhekov (2009), along with commentators such as Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 291; Conzelmann 1975, 120; Fee 2014, 322–28; Fitzmyer 2008, 287–90; Garland 2003, 282.

Laney, after noting the challenge of harmonizing the Synoptic accounts, states that, “It would be most helpful to know how a first-century Greek Scholar and theologian understood Jesus’ teaching on this topic. Fortunately, we have such a first-century interpreter of the words of Jesus in the apostle Paul” (40). This is almost precisely the insight impelling the present study. However the structure of Laney’s argument prevents the Apostle’s understanding of the JT from influencing his understanding of the Synoptics. Laney *first* outlines his interpretation of the Synoptic accounts, reaching particular conclusions on several interpretive uncertainties (31–40). *Only then* does he turn to 1 Corinthians, showing that Paul agrees with his interpretation of the Synoptic material (40–48). Laney is of limited utility to the present study as we seek instead to allow Paul’s understanding of the JT to inform our reading of the Synoptics.

This is where the second study is closer to ours. Dungan’s study concerns the relationship between 1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14 and their Synoptic counterparts. Dungan exegetes the Pauline passages first, using them in his subsequent exegesis of the Synoptic passages. In terms of Paul’s interpretation and application of the JT, Dungan’s summary fits within Furnish’s fifth “legitimate development” option (139; cf. 132).

Paul stands squarely within the tradition that led to the Synoptic Gospels, and is of one mind with the editors of those Gospels, not only in the way he understands what Jesus (the Lord) was actually commanding in the sayings themselves but also in the way he prefigures the Synoptic editor’s use of them.

Some of Dungan's insights will prove helpful to this study and we will reach similar conclusions. However Dungan's work is limited in its interpretive value for two methodological reasons. The first is his Form Critical assumptions. For example, Dungan takes a form critical approach to "retrieve" the words of the historical Jesus from the "records of the words and commands of the Lord" (xxxi). He takes the view that Matthew's account is more primitive than Mark's as it fits the "form" of a controversy dialogue more neatly (122).

However, as Kelber states, "it is no exaggeration to claim that a whole spectrum of main assumptions underlying Bultmann's Synoptic Tradition must be considered suspect" (1983, 8). In his recent review of *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, Byrskog (2003) identifies a number of these "suspect assumptions." For example: a misunderstanding of how orality and literacy interact (550); an over-emphasis on the role of the community (551); and a "tendency to dichotomise the sayings material and the narrative material" (553). In conclusion, Byrskog notes that, "The fundamental problem with Bultmann's method is ... precisely that his method does not work as a tool of historical inquiry. Wherever Bultmann speaks of tendencies, we meet irregularities" (554).

Comparing Dungan's conclusions with those of Catchpole (1974) provides an example of Form Criticism's weakness. While Catchpole also takes a Form Critical approach, he concludes that Mark is more original than Matthew. For Catchpole, where Mark is "consistent, logical and consecutive," Matthew is incoherent (97). Dungan, on the other hand, says that Mark is confused (1971, 127). Bultmann agrees, stating for example that, "The formulation of [Matt 19:4] is completely impossible, for in any real debate this is the point at which the

conditions of divorce must be stated” (1963 [1921], 27). Each conclusion rests upon an assumption of how a “real debate” *should* unfold.

The second methodological weakness in Dungan is its incoherence. When certain phrases do not fit his form (e.g. Matt 19:10), Dungan cites “the freedom the gospel editors seem to display, where ... inventing, altering, rearranging, omitting, and combining took place on an astonishingly massive scale” (142). For this reason, Dungan can say both that, “Paul stands squarely within the tradition that led to the Synoptic Gospels,” and also that Paul’s instructions clash with “the word of the command he actually cites” (140). These are both possible because Paul is “simply [reflecting] current practice, as shown by the Synoptic editors’ referring to Jesus’ saying by means of a rough approximation of the final phrases in Jesus’ answer” (140).

Dungan’s methodology casts questions over the value of his interpretive insights and his attempt to resolve the interpretive uncertainties of the Synoptic accounts. The approach of the present study has greater potential for fruitful interpretive outcomes as it depends upon less specific and problematic assumptions and avoids methodological inconsistencies. Instead it seeks to allow Pauline and Synoptic texts to shed light on each other without being subsumed into each other.

2.4 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed three areas of the literature. The first traced the debate concerning JT generally, its nature and transmission. The second examined Paul’s relation to JT more specifically, both his knowledge (or not) of

JT as well as his use of it. The literature relating to these first two areas included a number of arguments that, if legitimate, would act as roadblocks to the present study. However a number of arguments against them were also reviewed. In following chapters these arguments will be summarized and our conclusions put forth. The next chapter will relate to JT more generally while Paul and the JT will be discussed in Chapter 5. The final section of this review touched on two studies which were shown to be of limited value to the present work.

Chapter 3: Identifying Jesus Tradition

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, critical scholars have raised several issues related to JT that, if legitimate, would render this study untenable. These issues are possible roadblocks for this study and cannot be ignored. This chapter will first state these possible roadblocks under two headings. Second, it will point out weaknesses in the arguments commonly supporting them. Third, it will argue that an augmented version of Dunn's model (rather than Watson's model) provides a better explanation of the data. Finally, this model will provide a methodological framework for identifying JT in the Synoptics.

3.1. Two Possible Roadblocks

The issues raised in the previous chapter that are most problematic for this study can be categorized under two headings: Instability and Circularity.

3.1.1 Instability

A number of the scholars reviewed suggest that, to varying extents and for various reasons, the JT was not stable over time. Two such reasons ("Intentional Alteration" and "Memory") are outlined below.

3.1.1.1 Intentional Alteration

The first reason is that at various times Christians intentionally altered the accounts of Jesus. For Wrede it was the witnesses to the historical Jesus and the Evangelists who invented aspects of the gospel they preached and the early JT they passed on. For example, they invented the idea that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, his miracles, the resurrection, etc. The result is that our Gospels do not

reflect, in any straightforward sense, what actually occurred. It is possible that such scholars regarded the inventions as having ceased with the writing of Mark's Gospel. Nevertheless, these scholars introduced a destabilizing disconnection between the historical Jesus and gospel writing.

With Bultmann the instability is more explicit. The JT was, "fluid and plastic, open to new additions and new shapes" (Bailey 1991, 36). This was the case for the early JT shared orally amongst Christian communities, but it did not cease with the writing of Mark. Between Mark and Matthew the JT took on new "layers." The same would be true between the writing of 1 Corinthians and Mark.

It follows from Ehrman's uncontrolled model of transmission that the early oral JT changed "rapidly, repeatedly, and extensively" (2016b, 183). Indeed it is his "ultimate point" that the "invention of memories of Jesus ... has always been going on" (2016b, 25; cf. 2016a, 51, 134).

3.1.1.2 Memory

For Ehrman, however, the fault is not only intentional invention. The second reason for instability is the unreliable nature of human memory, both individual and collective. "All memories are distorted" (Ehrman 2016b, 291). Allison (2010, 2–8) and Hollander (2000, 353–54) likewise cast doubt on the ability of memory to provide a stable JT.

Based mainly on combinations of these reasons, critical scholars have brought the stability of the accounts of Jesus into question at different points of the transmission process. If this instability is a genuine phenomenon, the present study cannot proceed, for it requires the JT Paul refers to in 1 Cor 7 to be

comparable with that documented in the Synoptics. That is, it requires some level of stability in the JT.

3.1.2 Circularity

The second possible roadblock is that of circularity. It has been the “major view in the history of scholarship” that the Synoptic Evangelists depended significantly on Paul (Crossley 2011, 10). If Baur is correct, that Matthew and Mark are mediating a Pauline/Petrine schism, then it is possible that they intentionally brought their material on divorce into line with Paul’s view. The likelihood of this is increased if the Evangelists invented material. If Wrede is correct, that Paul “exercised ... the stronger ... influence,” it is possible that Paul’s position on divorce is the one we have recorded in the Synoptic Gospels rather than any prior JT (1908 [1905], 180). Hollander explicates just such a mechanism, that certain “Jesus sayings” were actually introduced by Paul and only then attributed to the historical Jesus (2000, 346).

More recent studies have carried this doubt forward in relation to each of the Synoptics. A few have sought “to locate Mark within the Pauline tradition” (Omerzu 2014b, 51; e.g. Nelligan 2015; Vig Skoven 2014). For example, Bird argues that Mark pictures the cross as “the apex of Christological revelation,” which is “a distinctly Pauline idea” (2011b, 43). Similar arguments have been made for Luke (e.g. Matthews 2017). Brodie (2004) and Goulder (1974) argue for Matthean dependence on Paul due to thematic similarities. Sim has argued that Matthew “did know the Pauline epistles” and alluded to specific Pauline

texts (e.g. Matt 16:17/Gal 1:11, 16–17), but that he was “vehemently opposed” to Paul (2009, 401, 410).

If these arguments are legitimate this study must take a very different direction, examining Mark’s use of Paul rather than Paul’s use of prior JT.

3.2 Questioning the Roadblocks

These roadblocks are not as sturdy as they appear. Each encounters multiple problems especially in relation to the NT evidence. Some such weaknesses will be outlined below.

3.2.1 Instability

In relation to instability our discussion will be limited to Ehrman (2016b) as a recent example. Three weaknesses will be mentioned. First, Ehrman occasionally lacks balance. This is most apparent in his model of the transmission process. For example, Ehrman makes the reasonable suggestion (against Bailey) that it would not *only* have been eyewitnesses who recited the stories about Jesus in the early Christian communities. However, rather than simply expanding the pool of authorized guardians of the tradition, he assumes (e.g. 74) the opposite extreme: a fully democratized situation with no such guardians. He implies (e.g. 86; 2016a, 50–51) that, if the models of Bailey and Gerhardsson are flawed, the only alternative is one in which stories were shared in a manner akin to the children’s game “telephones,” without any controls. Significantly, this model “controls his reception of memory research” (Kirk 2017, 89). Meier’s words regarding the Form Critics are apposite (1991, 1:170).

One would get the impression that throughout the first Christian generation there were no eyewitnesses to act as a check on fertile imaginations, no original-disciples-now-become-leaders who might exercise some control over the developing tradition, and no striking deeds and sayings of Jesus that stuck willy-nilly in people's memory.

Second, there are at least three inconsistencies in his presentation on memory.

- a) In line with memory research Ehrman states that, "All memories are distorted" (291). However he then states that he will use "distorted" and "false" synonymously (302 n. 3). This is somewhat misleading as these words are not synonyms.
- b) Ehrman cites as evidence Neisser's (1981) analysis of John Dean's faulty testimony during the Watergate scandal. For Ehrman, this suggests that we cannot trust eyewitnesses to give us any certainty about what Jesus said or did (146–47). However, Neisser's own conclusion points in a different direction.¹³ Neisser concluded that "Dean was fundamentally right about what had been happening ... [and his memory] reflects a genuinely existing state of affairs" (1981, 1).
- c) Kirk notes that memory distortion research has "come in for criticism" from a range of fronts (2017, 91–92). Bockmuehl, drawing on a number of memory studies, concludes that, "It is becoming more widely recognized that the confluence of individual and communal memory with written sources is often the meeting ground of 'good history' with what we call a 'true story'" (2007a, 346). He argues that just such a confluence is present in the transmission of JT and the inscription of the Gospels. They are both

¹³ Kirk (2017, 94–98) also exposes Ehrman's misuse of Rubin and Vansina.

“true story” and “good history.” Other examples could be added, such as: Dunn’s (2007, 185) use of Assmann’s “communicative memory” model; Bauckham’s work on the nature of eyewitness memory (Bauckham 2006, 319–57); or Le Donne’s suggestion that “studies on memory localization and distortion ... will yield results that do not confuse distortion with non-historicity” (2007, 177). The point is simply that Ehrman’s understanding of memory is not universally held and that his presentation of the data is at times misleading.

Third, Ehrman assumes the work of the Form Critics. Ehrman writes, “Today ... we are still more or less in their [*sic*] same boat” (65). We may contrast this to what Kelber wrote three decades earlier: “Today it is no exaggeration to claim that a whole spectrum of main assumptions underlying Bultmann's Synoptic Tradition must be considered suspect” (1983, 8). Sanders (e.g. 1969) and others have critiqued the Form Critics on literary grounds. For Kelber and others the problem with the form critics is their misunderstandings of oral cultures. Ehrman perpetuates this misunderstanding. A number of modern linguistic and sociological studies (see 2.1.6) have argued convincingly that there are no purely oral cultures. Oral and written cultures “interpenetrate one another” (Abasciano 2007, 165).

[From] the beginning Christianity was deeply engaged in the interpretation and appropriation of texts. That activity presupposed not only a mature literacy but also sophisticated scribal and exegetical skills. ... Early Christianity was never without a literary dimension. (Rodríguez 2014, 27, 29)

Indeed a curious suggestion with surprisingly good ancient support is that Jesus' disciples used notebooks to record his teaching (Millard 2000, 202–4; cf. Bird 2014, 45–47; Dunn 2013, 309; 2015, 215).¹⁴ This evidence suggests that there was no purely oral period as Ehrman and the form critics imagine. Rather, there are increasingly sound reasons to suppose that the traditions were remembered within “a fluid exchange between orality and textuality” (Bird 2014, 112; cf. Rodríguez 2014, 3).

New Testament Evidence

Drawing back from these details, the impression given by Ehrman, Bultmann and others is that the stability of the JT was not a paramount concern for the early church. Is this the impression given by the NT, our primary evidence? How does such a claim cohere with the importance Paul places on passing on tradition and retaining what had been received (e.g. Gal 1:9; Phil 4:9; Col 2:6; 1 Thess 2:13; 4:1; 2 Thess 2:15; 3:6)?

1 Cor 11 is particularly informative on this point. Paul praises the Corinthians for “keeping” the traditions (παράδοσεις) “just as” (καθώς) he had delivered (παρέδωκα) them (11:2). Paul’s “praise” for this is noteworthy given the general tone of the letter (e.g. 1:10–17; 5:1–2, 6, etc.). Again, he will *not* praise them when they reject what he himself received (παρέλαβον) and delivered (παρέδωκα) to them (11:23). Here and elsewhere (e.g. Col 2:6; 1 Thess 4:1; 2 Thess 3:6), Paul is using “the technical terms” for transmission (Büchsel 1964, 171; cf. Dunn 2008a, 100; 2013, 340; Fiensy 2010, 100.). Hellenistic

¹⁴ Q would be in this category.

philosophers, including Aristotle, Plutarch and Polybius, used the same terms to speak of the transmission of their standard doctrines (Thiselton 2000, 867; Wegenast 1971, 759-75). So Delling says that, in Paul, λαμβάνω can mean “to receive in fixed form, in the chain of Christian tradition” (1967, 5–15). Claire Smith notes that, “Implicit in this type of instruction, and reflected in the apostle’s praise, was the expectation that addressees would maintain and adhere to the content without deviation” (2012, 133). This sense of “adhering” is also connoted by the verb “keep” (κατέχω) (11:2).¹⁵ Paul’s churches were not to invent tradition, but to *keep* what they had received.

Similarly, in 1 Cor 15:1–3 the Corinthians have taken their stand on the gospel they have received (παρελάβετε) and will be saved by it if they hold to it (κατέχετε). Smith observes that, “Inadequate ‘reception’ or learning of the content would create misunderstandings of the resurrection and threaten eternal salvation” (2012, 137).

Paul himself acknowledges the authority of the traditions (e.g. 1 Cor 11:23; 15:3; Gal 1:9; Thiselton 2000, 867). In other words, Paul is not expounding “his personal preferences” (Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 506). He has been “entrusted with the secret things of God” and “it is required” that he “must prove faithful” (1 Cor 4:1–2). Paul represents himself “not as an innovator *de novo* but as one who stands within the context of a tradition” (Ellis 1986, 496).

Similar instructions are given within the Pastoral Epistles, with Timothy being called to “guard” (φύλαξον) what has been “entrusted” (παραθήκη) to

¹⁵ Amongst other similar options, BDAG offers “restrain,” “to adhere firmly to traditions,” and “confine” as possible meanings (BDAG, s.v. “κατέχω”).

him (1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:14).¹⁶ Timothy is in something of a transmission chain. He is to entrust (παράθου) to faithful men the things he heard from Paul (2 Tim 2:2). While this might not refer strictly to JT, it does presume “a stable, recognizable body of content” (C. Smith 2012, 140).

The Synoptics sound the same note. Jesus sends his followers out to speak *the same message* he spoke (Matt 10:7–8, 27; Mark 6:7–13; Luke 9:1–2; 10:9–11). The risen Jesus tells them to “Go ... teaching them to observe *everything I have commanded you*” (Matt 28:20). Pure invention has no place here (an emphatic point in Luke’s prologue). They are simply to be “witnesses” (Matt 10:18; Mark 13:9; Luke 21:13; 24:48).

One could add the NT injunctions to “remember” (e.g. Luke 22:19; John 14:26; 1 Cor 4:17; 11:2; 2 Thess 2:5; 2 Tim 2:8; Titus 3:1; 2 Pet 1:15). This “language of [remembering] reflects the expectation that the content would not progress or change over time” (C. Smith 2012, 376).

In summary, the NT evidence suggests that stability was of more importance than critical scholarship has generally recognized. These observations, as well as the weaknesses in Ehrman’s argument, bring into question the validity of the roadblock of instability.

3.2.2 Circularity

Circularity is the second major roadblock suggested by the previous chapter. Although Baur’s schism hypothesis was based on a Hegelian view of historical

¹⁶ If these epistles are classified as non-Pauline the point is strengthened. Not only Paul speaks this way.

development that collapsed in the 1850s, it is still possible that his textual observations were legitimate (e.g. McGrath 2005, 382). These observations relate to 1 and 2 Corinthians. For example:

1. 1 Corinthians 1:12 gives the names of at least two parties (the Paul and the Peter parties), “denoting their several opinions” (Baur 1873 [1831], 269).
2. 1 Cor 9:5 states, “Don’t we have the right to be accompanied by a Christian wife like the other apostles, the Lord’s brothers, and Cephas?” For Baur (1873 [1831], 279), this is “clear” evidence that Paul’s Corinthian opponents “belonged also to one class with the adherents of the party of Peter.”

Closer inspection of the text, however, raises questions as to such conclusions. Concerning point 1, it is noteworthy that in Galatians, where there were obviously “several opinions,” Paul argued a theological case, whereas 1 Corinthians has no such argument. Paul simply urges them to agree (1 Cor 1:10). Thus, according to Thiselton, “most scholars today” think that “the real problem being addressed ... is one of partisanship,” human politics rather than doctrinal differences (2000, 116–17; cf. Welborn 1997, 2–11). Again it is noteworthy that “Paul does not side with his own group against the others” (Thiselton 2000, 126). Thus Baur appears to have gone beyond what the evidence allows in identifying what characterized each of these “parties.”

As to the suggestion of the Evangelists’ dependence on Paul, *some* dependence seems *a priori* likely. Paul’s letters may well have shaped the

theology of those orally recounting JT in their communities, consciously or otherwise, which could have led in turn to “Pauline” theology entering the Gospels (Bird 2011a, 1).

In relation to Mark, Werner (1923) wrote against the suggestion that Mark was a Paulinist. He concluded that:

1) Where Mark agrees with Paul, it is always a matter of general early Christian viewpoints. 2) Where characteristically Pauline viewpoints come to the fore in his letters, either Markan parallels are lacking or Mark represents exactly contrary standpoints. 3) Therefore there cannot be the least influence of Pauline theology on the Gospel of Mark (English translation by Marcus 2000, 476).

Others have questioned Werner’s first point, showing that some agreements are reasonably unique to Paul and Mark. For example, Marcus (2000) suggests that their views of the cross are unique.¹⁷ This fact, coupled with the *a priori* likelihood of some influence, makes Werner’s concluding third point more absolute than the evidence warrants.

Bird (2011b) is more even-handed. He cites a small number of examples where he believes Mark has been influenced by Paul (e.g. 7:19; 10:45; 13:10) and concludes that Mark is “indebted to Petrine tradition and exhibits a pro-Pauline theological texture” (52). Nevertheless,

Mark remains in many ways a very independent thinker and he is neither slavishly bound to Paul’s theological framework nor hypnotically attached to Paul as his own theological teacher. Mark is more than willing to incorporate

¹⁷ Though establishing dependence on such broad topics is difficult (Crossley 2011, 11–13).

other traditions into his narrative even when they grate, potentially or actually, against Paul's own perspective (Bird 2011a, 3).

Nelligan's (2015) study is similar and pertinent to the present one. In seeking to establish Markan dependence on Paul, he concludes that any connections are "weak" (152; cf. 97).

Concerning Matthew, his "basic theological affinity" with Paul speaks against a Baur-style schism (Willitts 2011, 62; cf. Dodd 1947; Iverson 2012).¹⁸ Foster (2011), however shows that their themes not only converge but also diverge. Even in the convergences, "there is no way of establishing the case of dependence" (114). Matthew is neither Pauline nor un-Pauline; he is simply non-Pauline (Bird 2011a, 4).

In conclusion then, there remains a possibility of Pauline influence on the Evangelists.¹⁹ However, judging from the low level of influence we have found, and the fact that possible influences usually relate to soteriological matters (e.g. the Cross, the nature of true defilement, redemption, etc.) rather than ethical ones, it appears unlikely that Paul's views on divorce would have influenced the Synoptists to such an extent that they significantly modified or disregarded other JT available to them. Indeed, some level of influence from Paul actually supports the present study, lending feasibility to the methodology of using Paul's letters to shed light on interpretive uncertainties in the Synoptics.

¹⁸ For example (Dodd 1947, 295–98), both have an eschatological focus around the Kingdom of Christ "as in some sense distinct from the Kingdom of God." Second, they have similar ecclesiologies. Third, they both oppose certain aspects of contemporary Judaism.

¹⁹ As Crossley notes, Christian communities could also have influenced Paul (2011, 28–29).

3.3 Watson's Model

As we saw in the Literature Review, Watson (2013) has proposed a hermeneutical model that explains the variations evident in the Synoptics by reversing the dominant hermeneutical direction. This section examines and rejects Watson's model.

Concerning what is more traditionally understood as the transmission process, Watson begins outlining a model reasonably similar to Dunn's, combining a stable core with freedom in performance (345). However this oral phase is quickly left behind for a focus on Gospel writing.²⁰

Watson seeks to remove the need for the hypothetical source Q by arguing for the L/M model (in which Luke depended on Matthew) and by introducing a new, early "sayings collections" (SC) that Mark and Matthew would have used (but not Luke). Thomas is given as "a later exemplar" of this "archaic genre" (221). Bauckham has accused Watson of simply replacing Q with other, "suspiciously Q-like sources" (2014, 193). However Watson's purpose is symbolic rather than pragmatic. "To dispense with Q is also to abandon the fruitless quest for an original uninterpreted object and to attend instead to the dynamic of tradition" (158; cf. 102-3).

Watson notes elsewhere that this "dynamic of tradition" is a forward movement of reception and constant reinterpretation (2016, 113). Bauckham calls this a "reversal of hermeneutical direction" (2014, 186-7). In this forward movement each Evangelist (and there were many) sought to "contribute to the ongoing process of interpreting Jesus' significance to his later followers" (604).

²⁰ Indeed he is opposed to the focus Dunn gives to orality (172. n. 29).

This meant reinterpreting earlier “Gospels,” replacing them (2016, 4) and even actively disagreeing with them (2016, 16). Yet each Gospel in this process is still the written expression of JT. Despite disagreements, even if the “evangelist himself is the author of a story, ... whatever the degree of creativity exercised, inscription is the articulation of prior tradition” (352). Rather than moving away from Jesus, “each new gospel ... is also intended as a movement back to Jesus himself” (605).

The legitimacy of this reversal depends on the understanding that “the living Jesus” is still speaking.²¹ This view is shared by Bultmann and some amongst the New Quest and Third Quest: “the ascended Christ would assuredly have spoken” through his followers (Bultmann 1963 [1921], 127; cf. Crossan and Watts 1996, 22; Käsemann 1964, 60). Such words, even though “spoken” at a later time, were given equal weight to older, received traditions and were inscribed in the Synoptics. For Watson, it is for this reason that subsequent reinterpretations actually move closer to Jesus.

If Watson’s model is accurate the current study would be problematic. His model does not support a stable JT between the time when Paul and the Synoptists wrote. Seeking to harmonise the Synoptic accounts in any way would be inappropriate.

However Watson’s model has several weaknesses. It gives scant attention to the impact of orality on the JT. Oral traditioning is passed over in favour of “Gospel writing,” and particularly the writing of “Sayings Collections” (Watson 2013, 608–9). However, as Omerzu points out, Watson fails to “provide sufficient

²¹ A phrase he uses at least eight times. E.g. 2013, 249, 361, 365.

and real examples to prove the existence of an SC genre" (2014, 205). Thomas is the only example.

The broader weakness with Watson's model is his reversal of the hermeneutical direction, that is, his suggestion that we should dispense with the backward movement that seeks the earliest traditions in favour of the forward movement the Evangelists take. In Bauckham's (2014) view, "Watson's theological claim about the tradition as Jesus' own self-communication seems ... too little integrated with the historical and literary realities of gospels" (199).

In terms of historical realities, Watson treats the now canonical Gospels as equals with the non-canonical. Bauckham however maintains that, "simply as a matter of historical judgment ... [none] of the non-canonical gospels that we have belong to [the same] category" as the now canonical Gospels (197). He then outlines a more conservative history of reception (196–8).

Regarding the literary realities of the gospels, Bauckham takes issue with Watson for not explaining what a Gospel is in relation to contemporary Graeco-Roman literature (198). Since the publication of Burridge's *What are the Gospels?* (1992) there has been "a quiet revolution ... in the scholarly understanding of the Gospel genre" (Walton 2015, 81). Bauckham (2014, 198), Walton (2015, 81) and also Keener (2019) agree that the "now dominant" view is that the Gospels belong to a broader genre best described as "historiographical biographies." Writings in this genre were "expected to be well based on evidence" (199). In other words, invention and continual reinterpretation do not belong within the gospel genre.

Claiming that the living Jesus speaks ... do we not need to insist that the living Jesus also really lived in the story the narrative gospels tell? That story is the

criterion of his living identity, and so the historiographical genre of the narrative gospels – and the limits sets to freedom of interpretation – is not just of literary but of theological importance. (Bauckham 2014, 199)

Bauckham's questions regarding the history of transmission and the "Gospel" genre are problematic for Watson's model. Therefore the present study will not follow it.

3.4 Dunn's (Adjusted) Model

As demonstrated, the two identified roadblocks to this study and Watson's alternative model do not explain the NT data convincingly, nor do they cohere with recent genre, historical and orality studies. However, before announcing that the road is open for this study to proceed, a better model must first be put forward and defended. We propose that an adjusted version of Dunn's model provides a more adequate explanation of the evidence. We here summarise his model in two parts.

3.4.1 Oral Traditioning

In *Jesus Remembered* (2003), the first of his *Christianity in the Making* trilogy, Dunn raises three protests against earlier, liberal approaches to the transmission of JT and makes three alternative proposals.²² His second protest is against their assumption of a purely literary tradition—the "literary mindset" as Dunn puts it (2013, 304). His proposal is to take "the oral phase of the history of the Jesus

²² A summary can be found in Dunn (2005a) or (2013, 267-89).

tradition with all seriousness” (2013, 277). Using a “well-informed historical imagination,” Dunn attempts to paint a concrete picture of what this oral phase of the JT may have looked like (2005a, 53).

A disciple may have recalled to their “disciple group” a particular story or teaching of Jesus that had impacted them. If affirmed by the group, it would become part of their group tradition (2005a, 55). In subsequent gatherings, one member might request that tradition again, perhaps because of a particular challenge facing them (2008a, 194–5).

In response, a senior disciple would again tell the appropriate story or teaching in whatever variant words and detail he/she judged appropriate for the occasion, with sufficient corporate memory ready to protest if one of the key elements was missed or varied too much (2005a, 55).

These stories and teachings were the “narratives which made [the early Christians’] own life story meaningful, teaching by which they lived” (2011, 44). The JT was therefore self-stabilising, as the congregation “would not take kindly to major divergences in the content of the tradition by individual performers” (2007, 192). To be clear, these traditions were not shared simply for transmission, but for celebration and reflection (2013, 214). They were “performed, not edited” (2003, 248–9). This was a living tradition (2013, 308). This is different from the “oral history” of Baukham, Byrskog and Gerhardsson in which traditions were memorized (mostly by eyewitnesses) and recited to the Evangelists (2011, 40; 2013, 79).

3.4.2 Gospel Writing

Neither Jew nor Greek (2015), the final book in Dunn's trilogy, outlines the process of Gospel writing in light of oral tradition. He suggests that when the Evangelists came to write they had "an extensive range" of oral traditions available to them, as is evident from the diversity in the Gospels (2015, 309–10). This variety would have stemmed from at least four sources.

1. Jesus probably repeated a teaching on several occasions (2008b, 90; cf. 2015, 214). Hence, an eyewitness must decide which wording to use at which point (2015, 56). Perhaps there was a set wording drilled into the disciples for a particular teaching (à la the Scandiavian school).
2. Variety would come from the multiplicity of witnesses to any given event or teaching. Each would remember things slightly differently.
3. Translation of Jesus' *ipsissima verba* may have introduced small variations in wording or even meaning (2008a, 310–1). This is not to suggest that "the substance of the Jesus tradition was significantly altered" (2008a, 309).
4. The Evangelists would have been aware of a variety of traditions due simply to the natures of oral transmission and human memory. Both lead us to expect some flexibility around a stable core.

Dunn sees an overlap between oral traditioning and Gospel writing (2015, 213). When the Evangelists wrote, they would not have seen themselves as

moving away from orality. For Dunn, each Gospel is, “in effect, a written version of an oral recitation of Jesus tradition” (2015, 214).

What follows is that oral tradition’s “stability-with-flexibility” is “carried over into the written forms of the tradition” (2011, 41–2). Dunn sees that, as with an oral tradition, there was stability in “the theme of the story or in its core element” but a certain amount of flexibility was allowable, even expected (2005a, 52). He asserts that the variations between Gospels are, “little more than the variation which different oral teachers would give to the tradition they were teaching, to bring out its relevance to the situation of the particular audience addressed” (2015, 214). Evangelists also made use of this flexibility in order to give their Gospels “narrative movement and thematic emphasis” (2015, 225).

For Dunn, upholding such flexibility does not mean that he doubts the Evangelist’s intention to preserve JT. Kelber may be right in saying that, “preservation of oral tradition is not a primary function of writing” (1983, 207). However, putting “primary function” aside, the Gospels would not be collections of JT unless the writers maintained the core of such traditions. For Dunn, even if they stretch the category, the Gospels are still biographies in the ancient sense (2015, 195).

What remains is, firstly, to show how Dunn’s basic model accords with the NT data, and secondly to make adjustments to it in order to explain that evidence even more adequately.

3.4.3 Defending Dunn's model

Many of the Scriptural arguments above (3.2.1) opposing "Intentional Alteration" apply to this model also and will not be repeated here. Dunn notes several of them and adds the obvious importance of "witness" (e.g. John 1:7-8; 3:26; 5:32; Acts 2:32; 3:15; 10:41; 13:31) (2003, 176-8). He also notes that "Paul was careful to refer his churches back to ... foundation traditions," a point we will return to in Chapter 5 (2003, 176).

However, the most significant evidence for Dunn's model is not individual proof texts but the shape of the Gospels themselves. "It has always been a primary concern of my study of the Gospel traditions to understand how and why the Synoptic tradition takes the form that it does," especially in its "same but different" character (Dunn 2013, 214; cf. 2007, 179). In terms of that shape, Dunn accepts the two-source hypothesis as the "most obvious" way to explain the number of exact verbal parallels between Gospels (2015, 199). On its own however the hypothesis fails to adequately explain the variations between the Gospels (Dunn 2013, 293).²³ Significantly, "many if not most of the variations are inconsequential," not key interpretive points (Dunn 2011, 34). For example, Matt 3:8 has "fruit" where Luke 3:8 has "fruits." Purely literary models can only explain these variations as copying mistakes, the fruit of poor memory or intentional invention. For Dunn though, these variations are inherent byproducts of the oral "traditioning" process (2013, 277). The Evangelists began with multiple versions of the same traditions and followed the same pattern as those who performed the traditions orally.

²³ Ingolfsson holds that oral tradition is sufficient to account even for both stability and flexibility (2006, 193-94). Similarly Baum (2008, 1-23).

This blurring of oral and literary spheres, such that similar patterns govern them both, is a significant point in Dunn's argument. It is therefore worth reminding the reader of the evidence for such a view outlined in the Literature Review (2.1.6). Further evidence is added here.²⁴ First, with reference to Mark 1:1, Strauss notes that "the gospel" was first understood to be an oral proclamation (e.g. 1 Thess 1:5; 2:2, 4, 8–9) (2014, 27). Mark however, "identifies his narrative as a *written version of the oral proclamation*." Second, O'Brien notes that the word ἐπιστολή "originally referred to an oral communication sent by a messenger" (1993, 550). Third, this dynamic is observable in 1 Corinthians. For example, Paul writes on many practical matters for community life, expecting the Corinthians to "learn, understand, be transformed and continue to be informed by" the text (e.g. 1 Cor 14:27; C. Smith 2012, 161). However, at the same time he refers to that which he *orally preached* to them, noting that they have "taken their stand" upon it (e.g. 1 Cor 15:1–2). They are neither purely oral nor purely text based. The non-binary nature of oral and written media allows Dunn to conclude that each Gospel was, "in effect, a written version of an oral recitation of Jesus tradition" (2015, 214).

In Dunn's words, this process of oral traditioning, in conjunction with the two-source hypothesis, provides the "combination of fixity and flexibility, of stability and diversity, of the same yet different" that explains the Synoptic Gospels so well (2011, 38; cf. 2015, 211; cf. Mournet 2009).²⁵

²⁴ C.f. Bauckham 2006, 280; Dewey 2013, 79; Eddy 2013, 647; J. McGrath 2009, 5.

²⁵ This is a simplification. Scribes may not have recorded *verbatim* and oral transmission was not *necessarily* particularly flexible (e.g. Chang 2019).

3.4.4 Augmenting Dunn with individuals

There are weaknesses with Dunn's model. One weakness pertinent to this study is its highly democratic focus. The primary instrument for maintaining the stability of JT is the Christian community. As noted in the literature review (2.1.8), several scholars suggest that at least three groups of particular individuals should be given a greater role within Dunn's model. These are, for Bockmuehl (2010, 42), apostles; for Byrskog, (2004), teachers;²⁶ and for Bauckham (2006; cf. Witherington 2010), eyewitnesses.²⁷ These suggestions accord with the NT testimony.

3.4.4.1 Apostles

The Gospels themselves carry an expectation that Apostles would have a unique role in the transmission of the JT. By the power of the Spirit, the Apostles were to testify about Jesus, "because you have been with me from the beginning" (John 15:27; cf. Acts 1:21–22). It was the Apostles who were commanded to teach others "to keep *everything I have commanded you*" (Matt 28:20). This pattern was not only commanded by Jesus, it was practised. According to the witness of Acts, the Apostles *did* testify to Jesus (e.g. Acts 4:33). It was to their teaching that the early church committed themselves (Acts 2:42). The church was built on "the Apostles and prophets" (Eph 2:20). Paul draws on their testimony to assure the Galatians that his gospel is authentic (Gal 2:1–9). He may even speak explicitly of JT (e.g. Rom 6:17; Eph 4:20–21).

²⁶ Cf. Bird (2014, 63). If Jesus was a teacher, then establishing structures in the church for preserving his teachings makes sense.

²⁷ For more on these roles see 2.1.8. The work of scribes and "scribal memory" (*as per* Chang (2019) and Kirk (2011)) will not form a part of this model.

Evidence of Apostolic involvement also comes from later centuries. Justin spoke of the Gospels as “the memoirs of the Apostles” (e.g. *1 Apol.* 67.3). Papias (Eusebius, *Ecc. His.* 3.39.15) designates Mark as “the interpreter of Peter.”

Dunn acknowledges this correction, saying that “the basic thrust” of his model is that the Apostles “were the responsible agents in formulating and beginning the process of spreading the JT” (2010, 291).

3.4.4.2 Teachers

Once again, the New Testament gives ample evidence of the significant role of teachers (e.g. Acts 13:1; Rom 12:7; 1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11; Heb 5:12; Jas 3:1).²⁸ There has been debate regarding the role of this office.²⁹ However whether on the one hand a teacher was “above all a transmitter of the Tradition about Christ” (Moo 1980, 65; cf. Dickson 2014, 31; Liefeld 1999, 99); or if, on the other, this was only *part* of their role (e.g. C. Smith 2014; Wegenast 1971, 759), there is agreement that teachers passed on JT. Dunn even speaks of teachers as “the congregation’s repository of oral tradition” (2003, 176). The “retention and transmission” of the tradition was their “primary responsibility” (2008b, 91). This being so, their limited role in his model is a curious discrepancy.

3.4.4.3 Eyewitnesses

Finally, with regards to “eyewitnesses,” the NT also has much to say. For example, Paul appeals to the number of witnesses to Jesus’ resurrection, “most of whom are still living,” as if to invite the Corinthians to speak to these eyewitnesses (1 Cor 15:6). Luke wants Theophilus to “have certainty of the

²⁸ Greek students put confidence in their particular teacher and Jewish students gave special honour to the office of teacher, “the bearer of the tradition” (Delling, “λαμβανω,” TDNT 4:12–13).

²⁹ In relation to women, e.g. Bolt and Payne (2014) and Dickson (2014).

things” he has been taught (Luke 1:4). He does so by appealing to what the “eyewitnesses (αὐτόπται) and servants of the word” have “handed down (παρέδοσαν)” (Luke 1:2). John seems to consider it significant that he is an eyewitness (e.g. John 19:35; 1 John 1:1).

The importance of eyewitness testimony is also apparent in Papias. “I did not think that what was to be gotten from the books would profit me as much as what came from the living and abiding voice.” Hence, “if anyone came, who had been a follower of the elders, I questioned him in regard to the words of the elders” (Eusebius, *Hist. Ecc.* 3.39.4). He desires the words of “direct experience of an instructor, informant, or orator” (Bauckham 2006, 27). Again, Eusebius quotes a letter from Irenaeus which speaks of Irenaeus’ dedication to learning from Polycarp, not from a community (*Hist. Eccl.* 5.20.5–7).

As Witherington concludes, “The point is simple: whether we begin with Paul, Luke, the Fourth Gospel, or finally Papias, all these writers are concerned with being in touch with not merely the oral tradition but with the autopsy of eyewitness” (2010, 220).

3.4.4.4 Summary: Augmented Model

In summary, the NT evidence examined above supports an adjusted version of Dunn’s model. The “same yet different” shape of the Gospels is well explained by a combination of oral and literary sources, of the two-source hypothesis and oral tradition (Dunn 2011, 38; cf. 2015, 211). However it requires the controls provided by key individuals, that is, Apostles, eyewitnesses and teachers. It should be noted that Dunn is open to these additions (2010, 314), seeing his thesis as “complementary” to Bauckham’s and Byrskog’s.

I see no difficulty, then, in merging the insights of oral tradition as community tradition and recognition of the importance of individual eyewitnesses in providing, contributing to and, in at least some measure, helping to control the interpretation given to that tradition (Dunn 2004, 484).³⁰

This model provides a way forward for this study in two ways. First, it defends the stability of JT required for this study. If oral and written traditioning followed similar rules, then “there is no good reason to suppose that the range” of variations in a JT were ever wider than “the range we find in the Gospels themselves” (Bauckham 2006, 259). Further, if there is significant stability between Mark and Matthew, written at different times and in different places, this suggests a stability of the oral tradition across time and space reaching back to Paul also.

Second, this model has methodological implications for identifying the JT, as outlined below.

3.5 Methodology

The model outlined above suggests two angles of approach. On the one hand we will give primary place to the “stable core” of the divorce/remarriage tradition. But on the other we will take full account of the variety within the accounts. This tension reflects the oral traditioning process and the stability and flexibility of the Gospels. It is also essential for this study. On the one hand, we hope to show how Paul maintains the “stable core” of the tradition. But at the same time we

³⁰ Dunn’s purpose in *Jesus Remembered* was to establish that, “even without such direct supervision of the traditioning process, the character of that process ... ensured the coherence and consistency of the tradition” (2010, 313).

must examine the way he uses the tradition with some flexibility. Looking first at the Gospels will help establish the “stable core” as well as introducing us to the sort of flexibility the Evangelists applied and therefore what we might expect of Paul.

3.5.1 Stable Core

Our model suggests that there would have been a level of stability in the divorce/remarriage tradition (e.g. Dunn 2005, 52). The following chapter will seek to identify what we can of this stable core. We are not seeking some “original,” uninterpreted JT but seeking an outline of the JT that Paul had access to. We are following Dunn’s lead by seeking the *characteristic* tradition (2013, 285). We will proceed by examining four sections in which the Synoptic Evangelists refer to Jesus’ teaching on divorce and remarriage: Matthew 5:31–32; 19:1–12; Mark 10:1–12; and Luke 16:18.

We will begin with the details, seeking similarities in the **wording** of each passage at the level of individual lexemes and phrases. Dunn acknowledges that the Apostles and eyewitnesses were involved “in establishing the form and substance of a story or teaching which remained stable ... a core element of a story and key-note terms which did remain more or less fixed” (2008b, 99–100; cf. 2003, 882). Can we identify any of these “key-note terms” in relation to the divorce/remarriage tradition? Finding similar words across the Synoptics is an obvious starting point.

Mnemonic markers will also assist in identifying stable wording. Jesus was clearly seen as “a teacher,” having “all the marks of the Rabbi” (Wegenast

1971, 767). As has often been noted, education at this time had a significant focus on memorization (e.g. Le Donne 2011, 70; Small 1997, 136). As such, we would expect Jesus, the teacher, to have taught in memorable ways. It is even more likely that the Apostles, eyewitnesses and teachers would have taught in memorable ways as they repeated their accounts, giving the traditions their “form.” Indeed, “Much of Jesus’ teaching material appears to have been composed precisely in order to be wedged in memory” (Bird 2014, 40).

Therefore, identifying mnemonic markers in the divorce material may indicate that particular wording was part of the stable core of a tradition. For Riesner these markers may include parallelism, rhythm, paranomasia (puns), proverbs and more (2011, 418; cf. Byrskog 2011, 1480). These markers are “all the stuff of oral tradition” (Dunn 2003, 225). The “legal sayings” (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18) will form a special focus at this point.

Second, and less narrowly, is the **narrative setting** in which a tradition is located. The model suggests that Christian communities shared JT not only in order to transmit it to others but also because it was their story. It formed their identity. *Why* might they have shared the divorce tradition? What might it have contributed to their collective identity? To answer this, we must move out from the level of bare wording to look at narrative setting. We will first ascertain whether or not there is stability across the Synoptics at the level of narrative setting. If so, second, we will ask what the character of the narrative is. Then finally we will return to the broader question; What might this narrative have meant for the Christian community’s identity or self understanding?

Third, again focusing on context, we will explore the concept of “**groupings**.” Mournet argues that in the oral traditioning process that led to

Gospel writing, “the primary compositional unit ... was not the abstract, isolated saying, but a block or sequence of material. Units were interconnected together from the very beginning” (2005, 73; cf. Koester 1990, 153–54). Allison suggests that these “blocks” or “sequences” (“groupings” in our terminology) consisted of “like” traditions (1982, 10). The question is, was there stability in the perception of what the divorce/remarriage tradition was “like,” i.e. what “kind” of grouping it belonged to? This question will require some compositional redaction analysis across our passages, comparing and contrasting the collections of pericopes within which the Evangelists placed the divorce/remarriage material.

Fourth, we will examine similarities in **concept**. This question lies behind all the others. Particular wording and groupings were not repeated for their own sake. Wording is only semiotic. Thus we ask, are there common concepts undergirding the various accounts? Do they share the same force? This will be important as Paul shares very few words with the Synoptic material.

3.5.2 Flexibility

Alongside stability, this model explains the reasons for the variations in the Gospel accounts. Dunn and Bauckham provide several explanations for such variety. Their lists overlap for the most part and may be broken into two parts.³¹

- 1) For various reasons the Evangelists started with multiple accounts of the same traditions.

³¹ Dunn’s list of four explanations is at 3.4.2. Bauckham has five options (2006, 231–32). Three overlap with Dunn. He adds: 1) alterations required by the post-Easter situation; and 2) changes to integrate JT into a narrative.

- 2) For at least two reasons they then applied flexibility in their use of these accounts.

3.5.2.1 Reasons for multiple sources

For various reasons, the Evangelists may have begun their work with multiple versions of the same tradition (e.g. McGrath 2009, 5; Dunn 2008a, 123). For example, Jesus probably repeated his teachings with varying wording (Dunn 2015, 3:56; Eddy 2013, 642). This may have resulted in variations in the Gospels.

3.5.2.2 Intentional Flexibility

The second category of explanations for variations in the Gospel accounts relate to the flexibility open to the Evangelists. As we have seen, the rules of flexibility governing oral performance would be applied to written texts also. For Bauckham “the variability normal in oral performance ... probably accounts for many differences in the triple tradition” (2006, 231). Indeed the variations are “precisely the kinds of variations we should expect from one performance of an oral tradition to another” (Bauckham 2008, 228–29). Two reasons for this “normal variation” are 1) audience, and 2) rhetorical or narrative strategy.

3.5.2.2.a Audience

Dunn states that variations between Gospels are “little more than the variation which different oral teachers would give to the tradition they were teaching, to bring out its relevance to the situation of the particular audience addressed”

(2015, 214; cf. Bauckham 2006, 231). In other words, as with any performance of JT, the Gospel writers had their audience in mind. In terms of methodology then, it will be profitable to examine the “particular **audience** addressed” by an Evangelist.

Questions have been raised regarding the legitimacy of this method. Bauckham and others have argued against specifying audiences too rigidly. *The Gospels for All Christians* (1998) questions the idea that an Evangelist wrote primarily for their local community. While we agree with this basic thesis, with Strauss we hold that their conclusions are “probably overstated” (2014, 33). Surely an Evangelist would be informed, to some extent, by the life of his community or those around about him. What is the alternative? Surely his geographical spread could not have been overly expansive (e.g. Dunn 2013, 229). Cooper offers a useful tool here. In his work on Matthew’s Gospel he speaks of a “target reader profile” (2013, 33). Even if an Evangelist was writing for a broad audience (*à la* Bauckham), he would none-the-less have some group in the front of his mind, however vague that group may be. This kind of person would connect with his writing more easily than someone at the far end of the “profile.” Making use of this tool, we maintain that the Evangelists shaped their work around their experience of one or more *particular* Christian communities.

Mark: Mark’s “target readers” were probably Gentile, Roman Christians. While this conclusion is not beyond doubt, the weight of evidence has prompted most scholars to accept it (e.g. Culpepper 2007, 29; Edwards 2015b, 10; Incigneri 2003; Lane 1974, 12; Stein 2008, 12; Strauss 2014, 37; Voelz 2013, 79; Witherington 2001, 26–27). In terms of external evidence, Eusebius states that “Peter had preached the word publicly at Rome” and “requested that Mark, who

had followed him for a long time and remembered his sayings, should write them out" (*Hist. Eccl.* 6.14.6–7 [McGiffert, 1994]). Irenaeus concurs (*Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1 [1885]). It was commonly understood in the early church that Mark wrote this Gospel and that Peter was his main source.³²

Concerning internal evidence it has been noted that Mark quotes the OT relatively infrequently; that he explains Jewish practices (e.g. 7:3–4; 12:18; 14:12; 15:42); and that he translates Aramaic and Hebrew phrases (e.g. 3:17; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 10:46; 14:36; 15:22, 34). Edwards notes Mark's neutral presentation of Romans (e.g. 12:17; 15:1–2, 21–22, 39) (2015b, 10). Lane cites Mark's use of Roman rather than Jewish time-keeping (1974, 13).

If this conclusion is accepted, then Mark's "target reader" is also likely to have been "a suffering and persecuted church" (Strauss 2014, 20; cf. Edwards 2015b, 10; Voelz 2013, 79). Mark's purpose in writing was probably Christological in emphasis but also emphasized "cross-bearing discipleship" (e.g. Boring 2006, 22; Dunn 2015, 226–33; Stein 2008, 29–35; Strauss 2014, 41; Witherington 2001, 49).

Matthew: There is general agreement that Matthew's audience was Jewish (e.g. Osborne 2010, 32; Turner 2010, 698). Indeed, Nolland can say that Matthew's Jewishness is "so pervasive that it hardly needs to be documented" (2005, 17). Many agree that Matthew's audience is out of favour with the Jewish establishment and is engaged in some debate with them (e.g. Bacon 1930; Dunn 2015, 266; Osborne 2010, 32; Patrick 2010).

Luke: Unlike Matthew and Mark, Luke identifies his reader. Theophilus is the obvious sharp end of Luke's "target reader profile." Tew argues that Luke

³² For a list of such sources see, e.g. Edwards (2015b, 5).

was seeking to convince the Gentile Theophilus that the gospel was “the culmination of Judaism” and “nonthreatening to governmental and civic order” (2012, 1; cf. Keener 1993, 321). Further from the focus of his target reader profile, it would appear that Luke had both Jewish and Gentile Christians in mind and wanted to give them assurance in their faith (e.g. Green 1997, 22).

3.5.2.2.b Narrative or Rhetorical Reasons

The Evangelists made use of this flexibility not only for the sake of more targeted application to their audiences but also for the sake of “narrative movement and thematic emphasis” and broader rhetorical strategy or purpose (Dunn 2015, 225; cf. Bauckham 2006, 231). As Strauss claims, “It is widely acknowledged today that the Evangelists were more than merely compilers of traditions; they were authors and theologians in their own right” (2014, 26; cf. Hengel 2000, 86). To this end, the Evangelists may be applying conscious rhetorical strategies. For example, narrative critics point to strategies like characterisation, empathy and symbolism (e.g. Powell 2010, 245–49). Hence, we must examine variations in **wording**, open to the possibility that variations in wording are conscious authorial alterations.

3.5.2.3 Explaining a Variation

It will be difficult to determine which of these two options explains a particular variation (variation due to source or intentional flexibility). However, it is the category of “intentional flexibility” that will be more useful for this study as finding positive examples of this will provide helpful guidelines as to the flexibility we might expect Paul to apply in 1 Cor 7. Hence, in the following

chapter we will focus on variations that can most readily be explained as “intentional flexibility” on the part of the Evangelists.

3.6 Conclusion

We cannot know the contours and details of the transmission process with certainty. Dunn himself acknowledges as much (e.g. 2003, 210). Drawing on the evidence from the NT itself, we “have no choice other than to use well-informed historical imagination” to piece the process together (Dunn 2005a, 53). Having said that, we suggest that the model outlined above is the most defensible one. In brief:

- JT was shared democratically. It was celebrated amongst and formed the identity of a community. Stability in the core of a tradition was expected, while flexibility was allowable for the sake of the audience or rhetorical purposes. Due to its identity forming nature, it was self-stabilising to some extent.
- JTs were given shape by eyewitnesses, and Apostles, eyewitnesses and teachers guarded their stability to some extent.
- An individual tradition would circulate in collections of “like” traditions.
- When the Evangelists came to write, they followed a similar pattern to those governing oral traditioning.

This model explains how JT was used, transmitted, and then inscribed by the Evangelists. We have demonstrated that it fits with and explains the evidence of

the NT and wider sources. In chapter 5 we will show how Paul follows a similar pattern. The model here outlined provides not only an affirmation that this study may proceed but also the method by which it should proceed. In summary, the method suggested examines both the stability and flexibility of a JT.

Concerning stability:

- Similar wording and mnemonic markers may indicate the **wording** established by the eyewitnesses.
- Stability in **narrative settings** will indicate what the tradition meant for the Christian community's identity.
- A JT was probably considered to be "like" the traditions in its surrounding **grouping**.
- We expect a level of consistency in the **concepts** underlying the tradition.

Concerning flexibility, we will seek to explain variations in terms of **audience** and/or **rhetorical concerns**. Variations due to multiple sources will not aid our purposes.

The following chapter applies this methodology to the Synoptic accounts of the divorce/remarriage JT.

Chapter 4: The Divorce/Remarriage Jesus Tradition in the Synoptics

What might we conclude from the Synoptics concerning the divorce/remarriage tradition in existence when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians? This chapter seeks to answer that question by applying the methodology outlined in the previous chapter to four passages: Matthew 5:31–32; 19:1–12; Mark 10:1–12; and Luke 16:18. In line with that method, this chapter will first seek to discern and outline a “stable core” of the tradition before making observations regarding the variations (“Flexibility”) in the accounts.

In the course of this examination we will encounter seven interpretive uncertainties. This raises a matter of methodology central to the study. We could proceed by seeking to define the JT as sharply as possible, making interpretative decisions on any uncertainties (e.g. Laney 1990). However such decisions would be premature, precisely what this study is seeking to avoid. It endeavours instead to sidestep as much controversy as possible in the earlier stages, finally exploring how Paul’s use of the JT sheds light on such uncertainties. Recognising this tension we proceed with hesitancy, seeking clarity about that which is reasonably clear but withholding judgement on controversial interpretive issues.

4.1 Stable Core

The previous chapter described the “stable core” as that cluster of lexemes and phrases, themes and underlying concepts that were drawn upon whenever the tradition was repeated.

4.1.1 Wording

We begin at the level of lexemes and phraseology, focusing first on the longer disputes and then the legal sayings.

4.1.1.1 Mark 10 and Matthew 19

Despite their variations in order (see 4.2.2), the disputes in Mark 10:1–12 and Matthew 19:1–9 share many similarities in lexemes and phraseology. Some of the more significant shared lexemes are highlighted in bold in Table 4.1 below.³³

Table 4.1	
Mark 10	Matthew 19
² Καὶ προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι ³⁴ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναικα ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν.	³ Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Φαρισαῖοι πειράζοντες αὐτόν καὶ λέγοντες· εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναικα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν;
³ ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·	⁴ ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· [...]
τί ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο Μωϋσῆς ; ⁴ οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· ἐπέτρεψεν Μωϋσῆς βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράψαι καὶ ἀπολῦσαι.	⁷ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· τί οὖν Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο δοῦναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου καὶ ἀπολῦσαι [αὐτήν];

³³ Matthew 19 has been rearranged to highlight similarities.

³⁴ The possibility that προσελθόντες Φαρισαῖοι is an “intrusion from Matthew” (Metzger 1994, 88) (omitted in D 1661 2615^c it^{abd} cop^{sa(mss)} syr^s geo^A) is peripheral to the present study.

<p>⁵ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην.</p>	<p>⁸ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὅτι Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν,</p>
---	---

More precise agreement is seen in Mark and Matthew's quotation of Gen 1:27 and 2:24 (LXX). Table 4.2 lists all three passages with shared lexemes in bold.

Table 4.2		
Mark 10:6–8a	Matthew 19:4–5	Gen. 1:27; 2:24 LXX
<p>⁶ ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως</p> <p>ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ</p> <p>ἐποίησεν αὐτούς·</p> <p>⁷ ἕνεκεν τούτου</p> <p>καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος</p> <p>τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ</p> <p>τὴν μητέρα</p> <p>[καὶ</p> <p>προσκολληθήσεται</p> <p>πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα</p>	<p>⁴ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ</p> <p>κτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς</p> <p>ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ</p> <p>ἐποίησεν αὐτούς;</p> <p>⁵ καὶ εἶπεν·</p> <p>ἕνεκα τούτου</p> <p>καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος</p> <p>τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν</p> <p>μητέρα</p> <p>καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ</p> <p>γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ,</p>	<p>ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ</p> <p>ἐποίησεν αὐτούς.</p> <p>[2:24] ἕνεκεν τούτου</p> <p>καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος</p> <p>τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ</p> <p>τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ</p> <p>καὶ</p> <p>προσκολληθήσεται</p> <p>πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα</p>

αὐτοῦ], ³⁵		αὐτοῦ,
⁸ καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν·	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.	καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

In both Mark and Matthew, Jesus moves away from the post-fall concession of Deuteronomy 24 to “the beginning of creation” (Matt 19:4; Mark 10:6). Both passages quote Gen 1:27 (LXX) exactly and 2:24 (LXX) very closely (Matt 19:4–6; Mark 10:6–8).

The most significant agreement for this study however, is between Matt 19:6 and Mark 10:8–9. These verses first outline an inference (ὥστε) from Jesus’ Genesis quotations before Jesus’ practical corollary (οὖν). Table 4.3 compares the two passages, with shared lexemes in bold.

Table 4.3	
Mark 10:8b-9	Matthew 19:6
^{8b} ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ.	⁶ ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία.
⁹ ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν	ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν

³⁵ UBS5/NA28 places this material in brackets to indicate uncertainty. Most MSS include the phrase (as does the THGNT), but Ɑ B Ψ 892* and syr^s omit it. Either way, it is clear that Matthew refers to Gen 2:24.

ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.	ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω.
-----------------------	-----------------------

These clauses are easily memorized due to their punchy proverbial rhythm and clear parallelism. Following its inferential conjunction (ὥστε), the first clause (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:8) consists of three short, sharp words (οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο) contrasting a second set of three (ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία, Matt 19:6a; ἀλλὰ μία σὰρξ, Mark 10:8b). The adversative ἀλλά sets up an antithetical parallelism between “two” and “one.” The mathematical paradox is memorable. How can two become one?

The second sentence (Matt 19:6b; Mark 10:9) follows a similar rhythmic pattern, ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω. Its parallelism is stark due to the simplicity of the clauses (relative pronoun, subject, verb/subject, μὴ, verb). On the one hand *God* has done something; on the other, *humanity must not* do something.

Finally, both accounts notably finish with the verb χωριζέτω (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). This is of particular interest to the present study as χωρίζω frequently referred to divorce in wider Greek literature *but never in the NT* besides 1 Cor 7:10, 11, 15.³⁶ At other points when the Evangelists (and Paul) refer to divorce, they prefer ἀπολύω (Matt 1:19; 5:31–32; 19:3–9; Mark 10:2–12; Luke 16:18) or ἀφίημι (1 Cor 7:11–13). Furthermore, the more obvious verb to use as a contrast to συζεύγνυμι is διαζεύγνυμι (Collins, 1992, 99; cf. Josephus *Ant.*

³⁶ E.g. Isaeus 8.36; Polybius 31.26.6; BGU 1103; Justin, 2. *Apol.* 2.4, 6. 1 Esdras uses it with reference to divorce (8:66, 9:9) but the focus is on separation from gentiles (cf. Ezra 9:1–2).

4.253).³⁷

These observations—the similarities in phraseology and lexemes of Mark 10:1–12 and Matthew 19:1–9, the mnemonic characteristics of the couplets and the marked use of χωρίζετω—suggest that these *words and phrases* were part of the stable core of JT. They were likely the words passed down and preserved by Apostles, eyewitnesses and teachers.

The remarkable similarity between Matthew and Mark *at this point*, when compared with the differences in other features of the pericopae (e.g. the structural variations apparent in Table 4.1), suggest that Matthew has intentionally followed Mark here.

Legal Sayings

We now turn to the legal saying shared across all four passages. Table 4.4 has similarities in bold.

Table 4.4			
Mark 10:11–12	Luke 16:18	Matthew 5:32	Matthew 19:9
¹¹ ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ	Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ	πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας	ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ

³⁷ A possible explanation is the use of διαχωρίζω for elements of creation in Gen 1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18 (LXX).

καὶ γαμήση ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ’ αὐτήν·	καὶ γαμῶν ἐτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.	ποιεῖ αὐτήν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήση, μοιχᾶται. ³⁸	καὶ γαμήση ἄλλην μοιχᾶται. καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται. ³⁹
¹² καὶ ἐὰν αὕτη ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήση ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.			

³⁸ A few MSS omit καὶ ... μοιχᾶται. Metzger assumes this is because it “goes without saying” (1994, 11). Matthew’s inclusion of a possibly redundant phrase suggests it was part of the stable core of the tradition.

³⁹ The phrase καὶ ... μοιχᾶται is absent in Ɑ D L 124 and other witnesses, but included in e.g. K W Δ Θ Π f¹³ (Metzger 1994, 38). If the phrase is original it strengthens the stable core. A copyist’s addition (to match Matt 5:32) is less significant for this study than a variation.

In each instance the tradition is applied universally (ὅς ἄν, πᾶς); each is directed, in the first instance, to a man divorcing his wife, the introductory wording being almost identical across the four; and most significantly, in each case divorce (always ἀπολύω) and remarriage is equated with adultery of some kind.⁴⁰ These similarities again suggest that there was substantial stability in the wording of this tradition.

4.1.2 Narrative Setting

Next we examine the narrative setting in which the tradition was remembered. Our methodology suggested three questions. First, is there stability across the Synoptics as to the narrative setting? Second, if so, what is the nature of the narrative? Third, what may this have meant for the early Christian community?

To the first question, there is remarkable consistency across the Synoptics on this count. To the second, in each case the legal saying occurs within a narrative of *opposition* from Pharisees. In the Sermon on the Mount, opposition to Jewish leadership is only slightly veiled (e.g. Matt 5:20; Cooper 2013, 103).

Both Matthew 19:1–12 and Mark 10:1–12 are “controversy stories” (Strauss 2014, 421; cf. Hagner 2008, 547). The location of the debate enhances this sense of opposition. The Jordan (Matt 19:1; Mark 10:1) is where John ministered (Matt 3:13) before his beheading due, in large part, to his stand against Herod’s divorce and remarriage (Matt 14:1–12; Mark 6:14–29). Jesus expects to be treated “in the same way” (Matt 17:12; cf. Mark 9:12–13).

⁴⁰ The Matthean “exceptions” to this will be discussed below.

Regarding Luke 13:10–17:10, Green notes that, “The heightened presence of the Pharisees ... pushes forward the motif of conflict” (1997, 516).

This suggests an answer to the third question: When the early church recounted these traditions they consistently remembered them within a context of pressure. The divorce/remarriage tradition was understood to be a dangerous or at least counter-cultural position. It stood at odds with the Jewish leaders of Jesus’ day and also at odds with the social contexts of the Evangelists’ audiences.

A brief aside concerning divorce/remarriage practice validates this point and provides background for later discussion. The debate in Palestinian Judaism between the schools of Hillel and Shammai is well documented (e.g. Instone-Brewer 2002, 110–14). In short, the debate turned on the interpretation of “something improper” (עֲוֹנוֹת דְּבָר) in Deut 24:1. The Shammaites held “that only ‘unchastity’ was a valid ground for divorce,” while the Hillelites “allowed a man to divorce his wife for such a trivial offence as spoiling a meal” (France 2007, 207). Hillel’s more liberal teaching “held sway among most of Jesus’ contemporaries, possibly including even some of Jesus’ own disciples” (Köstenberger 2004, 228). Josephus says that Palestinian Jewish husbands could divorce for virtually any reason, καθ’ ἁσδηποτοῦν αἰτίας (Josephus, *Ant.* 4.253, cf. Matt 19:3). Importantly, for both schools divorce “was not normally granted to women” (Strauss 2014, 425; cf. Hays 1997, 352; Marcus 2009, 705).

Both Greek and Roman divorce law was more libertine (e.g. France 2007, 207. n. 99; Strauss 2014, 426). Divorce “could be initiated freely” by either husband or wife (Thiselton 2000, 523; cf. Marcus 2009, 706; Hays 1997, 352; Fitzmyer 2008, 293.). It “involved no stigma” (Keener, 1993, 6). “The marriage

ended when the consent to be married was renounced by mutual agreement or when one unilaterally repudiated the marriage” (Garland 2003, 295). Thiselton notes that the Corinthians aspired to be a Roman style society and would have embraced similar views (2000, 253).

Against the background of Graeco-Roman divorce customs and/or the popular Hillelite view, the teaching of Jesus was counter-cultural.⁴¹ By simply *holding* to such teaching the early church stood at stark odds with most of the world around it. This accords with the identity-defining nature of repeated oral tradition.

A plausible purpose for retelling the Jesus tradition was because it comprised the foundation of the early church’s self-understanding... the Jesus tradition enabled Christian communities to interpret the significance of its own adverse situation by remembering the past of Jesus. (Bird 2014, 31)

Again, in answer to our third question, it is reasonable to conclude that the divorce/remarriage tradition was not *only* remembered as teaching to guide the marriage customs of the early church, but was recounted and repeated as an example of their identity as Jesus’ holy people in a hostile world.

4.1.3 Groupings

The next discussion concerns “groupings.” As discussed under “methodology,” Allison proposed that traditions circulated in “groups” of “like” traditions (1982, 10; cf. Mournet 2005, 73). What follows focuses on three questions. First, does the material surrounding a particular account have any consistent themes? If so,

⁴¹ His teaching was different even from that of Shammai (see 7.6).

second, what are those themes? This may indicate what an Evangelist thought the divorce/remarriage tradition was “like.” Third, is there any stability in grouping *across the Gospels*? In other words, did the early Church and/or Evangelists group this material similarly?

4.1.3.1 Mark 10 and Matthew 19

The accounts of Mark 10:1–12 and Matt 19:1–12 fall within very similar groupings. Matthew 16:21–20:33 and Mark 8:31–10:52 can be considered to be relatively discrete units structured around three passion predictions (Matt 16:21; 17:22-23; 20:18; Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:32). Our passages of interest fall between predictions two and three (Matt 17:22–20:16; Mark 9:30–10:31).

It is taken that all Evangelists thoughtfully arranged their material. Yet Matthew and Mark produced similar sequences of pericopae in these units, as Table 4.5 illustrates.

Table 4.5	
Mark 9:30–10:31	Matthew 17:22–20:16
9:30–32 Second passion-vindication prediction.	17:22–23 Second passion-vindication prediction.
	17:24–27 Tax privileges for God’s children.
9:33–37 Squabbles over greatness. The greatest must be servant of all, like a child.	18:1–5 Greatness in the kingdom comes from humility, like a child.

9:38–41 Those who are for Jesus will not fail to lose their reward.	
9:42–50 Whoever causes the downfall of a little one is in trouble!	18:6–9 Whoever causes the downfall of a little one is in trouble!
	18:10–14 Do not look down on the little ones.
	18:15–20 Reconciliation with one who has sinned against you.
	18:21–35 Parable of the unforgiving slave.
10:1–12 Divorce	19:1–12 Divorce
10:13–16 Entering the Kingdom as children.	19:13–15 Entering the Kingdom as children.
10:17–31 The rich find it difficult to enter. The first shall be last.	19:16–30 The rich find it difficult to enter. The first shall be last.
	20:1–16 Parable of the landowner. The first shall be last.

The stability of the “grouping” of the divorce/remarriage tradition is clear. This suggests that the Evangelists considered this tradition to be “like”

traditions about taking the humble, childlike position (Matt 18:1–5; Mark 9:33–37); about not causing the downfall of a “little one” (Matt 18:6–9; Mark 9:42–50); about entering the Kingdom like a child (Matt 19:13–15; Mark 10:13–16); and about the first being last (Matt 19:16–30; Mark 10:17–31).

This relates closely to the themes of the broader unit. Directly after the first passion prediction we read that discipleship will be cruciform (Matt 16:24; Mark 8:34). This is explained (Matt 16:25–27; Mark 8:35–38) and subsequently developed throughout the section in a range of “case studies” (Cooper 2013, 255).

It is noteworthy that, though Matthew and Mark each include two sections that are predominantly controversies (Matt 12:1–45; 21:23–22:40; Mark 2:1–3:6; 11:27–40), they do not position this divorce controversy amongst them.⁴² Instead, it is included in groupings that highlight the costly, sacrificial nature of discipleship (e.g. Cooper 2013, 341; Dunn 2015, 237).

As noted above in relation to wording, the significance of these similarities in grouping is highlighted when we note that Matthew does not always follow Mark’s grouping of traditions. For example, Mark places the healing of the paralytic and calling of Levi (Mark 2:1–17) before the calming of the storm and exorcism of a demoniac (Mark 4:35–5:20) whereas Matthew has the reverse order (Matt 8:23–34; 9:1–12). Thus Matthew was not bound to echo Mark’s grouping of the divorce/remarriage tradition but consciously chose to preserve Mark’s positioning.

⁴² Similarly, between Jesus’ first passion prediction and entrance to Jerusalem his conflict with the Pharisees is otherwise absent.

The purpose of this section is not to establish precisely *how* the divorce/remarriage tradition is “like” the material around it. It simply concludes from Matthew and Mark’s conscious positioning of pericopae that they consider the tradition to be “like” traditions concerning sacrificial, cross-bearing service rather than being “like” other controversy stories.

4.1.3.2 Comparing Luke 16 and Matthew 5

Matthew 5 is part of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:1–7:29) while Luke places the tradition within his “Jerusalem Journey” (Luke 9:51–19:44; Bock 1998, v). This section shares many themes with Matt 17:22–20:16; Mark 9:30–10:31, but Luke’s ordering of pericopae is significantly different. Despite the differences in surrounding traditions, Matt 5:31–32 and Luke 16:18 share several similarities as demonstrated below.

Matthew 5:31-32: In Matthew 5:21–48 Jesus’ teachings are given in contrast to what “you have heard” (Matt 5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43). Jesus explicates “the true meaning of the Torah, in contrast to current rabbinic interpretations” (Gibbs 2006, 292). This is seen as the fulfillment of the law (5:17), a righteousness that surpasses that of the Pharisees (5:20). This righteousness involves “a totally integrated loyalty of heart and act” (Wright 1996, 290; cf. France 2007, 197). In Matthew 5 then, the divorce/remarriage tradition is remembered alongside traditions that regard Jesus’ teaching as a superior interpretation of the law than that of the Jewish leaders, an interpretation that failed to engage the heart.

Luke 16:18: Similarly, the accounts surrounding Luke 16:18 expose the Pharisees' hearts as being opposed to God's law. The account *prior* to our focus verse finds the Pharisees scoffing at Jesus' teaching on money (16:1–13), for they "were lovers of money" (16:14). God knows their hearts. What they "love" is "detestable (βδέλυγμα) before God" (16:15). The lexeme βδέλυγμα is common in the law (LXX), being applied to a particular divorce/remarriage practice in Deuteronomy 24:4 (LXX) and in Deuteronomy 25:16 to "immoral financial dealings" (Green 1997, 604). Thus, because of their hearts' loves, the Pharisees "transgressed the message of the Scriptures" (Green 1997, 600). The account that follows strikes the same note (16:19–31). The rich man acts unjustly towards Lazarus because, climactically, he did not listen to "Moses and the prophets" (16:31).

This context makes sense of the otherwise puzzling location of Luke 16:18 (e.g. Bovon 2013, 468. n. 78; Tannehill 1996, 250). The consistent theme suggests that Jesus is commenting on the Pharisees' failure to keep the law. The divorce/remarriage tradition is an example of something "detestable" from God's law which "the Pharisees tended to minimize" (Liefeld 1984, 990; cf. Edwards 2015a, 464). In contrast, Jesus' Kingdom preaching does not leave the law behind (16:16–17; cf. Matt 5:18). Thus, Luke has grouped the divorce/remarriage tradition with other accounts that present the Pharisees' hearts as being disinclined towards God's laws, while Jesus adheres to it faithfully.

These observations suggest that both Matthew and Luke considered the divorce/remarriage tradition to be "like" traditions that revealed Jesus as a better, more faithful interpreter of the Law, in opposition to the shallow, heartless interpretation (and example) of the Jewish leaders.

4.1.3.3 Returning to Mark 10 and Matthew 19

This theme is also clear in Matthew 19 and Mark 10 where Jesus states that the Pharisees' key text on this issue (Deut 24:1) was only given due to their hard-heartedness (Matt 19:8; Mark 10:5). He then provides a superior interpretation by citing the pre-fall situation of Genesis 1–2.

4.1.3.4 Groupings Summary

This examination of groupings suggests that Matthew, Mark and Luke each considered the divorce/remarriage tradition to be “like” traditions that show Jesus as a better interpreter of the law than the Jewish leaders, whose heart condition is brought into question. In line with the transmission model outlined in Chapter 3, with its semi-formalised verbal transmission, we might imagine teachers within the Early Church repeating this tradition in such a way. On the topic of divorce/remarriage they would have warned believers against a shallow, legalistic reading of God's Law and called them instead to obey God's Law and creation intentions from the heart. This obedience formed part of their humble, cross-bearing discipleship.

4.1.4 Conceptual similarities

The final level of stability is the conceptual level. What follows are the stable concepts arising from the above observations. Within this section the first three interpretive uncertainties will also be identified.

4.1.4.1 Marriage is defined by God’s creation intentions

In response to the Pharisees, Jesus moves the discussion to Genesis. That is, the tradition holds that marriage is defined by “God’s original, pre-fall intentions for marriage over against the Mosaic requirements” (Witherington 2001, 276; cf. Zhekov 2009, 185).

4.1.4.2 The centrality of “oneness”

Concomitant with the creation account, the concept of unity is central to the JT. The final words of Gen 2:24 (LXX) as quoted in Matt 19:5 and Mark 10:8a are ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.⁴³ This is underlined by Jesus’ next statement, ὁ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:8b). God joins the two.

4.1.4.3 Divorce is counter to God’s intentions

The third concept follows: Divorce is counter to God’s intentions and “fundamentally inimical to” Him (Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 493–94). What God has joined together, man *must not* separate. To do so is “always against the will of God” (Stein 1992, 193).

4.1.4.4 Divorce and remarriage (without a case of πορνεία) amounts to adultery.

Fourth, according to three legal sayings (Matt 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18a), if a man divorces his wife (with the possible exception of πορνεία) and marries another, this amounts to adultery.⁴⁴ Additionally (Matt 5:32b; Luke 16:18b), the one who marries a divorced woman is also said to have committed adultery. Here we come across our **first three interpretive uncertainties**.

⁴³ The Gospels follow the LXX here (“*the two* will be (ἔσονται οἱ δύο) one flesh”), rather than the less emphatic MT, “*they* become” (וְהָיוּ) one flesh.

⁴⁴ For Matt 5:32 see 4.2.1.3.a–b.

4.1.4.4.a Uncertainty #1: Which practice is equated with adultery?

First, *which* practice is equated with adultery? Divorce, remarriage, or some combination of the two? There are four options.

Option 1: Some identify remarriage as the focus (e.g. Garland 1996, 380; Hagner 2008, 2:249; Witherington 2001, 278). Any remarriage is adulterous.

Option 2: Others, like Gordon Wenham (1984, 106; cf. 2017) and Laney (1990, 38), draw a more stringent conclusion from the legal sayings, arguing that divorce itself, apart from any remarriage, amounts to adultery.

Option 3: Others, for exegetical and social contextual reasons, hold that the two-fold practice of *divorce-for-remarriage* is in view here (e.g. Fee 2014, 324; Wong 2002, 184). The divorce is undertaken with a premeditated intent to remarry.

Option 4: The final option extends option 3 to include cases in which a spouse illegitimately divorces with no intent to remarry, but some time later does remarry. The weakness of this option is that it is generally acknowledged that (at least) men did not divorce in order to remain unmarried, but in order to remarry (e.g. Bock 1994, 2:1357; Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 303; Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493).

4.1.4.4.b Uncertainty #2: Why the equation for the first man?

The second question is linked to the first. That is, *why* does Jesus equate divorce and/or remarriage with adultery in the case of the first man (“Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery”)? There are three options.

Option 1: It could be that, “in God’s eyes, the wife is still considered to be married to her first husband” (Köstenberger 2004, 249; cf. R. Collins 1992, 179;

Keener 1993, 161; Marcus 2009, 711–12; Witherington 2001, 278). This conclusion accords with the literal definition of “adultery” which assumes marriage. “Adultery is the violation of the marriage of another” (Hauck, “μοιχεύω,” TDNT 4:730). By remarrying, the man has committed adultery in relation to his former marriage. Despite his *de jure* divorce, the perpetrator’s first marriage still has some *de facto* reality.

Option 2: Jesus *redefines* adultery. This is precisely the case in Matt 5:27–28. Jesus has widened the definition to include “the desire which negates fidelity” (Hauck, “μοιχεύω,” TDNT 4:734). In v. 32, it is possible that Jesus also redefines adultery to mean something like, “unfaithfulness to marriage covenant promises.” There is OT precedence for describing covenant unfaithfulness as adultery (e.g. Jer 3:8–9; Ezek 16; Hos 2:2). Malachi 2:10–14 connects unfaithfulness to marriage vows with unfaithfulness to the patriarchal covenant.

While Matt 5:32 is not strictly under consideration here, it is possible that the other legal sayings similarly redefine adultery around vow keeping (e.g. Bock 1994, 1356). However this is unlikely given that redefinition does not suit the context of the legal debates of Mark 10 and Matt 19. Also, Mark explicitly says that the man commits adultery *against his wife* (10:11; see 4.2.1.2) rather than against the Lord or his marriage vows.

Option 3: Keener (2009) argues that the equation is not actual, but simply hyperbole “used to underline graphically a controversial point” (192). He notes (190) “the technique of rhetorical overstatement that pervades the context” of Matt 5:32 (e.g. 5:18–19; 29–30; 6:3). Similar to Option 2, such an “overstatement” is possible in Matt 5:32 (given its context) but less natural in the instances of the legal saying under consideration here.

4.1.4.4.c Uncertainty #3: Why the equation for the second man?

The third uncertainty is the same as the second but with reference to the *second* man mentioned in the legal sayings of Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18 (“And everyone who marries a divorced woman commits adultery”). Why are this man’s actions equated with adultery?

Option 1: As above, Matthew and Luke may redefine adultery such that the man who marries the divorced woman is said to commit adultery because adultery is now defined as, something like, “making light of covenant vows.” The weaknesses noticed in relation to Option 2 in Uncertainty 2 apply here also.

Option 2: The second man commits adultery because he marries a woman who has been illegitimately divorced and who is therefore still married (e.g. Luz 2007 [2002], 256; Laney 1990, 39). This is a general statement for all men (“anyone who marries”) concerning any woman who has been divorced at any time (“divorced woman” is anarthrous), not only the woman mentioned in v. 32a.

Option 3: The second man commits adultery because he takes part in a divorce-and-remarriage situation like that of Deut 24:1–4, justified by the Pharisees’ interpretation of that passage. This observation also relates to Option 3 of Uncertainty 4 and requires some explanation (see further 4.2.1.3.a).

In Matt 5:31–32 Jesus is responding to the Pharisees’ interpretation and application of Deut 24:1–4. In v. 32a he corrects (“but I tell you”) their interpretation of Deut 24:1 concerning a man divorcing his wife. Jesus then moves on (v. 32b) to address the second man who (as in Deut 24:2) marries the divorced woman. That is to say, v. 32b should not be taken as a general or universal statement on divorce, but with special reference to Deut 24:1–4. Option 3 holds that the second man’s actions are equated with adultery because

he takes part in a kind of divorce-for-remarriage situation modeled on and justified by the Pharisees' interpretation of Deut 24:1–4.

Luke 16:18 has very similar wording to Matt 5:32. Given this similarity and the fact that all other instances of the divorce/remarriage JT explicitly refer to Deut 24:1–4, it is plausible to assume that Luke 16:18 relates to divorce and remarriage practices that are similar to, though perhaps not precisely the same as, those represented in Deut 24:1–4.⁴⁵

We are thus presented with three interpretive uncertainties. As will be shown in Chapter 7, an examination of 1 Corinthians can shed light on these uncertainties. What can be said at this point is that the Synoptics consistently equate *at least* divorce-for-remarriage with adultery *for some reason*. It is regularly noted that even this position stood in stark contrast to most contemporary practice (e.g. Green 1997, 603; Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493; Warden 1997, 143).⁴⁶

4.1.4.5 A case of πορνεία damages “one flesh” union.

The nature of the “one flesh” union (and how it is affected by πορνεία) is much debated. Most agree that there is a sexual element. Others will also add social, kinship and/or spiritual elements. Some hold that it is indissoluble (e.g. Edwards 2015a, 466; France 2007, 717). Others, noting that Jesus did not say “man *cannot* separate,” argue that adultery creates a new ontological reality and “severs the previous union with another” (Loader 2015, 75, 77; cf. May 2004, 113). Still others argue that the union is more generally dissoluble (e.g. Instone-Brewer

⁴⁵ Luke 16:18 may also allude to Deut 24. See 4.1.3.2.

⁴⁶ The exception of Shammai will be discussed in chapter 7.

2002, 302). At this point we simply note that despite this diversity all options agree that πορνεία at least *damages* a “one flesh” union. (See further 6.2.2.3.c.)

4.1.4.6 The Position of Women in Marriage is Elevated

Finally, the JT elevates the position of women in marriage with respect to contemporary understandings. At minimum, each account protects women from divorce “for any reason.” As with Deuteronomy 24:1–4, the JT sees women as more than possessions to be married and divorced at will.

4.1.5 Conclusion (Stability)

This examination of the stable core of the divorce/remarriage JT has identified consistencies in wording, narrative setting, grouping and concepts. These findings will be summarised at the conclusion of the chapter. In the process it has also identified three uncertainties that will be addressed in Chapter 7.

1. What practice do the legal sayings (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18) equate with adultery? Divorce, remarriage, or some combination of the two?
2. Why does Matt 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18 make this equation with adultery for the first man?
3. Why do Matt 5:32b and Luke 16:18b make this equation for the second man?

4.2 Flexibility

We turn now to the flexibility evident in each of these accounts. The flexibility applied by the Evangelists will also inform us as to the kind of flexibility potentially open to Paul. The methodology followed here was outlined in 3.5. Two further methodological details will help to explain this section of the study.

First, the focus here will be on **wording** of the legal sayings and the **narrative structure** of Matt 19:1–12 and Mark 10:1–12. Variations in **grouping** have been discussed sufficiently above. In brief, Matthew 19:1–12 and Mark 10:1–12 are very similar in terms of their grouping, but quite different from both Matthew 5 and Luke 16.

Second, as we encounter variations across the accounts we will also encounter conflicting opinions as to how these variations should be interpreted and how (or if) they can be harmonized. As noted above, the methodology of the present study requires us to identify clarity where it exists but to withhold judgement on significant interpretive uncertainties. Three such uncertainties have been identified above. Four additions will be noted here.

4.2.1 Wording: Legal sayings

While France may overstate his case, it is true that “the normally accepted texts of the four passages ... present a wide variety of structure and of forms of wording” (2007, 720. n. 25).⁴⁷ Significant variations are underlined in Table 4.6.

⁴⁷ With regards to textual variants France says “there are many” (2007, 720. n. 25). However Metzger only lists six, all in Matthew, most of which are poorly attested and easily explained as harmonisations. Cf. R. Collins 1992, 67-69.

Table 4.6			
Matthew 5:32	Matthew 19:9	Mark 10:11-12	Luke 16:18
<p>πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</p> <p><u>παρεκτὸς</u> <u>λόγου</u> <u>πορνείας</u></p> <p><u>ποιεῖ αὐτὴν</u> μοιχευθῆναι,</p> <p>καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.⁴⁸</p>	<p>ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</p> <p><u>μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ</u></p> <p>καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην</p> <p>μοιχᾶται.</p> <p>καὶ ὃ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται.⁴⁹</p>	<p>ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</p> <p>καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην</p> <p>μοιχᾶται <u>ἐπ’</u> <u>αὐτήν</u>.</p> <p><u>καὶ ἐὰν αὕτῃ</u> <u>ἀπολύσασα τὸν</u></p>	<p>Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ</p> <p>καὶ γαμῶν ἐτέραν</p> <p>μοιχεύει,</p> <p>καὶ ὃ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.</p>

⁴⁸ See 4.1.1 concerning the inclusion of the final six lexemes.

⁴⁹ As above.

		<u>ἄνδρα αὐτῆς</u> <u>γαμήσῃ ἄλλον</u> <u>μοιχᾶται.</u>	
--	--	---	--

There are a number of minor differences in the opening three words. These can reasonably be explained by literary context; dwelling on these will not further this study considerably.⁵⁰ We will focus rather on three more significant variations. For each we will seek to elucidate its meaning and then ask why the Evangelist may have included it.

4.2.1.1 Mark: “And if she...” καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ...

Mark alone includes the command to women not to divorce and remarry (Mark 10:12). The meaning is clear. It is generally accepted (e.g. Zhekov 2009, 185) that Mark adds this variation for the sake of his Gentile audience for whom it was common for women to divorce their husbands (see 4.1.2). Such an explicit statement would have been inappropriate for either Matthew’s Jewish or Luke’s Greek-speaking Jewish audience. Mark’s addition explicitly clarifies that Jesus’ teaching relates to women also. Thus, Mark may have used flexibility at this point in order to uphold and emphasise Jesus’ teaching for his particular audience.

⁵⁰ Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18 have πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων. For Matthew, this matches the two earlier “but I tell you” statements (5:22, 28). For Luke, it matches 16:16, indicating that those who are seeking to force their way into the kingdom are also the subject of the legal saying.

4.2.1.2 Mark: ἐπ' αὐτήν

In Mark 10:11 alone a husband's adultery is ἐπ' αὐτήν. Some scholars (e.g. Schaller 1972; Turner 1956) translate the preposition as "with" because in a traditional Jewish setting adultery was only committed "against" a husband.⁵¹ However this suggestion has two weaknesses. First, if Mark meant "with her" why did he not use the familiar idiom, μοιχεύω + accusative (e.g. Lev 20:10; Jer 3:9; 36:23; cf. Pss. Sol. 8:10; Marcus 2009, 705)? Second, "with" does not sit comfortably within the bounds of the normal semantic range of the preposition.⁵²

Despite the discordance with the accepted Jewish understanding of adultery, the more likely translation is "against." The impact is that the wife is "thereby elevated to a position of equal partnership and rights in the marriage and entitled to the same fidelity that the husband could expect from his wife" (Culpepper 2007, 331; cf. Edwards 2015b, 298; Zhekov 2009, 185).

Such a reading accords with Mark's Graeco-Roman audience and also his ancillary rhetorical purpose of elevating women. Along with prominent roles, Dewey notes that "Mark portrays women (and not men) as models of discipleship and service" (2006, 29; e.g. Mark 12:41–44; 14:3–9).

In contrast, Matthew says little about women outside chapters 1–2 and his Markan material. He does not include the Markan widow's mite pericope (Mark 12:41–44). He puts the selfish request of James and John onto the lips of their mother (compare Mark 10:35–37; Matt 20:20–21). Luz notes the "passive" role of women in Matthew's divorce discussion (2007 [2002], 1:251). They are

⁵¹ For example, in Deut 22:24 the sexual crime (not explicitly "adultery" here) is committed against the man not the woman.

⁵² BDAG does not suggest "with" as a translation. BDAG, s.v. "ἐπί."

“essentially objects of marriage.”⁵³

While Luke also writes to a Graeco-Roman audience and appears to elevate women (e.g. Bock 1996, 18), he omits the Markan phrase.⁵⁴ Given that there is no third party mentioned it may be implied that adultery is committed against the wife (e.g. Edwards 2015a, 465). Also, in its immediate context, Luke 16:18 is an example of the (male) Pharisee’s approach the law. Mark 10:11 is in the context of a larger debate in which Jesus appeals to God’s creation intentions for male *and female* (vv. 6–9). Jesus here quotes Genesis 1:27, a verse that speaks of the equality of male and female. Mark’s prepositional phrase emphasizes an aspect of that passage.

In summary, Mark’s variation elevates women and thereby emphasizes one of his broad rhetorical purposes; it fits more narrowly within the context of chapter 10, emphasizing rather than altering the teaching of Jesus; and finally it would have been radical but intelligible to his Graeco-Roman hearers. This variation is not controversial amongst interpreters.

4.2.1.3 Matthew: Uncertainties Concerning Exceptions

Much more controversial are Matthew’s “exception clauses.” Whereas the legal saying in Mark and Luke appear to amount to “absolute prohibitions” on divorce, Matthew includes “exception clauses” in both his accounts. We ask two questions: 1) What do they mean? 2) How might they be accounted for?

⁵³ Rather than branding Matthew a chauvinist, we simply note that elevation of women is not one of his rhetorical purposes.

⁵⁴ Luke includes many women (1:1–2:52; 7:11–13, 36–50; 8:1–3; 10:38–42; 21:1–4; 23:27–31, 49; 23:55–24:11), including thirteen women unique to the Synoptics. They also play key roles (e.g. 24:9–11).

With regards to meaning, the two exception clauses (παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, Matt 5:32 and μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ, Matt 19:9) refer to “the same exceptional situation” (Witherington 2006, 134; cf. Hagner 1993, 1:124; Osborne 2010, 198). That is, divorce (and possibly remarriage) does not amount to adultery *if* the woman has already committed an act of πορνεία.⁵⁵

Luz provides seven options for what πορνεία refers to in this context (2007 [2002], 1:254). Most commonly it is given a broad definition as “a generic term for all sorts of sexual misconduct” (Hays 1997, 353; cf. Bock 1994, 2:1358; France 2007, 209). In the present context some kind of adultery as a subset of πορνεία is most likely in mind (cf. Loader 2015, 72; cf. France 2007, 209; Luz 2007 [2002], 1:254).

The second question is how these variations are to be accounted for. This question gives rise to four interpretive uncertainties. The issues will be explored and options presented but final judgments will be reserved until Chapter 7, following an examination of 1 Cor 7.

4.2.1.3.a Uncertainty #4: Why does Matthew omit “and marries another?”

Uncertainties 4 and 5 relate to Matthew 5:32, the legal saying with the most variations. In each of the other accounts the man who divorces and remarries commits adultery. However in Matthew 5:32 the man who divorces “*makes her* commit adultery” (ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι), apparently even when he does not “marry another.” Uncertainty 4 concerns this omission of “and marries another.”

⁵⁵ Olendar translates the exceptions as “not even for πορνεία” (1998, 105). Guenther (2002) agrees for Matt 19:9. However μηδ(έ) (rather than μή) is unattested and παρεκτός “cannot be so understood” (Hagner 1993, 124).

Option 1: For Heth and Wenham (1984; cf. G. Wenham 2017) and others (e.g. R. Collins 1992, 113; Kleiveland 2017) the absence of “and marries another” means that Jesus equates divorce *itself* with adultery (even without remarriage).⁵⁶ This fits Matthew’s tone, making him “more severe than the other Synoptists” (G. Wenham 1984, 105).

There are three possible weaknesses in this approach. First, in this view Matthew 5:31–32 diverges significantly from the other accounts, whereas in most cases Matthew’s divergences are far less significant. Second, unlike the other accounts, Matthew does not directly equate the man’s actions with adultery but with “causing her to commit adultery” (more below). Finally, this option requires “a radical redefinition” of adultery, since adultery (traditionally understood) “is the violation of the marriage of another [occurring when] there is carnal intercourse between a married man and a married or betrothed Israelitess” (Hauck 1967, 729–35; cf. France 2007, 212. n. 117). Nevertheless, as noted above, this is possible, given that Jesus has just previously given just such a radical redefinition (Matt 5:28).

Option 2: The second interpretation takes “and marries another” as read from the context of v. 28. This reading finds some support by noting that Matthew 5:27–30 should not be read independently of vv. 31–32, though that is the usual practice (e.g. Osborne 2010, 198; Keener 2009, 189). The two sections share the same theme, “adultery” being mentioned twice in each section. Also, the introductory formula (“You have heard that it was said...” vv. 21, 27, 33, 38,

⁵⁶ Note that Heth (2002) has subsequently changed his view.

43) is minimized in v. 31. It simply begins, “And it has been said.” Reading these sections together may suggest a chronological or logical sequence that supports Option 2.

- 1) The man looks at the woman “in order to desire her” (v. 28). There is intention here (e.g. France 2007, 204; Keener 2009, 189). Thus he has “committed adultery with her in his heart” (v. 28).
- 2) Following this lustful look, the next step is divorce (v. 31–32), which would naturally be followed by remarriage. That is to say, “and marries another” can be taken as read.

While these sections probably should be read together to some extent, there are at least two weaknesses with this approach. First, divorcing *for remarriage* is not strictly the focus of Deut 24:1, the passage cited in v. 31 (see 4.1.4.4.c). Second, following this option requires us to accept Option 2 under Uncertainty 5 (that the divorcing husband makes his wife *appear to be* an adulteress), which is an unlikely interpretation (see 4.2.1.3.b).

Option 3: Jesus’ comments relate to the Pharisees’ interpretation of Deut 24:1 (e.g. Feinberg and Feinberg 2010, 627). In this verse, remarriage is not in focus. This option requires some explanation.

As with each of the issues in 5:21–48, Jesus is discussing what his disciples “have heard from their teachers of the law,” not simply from Scripture (Cooper 2013, 103). In Matt 5:31–32 Jesus is responding to the Pharisees’ interpretation and application of Deut 24:1–4. That passage *describes* a complex case of divorce and remarriage, prohibiting a certain kind of remarriage.

However, as suggested by the pointed summary of that passage in Matt 5:31, the

teachers of the law used Deut 24:1 as a command *prescribing* the grounds for and legal requirements of divorce (e.g. France 2007, 205; Feinberg and Feinberg 2010, 599).⁵⁷

In v. 32a Jesus states an alternative interpretation of Deut 24:1. He effectively repeats the protasis of the Deut 24:1 summary (v. 31) but changes the apodosis dramatically (Table 4.7).

Table 4.7	
“It has been said...”	“But I tell you...”
ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὐτῇ ἀποστάσιον.	πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ... ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι.

Jesus’ conclusion suggests that the teachers of the law have taken Deut 24:1–4, a passage guarding “against divorce becoming a legalized form of adultery” (Laney 1992, 13; Craigie 2007, 305), and used it in precisely the opposite way. Using Deut 24 to “sanction divorce” (Cooper 2013, 104) results in adultery, the blame for which Jesus places squarely at the feet of the first husband.

The vital point here however is that Deut 24:1 does not mention remarriage. This is why, according to Option 3, Matthew omits “and marries another” in his discussion. Jesus goes on (v. 32b) to address the content of Deut 24:2, the remarriage of the divorced woman. However the focus of v. 32a and the Pharisees’ interpretation of Deut 24:1 was divorce rather than remarriage.

⁵⁷ The words “something indecent” דְּבַר עֲרֻוָּת (Deut 24:1) were the crux of the debate between the Shammmites and Hillelites. Many agree that Matthew’s phrase λόγου πορνείας (v. 32) are a “very literal rendering” of that phrase (Hays 1997, 356; cf. Osborne 2010, 198; France 2007, 210).

4.2.1.3.b Uncertainty #5: Why does Matthew add “makes her commit?”

Matthew 5:32 diverges from the other accounts in that the divorcing husband “makes” the woman “commit adultery.” The passive infinitive μοιχευθῆναι should probably be translated actively. When a male is the subject of adultery μοιχεύω takes the active voice. For a female however, μοιχεύω is often passive (e.g. Sir 23:23) or middle/passive but with an active meaning (e.g. Lev 20:10; John 8:4; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.131; Philo, *Decal.* 124; *Spec.* 3.57, 58). Less certain is why the man’s actions have this effect.

Option 1: The woman is forced to remarry for financial reasons (e.g. Bock 1994, 2:1357; Hagner 1993, 1:125). She thus remarries while still married to her first husband (assuming Option One from 4.1.4.4.b).

Against this option, Paul assumes that (in the Corinthian setting) a divorced woman could remain unmarried (e.g. 1 Cor 7:8). This may also have been possible in a Jewish setting. Instone-Brewer (2002, 150) argues that, “Many women had sufficient financial security in their [marriage contract].” A divorced woman may have returned to her father’s house (e.g. Lev 22:13; Gen 38:11).

Option 2: Alternatively the woman is “made to look” as if she were an adulteress, when in fact she is not (e.g. France 2007, 211; Powers 2012, 169). Against this view, given that the majority of divorces were for “any reason,” this stigma may not have persisted. Secondly, in the NT ποιέω only rarely has the sense of “making something what they are not” (e.g. Matt 20:12; 1 John 5:10) and never the verbal sense of “making someone *do* something.”

4.2.1.3.c Uncertainty #6: Does the exception relate to divorce alone or also to remarriage?

The sixth interpretive uncertainty is the *scope* of the exception clause in chapter 19.

Option 1: Wenham (1986) and others (e.g. Cornes 1998, 96; Laney 1990, 37–40) argue that the exception clause applies only to divorce. Remarriage is disallowed even in cases of πορνεία. Otherwise, Wenham argues, Matthew becomes “singularly inept, since he thereby made Jesus agree at least with the Shammaite Pharisees, whose view of divorce he had just condemned” (1986, 18). This “harder” ruling fits well with the disciples’ astonished reply (v. 10).

Option 2: Alternatively, for many scholars the exception applies to both divorce *and* remarriage (e.g. France 2007, 212; Neirynck 1996, 171). Nolland finds Wenham’s reading “torturous” and “hardly defensible” (1995, 22).

Alongside both options Luz asserts that “the wording of v. 9 offers no basis for a decision one way or the other” (2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493). Again, an examination of 1 Cor 7 will cast light on this question.

4.2.1.3.d Uncertainty #7: The Reason for the Exceptions

The final uncertainty is the mere presence of these exceptions that seem to “represent a substantial softening” of the stark absolutes of Mark and Luke (France 2007, 210). In Goulder’s words, “the radical Jesus disappears in qualifying phrases, and emerges as a rabbi of the school of Shammai” (1974, 18). While several solutions have been brought forth, there are three main

explanations, each with weaknesses.⁵⁸ Possibly all three options are true and complement each other.

Option 1: Matthew, for the sake of his audience, has made Jesus' "unworkable" (France 2007, 210) absolute teaching "more readily applicable as a rule for the community's practice" (Hays 1997, 353). In the extreme, it can be seen as a "pragmatic adaptation" in which Matthew "attributed to Jesus his own church's practice" (France 2007, 210).

The main weakness of this approach is that it does not fit Matthew's general tone nor the specific contexts of chapters 5 and 19. It does not match the tone of the Sermon on the Mount, failing to "surpass the righteousness of the Pharisees" (5:20). Such a reading requires Jesus to "contradict himself in succeeding sentences," presenting a radical view in 19:4–8 before suddenly "softening" in v. 9 (G. Wenham 1984, 98; cf. Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 492). If this is so, as Wenham notes, "It is, to say the least, most inept editing" (1984, 98).

Option 2: The legal sayings in Mark and Luke contain "exaggeration for effect" (e.g. Stein 1992, 198) or present "a generalization which admits of certain exceptions" (Blomberg 1990, 162; cf. Bock 1998, 429). There are three weaknesses to this approach. First they are arguments from silence. Second they raise uncertainty about the extent of the exaggeration or possible exceptions. Third, it suggests that Matthew's accounts do not use exaggeration or generalization even though he does so repeatedly in the context of Matthew 5:31–32 (e.g. 5:29–30; 34–37; 39–42; 6:3, 6; 7:3–5).

⁵⁸ Weibling's (2001) explanation is also worth noting. He reads the exception as a call for Jewish wives to be faithful in marriage, mirroring Mark 10:12. Πορνεία then refers to when the wife "wholeheartedly wanted to leave and marry another" (229). This explanation could fit within that developed below.

Option 3: The “exception” is assumed in Mark and Luke because they understood divorce due to πορνεία to be a separate category of divorce. Matthew, “rather than uncharacteristically softening Jesus’ demand, simply spelled out what had always been assumed” (Loader 2015, 74). However we must ask why Mark and Luke would assume this while Matthew spells it out. Also this solution does not explain why Jesus appears to be a Shammaite; it simply includes Mark and Luke in the problem.

These uncertainties will be revisited in Chapter 7, where Paul’s use of the divorce/remarriage tradition will shed light on these uncertainties.

4.2.2 Narrative Structure: Matt 19/Mark10

Leaving behind the legal sayings we now focus on the different narrative structures of Mark 10:1–12 and Matthew 19:1–12. This section offers further examples of how variations can be explained with reference to audience and/or rhetorical concerns.

Six variations in the narrative setting will be discussed here. Four are underlined and numbered in Table 4.8 (in which Matthew has been reordered for the sake of comparison).

Table 4.8	
Mark 10:1–12	Matthew 19:1–12
² The Pharisees’ ask: “Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?”	³ Matthew includes in the Pharisees’ question: “... <u>for any cause?</u> ” (<i>Variation 1)</i>)

<p>³ Jesus: “What did Moses command?”</p> <p>⁴ Pharisees: “Moses allowed...”</p> <p>⁵ Jesus: “Because of hardheartedness.</p> <p>⁶⁻⁹ From the beginning... Let no man separate.”</p> <p>¹⁰ <u>In the house</u> the disciples ask about this matter. (<i>Variation 2</i>)</p> <p>¹¹ Jesus: “Whoever divorces...”</p>	<p>⁷ Pharisees: “Why did Moses command?”</p> <p>⁸ Jesus: “Because of hardheartedness.”</p> <p>⁴⁻⁶ Jesus: “From the beginning... Let no man separate.”</p> <p>⁹ Jesus: “Whoever divorces...”</p> <p>¹⁰ <u>Disciples: “If this is the case, better not to marry!”</u> (<i>Variation 3</i>)</p> <p>¹¹⁻¹² Jesus: Accepting a word concerning <u>eunuchs</u>. (<i>Variation 4</i>)</p>
---	---

The fifth variation is actually a collection of differences that might be summarized as a variation in tone. Three examples belonging to this category are listed in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9	
Mark 10:3-4	Matthew 19:4-8

v. 3 Jesus responds to the Pharisees with an open question.	v. 4 Jesus gives a “forceful direct response” (Hays 1997, 353).
v. 4 Pharisees <i>respond</i> with Deut 24.	v. 7 Deut 24 is the Pharisees’ question.
vv. 3–4 Jesus asks about Moses’ “command.” The Pharisees say he “permitted.”	vv. 7–8 Jesus corrects their reference to Moses’ “command” with “permit.”

The sixth variation is the difference in ordering (obscured in Table 4.9). These variations might be explained in a number of ways.

4.2.2.1 Empathy and Antipathy in Matthew

Variations 3, 5 and 6 may be explained with reference to Matthew’s regular employment of the rhetorical strategies of empathy and antipathy (Bolt 2014, 6). As Luz (2007 [2002], 1:17) and others (e.g. Cooper 2013, 57) have noted, Matthew seeks to include his audience in the narrative through empathy with the disciples. While this could also be said of Mark, Matthew presents the disciples more positively (compare e.g. Mark 9:33 and Matt 18:1). For example (variation 3), the reader is more likely to identify with the disciples’ incredulity in Matt 19:10 than with their impersonal response in Mark 10:10 (Powell 2009, 67).

On the other hand, Matthew distances his readers from the Pharisees (e.g. Dunn 2015, 251). He depicts the Pharisees as “unilaterally opposed to Jesus and,

indeed, as unwittingly opposed to God” (Powell 2009, 68). These two rhetorical strategies may explain Matthew’s difference in tone (variation 5), which is achieved in part by his variation in ordering (variation 6).

4.2.2.2 “Any Cause” Assumed in Mark and Clarified in Matthew

Commentators postulate that Mark assumes variation 1, the “any cause” phrase (Mark 10:2; e.g. Boring 2006, 286; Dungan 1971, 112; Lane 1974, 353). Their hypothesis is due to the awkward nature of the question. It concerns the legality (ἐξεσθιν, Matt 19:3; Mark 10:2) of divorce. This is a “strange question” given that “all first century Jewish groups known to us permitted divorce” (Marcus 2009, 700; cf. A. Collins 2007, 465). Therefore “it seems reasonable to conclude that ‘for any matter’ is implied in the question” (Edwards 2015b, 300, 305). There are several reasons why Matthew (19:3) may have made explicit what Mark assumed. Perhaps by doing so Matthew paints the Pharisees as “liberal” and far from Jesus’ radical view, once again distancing the reader from them (Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 489). Alternatively, given that Matthew provides a more precise answer (“except for πορνεία” Matt 19:9), he also provide a more precise question.

Whether or not Matthew began with an alternate tradition, he has made intentional choices to vary from Mark here. Many scholars agree that Matthew’s broad rhetorical goal concerns the discipleship of his audience within a context of Jewish opposition (e.g. Cooper 2013; Osborne 2010, 31; Riches 2005; Keener 1997; Blomberg 1992; Carson 1984; Bacon 1930). The above observations concerning empathy and antipathy are rhetorical strategies towards that end.

Thus, once again, Matthew appears to make use of flexibility in the tradition for the sake of his rhetorical purpose for his audience.

4.2.2.3 Mark's "Scene Change"

Variation 2 is the setting in which the legal saying is pronounced. In Matthew the legal saying falls within Jesus' dialogue with the Pharisees (Matt 19:9). In Mark it occurs inside a house with only the disciples present (Mark 10:10–12). This is a "characteristic" pattern in Mark (e.g. 4:1–10; 7:14–17; 9:27–28; 13:1–4; Marcus 2009, 707). There are several theories as to Mark's reason for this (e.g. Ahearne-Kroll 2010; Collins 1992, 72–73; Marcus 2009, 711). For the purpose of this study we need only note that Mark has again applied this rhetorical strategy to the divorce/remarriage tradition. Matthew did not make use of this strategy.

4.2.2.4 Matthew and Eunuchs

Finally, Matthew appends additional material to the end of this pericope (variation 4), addressing the possibility of remaining unmarried (Matt 19:10–12). It is not clear why Matthew includes it here. Perhaps it accords with his eschatological outlook. Significantly, Paul will say something similar in 1 Cor 7:32–35 (see 6.2.2.1).

4.2.3 Conclusion (Flexibility)

There are other variations between the Synoptic accounts that have not been explored here. Those addressed above have been examined in order to ascertain the kinds of flexibility we might expect Paul to employ.

4.3 Conclusion

We have examined both the stability and flexibility of the divorce/remarriage tradition in the Synoptics and can now summarise our findings concerning both the stable core of the tradition and the kind of flexibility that could occur in expressing that tradition.

4.3.1 The Stable Core of the Divorce/Remarriage Tradition

When a teacher or authorized member of an early church community repeated this tradition, along with some allowable flexibility, they would have consistently used a cluster of core words, related themes and underlying concepts.

In terms of **wording**, the quotation of Genesis 1:27; 2:24 (LXX) appears to have been a stable feature, as does Jesus' conclusion concerning their unity and his command against "separating" (χωρίζετω) (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:8b–9). The broader context of the divorce debate (Matt 19:1–9; Mark 10:1–9) also seems relatively stable. As argued above, Matthew's verbal agreement with Mark is not a sign of mindless copying but evidence that this particular wording belonged to the stable core of the tradition. The other constant in wording is the legal saying (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11; Luke 16:18). While no two are exactly the same, the basic phraseology and lexemes are reasonably stable.

The **narrative setting** of each passage suggests that when the early church recited this tradition they often remembered also that their view was counter-cultural, possibly dangerous. It would have reinforced their identity as Jesus' holy people in a hostile world.

Again, when the early Church remembered this tradition, it is likely they did so in conjunction with other "like" traditions. Examining the **groupings** of

traditions that our passages fall within suggested that the early church consistently considered the divorce/remarriage tradition to be: a) “like” teaching on sacrificial, humble, cross-bearing discipleship; and b) a better interpretation of the Law than that of the Jewish leaders. This tradition might be counter-cultural, but it is also faithful to the intent of God’s law and is the path of Christian discipleship in marriage.

Finally the following **concepts** appear to have been consistent. Marriage is defined by God’s creation intentions; “oneness” is central to this understanding of marriage; divorce runs counter to God’s intentions; at minimum, divorce for remarriage (without *porneia*) amounts to adultery; πορνεία at least *damages* a “one flesh” union; and the position of women in marriage is elevated. It is hoped that these concepts find general support.

In this discussion of concepts we identified our first three interpretive uncertainties. The first relates to the practice which is equated with adultery. Was it divorce, remarriage or some combination? The second and third recognized an uncertainty around *why* the legal sayings made such an equation. These will be explored further in Chapter 7.

4.3.2 The Kinds of Flexibility that might be Expected in the Divorce/Remarriage

Tradition

Three questions will help summarise our findings concerning flexibility.

- 1) What kinds of flexibility might we expect at the level of **wording**?

Anyone engaged with the process of JT (including Paul), may have felt free to use different **wording** from what he had received, while maintaining many of the key terms.⁵⁹ They could add extra clauses, like Matthew's exception clauses or Mark's application to the wife. They could leave out clauses if they expected them to be assumed, like Mark's omission of "for any cause." They could make significant alterations to the surrounding narrative while retaining many of the same words (as Matthew 19:1–12; Mark 10:1–12).

2) What might be legitimate **motivations** for such variations?

As with the Evangelists, others engaged with the process of JT might be motivated by their rhetorical concern and/or their particular audience.⁶⁰ A variation might be made in order to clarify the Jesus tradition for an audience (e.g. "and if *she* divorces..." Mark 10:12). It might emphasise or build on a broader rhetorical purpose of his (e.g. Mark's concern for women). It might follow the pattern of the author's rhetorical strategies (e.g. Matthew's empathy with the disciples). Likely, audience and rhetorical purpose will be linked. For example, Matthew's purpose of distancing the reader from the Jewish leaders relates to the Jewish opposition his audience is facing.

⁵⁹ Other teachers may have felt more or less authority to vary JT. We know that Paul understood himself to have considerable authority (e.g. 1 Cor 7:40; 14:37) but also to be bound by received tradition (see 5.1.3). Hence the flexibility applied by the Evangelists may provide suitable expectations for Paul.

⁶⁰ It is impossible to have certainty regarding the Evangelists' motivations for making a variation (if that is what happened). However, our transmission model suggested these twin motivations for both oral and print transmission.

3) In what way would these variations in wording affect the **stable conceptual core** of the tradition?

We expect significantly less flexibility to be allowed at the level of the **concepts** behind the tradition (though we noted Matthew's comments on eunuchs).

In relation to flexibility we also identified four further interpretive uncertainties:

- Uncertainty 4: Why does Matthew omit "and marries another" in 5:32?
- Uncertainty 5: Why does Matthew add "makes her commit adultery" in 5:32?
- Uncertainty 6: What is the *scope* of Matthew's exception in 19:9? Does it relate to divorce only or to divorce and remarriage?
- Uncertainty 7: Why does Matthew include the exceptions (Matt 5:32; 19:9) at all?

These uncertainties will be taken up again in Chapter 7, where insights from Paul's application of the divorce/remarriage JT will be used to shed light on these (and the earlier three) uncertainties. To that end, we turn now to Paul's use of the JT.

Chapter 5: Paul and Jesus Tradition

The intention of this study is to demonstrate that Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT can shed light on the interpretive uncertainties present in the Synoptic accounts of said JT. In order to do this, two prior conditions must be met.

First, the Synoptic JT must be identified. This was the task of Chapters 3 and 4, in which we developed a model for identifying JT and applied it to the Synoptics. The result was: an outline of the stable core of the tradition; a description of the kinds of intentional variations that might arise due to an author's audience and/or rhetorical purpose; and seven interpretive uncertainties.

Second, it must be shown that Paul actually knew JT and used it in legitimate ways. That is, while applying some flexibility, he maintained the core of the tradition.⁶¹ As the Literature Review demonstrated, many scholars doubt Paul's knowledge and/or legitimate use of JT. For example, for Rothschild (e.g. 2014, 29) Paul is "uninterested" in JT. For Akenson (2000), Paul illegitimately develops the divorce/remarriage JT, having "no hesitation in overruling" it (182–83). If Paul were unconcerned with JT or its legitimate usage then the present study (comparing his use of a JT with its Synoptic counterparts) would not be possible. The burden of the present chapter is to provide evidence that Paul knew JT and used it "legitimately."

⁶¹ A discussion of what constitutes a *legitimate* use of JT is discussed in 5.2.

It will proceed in three parts.

1) Did Paul know and use JT? Several possible “Pauline roadblocks” will be summarized and responded to.

2) If Paul did use JT, how ought we go about examining his use of it? This section concerns methodology.

3) How does Paul use JT in 1 Corinthians? Does he do so legitimately?

This section will examine Paul’s use of JT in other parts of 1 Corinthians in preparation for our examination of 1 Cor 7 in Chapter 6.

5.1 Did Paul know of and use Jesus Tradition?

The second section of the Literature Review was given over to the question of whether or not Paul knew and used JT. Below is a summary of the second group of roadblocks we identified in the Literature Review—four “Pauline roadblocks”—along with their weaknesses.

5.1.1 Key passages purportedly affirming Paul’s independence/distance from the Historical Jesus

Two particular passages have been used as evidence of Paul’s independence from JT: 2 Cor 5:16 and 1 Cor 2:2. The following exegetical comments suggest that this is unwarranted.

5.1.1.1 2 Corinthians 5:16

As noted in the literature review, Bultmann and others see this verse as “expressing clear disinterest in the historical Jesus or the Jesus-Tradition” (Wolff 1989, 84).

In light of Paul’s wider argument and opponents, Wolff (amongst others) suggests that Paul is explaining that his knowledge of Christ is overwhelmingly shaped by Christ’s reconciling work on his behalf, over and above other historical particularities of Jesus’ life. “Such knowledge of Christ provides the standard by which Christians measure themselves ... [Because of this] all his former standards are destroyed, those by which he judged and condemned” the news of a crucified Messiah (Wolff 1989, 97). Paul is not, therefore, minimising the significance of the historical Jesus or JT.

5.1.1.2 1 Corinthians 2:2

As noted above, this verse has been taken to imply Paul’s disinterest in the historical Jesus. However, in its context, this verse is explaining (γάρ) the *manner of Paul’s “coming”* (ἔρχομαι twice) rather than *the content of his announcement* (2:1). Paul is not declaring his independence from JT. Rather he explains that, in coming to them, his “whole mind-set and stance” was determined by the crucified Christ (Thiselton 2000, 213). His manner of “coming” was “consonant with [his] message” (Garland 2003, 84).

5.1.2 Paul’s Distance from Jewish Christianity

In Galatians 1–2 Paul distances himself from the Jerusalem Christians. For this reason (among others) Baur and then Wrede concluded that Paul “developed his

doctrine in complete opposition to that of the primitive Christian community” (Schweitzer 1912 [1911], 12).

Three points count against this conclusion. First is the criticism discussed in 3.2.2, that Baur’s Hegelian reconstruction of a Pauline/Petrine schism is without sufficient exegetical or philosophical warrant. Second, Paul and Mark are actually far closer than Baur or Wrede admit. For example Dunn (2011), Schoberg (2014), David Wenham (1995) and others have demonstrated the thematic overlap between Paul and the Synoptics.⁶² Third, as Davies (1948), Sanders (1977) and others have shown, Paul remained Jewish in his thinking and broader historical-theological framework (see 2.2.2.7).

5.1.3 Paul’s Independence from The Twelve

Heitmüller, Bultmann and others have highlighted Paul’s independence from The Twelve and from their traditions. Paul was dependent instead on the Hellenists and/or the risen Lord. For Bultmann, “Paul made no effort toward contact with Jesus’ disciples or the Jerusalem Church for instruction concerning Jesus and his ministry” (1952 [1948], 1:188). Three points run against these assertions.

First is the text of Gal 1–2 itself. Following Bruce’s (1980) lead, Dunn shows that προσανατίθημι (Gal 1:16 – “I did not consult anyone”) has the sense of “consulting with someone who is recognized as a qualified interpreter about the significance of some sign” (1982, 462). Paul did not require such assistance to interpret his conversion experience. Dunn also notes that Paul’s visit to Jerusalem, which was far longer than “the normal two to three days ... offered to

⁶² Cf. 3.2.2.

a visitor,” had as its aim “to get to know Cephas” (Gal 1:18) (2008a, 368).⁶³ Here the lexeme translated “get to know” (ἵστορέω) connotes gaining information.⁶⁴ Thereby Dunn concludes that “Paul was quite ready to acknowledge his indebtedness to Peter for further information” on Jesus (1982, 465; cf. Barnett 2008, 84).

Second, particularly in relation to Galatians, a distinction can be made between the gospel received as revelation and that received as tradition (“the words of the gospel”) (Gerhardsson 1961, 296; cf. Bruce 1980, 87; David Wenham 1995, 396). The second could be received from man.

Third, 1 Cor 15:11 suggests that Paul knew and agreed with the message proclaimed by the Apostles. Dodd concludes that 15:3–7 was “a tradition that was common to the whole apostolic body” (1938, 64). Paul accepted the Apostolic tradition as “the supreme (human) doctrinal authority of the Church” (Gerhardsson 1961, 296). These three points suggest that postulating a Hellenistic dependence is unnecessary.

5.1.4 The Paucity of Jesus Quotations in Paul

It is true that Paul quotes JT sparingly. Harnack states that Paul was unable “to appeal to a single word of his Master’s” (1902, 193). Similarly Bultmann says Paul’s “letters barely show any traces of the influence of the Palestinian tradition” (1952 [1948], 1:188). The question here is not only *whether* Paul used JT but also *how* he used it.

⁶³ Ehrman finds it “almost inconceivable” that Paul and Cephas would not have discussed “something of Jesus’ life” (2016b, 103).

⁶⁴ BDAG, s.v. “ἵστορέω.”

While other explanations exist,⁶⁵ for a significant number of scholars Paul quotes JT infrequently because he “assumes in his epistles that the basic authoritative tradition has already been passed on *at an earlier stage*,” and did not need to be woodenly repeated (Gerhardsson 1961, 291; cf. Allen 2013, 49; Allison 1982, 22; Dunn 1998, 189; Eriksson 1998, 73; Kim 1993, 489). Paul uses the (punctiliar) aorist παρέδωκα to describe this passing on (1 Cor 11:23; 15:3). For Dunn, the tradition was now a living resource (2007, 188). Rather than simply recite JT, Paul would *use* it, developing it in legitimate ways (e.g. Allen 2013, 64; Barnett 2008, 7; Kim 2002, 290; Lee 2016, 19; Sumney 2017; Thompson 1991, 240). As with the Synoptists, Paul would “uphold and protect” the core of a tradition while adapting it to his needs and those of his audience (Allen 2013, 64).

The Literature Review also listed several studies that supported this understanding. Lee (2016) showed that Paul used the LXX and JT in the same way that the Qumran community used the LXX. We noted that Rosner’s (1994) description of Paul’s use of the LXX could also be applied to his use of the JT. Bauckham (1999) provided a useful parallel by fending off accusations against James’ infrequent references to JT. Concerning stability he argued that “James’ wisdom has been decisively shaped by the distinctive character and emphases of Jesus” (1999, 100).⁶⁶ Concerning flexibility he notes that James reformulated JT for “new contexts” (1999, 79). Finally, from a comparison with other canonical and non-canonical writings, Thompson (1991, 61–62) concludes that:

⁶⁵ E.g. Hengel’s (2000, 128) explanation is that the Gospels were not yet received as Scripture.

⁶⁶ Jesus’ emphases are summarized under five headings (1999, 97–99). Bauckham shows (100–106) that James shares these. Significantly, the same could be shown from 1 Corinthians.

- We are “unrealistic to expect more than a few explicit references to Jesus’ teachings in Paul.”
- We should not expect lengthy quotation, material from parables, or reports of particular miracles.
- “We might expect a few references to the example of Jesus in Paul, but primarily to characteristics seen in his Passion.”

5.1.5 Arguments for Paul’s Knowledge and Use of JT

Thus there are significant weaknesses in the arguments arrayed *against* Paul’s *knowledge* and *use* of JT. However Paul’s infrequent reference to JT cannot be ignored. A positive argument for his knowledge and use of JT must be given. A number of these have been outlined in the literature review and are here summarized under four headings.

- 1) *A priori* arguments regarding the likelihood of Paul and his converts desiring knowledge of JT (e.g. Hiestermann 2016, 166). Such arguments do not prove much positively but demonstrate the plausibility of the idea.
- 2) Thematic continuity between Paul and the Gospels. Similarities were noted concerning: the Kingdom of God; an inaugurated eschatological

outlook; the inclusive nature of their message; the roles of law and love; and the cruciform shape of their theology.⁶⁷

- 3) Biographical data from the NT regarding Paul's history and ministry praxis suggest that he both learnt and passed on JT. As noted in 3.2.1, Paul regularly used the technical terms for transmission (e.g. Dunn 2013, 340; Fiensy 2010, 100). Again, Paul often appeals to the example of Jesus (e.g. Rom 6:17; 8:15–16; 13:14; 15:1–6; Col 2:6–7; Phil 2:6–11), which presupposes “that his readers knew characteristic events from Jesus’ ministry and characteristic teaching of Jesus” (Dunn 1990, 195; cf. 1998, 189; cf. Bruce 1980, 20).
- 4) Possible quotations and allusions to Jesus tradition. Even avoiding the temptation to find parallels everywhere, there are a number of likely Pauline allusions to JT (e.g. Rom 8:15; 12:14, 17; 13:7; 14:13, 14; 1 Cor 7:10–11; 9:14; 11:23–25; 1 Thes 5:2, 13, 15).

We have also made several observations concerning Paul's use of tradition and other related terms in 3.2.1. Two further observations from 1 Cor 7 can be added here. First, Paul is able to distinguish between his own words and those of “the Lord” (1 Cor 7:10, 12). Second, in 7:25 Paul appears to “regret” not having an authoritative word of the Lord for virgins (Allison 1982, 3). This suggests that Paul was familiar with a body of JT and considered it to be authoritative.

⁶⁷ However actual Pauline *dependence* here is difficult to prove.

While none of these points alone is enough to carry the argument, together they present a strong case. If Paul and the JT share distinct themes; if Paul had opportunity to learn JT and appears to have passed it on to his churches; if there are at least some quotations of and allusions to JT in Paul; if Paul's life was shaped around the pattern of Jesus' life; and if it is *a priori* likely that Paul would want to know about Jesus' life; then we propose that we are justified in thinking that Paul did indeed **know** at least a reasonable amount of JT.

With regards to how Paul **used** that tradition, we have noted significant support for Furnish's (1989, 47–48) "legitimate development" option (2.2.3.3). The churches Paul wrote to were familiar with particular JTs, "immersed" in a body of traditions, such that Paul did not need to repeat them. While maintaining similar themes and concerns as the traditions, Paul would use them with some flexibility or "creativity." Below, after a discussion of method, we will observe this practice in 1 Corinthians.

5.2 Further Methodological Considerations

Before proceeding, two methodological clarifications must be noted. The first concerns the application of our model to Paul. Having argued that Paul was a tradent of JT in a similar milieu to that of the Synoptists, our examination of Paul will follow a similar methodology to that applied to them in chapter 4. However we note four differences in method due to genre difference.

- 1) Unlike the Gospels, 1 Corinthians is not "a written version of an oral recitation of Jesus tradition" (Dunn 2015, 214). It is an epistle with a "deliberative" agenda (Eriksson 1998, 68). Therefore, in terms of

wording, we should expect an increased flexibility in line with Paul's rhetorical purpose.

- 2) The fact that Paul names his addressees, along with extrabiblical evidence, allows for greater specificity in describing Paul's audiences than those of the Gospels.
- 3) The term "narrative setting" will not always be appropriate in the epistolary genre. Hence at times we will simply speak of "setting." "Setting" will be tightly connected with rhetorical purpose.
- 4) Finally, given that Paul does not group traditions together in the same way as the Synoptics, the concept of "grouping" will be of limited utility.

Second, we are seeking to show that Paul's use of JT could be termed "legitimate development." Given that the inscribing of JT followed similar rules to oral traditioning, we should not expect Paul to recite JTs with *verbatim* precision. There will be development. We want to establish that this development is *legitimate*. Though Furnish coins the term "legitimate development," he does not define it (1989, 48).

The present study holds that if Paul's use of the JT falls within similar bounds to those of the Synoptists, it can reasonably be termed *legitimate development*. The Synoptists' usage was summarized at the conclusion of the previous chapter. Significant flexibility was allowed to wording for the sake of audience and rhetorical concerns. However a cluster of key terms, the narrative setting, the grouping of traditions and the concepts underlying the tradition would all remain stable. As noted in our first methodological point, when applying this to Paul's epistolary genre, we will usually exchange "narrative

setting” for simply “setting” and pass over “groupings.” Also, we will expect a greater degree of flexibility in Paul’s wording. The examples in this chapter seek to demonstrate that Paul’s use of the JT falls within these bounds and can rightfully be termed “legitimate development.”

5.3 Evidence from 1 Corinthians

We turn now to the primary literature, i.e. 1 Corinthians. We begin with a brief outline of the message and structure of the letter before turning to Paul’s *use of* JT within it.

5.3.1 Message and Structure

Many have seen 1 Corinthians as a piecemeal response to issues raised in reports from the Corinthians (Thiselton 2000, 36–37). Garland says the letter “may be summed up as a warning against various perils” (2003, 21). Bailey sees it as five distinct and uniformly structured essays (2011, 26).

Against such suggestions, Mitchell has argued for a “unitary composition” pursuing unity in the Corinthian Church (1991, 1). Mitchell’s work has been influential but cannot account for the variety of issues Paul addresses (e.g. Fee 2014, 5–6). More plausibly, several scholars unite 1 Corinthians under a broad practical, eschatological theme (e.g. Fee 2014, 17; Thiselton 2000, 40; Hays 2005, 21). Rosner and Ciampa (2010, 52) summarise it thus:

1 Corinthians is Paul’s attempt to tell the church of God in Corinth that they are part of the fulfillment of the Old Testament expectation of world-wide worship of the God of Israel, and as God’s eschatological temple they must act in a

manner appropriate to their pure and holy status by becoming unified, shunning pagan vices and glorifying God in obedience to the lordship of Jesus Christ.

Various suggestions have also been made concerning the epistle's structure (e.g. Winter 1994, 1161–62; Conzelmann 1975; Thiselton 2000). This study will follow the structure suggested by Rosner and Ciampa as it provides a compelling explanation of how apparently piecemeal topics fit together (2010, 24). Their structure contains four major sections (1:10–4:17; 4:18–7:40; 8:1–14:40; 15:1–58). The first three sections are each dealt with in a negative and then a positive way. For our section these are, “Flee sexual immorality” (5:1–6:20) and “Glorify God with your bodies” (7:1–40). Within each of these treatments there is also an excursus addressing the underlying concept “that should govern the readers” thinking on the practical topic (Ciampa 2011, 108). This outline will be important both for this chapter and for Chapter 6.

5.3.2 How did Paul use JT in 1 Corinthians?

By applying our method to several passages from 1 Corinthians, this section provides support for the “legitimate development” case and identifies patterns and expectations for our examination of 1 Cor 7. How do we see Paul using JT in this letter? Can patterns be discerned that might illuminate Paul's use of the JT on divorce/remarriage in 1 Cor 7? These questions will be examined in relation to two generally accepted citations of JT (9:14 and 11:17–30) and two probable allusions (8:13 and 13:2).

5.3.2.1 Citations

5.3.2.1.a 1 Corinthians 9:14

In 9:14 Paul refers to the tradition recorded in Matthew 10:10 and Luke 10:7, “the worker is worthy of his food/wages” (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 413; France 2007, 386).

Stability

Concerning **wording**, Paul’s command shares no lexeme with its Synoptic parallels.⁶⁸ However in vv. 4–18 Paul uses a number of words shared with Luke 10 (e.g. ἐσθίω and πίνω Luke 10:7/1 Cor 9:4; μισθός Luke 10:7/1 Cor 9:18; ἐξουσία Luke 10:19/1 Cor 9:4, 5, 6, 12, 18; cf. Fjärstedt 1974, 65–77; Allison 1982, 9). Paul appears to have been familiar with the broader missionary discourse and refers to it throughout 1 Cor 9:4–18 with particular lexemes.

The **narrative setting** of Matthew 10:10 and Luke 10:7 suggest that when the early Christian community recited this tradition they also remembered that they were a missionary people (Green 1997, 400–401). It would have stirred them to “single minded dedication to their task” (Thiselton 2000, 693). Examining Paul’s **setting** suggests that he understood something of this sense also. Paul is demonstrating that he is willing to waive his rights “so that [others] may be saved” (10:31). Paul is “single minded” in this task (e.g. 9:12, 22). He calls the Corinthians also to, “Follow my example” (11:1). As with the Synoptics, Paul is reminding the Corinthians that “the recipients of his ministry ... become its agents” (France 2007, 370).

⁶⁸ If one accepts Pauline authorship of the Pastorals this point is more noteworthy, for in 1 Tim 5:18 the author quotes Luke 10:7 precisely.

The main **concept** is also stable across Paul and the Synoptics. That is, those who benefit from gospel proclamation should provide materially for those who share it. This is a practice disciples should expect others to perform, “a ‘right,’ not an obligation” (Garland 2003, 416; cf. Hiestermann 2016, 203).

Flexibility

A number of differences can be explained with reference to Paul’s **audience**. First, the Corinthians had already received at least some tradition from Paul (1 Cor 11:2, 23). Hence he need not repeat it *verbatim*. Second, unlike the Synoptics, Paul need not refer to persecution or unwilling reception since the Corinthians have already welcomed message and messenger. Third, Garland (2003) argues that Paul’s unwillingness to make use of his “right” is due to the fact that his audience was significantly different from that anticipated in the Synoptics, Gentile unbelievers rather than Jews (416). Paul could not say, “The Lord commanded me to be supported by you.”

Finally, the way in which Paul uses the JT differs from the Synoptics due to his **rhetorical purpose**. Paul is not speaking about support that the Corinthians should receive. He is establishing himself as an example for them to follow, an example of waiving personal rights for the sake of the salvation of others (9:19, 22–23; 10:31–11:1). He establishes his right to support in a list of short statements and questions (9:1–13), which concludes with what “the Lord has commanded” (9:14), “an argument from authority” (Fitzmyer 2008, 365). Once conclusively established, Paul provocatively declares that he will not make use of it (9:15; cf. 9:12b).

In this citation elements of stability and flexibility are apparent. These will be gathered together in the conclusion.

5.3.2.1.b 1 Corinthians 11:17–30

This passage is particularly instructive for at least three reasons. First, as with 7:10–11 and 9:14, this tradition is from “the Lord” (11:23). Second, it is perhaps “the only place that Paul, at least in a longer quotation, betrays his knowledge of the Jesus tradition which later became the Synoptic Gospels” recorded in Matt 26:26–28, Mark 14:22–24 and Luke 22:19–20 (Eriksson 1998, 100). Third, in it Paul explicitly places himself within the line of transmission (3.2.1). In this lengthy reference to JT we can observe what it looks like for Paul to be “faithful” to the tradition, both in retaining stability and in applying flexibility.

Stability

At the level of **wording**, 1 Cor 11:23c–25 shares 15 of its 37 significant lexemes with Matthew 26:26–28 and Mark 14:22–24 and 26 lexemes with Luke 22:19–20, including “Do this in remembrance of me” (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24).⁶⁹

In terms of **narrative setting**, each Synoptic Evangelist intends the Supper to interpret Jesus’ suffering which follows (e.g. France 2007, 987; Green 1997, 758, 762). The JT would have informed their cultic practices (e.g. France 2007, 988), but more importantly it would have reminded the early Christian community that Jesus had “freely yielded” his life “for” them, to bring them into the new covenant of forgiveness (France 2007, 987–88; cf. Green 1997, 757). The way Paul uses the tradition maintains this sense also. He indicates the original

⁶⁹ For a detailed list of similarities and differences, see Hiestermann (2016, 211–13).

historical setting of the tradition, “the night he was betrayed” (v. 23). While addressing their worship practices, Paul’s focus is Jesus’ self-giving suffering, as in the Synoptics. More will be made of this below.

At the level of **concept**, Paul’s use is consistent with that presented in the Synoptics. Again, more will be made of this below.

Flexibility

While this account has a high level of verbal stability, there are significant differences also. One example of this is Paul’s double call to “do this in remembrance of me” (1 Cor 11:25c; cf. Luke 22:20). This addition appears to be intentional and relates to his rhetorical purpose for his particular audience.

Within his **rhetorical purpose**, Paul first describes his **audience** (vv. 17–22). Their celebration of the supper makes a mockery of the “church of God” (11:22). They do not wait for each other (11:21).⁷⁰ The tradition then comes as Paul’s authority, explaining (γάρ) why their behaviour is problematic. It is because at that first supper Jesus symbolically enacted his giving of himself for his disciples, renouncing “self-direction and autonomy” (Thiselton 2000, 870).

The Supper is meant to “proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes” in a lived symbol of that self-giving death (11:26). To “remember” this tradition is not merely to adhere to the correct liturgy. It is to manifest what the supper was all about. The way the Corinthians practiced the supper “defeated the very proclamation of the Lord, whose death was ‘for us’ and ‘for the other’ as one body” (Thiselton 2000, 850; cf. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 553). Hence Paul repeats the call to “remember.”

⁷⁰ Fee notes that in v. 21 ἑκάστος is in the emphatic position, highlighting “the individualistic behavior of the well-to-do” (2014, 599).

Once more, stable and flexible features have been noted here and will be summarized in the conclusion.

5.3.2.2 Allusions

As noted in the literature review, there is little agreement as to the number of genuine allusions to JT in 1 Corinthians. Hence we will limit ourselves to two more likely examples here.

5.3.2.2.a 1 Corinthians 8:13

The first is in 8:13, “Therefore, if what I eat causes my brother to fall into sin, I will never eat meat again, so that I will not cause him to fall.” Allison (1982, 14) argues persuasively that Paul knew the JT that lay behind Mark 9:33–50 and is alluding to it here.

Stability: In terms of **wording** the verb “to cause to stumble” (σκανδαλίζω) has no antecedent in the canonical books of the LXX. Transitive uses of this verb are also “extremely rare,” but occur as something of a “catch word” in Mark 9 and twice in 1 Cor 8:13 (Allison 1982, 15). The **narrative setting** of Mark 9:33–48 would remind the early Christians that their greatness comes from welcoming “little ones” and outsiders. Paul retains this sense in his **setting**. The Corinthians are prizing knowledge over love for “weak brothers.” The **concepts** also remain stable. There are dire consequences for causing a “little one” or “weaker brother” to stumble. Radical measures should be taken to avoid doing so (cf. Mark 9:43–45; 1 Cor 8:13).

Flexibility: In Mark, Jesus warns against *causing others* to stumble as well as *that which causes the reader* to stumble. Paul’s **rhetorical purpose** is that his

readers relinquish their freedoms for the sake of others. Hence, Paul only applies the tradition to *causing others* to stumble. Paul's **audience** has questions about eating food sacrificed to idols, an ostensibly harmless practice (1 Cor 8:4–6, 8). Hence, the language of being “thrown into hell” (Mark 9:47) would be inappropriate at this point.

5.3.2.2.b 1 Corinthians 13:2

The second example is from 1 Cor 13:2, “if I have a faith that can move mountains.” This is possibly an allusion to the JT recorded in Mark 11:23, Matthew 17:20 and 21:21. While dependence cannot be proven conclusively, this is “generally conceded” to be a “firm echo” (Allison 1982, 10; cf. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 632; Yeung 2002).

Stability: Each reference uses the **words** “faith” (πίστις) and “mountain” (ὄρος). Matthew 17:20 and 1 Cor 13:2 also use “move” (μεταβαίνω). In the Gospels this saying relates to some great work of Jesus. “Moving mountains” appears to be Jesus’ prime (perhaps proverbial) example of the greatest work. Paul’s **setting** maintains this sense of “mountain moving” as the prime example of great works of faith. At a **conceptual** level each reference focuses on faith and the power available to it (e.g. France 2007, 794).

Flexibility: In Matthew 17 even mustard-seed sized faith can move a mountain, but for Paul “mountain moving” is an example of “all faith” (πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν). The Evangelists use the image to encourage faith in Jesus’ followers. By contrast, Paul’s **rhetorical purpose** is to show that even the greatest works of faith amount to nothing without love. Nevertheless, Paul is not contradicting the

Synoptics or disparaging “mountain-moving faith.” He simply argues that one who has such faith *without love* is “nothing.”

5.4 Conclusion

The goal of this chapter was to demonstrate that Paul knew JT and *legitimately* developed it. Section 5.1 argued this from various passages and scholarly literature. Section 5.3 sought to demonstrate this by examining Paul’s use of JT in two citations and two allusions. In concluding this examination, ten reasonably consistent features of Paul’s use of JT can be discerned.⁷¹ These features create a pattern that we may also find in his use of the divorce/remarriage JT.

Regarding **wording**, Paul:

- i) Uses a formula to introduce the JT;
- ii) Usually only uses a word or two from the actual JT;
- iii) Often uses words and concepts from the saying and its Synoptic context in his broader argument.

Regarding **flexibility** (due to audience and rhetorical purpose) Paul:

- iv) Cites the tradition because the Corinthians were straying from it or in danger of doing so;
- v) Has a deliberative agenda, seeking to elicit a change in the Corinthians;

⁷¹ This pattern is also apparent in Paul’s use of the OT and in 1 Cor 15:1–11.

- vi) Uses the tradition as a premise or authority in his broader argument;
- vii) Exhibits significant liberality with his use of the tradition in order to apply it to the Corinthian context;
- viii) Introduces variations with the intention that his audience keeps the original tradition more fully.

Regarding **setting** and **concepts** Paul:

- ix) Displays consistency with Synoptic parallels;
- x) Demonstrates familiarity with what a tradition “meant” to the early Christian community and retains some sense of that in his letter.

In short, Paul retains a stable core of JT in relation to concept, setting and a few key lexemes. Other than those lexemes, his wording demonstrates significant flexibility. This is not unexpected, given that he is not writing a Gospel, but an epistle to those who have already received JT. With that in mind, the flexibility he exhibits falls within the same kinds of bounds as that applied by the Synoptists, for the sake of their audience and rhetorical purposes. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that Paul’s use of JT in 1 Corinthians can rightly be termed “a legitimate extension and development of Jesus’ teaching” (Furnish 1989, 48).

For Wrede, “The name ‘disciple of Jesus’... has little applicability to Paul” (1908 [1905], 165). For Dunn, Paul “can be characterized as one of the truest disciples

of Jesus” (2011, 115). This chapter has demonstrated that if Paul should feel embarrassed by his lack of clear references to the JT, he is entirely unaware of the fact. He alludes to it freely, expecting his readers to pick up on this as part of their shared tradition. He maintains its core concepts, understanding “the Lord’s teaching to be the norm for all Christian ethics” (Garland 2003, 282). At the same time though, he had no “qualms about interpreting some teaching of Jesus in a way which brought out its relevance more forcibly to their own situation” (Dunn 2013, 308; cf. Lee 2016, 168). This is exactly what we should expect of Paul both from an oral tradition perspective and by the standards of other writings of the time. It also accords with the studies of Lee (2016), Rosner (1994), Bauckham (1999) and Thompson (1991). As suggested already, these observations will be useful in the next step of this study, an examination of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7.

Chapter 6: The Divorce/Remarriage Jesus Tradition in 1

Corinthians 7

Hays identifies 1 Corinthians 7 as “the most interesting instance we have of a consciously reflective pastoral adaptation of the tradition concerning Jesus’ teaching” on divorce and remarriage (1997, 357). This chapter will demonstrate that Paul’s “adaptation” is another example of Furnish’s “legitimate development,” consistent with the pattern observed in the previous chapter. The findings in this chapter will position us for the following chapter, in which we will use Paul’s understanding of the divorce/remarriage JT to shed light on our seven identified interpretive uncertainties from the Synoptic accounts (Chapter 4). It will do that in two ways:

- 1) It will establish that Paul is a faithful interpreter of the divorce/remarriage JT. Therefore it is legitimate to allow his understanding of the JT to inform our understanding of the Synoptists, who are also faithful interpreters of the JT.
- 2) It will identify three particularities of Paul’s use of the JT that will in turn shed light on the Synoptic uncertainties.

The argument of the present chapter relies particularly on the prior arguments in Chapters 3 and 5. In Chapter 3 we established a model for identifying JT. In Chapter 5 we argued for Paul’s knowledge and legitimate development of JT then demonstrated this by applying the same (slightly adjusted) model to several

passages in 1 Corinthians. In so doing we identified a pattern in Paul's use of JT consisting of ten features.

This work has positioned us to examine Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7. This chapter will follow the same method as the previous one and build on the argument and structure of 1 Corinthians outlined there (5.3.1).

6.1 Stability

The vast majority of scholars agree that 1 Cor 7:10–11 refers to the JT on divorce and remarriage.⁷² For example, Hays states that, "Although the wording here is different from that found in the Gospels, Paul is certainly alluding to the tradition that Jesus had forbidden divorce" (2011, 120). The question, however, is: to what extent is Paul *faithful* to the tradition? To what extent does it remain "stable"? This will be examined at the level of wording, setting and concept.

6.1.1 Wording

Paul only uses a few words from the JT we identified in the Synoptics (see 4.1.1).⁷³ However he does use: a key lexeme in 1 Cor 7:10–11; a second key lexeme and phrase in his wider context; and similarly structured phraseology.

A key lexeme: The key lexeme in this instance is χωρίζω. It has been noted (4.1.1) that χωρίζω is never used in the Synoptics except in the phrase, "What God has

⁷² Though some (e.g. Richardson 1980, 71) maintain that these words come from "charismatic insight" from the resurrected Lord.

⁷³ For an argument of which Synoptic account Paul is closest to, see Hays (1997, 358) and Hiestermann (2016). Dungan is probably correct: the question must "be left open" (1971, 134).

joined together, people must not separate” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9) and is never used in the NT to refer to divorce other than in these instances. Due to this peculiar usage and Paul’s attribution of his commands to the Lord (v. 10), it is safe to conclude that “Paul, Mark and Matthew shared a common tradition when they used χωρίζω” (Hiestermann 2016, 179; cf. e.g. Sciarabba 2017, 133).

Wider Context: Paul also uses lexemes from the JT in the surrounding context. In 1 Cor 6:16 Paul speaks against being “joined (κολλώμενος) to a prostitute.” He then recites Gen 2:24 to argue that such joining makes a man “one body” with her. This passage is referred to nowhere else in the NT apart from the Synoptic divorce passages and Eph 5:31. The key word “join” (κολλάω) is also central to the divorce passages (Matt 19:5; Mark 10:7), being the reason for Jesus’ conclusion that “they are no longer two, but one flesh” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:8).

Similarly Structured Phrases: Finally, 1 Cor 7:10–11 has a similar structure to that of Matt 19:6b and Mark 10:9. The memorable, punchy, proverbial structure of the Synoptic passages was noted in 4.1.1. Paul follows a similar pattern, as demonstrated by Table 6.1.

Table 6.1		
Matt 19:6b; Mark 10:9	1 Cor 7:10b	1 Cor 7:11b
ἄνθρωπος	γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς	καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα
μὴ χωρίζετω	μὴ χωρισθῆναι	μὴ ἀφιέναι

That Paul applies the JT to women and men separately fits the pattern of the chapter and the concrete situation in Corinth (see 6.2.1). Hence it is possible that Paul echoes the JT not just in two key terms and a key quotation, but also in phrase structure.

6.1.2 Setting

As we have seen (4.1.2), the Synoptic Gospels consistently placed this JT within a setting of opposition. Reciting the counter-cultural divorce/remarriage tradition would have reinforced in the early Christians their identity as Jesus' holy people. Paul here echoes that setting (albeit without the note of conflict and persecution).

Counter-cultural: In view of the sexual practices of Corinthian society (see 6.2.1), Paul's instructions concerning divorce/remarriage are clearly counter-cultural. The point here however is that these instructions occur *amongst other* counter-cultural material. Three examples may be given. First, in 6:12–18 Paul calls the Corinthians to resist the prevailing sexual practices. Indeed, they are to resist their own appetites (6:12–13). Second, the “complete mutuality” of husband and wife in 7:2–5 is remarkable (Fee 2014, 300). In vv. 2–4 Paul gives the same conditions to both sexes. In v. 5 he speaks of “each other.” Ciampa calls this a “revisionist property ethic” contrasted to Roman culture (2011, 121). Rather than being the one who determines the sexual experiences of his household, the Christian paterfamilias finds his own body under the authority of his wife. Third is Paul's preference for singleness. Roman law (e.g. *Lex Papia et Poppaea*; cf. Long

1875) made marriage compulsory after a certain age, with celibates losing the right to inherit. Against this background Paul's views are indeed counter-cultural.

Holy Identity: Paul's paranaesis springs from the Corinthians' identity as holy people. Paul began his letter by reminding them that they are "sanctified" and "called to be saints" (1:2). They are a holy sanctuary (3:17) in the midst of the world (5:9–10). They have been redeemed from "malice and wickedness" by the sacrifice of the Passover lamb (5:7–8). They have been washed, sanctified and justified (6:11). Their future is resurrection glory and victory over sin and death (15:54–57). It is for this reason that they are to be counter-cultural in wisdom (1:18–4:13), sexual practices (5:1–7:40), and worship (8:1–14:40). Hearing Paul's commands cannot but have reinforced in the Corinthians their identity as God's holy people.

In short, the setting of the JT remains stable. In each context it would function to remind God's people of their holy identity expressed in counter-cultural lives. In some respects this could be said for much Christian paranaesis. However instructions about sexuality and marriage would do so with particular weight, as they were "cutting across and grating against the conventions and expectations of the old social grouping (the household)" (Dunn 2008a, 800–1).

6.1.3 Concepts

The next step is to ascertain whether or not Paul retains the same *concepts* as those underlying the Synoptic accounts. This layer is more complex than it was for the examples in the previous chapters for two reasons. First, the topic of the JT (divorce/remarriage) is in view in at least three places within the chapter (vv. 10–11, 12–15, 39). Second, there are multiple concepts underlying this JT (we identified six from the Synoptic accounts). At this point we will identify only reasonably obvious, surface-level conceptual stability. In turning to flexibility below we will also find conceptual stability within the variations.

6.1.3.1 Marriage Defined by God's Creation Intentions

In Matt 19:4–6 and Mark 10:6–9, Jesus' understanding of marriage is defined by God's creation intentions. Jesus quotes Gen 2:24 and concludes that, "What God joined together people must not separate" (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). This understanding is in contrast to his contemporaries who looked to Deut 24:1–4. Paul does not engage with Deuteronomy but he too pushes back against the contemporary pattern of defining marriage and sexual practices in relation to appetite and gender hierarchy (e.g. 6:12–13; 7:2–5). He too presents a counter-cultural vision based on God's creation intentions. This is most evident immediately before chapter seven where Paul also cites Gen 2:24, including the key word "join" (κολλάω), and clearly cites Jesus' corollary (7:10). Thus Ciampa and Rosner conclude that Paul "knew that marriage was a creation ordinance" (2010, 296).

It must be acknowledged however that there is a difference in focus here. Paul's discussion is heavily influenced by the fact that "this world in its present form is passing away" (v. 31). This variation will be taken up below (6.2.2.1).

6.1.3.2 The Centrality of "Oneness"

In the Synoptic accounts, "oneness" ("joining" and "one flesh") is central to the definition of marriage and forms the warrant for Jesus' conclusion concerning separation (Matt 19:5–6; Mark 10:7–9). While Paul does not mention "oneness" in 1 Cor 7, he is clearly aware of the unifying function of marriage and sexual activity. He used "joining" and "one flesh" as the warrant (γάρ, 6:16) for his argument in 6:15–17. Second, it would seem that "oneness" is still in Paul's mind as he instructs married people in 7:2–4. These verses show a "complete mutuality" in marriage (Fee 2014, 300). Neither husband nor wife is purely their own. They have obligations to the other (v. 3). They do not have authority over their own bodies (v. 4). This is the "revisionist property ethic" referred to earlier (Ciampa, 2011, 121). For Paul, just as we are God's possession, "bought at a price" (6:20), so also our spouse has "authority" over our bodies (7:4). This concept is not far from "oneness" and will be further addressed below.

6.1.3.3 Divorce is Counter to God's Intentions

The third concept taken from the Synoptics is that divorce is counter to God's intentions. Paul's agreement with this concept is clear. The default position is that married people should "remain" married.

In addressing married believers (vv. 10–11), Paul explicitly cites the JT (οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλ' ὁ κύριος). In short, "Christian wives and husbands should not

divorce one another” (Hays 2011, 119; cf. Fitzmyer 2008, 295; Johnson 2004, 116). His wording here is absolute as in Mark and Luke (Fitzmyer 2008, 288).

Turning to believers married to unbelievers (vv. 12–13) Paul first applies the JT in a direct, unqualified way: a believing husband or wife must not divorce their unbelieving spouse. The agreement with the JT is unmistakable, “an extension of the basic thrust of the Jesus Tradition to a new situation” (Collins 1992, 45).

Finally, Paul informs wives that they are “bound” to their husbands “as long as they live” (7:39). They are not free to divorce and remarry.

6.1.3.4 Divorce and Remarriage (Without a Case of Πορνεία) Amounts to Adultery.

In each of the legal sayings (except perhaps Matt 5:32) divorce and remarriage is equated with adultery. While Paul does not explicitly make this equation, we will see below that there is good evidence that he has this concept in mind (6.2.2.3.d).

6.1.3.5 A Case of Πορνεία Damages One Flesh Union

The fifth concept from the Synoptics was that πορνεία damages one flesh union. That Paul is aware of this concept is apparent from 6:15–17, where physical union impacts spiritual union. There it is unthinkable (μὴ γένοιτο) to Paul that believers should “snatch and carry off” (Thiselton 2000, 465) the “members of Christ” (6:15), those “one with him in spirit” (6:17), and “join” them with a prostitute (6:15b–16) through πορνεία. His argument is summarized in 6:18–20 where we are told that πορνεία is a unique sin that joins our bodies in a sinful way (Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 262), the very bodies that are temples of the Holy Spirit, bodies bought by God at a price. More will be said about this concept below (6.2.2.3.c).

6.1.3.6 Honouring Women

A final concept most obvious in Mark's account was that the JT honours women. They are not mere possessions to be divorced or traded. Despite some assessments of Paul as a "misogynist" (e.g. Gilmore 2010, 86), the picture of marriage he outlines here clearly values women. In line with his counter-cultural, cross-shaped vision, the husband is to "fulfill his marital duty to his wife" (v. 3). For Paul, a wife has authority over her husband's body (v. 4).

6.1.3.7 Conclusion Concepts

We have undertaken a surface-level comparison between the concepts underlying Paul's use of the JT with the six identified concepts underlying the Synoptic JT. We have seen that:

- Paul retains two concepts in a straightforward way in chapter 7: Concept 3 (divorce is counter to God's intentions); and Concept 6 (honouring women);
- Paul retains three in a less direct way from chapter 6: Concept 1 (defined by God's creation intentions); Concept 2 (the centrality of "oneness"); and Concept 5 (πορνεία damages one flesh Union);
- and that he does not explicitly touch on Concept 4 (illegitimate divorce and remarriage amounts to adultery).

Most of these concepts will be revisited below (6.2.2). It will be shown that, despite significant variation in wording, Paul retains far greater conceptual stability than this surface-level comparison suggests.

6.1.4 Conclusion (Stability)

In conclusion to the first half of this examination, we have seen that Paul retains stability at each level. Concerning **wording**, Paul uses a key lexeme (χωρίζω), a second key lexeme (κολλάω) and phrase (Genesis 2:24) in his wider context, and similarly structured phraseology. Concerning **setting**, like the Synoptic accounts, Paul's use of the JT would have reminded God's people of their holy identity expressed in counter cultural lives. Concerning **concepts**, at a surface level, agreement with the concepts underlying the Synoptic accounts is substantial.

6.2 Flexibility

Despite the above observations concerning stability, Paul clearly employs a high level of flexibility in his use of the divorce/remarriage JT. Can these be reasonably explained with reference to Paul's audience and/or rhetorical purpose? Or has Paul developed the JT in "illegitimate" ways? These questions are the burden of this second section. It aims to show that, as in the previous chapter, Paul develops the JT in legitimate ways.⁷⁴

6.2.1 Audience

This section draws attention to five features of Paul's audience that account for a number of his variations.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Our definition of "legitimate" has been outlined in 5.2.

⁷⁵ For a fuller introduction to Paul's audience in 1 Cor see e.g. Ciampa and Rosner (2010), Malcolm (2013) or Winter (2001).

Firstly, the majority of the Corinthian population (and church) was Greek (e.g. 1 Cor 12:2), though some Jews were present (e.g. 1 Cor 8:18–19; cf. Acts 18:2). The sexual morality of the city “was probably neither better nor worse ... than other major cities in Greece” (Johnson 2004, 17). This explains two features of Paul’s writing. First, Corinthian marriage practices would also have followed common Graeco-Roman practices, meaning that wives would regularly enact a divorce (see 4.1.2). Hence, like Mark, Paul explicitly addresses his instructions to both men and women in vv. 10–11 (e.g. R. Collins 1992, 34). Second, this contributes to Paul’s broader pattern of oscillating between male and female throughout this chapter (vv. 2–4, 10–14, 16, 28, 32–34).

Secondly, the Corinthian church was established as part of Paul’s Gentile mission 2–4 years before he wrote (Thiselton 2000, 32). This may explain another two features of Paul’s writing. First, as we have argued, when Paul established the Corinthian church he (and/or possibly Apollos; cf. 1 Cor 3:5) would have “passed on” Jesus’ teaching to them. Hence he does not need to repeat the legal saying of the JT. Instead we find him developing and applying the JT. Second, as a young church, some members were married to unbelievers (vv. 12–15). This situation was “not envisioned by the teaching of Jesus” and necessitated variations to the JT (Hays 2011, 120).

Thirdly, Paul’s audience have written to him about concrete issues. Paul has received reports: from Chloe’s household (1:11); from the Corinthians’ letter (e.g. 1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1); and an oral report from several members (16:17–18). The issues raised portray a community still in the “process of

developing its distinctively Christian character” (Dunn 1998, 695). This explains at least one variation in Paul’s use of the JT. The Synoptic accounts are almost exclusively focused on the married, whereas in 1 Corinthians 7 Paul is writing to believers in various, concrete life-situations (e.g. married believers, mixed marriages, the unmarried, widows, virgins etc.).

Fourthly, it would seem that the Corinthians’ reports included the fact that at least one Christian sister (possibly more than one)⁷⁶ was (at least) considering divorcing her believing husband (7:10–11).⁷⁷ It is likely that, as Paul writes, such a divorce is a future possibility (e.g. Fee 1987, 294–95) or that he is aware of at least one *possible* divorce.⁷⁸ Given the time that had elapsed between the

⁷⁶ The omission of an article before γυναῖκα may suggest a group of women rather than an individual. Alternatively, Paul states the general teaching before applying it to an individual case (e.g. Dungan 1971, 90). We will keep both options in mind.

⁷⁷ Raymond Collins states that “most commentators” agree that this is a concrete situation (1992, 15; e.g. Rosner and Ciampa 2010, 289). Seven pieces of evidence can be offered. 1) Paul uses an aorist for the wife but a present for the husband (both are infinitives functioning as imperatives). As Campbell states, the “main pragmatic function” of an aorist imperative “is to convey *specific* commands. ... [That is] it involves a specific agent performing action within a specific situation. This function of the aorist imperative contrasts clearly with the present imperative, which normally conveys commands that are general in nature” (2008, 106). For example, 1 Cor 7:2, 3, 5 use a present imperative. 2) In v. 10 Paul changes his consistent pattern, addressing the wife before the husband (Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 291; Murphy-O’Connor 1981, 602). 3) The husband receives no parenthetical clause. 4) Vv. 10–11 is an “awkward formulation,” as Paul pauses half way through his application (R. Collins 1992, 23). 5) Paul usually *assumes* marriage is lifelong (e.g. Rom 7:2; 1 Cor 7:39), but here cites JT as his authority, as he also does in relation to other concrete situations (e.g. 1 Cor 9:14; 11:23–25; 1 Thes 4:15). 6) As discussed earlier (4.1.2), divorce would not be surprising in this Graeco-Roman context. 7) Chapter 7 seems to be dealing with concrete matters arising from reports.

⁷⁸ Some (e.g. Conzelmann 1975, 120) argue that Paul is aware of a divorce that has *already* occurred. However grammar counts against this conclusion in two ways. First, third class conditions normally suggest an “element of doubt” (J. Wenham 1965, 167). Second, ἐάν plus a subjunctive does not normally refer to

messengers leaving Corinth and Paul putting pen to papyrus, it would be impossible for him to know if such a divorce had proceeded or not. Murphy O'Connor suggests that ἐάν with the subjunctive points to exactly this situation as it can refer to "something which was impending in past time" (1981, 603). In what follows we will hold both possibilities in mind. This may explain four of Paul's variations. First, once again (unlike the Synoptics), Paul is not addressing divorce and remarriage in a hypothetical or casuistic way. "Paul is not writing a general treatise on marriage; rather, he is responding to a specific situation" (Hays 2011, 111). Second, we have shown that Paul consistently addresses both male and female throughout this chapter. In most cases he addresses the male first and then the woman (vv. 2–4, 12–15, 32–34). In vv. 10–11 he reverses that order (cf. v. 16). Perhaps this is because of the concrete situation (Murphy-O'Connor 1981, 602). Third and similarly, vv. 10–11 breaks Paul's pattern of applying his teaching equally to both sexes.

Fourth and perhaps more significantly, this may partially explain why Paul uses χωρίζω for the wife in v. 10 and then ἀφίημι for the husband in v. 11. Some have suggested that the different lexemes are suitable because they refer to different practices.⁷⁹ However a precise distinction is difficult to determine since "both words are well attested in the sense of separation meaning divorce"

past action. In none of the 35 examples Wallace gives is a "past action" referent possible (1996, 697–99). Indeed, in 1 Cor 7:28 the same formula clearly refers to a hypothetical future possibility.

⁷⁹ Some (e.g. Barrett 1968, 162; Blomberg 1994, 134; Olender 1998, 96) suggest that χωρίζω is separation whereas ἀφίημι refers to legal divorce. Davies and Sanders think this accommodates Jewish wives (1989, 327). Alternatively, Wong suggests that χωρίζω denotes "divorce by mutual consent," whereas ἀφίημι "means a divorce against the will of the other" (2002, 185). This makes good sense of vv. 12–13 but does not fit easily with v. 15.

in a legal sense.⁸⁰ Hence many scholars think it best to treat them as virtual synonyms (e.g. Neirynck 1996, 161; Hays 2011, 120; Garland 2003, 281; Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 292; Sciarabba 2017, 137; Instone-Brewer 2002, 199). The question remains, however: why does Paul use these different words in vv. 10–11? It is possible that Paul varies the lexeme simply to indicate a lack of symmetry in his instruction since the instruction to the wife relates to a concrete situation while (as far as Paul is aware) the instruction to the husband does not. In vv. 12–13, when the situation (protases) of husband and wife are symmetrical, both apodoses use the same verb (ἀφίημι). In vv. 10–11 however their situations are not symmetrical and nor are the verbs applied to them.

Whether this explanation of the variation in lexemes is accepted or not, it is significant for this study that Paul applies χωρίζω to the wife (v. 10) and not the husband. This key lexeme relates to the JT, which, we will argue in 6.2.2.iii.a, Paul is about to apply to the wife (v. 11a).

The fifth and final note on audience is that this church is under Paul's pastoral care. Fee states that in 1 Corinthians, "Paul is on the attack" (2014, 10). At the same time, Paul is their "father" and they are his "dear children" (4:14–15). In chapter 6 Paul appears exasperated, asking six times, "Do you not know?" (6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19), whereas in chapter 7 we have "Paul the pastor at his best" (Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 271). In their varied life situations, Paul "continues to hold open a space for the Corinthians ... to exercise their own discernment" (e.g. vv. 5, 9, 21, 28, 36; Hays 2011, 112). This observation sheds light on Paul's tone. It is

⁸⁰ Instone-Brewer notes that Greek marriage and divorce contracts used more than fifty different terms for "divorce" (2002, 199).

quite unlike Jesus' tone in the controversy stories of Matt 19:1–10 and Mark 10:1–12. There the Pharisees came with “unscrupulous motives” to trap/tempt him (Matt 19:3; Mark 10:2; Blomberg 1994, 290). The conversation was a legal dispute. Paul's tone is pastoral as he addresses this young church.

In summary, Paul appears to have used the flexibility available to him to apply the JT to his particular audience. We have examined five features of that audience that may help to explain a number of Paul's variations from the Synoptic accounts.

6.2.2 Rhetorical Purpose

The second feature that may explain Paul's variations is rhetorical purpose. In what follows we will begin with Paul's broad rhetorical purpose before focusing on smaller units.

6.2.2.1 Broadly Eschatological

As mentioned (5.3.1), Paul's purpose in 1 Corinthians is practical eschatology (e.g. Fee 2014, 17; Thiselton 2000, 40). He has a deliberative agenda, calling the Corinthians to live in line with their eschatological reality in Christ Jesus their Lord. This eschatological focus explains the variation we noticed above in relation to Concept One, “Marriage Defined by God's Creation Intentions.” While Paul does recognize this concept, his instructions are informed by his broader rhetorical purpose. Hence, the reality that “this world in its present form is passing away” (1 Cor 7:31) relativises “the importance of all worldly conditions

and relationships” (Wimbush 1987, 16). For example, the married man “should live as if he had” no wife because “the time is short” (7:29).

This is most explicit in Paul’s recommendation of singleness. While Matthew is positive regarding eunuchs (Matt 19:12; cf. Acts 8:26–38), Paul goes further and claims singleness as the “better” option (v. 38), his “clearly stated preference” (Dunn 1998, 693). This becomes his focus from v. 26 where the whole discussion takes a more eschatological focus. Singleness is a “better” option because of this eschatological focus and the priority of serving Jesus. Such service will be hindered by the distraction of marriage (vv. 32–35).

This difference in eschatological focus should not be overstated, however. The teaching of Matt 19:1–12; Mark 10:1–12 occurs within a section focused on the Kingdom way of cross *and vindication*. It distinguishes between “the present age” and “the age to come” (Mark 10:30; cf. Matt 16:27; 20:21–23; Mark 8:38; 10:37–40). It speaks of “the renewal of all things” (Matt 19:28); “entering life/the Kingdom” (Matt 18:3, 8–9; 19:23–24; Mark 9:44–47; 10:15 23–25); and receiving the Kingdom (Mark 10:15), something hard for the rich of the present age (Matt 19:23–24; Mark 10:23–25). Not long after this section Matthew and Mark record Jesus’ statements about marriage at the resurrection (Matt 22:29–32; Mark 12:24–27) and his “apocalyptic discourse” (Matt 24; Mark 13). Thus there may be more conceptual similarity with Paul than is usually recognized.

Nevertheless, even having noted these similarities, the “pull of the future shapes” Paul’s teaching on divorce/remarriage in a more explicit way (Johnson 2004, 107). Paul is aware that marriage is based on God’s creation intentions, but this is relativised under his overall eschatological purpose.

6.2.2.2 “Remaining” Applied to Life-Settings

Within this broad eschatological purpose the overarching ethical directive of chapter 7 is that, “Each person should remain in the situation they were in when God called them” (7:20; cf. 7:17, 24). The directive to “remain” (μένω) is applied to various life-settings (e.g. Rosner 1994, 147). In some instances he employs the specific lexeme (vv. 8, 11, 40) while in others the concept is implicit (vv. 1–7, 12–16, 25–38). “Remaining” is not the focus of the Synoptic accounts. Paul applies a certain level of flexibility in using the JT within his broader command to remain. In line with this command, Paul’s desire is for married members of the Corinthian church to *remain* married, thus emphasizing Concept 3, “Divorce is Counter to God’s Intentions.”

6.2.2.3 Detailed Argument

In what follows we trace the rhetorical flow of four separate verses, vv. 11a, 14, 15 and 39. The aim is to show how Paul uses the JT flexibly within his particular argument to particular groups while retaining its stability.

6.2.2.3.a v. 11a

As argued above (6.1.1), vv. 10, 11b clearly reflect the JT, “What God has joined together man must not separate” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). However when Paul comes to address the situation in which a separation has (or may) take place (v. 11a), he appears to diverge from the JT, tolerating the separation (see Table 6.2).

Table 6.2		
1 Cor 7:10b–11a	Mark 10:9	Mark 10:12
A wife must not separate (χωρισθῆναι) from her husband. But if she does separate (ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ), she must remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband.	Therefore what God has joined together, let man not separate (μὴ χωριζέτω).	And if she divorces (ἀπολύσασα) her husband and marries another man, she commits adultery (μοιχᾶται).

Dungan sees here a repudiation of Jesus' prohibition on divorce (1971, 89–93). Similarly Wong concludes that here, unlike the Synoptics, “what is forbidden is not separation, but remarriage” (2002, 184). These positions however, run counter to the commands of vv. 10, 12, 13 and Paul's consistent call to “remain.” Rather than allowing for separation, Paul is: 1) addressing the fact that a separation has already taken place or may take place in the future (see 6.2.1); and/or 2), as a realistic pastor, “reckon[ing] with the possibility that some within the community may not obey” the JT (Hays 2011, 120; cf. Marcus 2000, 712).

In such a case, Paul uses imperatives to command the divorcee to “remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband” (7:11a). Here Paul uses neither of the two key words in the in legal sayings (“divorce,” ἀπολύω and “adultery,” μοιχᾶω – see Table 6.2). This leads Hiestermann (2016) to conclude that “what Paul says ... has no clear parallel in the Synoptic Gospels” (184). Similarly,

Kistemaker (1993) sees v. 11a as a parenthesis containing Paul's own thoughts before he returns to the JT in v. 11b (221).

However, as the pattern identified in chapter five suggested, we should not expect Paul to use more than a few words from the JT. An examination of the *content* and *force* of v. 11a shows clear parallels with the legal sayings. Paul effectively prohibits in positive terms what the Synoptics do in negative terms. To instruct a separated woman "to remain unmarried or else be reconciled" (v. 11a) is to prohibit remarriage, divorce-for-remarriage and remarriage when reconciliation is possible. Thus, Paul appears to have had the tradition (including the legal saying – Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18) in mind throughout vv. 10–11 (e.g. Zhekov 2009, 186). In Hays's (1997, 358) words, v. 11a is "Paul's own gloss on the tradition."

It is worth noting one aspect of Paul's application of the JT at this point. The command to "reconcile" or "remain unmarried" suggests that Paul sees the couple as still married in some sense. Despite her divorce, the wife is not free from her marriage. Her marriage union has not dissolved. The couple is able to reconcile, rather than needing to remarry each other. "The assumption behind this instruction" is that "the marriage bonds remain intact" (Garland 2003, 283). This observation will be important in the following chapter as we use Paul's understanding of the divorce/remarriage tradition to shed light on Synoptic uncertainties.

6.2.2.3.b v. 14

In turning to those in mixed marriages, Paul begins by repeating the force of the JT in unqualified terms: a believing husband or wife must not divorce their

unbelieving spouse (vv. 12–13). Paul then provides his warrant (γάρ) for this instruction (v. 14). At this point we notice again the difference between Paul’s warrant and that used in the Synoptics. In the Synoptic accounts of the JT the warrant for Jesus’ position on divorce/remarriage is “Oneness” (Matt 19:5–6; Mark 10:7–9), as per Concept 2. Paul’s warrant for his instructions in 1 Cor 7:12–13 on the other hand is that the unbelieving spouse is “made holy” because of the believer (v. 14). As noted above (6.1.3), Paul is clearly aware of the unifying function of marriage and sexual activity (cf. 6:15–17) and presents a radically unitary vision of marriage. However, this unity is not Paul’s precise focus at this point.

Tracing Paul’s argument in chapters 6–7 opens up another possibility here. While “oneness” is not Paul’s *direct* warrant for his instructions in vv. 12–13, it may be his *indirect* warrant. That is, Paul’s direct warrant (the unbeliever partaking in the believer’s holiness) *presupposes the couple’s union*. This argument is found in reverse in chapter 6. There, the believer has been *sanctified* (6:11). Their “body is a temple of the *Holy Spirit*” (6:19). It is inappropriate to take the holy “members of Christ” and “*join*” them to a prostitute (6:15–16). In short, sexual activity takes a holy one into a union to which they do not belong. The reverse is true in 7:14. Marriage union (with its concomitant sexual activity) takes the unbeliever where they do not naturally belong, into holiness.⁸¹ Somehow the unholy unbeliever is “sanctified” through their marriage to the believer.

⁸¹ As Morris notes, “It is not possible to give a precise explanation of what this means” (1985, 109–10; cf. Johnson 2004, 118). Clearly this “holiness” is not necessarily salvific (cf. v. 16).

Given the proximity and similarity of the argument in chapter 6, it seems likely that “joining” is the warrant for the conclusion here also (cf. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 299–300; Garland 2003, 288–89). Thus, “oneness” acts *indirectly* as the warrant for Paul’s prohibition of separation in 7:12–13. In short then, Paul upholds Concept 2, “The Centrality of ‘Oneness,’” working it into his argument.

6.2.2.3.c v. 15

In vv. 12–13 Paul has addressed the situation in which an unbeliever was willing to live with the believer. In that situation, the JT is applied directly and without qualification. In v. 15, however, Paul turns to the situation when the unbeliever is unwilling. In this connection, Paul is required to “adjudicate the situation himself” (Köstenberger 2004, 245). He cannot give a “command” of the Lord as in v. 10. However this contrast must not be overstated. Paul does not say “I have *no* command from the Lord” (as in v. 25). He gives more than “an opinion” (v. 25). As we shall see, Paul’s commands here develop rather than oppose the JT. Indeed the JT remains central (e.g. Garland 2003, 285; Conzelmann 1975, 121; Sciarabba 2017, 130).⁸² It is simply that the JT is not “applicable to mixed marriages” without some qualification (Collins 1992, 45).

So what are Paul’s instructions when an unbeliever is unwilling to live with a believer? If “the unbeliever separates (χωρίζεται), let him separate (χωριζέσθω). A brother or sister is not enslaved (δεδούλωται) in such cases” (v.

⁸² *Pace* Jacobi 2015 and Hiestermann 2016, 172, whose structures diminish the place of the JT.

15).⁸³ To recognize how Paul is using the JT in this argument, it is important to understand what he means by “not enslaved.”

Before answering that question however, we must explain the divergent instructions given believers in vv. 11 and 15 (see Table 6.3). We will not need to resort, with Murphy-O’Connor, to charges of Pauline inconsistency (1981, 606).

Table 6.3	
v. 15	v. 11a
But if the unbeliever separates (χωρίζεται), let him separate (χωριζέσθω). A believing man or woman is not bound (οὐ δεδούλωται) in such circumstances	But if she does separate (χωρισθῇ), she must remain unmarried or else be reconciled to her husband.

In v. 15 the believer is “not enslaved.” Whatever “not enslaved” means, it is not an obvious description of the woman in v. 11. She is not free from her marriage. She must “remain unmarried or else be reconciled.” Why the difference in commands? In short (as 6.2.2.2), Paul is applying his overarching ethical directive of “remaining” to a series of *particular* life-settings. “Remaining” looks markedly different when applied to an actively divorcing believer (vv. 10–11) as opposed to a (passive) believer from whom an unbeliever separates (v. 15).

We turn now to the meaning of “not enslaved.” Several commentators have argued that, in contrast to the woman in v. 11, the deserted believer in v. 15 is “not enslaved” *to the need to reconcile with their spouse*. For example, Olender understands “not enslaved” to mean that “God does not require a believer to

⁸³ Grudem (2020) argues that “in such cases” suggests that there are other similar cases in which separation is permissible.

maintain a marriage forcibly against the will of an unbeliever” (1998, 95).

Similarly Blomberg says that the believer is “not compelled to try to prevent the separation” (1994, 135). Finally, Laney concludes that, “The word *enslaved* has to do with how the partners relate” (1990, 43–44). While these conclusions may hold some truth, they face two weaknesses. The first is a pragmatic weakness. In a context in which divorce was effected simply by separation, after which it could not be contested (e.g. Fee 2014, 325; Garland 2003, 291; Instone-Brewer 2002, 190), how might a deserted spouse “forcibly” maintain their marriage? They have no power to effect such reconciliation anyway. How might a believer practically “not try to prevent separation?”⁸⁴ The second weakness of these suggestions is that they do not relate to the object to which the believer is enslaved; they are simply implications.

Instead, it is more likely that the believer is “not enslaved” to their *legal marriage union*. That the *marriage union* is in view (rather than “your spouse”) is suggested by Paul’s use of the key lexeme χωρίζω. As has been noted, this is a peculiar verb in the NT and when used of divorce it draws the JT to mind. The JT forbids the separation (χωρίζω) of what God has joined together. That is, he forbids the separation of a singular thing (singular ὅ; Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9), that is, the “one flesh” marriage union. Hence the focus here is not simply on separation from a “spouse” but from a divinely wrought and legally affirmed “union” with that spouse.

That Paul is thinking of marriage union *legally established* here is suggested by Rom 7:1–3. There, Paul uses “slavery” language (κυριεύω, δέω

⁸⁴ This runs counter to Paul’s insistence on “remaining” and his hope that the unbeliever might be saved through the believer (v. 16).

νόμῳ, ἐλεύθερος, cf. δουλεύω in v. 6) to discuss being bound and not-bound to the “law of the husband”, τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός, which in that context refers to the legal situation of marriage.⁸⁵ Assuming the same legal understanding of marriage, it is possible that Paul is not giving his own radical ruling in 1 Cor 7:15, but simply noting that the regular Roman law concerning divorce and remarriage also applies to deserted Christians. That is, perhaps “not enslaved” is less significant than discussion sometimes makes out.

That the deserted believer is “not enslaved” to their legal marriage union is a common view amongst scholars. Yet does this entail the right to remarriage? Some say no (e.g. Bruce 1971, 70; Dungan 1971, 97; Laney 1990, 44–45; Olender 1998, 95). Others consider it to denote the freedom to remarry (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 302; Zhekov 2009, 350; Instone-Brewer 2002, 202; Bock 1994, 2:1358; Stein 1992, 197; Carson 1984, 417; Conzelmann 1975, 123; Calvin 1972, II:247).

Perhaps Fee is correct to say that “not enslaved” does not speak to the question of remarriage one way or the other (2014, 335). This would fit the tenor of the passage, in which Paul is “quite happy to leave loose ends” and space for individual discernment (Thiselton 2000, 536). However four pieces of evidence suggest that Paul at least left open the possibility of remarriage.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Instone-Brewer offers further support, noting that, “Jewish marriage was based on a concept of bondage” (2002, 191).

⁸⁶ Four other pieces of evidence could be added. First, Peterson (2018, 43) argues that “Paul may have drawn upon the marital life of Moses, who appears to have remarried ... after being abandoned ... due to his Abrahamic faith.” Second, denying remarriage at this point probably requires us to affirm the indissolubility of marriage in relation to Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18. Hugenerberger (1998; cf. Heth 2002), amongst others, has brought indissolubility into significant doubt. Third, 1 Cor 6:16 opens the possibility that a (married?) man may enter into a new “one-flesh union.” Paul says that the one who visits a

First, the verb “enslaved” δεδούλωται is a perfect. Though not the universal understanding, Campbell (2008, 128) argues that the sense of the perfect is expressed by either “intensification or prominence.” Hence, whatever we take “not enslaved” to mean then, it may require an expansive rather than limited sense.

Second, in contemporary culture (Jewish and Graeco-Roman), a divorcee was expected to remarry and the divorce certificate would almost certainly have “contained the words, ‘you are free to marry any man you wish,’ or something very similar” (Instone-Brewer 2002, 202; cf. Keener 1997, 123; Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 303).⁸⁷ Indeed, “the whole purpose of divorce in the ancient world (both Jews and Gentiles) was to permit remarriage” (Osborne 2010, 200; cf. Keener 1993, 7). To be sure, the holy, counter-cultural people of God do not take their lead from society around them, but if Paul does not specify that they should remain unmarried then the option of remarriage would probably be their assumption. “Paul would have been much more explicit in forbidding [remarriage] if that was his intention” (Blomberg 1994, 108).

prostitute “is one body with her. For it is said, ‘The two will become one flesh’” (Gen 2:24). While Paul does not explicitly say they are “one flesh,” his argument and reference to Gen 2:24 suggest that sexual intercourse creates something akin to such a union, an “enduring bond” (Nash 2009, 168). Fourth, many commentators (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 286; Zhekov 2009, 184) note that in v. 9 the “unmarried” (cf. v. 11) are able to marry. We have not offered this as evidence due to its weaknesses discussed in 6.2.2.3.d.

⁸⁷ E.g. m. Gittin 9:3. “The essence of a [certificate of divorce is]: You are permitted to every man. Rabbi Yehudah says: ‘The [certificate of divorce] must state clearly that it, i.e., the document is effecting the divorce and therefore, the [certificate of divorce] must include the following words: And this shall be from me to you a scroll of divorce, a letter of dismissal, a bill of release, to go and marry any man whom you choose.’” Similarly a Greek divorce certificate (BGU 1103) permits the wife “to join another man in wedlock and [the husband] another woman.”

Third, while the term “bound” δέδεταῖ in v. 39 may not be synonymous with “enslaved” δεδούλωταῖ (Garland 2003, 290), their semantic fields overlap.⁸⁸ (See further 6.2.2.3.e.) Hence it is significant that when a woman becomes “unbound” to her husband through death, she becomes “free to marry” (v. 39; cf. Rom 7:2-3; Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 303).

Finally, pointing to v. 11, some may argue that Paul does indeed specify that divorcees should remain unmarried. However applying the instruction of v. 11 to the situation in v. 15 is problematic given the contrast between these verses and the life-settings they address.

If this reading is correct and the deserted believer is able to remarry, then we may conclude that the marriage union in v. 15 is truly “put asunder.” The unbeliever has effected a genuine “separation” of what God “has joined together” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). Once more, this is in contrast with v. 11 in relation to which we concluded that a true separation has not occurred. The wife is still in some ways “enslaved” to her marriage union.

This raises a question: by what means has the unbeliever effected an actual separation? It is not affected by virtue of their being an unbeliever. Concept 1 from the JT (see 4.1.4.1) asserts that marriage is defined by God’s *creation* intentions (Matt 19:4–6; Mark 10:6–8; 1 Cor 6:16). “It is generally agreed that the marriage covenant isn’t changed when one is converted” (Laney 1990, 42; cf. 1 Cor 7:12-13).

Nor does an act of πορνεία *necessarily* effect a separation. In Jewish thought it did. A second “one-flesh” union, contracted through an act of πορνεία,

⁸⁸ Indeed, Blomberg (1994, 108) says that they are “seemingly synonymous.”

“was understood to violate the original one so radically that the subsequent continuation of the original marriage was unthinkable; it was officially dissolved” (France 2007, 210). As we have seen (6.1.3.5), Paul agrees with Concept 5, that πορνεία damages a one-flesh union (cf. 1 Cor 6:15–16). However he does not require the spouse of the sexually immoral person to divorce them.⁸⁹ Indeed he calls all married believers to “remain” in their marriages (1 Cor 7:12–13), even though some believers appear to have committed πορνεία (6:12–20). This accords with Matthew 5:32; 19:9, where Jesus does not *require* divorce in cases of πορνεία. Hence, we are hesitant to say more than that πορνεία *damages* a one-flesh union.

Finally, does a new marriage union effect an actual separation of a former union? That is, when a spouse “leaves and cleaves” to a new spouse (Gen 2:24)? It is commonly assumed that, following contemporary cultural practice, the deserting unbeliever has remarried (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 303; France 2007, 211; Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493; Woodhouse 2014, 19). Is Paul possibly open to remarriage in v. 15 because he assumes this also? While not explicitly stated, this answer seems likely. Murray (1961, 111) puts it thus: “The second marriage is undoubtedly adulterous and, therefore, illegitimate. But we are not prepared to say that it is invalid. ... It has the effect of dissolving the first marriage.”⁹⁰ This conclusion will be nuanced in 7.3.

⁸⁹ Paul says that the one “joined to a prostitute is one body with her (1 Cor 6:16)” rather than “one flesh” as Gen 2:24 says. Perhaps this guards against the conclusion that the one “joined to a prostitute” is married to her. Marriage is more than sexual activity. See e.g. Laney (1990, 19).

⁹⁰ Heth (2002, 17), based on Hugenberger (1998), provides two arguments against indissolubility: 1) “biblical covenants can be violated and dissolved;” and 2) “‘one-flesh’ marital-kinship union is not a literal flesh and blood relationship.”

Our conclusion here concerning the possibility of remarriage in certain circumstances will be important for the next chapter. To be clear though, we are not, with Murphy O'Connor (1981, 606), concluding that in v. 15 Paul allows "precisely what the logion [cf. Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9] forbids." The situation in the Synoptics is markedly different from that of 1 Cor 7:15. The Synoptics always discuss divorce in the context of a discussion of remarriage (4.1.4.4.c), whereas Paul here discusses divorce without explicitly referring to remarriage. Paul's application of the JT to this new situation, within his broader purpose of calling the Corinthians to "remain" in their marital state, requires a development of the JT (see 7.3).

Hence, rather than Paul allowing what the JT forbids, Paul is giving what Garland calls "an imperative of toleration" (2003, 290). If an unbeliever separates themselves from union with a believer, the separation is actual and the believer must accept this. Paul acknowledges that "the believer really cannot do anything if his or her unbelieving mate chooses to divorce" (Stein 1992, 192).

That such separation is counter to Paul's general aim is evident from the way he returns to his main focus in v. 15c, "God has called us to peace."⁹¹ "Peace" would most readily be expressed by "remaining." Hence v. 15a and the possibility of separation due to desertion, is something of a parenthesis (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 302), similar to 7:11a.⁹²

⁹¹ ἡμᾶς has "slightly stronger external support" than ὑμᾶς (Metzger 1994, 489).

⁹² For Laney etc. "peace" is contrasted with "enslaved" (1990, 44). This is unlikely given that: a) the believer would be unable to maintain the fractured marriage in any meaningful way; and b) "peace" consistently refers to "continued relationship" rather than a lack of hostility or angst (e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 304).

In summary, in vv. 12–16 Paul directly applies but also develops the JT to this new situation. He *applies it directly* to the believer whose unbelieving spouse is willing to remain with them. However when the unbeliever definitively separates from the marriage union, Paul *develops* the tradition. Unlike the Synoptic accounts of this JT, Paul applies the JT to divorce without also discussing remarriage. He instructs the believer to “let him separate” (7:15), accepting that their marriage union has been “separated.” They are “not enslaved” to the former marriage union and presumably the possibility of remarriage is also open. In Johnson’s words, Paul’s instructions are “a further application of Christ’s command to a situation not addressed by the Lord” (2004, 117).

6.2.2.3.d Discussing Concept 4: Divorce and Remarriage (Without a Case of Πορνεία) Amounts to Adultery.

It was noted above that Paul does not explicitly equate divorce and remarriage with adultery (Concept 4). Does this mean that he is unaware of the legal sayings (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18) or disagrees with them? Our examination thus far provides evidence to the contrary. However before demonstrating this more positively, three preliminary remarks will be noted.

First, Paul’s silence regarding adultery does not mean that he is ignorant of the legal sayings nor that he disagrees with it. Indeed, second, our model suggests that Paul did in fact know the legal sayings. In support of this we noted that v. 11a seems to restate the legal sayings in positive terms. Third,

establishing such an equation or restating the legal sayings is not the purpose of Paul's argument.

It is possible to argue in a more positive way from 1 Corinthians that Paul *probably* equated the combination of divorce and remarriage, under certain conditions, with adultery. The argument proceeds in four stages:

- 1) *Paul does not consider divorce alone to be adultery.* In 5:1–2 Paul rebuked the Corinthians for allowing a sexually immoral man to remain in the church. Adultery is a kind of sexual immorality. Hence if divorce itself is adultery (a kind of sexual immorality), we would expect Paul to rebuke the (possible) divorcee in chapter 7. However he does not do so. “Presumably, they are allowed remain in the community, with the proviso that they are not to marry again” (Hays 2011, 120). It therefore seems as though Paul does not consider the divorcee to be an adulteress for simply divorcing. He does not appear to have understood the legal sayings in that way. This point will be important for our reading of the Synoptic JT (see Chapter 7).

This is not to agree with Wong and Dungan, that Paul *allows* divorce. As has been shown, Paul's consistent position is that couples must not divorce. Believers are called to life-long commitment to their spouses (cf. v. 39). Marriage is “a bond which is not to be dissolved at will” (Thiselton 2000, 541).

However Paul finds himself addressing a situation in which a divorce may well have taken place already.

2) *Paul probably does not consider remarriage alone to be adultery:*

As we have just argued, Paul seems to leave open the possibility of remarriage for a deserted believer (v. 15). Hence remarriage is probably not adulterous in all cases.

3) *Paul opposes divorce and remarriage under certain conditions:* If

neither divorce alone nor all types of remarriage constitute sexual immorality, then what is left? Divorce *and* remarriage. The divorced woman must “remain unmarried or be reconciled” (v. 11).

It is not clear from 7:10–11 what Paul is seeking to rule out: divorce *with the express intention* of remarriage (divorce *for* remarriage); divorce *and possible remarriage at some later time*; or both (see 4.1.4.4.a). We do not know the precise Corinthian situation.⁹³

Greater specificity is possible *if* the “unmarried” of v. 8 includes divorcees. If it does, then certain divorcees are able to (re)marry (v. 9). Not only does this support our conclusion concerning remarriage (6.2.2.3.c), it may also suggest why certain divorcees may remarry while others (e.g. vv. 10–11)

⁹³ Ciampa (2011) and Rosner and Ciampa (2010, 268–69) have effectively critiqued the argument that women divorced for celibacy. They suggest (2010, 290–91) other motivations for possible Corinthian divorces.

may not. Perhaps it relates to the possibility of reconciling with their former spouse.

However this conclusion requires showing that when Paul uses the term “unmarried” (ἄγαμος) in verse 8, he has in mind a general category that includes divorcees. Paul’s use of the term in vv. 11 and 34 may support this reading. In v. 11 ἄγαμος is used to describe a divorcee. In v. 34 “the unmarried (ἄγαμος) woman” is distinguished from the “virgin” (παρθένος). Rather than indicating betrothal (*pace* ESV), “virgin” here refers to a young woman who has not had sexual intercourse.⁹⁴ Presumably then, ἄγαμος does not describe virgins. Additionally, v. 8 suggests that widows are a separate category from the unmarried. The remaining options are divorced women or those who have never married but have been sexually active. The “balance of writers” include divorcees in the category of ἄγαμος (Thiselton 2000, 515; e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 287; Johnson 2004, 113; Garland 2003, 276; Witherington 1996, 30).

This understanding has two weaknesses. First, we were unable to find any instance in the TLG in which ἄγαμος explicitly

⁹⁴ “Virgin” does not include the concept of betrothal in broader literature (Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 332). There are other ways of indicating betrothal (e.g. Deut 22:23). The usual reference is to “one who has never engaged in sexual intercourse” (BDAG, s.v. “παρθένος”; cf. e.g. Mat 1:23; 2 Cor 11:2; Rev 14:4; Gen 24:16; 34:3; Ex 22:15; Lev 21:13; Jud 21:12 LXX). While vv. 36-38 do relate to betrothal, there she is consistently “his virgin.”

includes divorcees.⁹⁵ Furthermore, in the cases examined, whenever the context provides an indication as to *why* the person is ἄγαμος, the reason given is that they have *never married* (Sophocles, *Antigone* 865; Euripides, *Ephigenia Taurica* 220; Euripides, *Helena* 685; Vallens, *Anthologies*, 2; Plato, *Leges* 774.a; Homer, *Iliad* III.40; Plato, *Symposium* 192.b; cf. 4 Macc 16:9). Second, the above understanding requires reading Paul backwards. The fact that Paul uses ἄγαμος in v. 11 to refer to a divorcee does not necessarily mean that he had divorcees in mind in v. 8. He may be applying the term to different groups.

In short, we cannot be certain whether or not vv. 8–9 relates to divorcees. The evidence suggests that, when Paul used the term ἄγαμος in v. 8, he probably had in mind those who had never married.⁹⁶ Therefore we cannot be certain what Paul would consider to be sexual immorality in relation to those who divorce illegitimately (without intent to remarry) and later remarry. Would he consider it to be sexual immorality if they were able to reconcile with their former spouse but did not? Verses 10–11 suggest that he would. Their marriage has an ongoing reality. Would he consider it to be sexual immorality if they remarried, not being able to reconcile with their former

⁹⁵ A search for the lemma ἄγαμος produced 577 results across the entire TLG canon (M. Pantelia, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature* (Irvine, CA: University of California, 2014) <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/> searched 25 November 2020).

⁹⁶ Pace the “balance of writers,” who include divorcees in the category of ἄγαμος (Thiselton 2000, 515; e.g. Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 287; Johnson 2004, 113; Garland 2003, 276; Witherington 1996, 30).

spouse? (This common, modern situation would have been possible but probably unlikely in the first century.) If their former spouse has since entered into a new marriage, it seems as though Paul would not classify this as πορνεία since, similar to v. 15, he considers the former marriage union to be dissolved (6.2.2.3.c). However if reconciliation is not possible for *some other reason*, then we cannot be sure of Paul's position. His application of the divorce/remarriage JT does not explicitly cover such a scenario (perhaps because it was unlikely in the first century) and we have been unable to address it through extrapolation from his discussion. Even if we could, the practical question would remain, "what constitutes a *legitimate* inability to reconcile?" Due to the lengthy nature of the above descriptions, we will refer to this complex of prohibited remarriages as "prohibited Pauline remarriages."

- 4) *Paul probably considered these "prohibited Pauline remarriages" to be adulterous:* It is not possible to be certain that Paul would have equated these practices with adultery *per se*. However given that adultery is "the central issue" in the Synoptic accounts of the tradition (which we believe Paul knows and cites), Fee concludes that, "one would be hard-pressed to argue that for Paul [these practices] did not mean the same" (2014, 327. n. 121).

6.2.2.3.e v. 39.

Our final verse presents more uncertainties. “A wife is bound as long as her husband lives. But if her husband dies, she is free to be married to anyone she wants—only in the Lord” (7:39). At first glance this verse prohibits all remarriage while a spouse is living (e.g. Kistemaker 1993, 255). This contradicts our earlier observation concerning v. 15 (see Table 6.4).

Table 6.4	
v. 39	v. 15
A woman <u>is bound</u> (δέδεταί) to her husband as long as he lives. But if her husband dies, she is free to marry anyone she wishes, but he must belong to the Lord.	But if the unbeliever leaves, let him do so. A believing man or woman is <u>not enslaved</u> (οὐ δεδούλωται) in such circumstances.

However a closer examination of Paul’s argument reveals that Paul continues to apply the JT to a particular audience within this carefully structured chapter.

First however, a comparison of the lexemes “bound” (δέω; v. 39) and “enslaved” (δουλόω; v. 15) highlights the problem. It may be that the two lexemes are “not synonymous” (Garland 2003, 290; *pace* Blomberg 1994, 108). However they are functionally similar. In v. 39 being “bound” is contrasted with being “free to marry whom she wishes.” In other words, a wife’s being “bound” means that she is not free to divorce and remarry. We have concluded that, in v. 15, “not enslaved” has precisely the opposite outcome. So while these terms may not be synonyms, they have similar functional outcomes. This conclusion exacerbates our problem. If “enslaved” and “bound” are functionally similar, how

is it possible for a deserted Christian sister to be simultaneously “not enslaved” to her (deserting) husband but also “bound” to him as long as he lives?

Two observations may help us. The first concerns the context of Paul’s argument. In vv. 32–40 Paul is discussing the goodness of singleness (e.g. v. 38). This is still his focus in v. 40. The widow may remarry (v. 39) but is probably best not to do so. The statement about the binding nature of marriage is not the focus of v. 39. It simply “sets up the next clause” (Garland 2003, 343).

Similarly, the second observation calls attention to the careful structure of Paul’s argument as discussed above (6.2.2.2). Two further observations can be added at this point to further emphasise this structuring. First, widows were addressed briefly in v. 8 alongside the unmarried. These categories are taken up again in turn (“unmarried” in vv. 25–38, “widows” in vv. 39–40). Second, as we have seen, Paul consistently moves back and forth between men and women, balancing commands to each (e.g. vv. 3, 4, 10–11, 12–13, 14, 16, 28, 32–34). In vv. 36–38 Paul discusses unmarried men apparently without a female counterpart. Then v. 39 moves to wives without a male counterpart. Garland suggests that these two groups form a couplet in Paul’s structure, noting that Paul’s advice to each is similar: they may marry if they want (θέλει), but they are better off remaining as they are (2003, 343). Paul’s carefully structured argument, directed to various life-settings in turn, suggests that we must pay careful attention to the life-setting Paul is addressing in v. 39 (widows), rather than applying his instructions to both married and deserted women.

In short, Paul is addressing widows considering remarriage. Paul’s main instruction to them, in keeping with the message of vv. 32–38, is that she is “free to marry anyone she wishes ... In my judgement she is happier if she remains as

she is” (vv. 39–40). He is not discussing divorcees. He is simply stating that, as in Rom 7:1–3, she was “bound” δέω but now she is “free” ἐλεύθερος—with certain limitations (vv. 39c–40). This (and Rom 7:1–3) leads us to conclude that the “husband” of v. 39 should be taken to be “the man you *were* married to before he died” and/or “the man you are *considering* being married to,” rather than (in the case of v. 15) “the man you *were once* married to.” If a woman has been deserted by her unbelieving husband (as v. 15), then the woman is “not enslaved” to the marriage union. The man is no longer her husband. Therefore she no longer fits the “life-setting” of v. 39.

This reading arises naturally from our close attention to Paul’s use of the JT within this carefully structured chapter. It results in a coherent and consistent understanding of Paul’s view on divorce and remarriage. In summary:

- 1) In line with the tradition, a believing wife must not separate from her husband (vv. 10, 14). Indeed, she is “bound to [him] as long as he lives” (v. 39).
- 2) However, if somehow the marriage bond is broken—either by death (v. 39) or by desertion (v. 15)—then a wife is “not bound/enslaved.”

6.2.3 Conclusion (Flexibility)

By recognizing certain features of Paul’s audience and by tracing his argument closely, we have seen that (despite the limited verbal similarities) he has applied the JT to three groups with clearly discernable consistency. In each case he has

upheld its prohibition on divorce but also developed the tradition in order to apply it to the particular life-settings of his audience. Most significantly he applies it to divorce apart from a discussion of remarriage, something the Synoptists do not appear to do. Earlier we identified certain variations in the concepts underlying the Synoptic JT and Paul's use of it here. However it has been argued that these apparent variations can be explained with reference to Paul's audience and rhetorical purpose.

6.3 Conclusion

By way of summary we may compare the findings of this chapter with the ten features of the pattern identified in the previous chapter (see 5.4).⁹⁷

One: Paul consistently uses a formula to introduce the JT. After introducing the JT with a formula in v. 10, Paul continues to have the JT in mind as he addresses other life-settings without using such a formula. He appears unwilling to "stretch" the tradition and still call it "the Lord's command."

Two: Paul only uses a lexeme or two from the actual JT. In the present instance that lexeme is $\chi\omega\rho\iota\zeta\omega$, "summarizing rather than quoting the tradition" (Hays 1997, 358).

Three: Paul may use words or concepts from the JT and its Synoptic context in his broader argument. In 1 Cor 6:16 Paul uses the word "joined" and recounts Genesis 2:24, key elements of the Synoptic JT (Matt 19:5; Mark 10:7–8).

⁹⁷ It is noted that Paul's use of the JT here also meets both Thompson's (1991, 30–36) and Fiensy's (2010, 92) criteria for a legitimate parallel.

Four: Paul cites the tradition because the Corinthians were straying from it or were in danger of doing so. We have argued that there was at least one female member of the Corinthian church who had or was planning to divorce her believing husband.

Five: Paul cites the JT with a deliberative agenda. That Paul is seeking change is evident from his tone. He uses seven imperative verbs in vv. 10–15.

Six: Paul uses JT as a premise or authority in his broader argument. Demonstrating this point has been a major burden of the present chapter. We have sought to show that Paul has the JT in mind not only in v. 10, but in vv. 11–15, 39.

Seven: Paul tends to exhibit significant liberality with his use of the tradition in order to apply it to the Corinthian context. Paul allows himself such freedom, working the JT into his argument for the sake of his audience. For example, in v. 15 he accepts separation as a reality in a certain circumstance.

Eight: Paul's variations are introduced with the intention that his audience keeps the original tradition more fully. The basic force of the Synoptic JT might be summarized, “What God has joined together people must not separate” (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9). Paul upholds that force for each of the three life-settings he addresses. The main burden of the chapter is that his readers “remain in the situation which he or she was in when God called him” (7:20; cf. 17, 24). This includes not separating.

Nine: Paul retains consistency with the setting and concepts of the Synoptic JT. Once again, establishing that this is the case in 1 Corinthians 7 has been central to the argument of this chapter.

Ten: Paul demonstrates some familiarity with what a tradition “meant” to the early Christian community and to retain some sense of that in his letter. As in the Synoptic accounts, so in 1 Corinthians 7, the readers would have been reminded that they were God’s holy (and therefore) countercultural people.

This summary indicates once again that Paul’s use of the JT follows a similar pattern to that of the Synoptists and can be termed “legitimate development.” Paul had “a core of Jesus-related tradition” that he “sought to uphold and protect,” but which he was willing to “adapt in the light of particular circumstances” (Allen 2013, 64; cf. Dunn 2013, 341). That is to say, Paul is a reliable interpreter of the JT.

This in turn opens the way to the next chapter. It suggests that Paul’s understanding of the JT may be used to shed light on interpretive uncertainties in the Synoptic accounts. Three particular features of Paul’s understanding identified above will be especially significant to that end.

- 1) Paul seems to suggest that divorce under certain conditions does not actually end a marriage. Therefore Paul: prohibits a believer from divorcing *for* remarriage; *probably* prohibits them from remarrying when reconciliation is possible; and *possibly* prohibits them from remarrying when reconciliation is not possible, unless the former spouse has remarried.

- 2) While Paul's consistent position is that couples must not divorce, yet he does not equate divorce *without* remarriage with sexual immorality.
- 3) Paul may leave open the possibility of remarriage in certain situations, for example when an unbeliever separates from a believer and (presumably) remarries. In such a case, the believer is "not enslaved" to the former marriage. They may be permitted to eventually remarry.⁹⁸

⁹⁸ The word "eventually" is seeking to represent (albeit only temporally) the way Paul separates the divorce and any remarriage.

Chapter 7: How 1 Corinthians 7 Sheds Light on Synoptic

Uncertainties

The goal of this study is to identify the divorce/remarriage JT with greater certainty. The Synoptics contain important instantiations of this JT (Matt 5:32; 19:1–12; Mark 10:1–12; Luke 16:18). However we have noted seven interpretive uncertainties in relation to them (Chapter 4).

1. Which practice does Jesus equate with adultery in the legal sayings (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18)?
2. Why, in Matt 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18a, does Jesus equate this practice with adultery in the case of the first man?
3. Why, in Matt 5:32b and Luke 16:18b, does Jesus make this equation in the case of the second man?
4. Why, in Matthew 5:32a, does Matthew omit “and marries another?”
5. Why, in Matthew 5:32a, does Matthew add “*makes her* commit adultery?”
6. What, in Matthew 19:9, is the scope of the exception “except for πορνεία”?
7. How can we explain the existence of Matthew’s exceptions (5:32; 19:9)?

1 Corinthians 7 offers another instantiation of the JT. We have shown that, despite the flexibility with which Paul has applied to it there, the stable core of the JT is still present (Chapter 6). Paul has developed it legitimately. In

establishing this, we identified three statements on divorce/remarriage that are particular to Paul's instantiation.

Particularity 1: Paul seems to suggest that divorce under certain conditions does not actually end a marriage. Therefore Paul: prohibits a believer from divorcing *for* remarriage; *probably* prohibits them from remarrying when reconciliation is possible; and *possibly* prohibits them from remarrying when reconciliation is not possible, unless the former spouse has remarried.

Particularity 2: While Paul's consistent position is that couples must not divorce, yet he does not equate divorce *without* remarriage with sexual immorality.

Particularity 3: Paul may leave open the possibility of remarriage in certain situations, for example when an unbeliever separates from a believer and (presumably) remarries. In such a case, the believer is "not enslaved" to the former marriage. They may be permitted to eventually remarry.

The strategy of the present study is to use these Pauline particularities to shed light on the Synoptic uncertainties listed above. We have argued that this is a reasonable strategy given the conserving nature of the model of transmission of JT outlined (Chapter 3) and the related fact that Paul handles JT faithfully (Chapter 5).

Building on the foregoing chapters, the present chapter puts that strategy to work. Each of our seven uncertainties will be addressed in three steps. First, the uncertainty and interpretive options (as outlined in Chapter 4) will be summarised. Second, particularities from Paul's use of the JT will (in most cases) suggest one interpretative option. Third, (in most cases) we will show how this option makes sense of the Synoptic material.

7.1 Uncertainty #1: What practice is equated with adultery?

In the legal sayings (Matt 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18; cf. Matt 5:32), what practice is being equated with adultery? The four options are: 1) remarriage; 2) divorce; 3) divorce for remarriage (that is, divorce with premeditated intent to remarry); or 4) alongside option 3, divorce for an illegitimate reason but without intent to remarry, after which remarriage nonetheless occurs.

According to Particularity 2, Paul does not equate divorce *without remarriage* with sexual immorality, which we can extend to adultery. This rules out Option 2 here. According to Particularity 3, Paul does not seem to believe that all remarriage is necessarily problematic. We argued that he might leave open the possibility of remarriage for the deserted believer. This makes Option 1 unlikely. Particularity 1 states that Paul prohibits divorce *for remarriage* and possibly also other “prohibited Pauline remarriages” indicated above. If Paul is a faithful interpreter of the JT (which is also contained in the Synoptics), this suggests that at least option 3 is correct and possibly Option 4, though with various levels of certainty depending upon the situation. That is, the legal sayings *probably* relate to remarriage when reconciliation is still possible and *possibly* to

situations when reconciliation is not possible (excepting when the former spouse has remarried).

Two factors suggests that the Synoptics probably have Option 3 in view though. First is the fact that the JT in Matt 5:31–32; 19:1–12 and Mark 10:1–12 is stated in connection to a debate concerning Deut 24:1–4, a passage which can be seen to be guarding “against divorce becoming a legalized form of adultery” (Laney 1992, 13; cf. Craigie 2007, 305). That is, they envisage a setting in which divorce and remarriage are closely associated (see 6.2.2.3.c). Second is the general agreement that (at least) men did not divorce in order to remain unmarried, but in order to remarry (e.g. Bock 1994, 2:1357; Ciampa and Rosner 2010, 303; R. Collins 1992, 100; France 2007, 212; Green 1997, 603; Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493; Stein 1992, 193; Tannehill 1996, 251; Warden 1997, 143; Woodhouse 2014, 19).

In conclusion then, our findings from 1 Cor 7 suggest that the practice that the JT equates with adultery is divorce *for* remarriage but that it also applies to divorce *and* other “prohibited Pauline remarriages” as indicated above. While we may wish to say something more precise, this conclusion has the twin benefit of making sense of each Synoptic account as well as contemporary marriage practices.

7.2 Uncertainty #2: Why, in Matt 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18a, does Jesus equate this practice with adultery for the first man?

Having discussed *which practice* the legal sayings equate with adultery, the second uncertainty concerns *why* such an equation is made for the first husband (when no charge of πορνεία is present). Three conceivable explanations were put forward.

Option 1: Divorce for illegitimate reasons does not actually dissolve the first marriage union. Thus, when the spouse remarries, that sexual activity is adulterous. In Köstenberger's words, "in God's eyes, the wife is still considered to be married to her first husband" (2004, 249). Given that adultery requires "the violation of the marriage of another" (Hauck "μοιχεύω," TDNT 4:730), it could be concluded that the perpetrator's *de jure* divorce has not enacted a *de facto* divorce in God's eyes. In some way, the first marriage has some ongoing reality.

Option 2: The legal sayings offer a redefinition of adultery (as in Matthew 5:28) rather than a renewed understanding of marriage (as Option 1).

Option 3: The equation is not actual, but hyperbole "used to underline graphically a controversial point" (Keener 2009, 192).

While some redefinition of adultery is surely evident in the JT (see 4.2.1.2), Particularity 1 suggests that, for Paul, divorce for illegitimate reasons does not necessarily end a marriage. Paul suggests that the Christian sister who has separated from her husband (1 Cor 7:10–11) is still in some way bound to the marriage. She must "remain unmarried or be reconciled." That is, her marriage

union still has some enduring reality.⁹⁹ If Paul is a faithful interpreter of the JT, his conclusion encourages us towards Option 1 above. Once again, this approach coheres with each of the Synoptic accounts. In what follows (7.3), this statement will be nuanced and clarified somewhat.

7.3 Uncertainty #3: Why do the legal sayings make this equation for the second man?

Why, in Matt 5:32b and Luke 16:18b, is the second husband's act equated with adultery?¹⁰⁰ Three options were noted.

Option 1: As with Uncertainty 2, Matthew and Luke have redefined adultery as, something like, "making light of covenant vows." This option can be ruled out since, along with the weaknesses mentioned (4.1.4.4.c), if it was not the case in the first half of the statement (7.2) it will not be the case in the second half. It mentioned here for the sake of consistency with chapter 4.

Option 2: The second man commits adultery because he marries a woman who has been illegitimately divorced and who is therefore still married (e.g. Luz 2007 [2002], 256; Laney 1990, 39). This is a general statement for all men ("anyone who marries") concerning any woman who has been divorced at any time ("divorced woman" is anarthrous), not only the woman mentioned in v. 32a.

Option 3: The second man commits adultery because he takes part in a divorce-for-remarriage situation like that modeled on and justified by the Pharisees' interpretation of Deut 24:1–4 (see 4.1.4.4.c).

⁹⁹ We note something of this in Deuteronomy 24:1–4. The first marriage continues to place certain limitations on the first man. He cannot remarry his first wife. The former marriage union is not entirely emptied of implications.

¹⁰⁰ We have noted (4.1.1.1) that some MSS of Matt 19:9 also include this clause.

Option 2 does not cohere with Particularity 3. It presents us with the possibility of a woman who has at some time in the past been divorced by a man (who has most likely remarried – see 7.1). Nonetheless, she is “enslaved” to that man (to borrow Paul’s term), such that anyone who marries her commits adultery.

Particularity 3, on the other hand, suggests (from 1 Cor 7:15) that if a believer is deserted and their former spouse remarries, the believer is “not enslaved” to that spouse. It is likely that they are able to remarry.

We are therefore left with Option 3. That is, Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18 are not referring to situations in which the first husband has remarried at some point in the past, thus dissolving the former marriage and leaving his former wife “not enslaved” to it (Option 2). This scenario may well have been in Paul’s mind in 1 Cor 7:15 (see 6.2.2.3.c), but it is not the case in Deut 24:1–4. There, the close connection between divorce and remarriage is explicit. In the same way, the first man in Matt 5:32a and Luke 16:18a is charged with adultery because of the close connection between divorce and remarriage, the two mentioned in almost the same breath (see 6.2.2.3.c). Likewise, Option 3 here holds that the second man (Matt 5:32b; Luke 16:18b) is charged with adultery not simply because he marries a divorced woman, but because he marries the divorcee *in this kind of situation*, a divorce-for-remarriage situation like that described and justified by the Pharisees’ interpretation of Deut 24:1–4.

A valuable corollary can be drawn here. That is, it is not always clear *when* a marriage union is ultimately dissolved. This point arises from an apparent contradiction. In Luke 16:18 the first husband appears to remarry before the

wife does, a possibility in Matt 5:32 also. Pauline Particularity 3 (based on 1 Cor 7:15) might lead us to assume that this remarriage dissolves the former marriage union, leaving the wife “not enslaved.” Thus her subsequent remarriage would not technically be adulterous. However the conclusion in Luke 16:18 is otherwise.

This apparent contradiction is explained by the different situations which 1 Cor 7:15 and the Synoptics refer to. Paul discusses divorce (“separation”) without explicit reference to remarriage. In that instance, the possible remarriage of the deserting unbeliever is highly significant. It probably affects an ultimate dissolution of the first marriage union and may open the possibility of an eventual remarriage for the deserted believer.

In contrast to this, the Synoptics have no discussion of remarriage eventually dissolving a marriage union or the possibility of an eventual remarriage for the deserted party. Such factors are simply not in view. In the Synoptics the issue is the Jewish leaders’ shallow, heartless interpretation and application of Deut 24:1 (see 4.1.3). In that passage, divorce and remarriage are practiced together as a kind of complex. It seems that the same kind of complex, though perhaps not identical, underlies Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18 (see 4.1.4.4.c).

The same is probably also true in Matt 19:1–12 and Mark 10:1–12. As with Matt 5:32, in those passages Deut 24:1 is explicitly discussed. It is the Pharisees’ primary verse on this topic, rather than Gen 2:24 (Matt 19:6; Mark 10:4). It is Hillel’s interpretation of that verse that formed the Pharisees’ *modus operandi* in relation to divorce and remarriage (see 4.1.2). Luke 16:18 takes a summary line from this larger debate. Hence, it is unlikely that Luke and Matt 19:1–12/Mark 10:1–12 have different divorce-and-remarriage practices in mind.

For these reasons it is reasonable to assume that this same divorce-and-remarriage complex is under discussion in Matt 19:1–12 and Mark 10:1–12 also.

In each of the Synoptic accounts, divorcing and remarrying *in that kind of* way is equated with adultery, no matter who has remarried or when they have done so. While the first husband in Luke 16:18 appears to have remarried before the wife is remarried, we cannot be sure that the opposite is not true. This does not appear to be a concern to Luke. While modern interpreters may desire hard and fast rules around how and when a marriage dissolves and what this means for remarriage, the Synoptic situation does not directly give such rules.

All this is to say that it is not always clear *when* a marriage union is ultimately dissolved. Hence we can emphasise the deliberately open wording used in our conclusion to Uncertainty 2. There (7.2) we said that the JT equates illegitimate divorce and prohibited remarriage with adultery because the former marriage *has some enduring reality*.

This conclusion also demonstrates the utility of this study's method. It draws our attention to the way Paul flexibly applies the JT to a situation significantly different from that which the Synoptics address. While the Synoptists address this divorce-and-remarriage complex, Paul holds the two apart. The believer's (passive) separation is not associated with remarriage. A believer might remain unmarried after divorce. As above, when divorce ("separation") and remarriage *are* in some way associated (vv. 10–11), Paul cites and applies the JT directly (see 6.2.2.3.a). However in v. 15 Paul is addressing a new situation not envisaged by the JT. First (6.2.1), Paul is applying the JT to mixed marriages. But further, he

applies the JT to divorce *apart from a discussion of remarriage*. In v. 15 Paul does not explicitly mention remarriage for the deserted believer.

When Paul applies the JT to this doubly new situation, his conclusion is somewhat different from that of the JT. This flexible new application of the JT requires a certain development of the JT. In this new application, Paul's preference is that the deserted believer remains unmarried (vv. 7–8). However he does not explicitly close off the possibility of remarriage, but “holds open a space for the Corinthians ... to exercise their own discernment” (Hays 2011, 112; cf. Thiselton 2000, 536). Unlike in the Synoptics, divorce and possible remarriage are held apart.

7.4 Uncertainty #4: Why does Matthew 5:32 omit “and marries another”?

Uncertainties 4 and 5 both relate to Matthew 5:32 where Matthew omits “and marries another” but includes “*makes her* commit adultery.” First, uncertainty 4 asks, why does Matthew make this omission?

Option 1: The omission shows that Matthew equates divorce itself with adultery, with or without remarriage (e.g. R. Collins 1992, 113; Heth and Wenham 1984; Osborne 2010, 198).

Option 2: The reader should take “and marries another” as read from the context of v. 28.

Option 3: Jesus' comments relate to the Pharisees' interpretation of Deut 24:1 (e.g. Feinberg and Feinberg 2010, 627). In this verse, remarriage is not in focus.

Option 1 here is highly unlikely due to Particularity 2, which suggests that Paul does not equate divorce *without remarriage* with sexual immorality (Paul does not explicitly speak of adultery here).¹⁰¹ Given the weaknesses associated with Option 2 (4.2.1.3.a) and the fact that we have affirmed the importance of Deut 24 for our interpretation of Matt 5:32 (7.3), Option 3 is the most likely reading. Jesus is discussing the Pharisees' interpretation of Deut 24:1 and their associated divorce practices. In that verse, remarriage is not mentioned. Hence it is omitted from Matt 5:32.

7.5 Uncertainty #5: Why does Matthew 5:32 include “makes her commit adultery”?

The fifth interpretive uncertainty relates to the above: *How* is it that the man's actions result in adultery such that he “makes her commit adultery” (v. 32)? Two options have been identified.

Option 1: The divorced woman is forced to remarry for financial reasons while she is, in Jesus' estimation, still married to her first husband (e.g. Bock 1994, 2:1357; Hagner 1993, 1:125).

¹⁰¹ It could be suggested that Matthew 5:32 is a significant divergence from the JT Paul knew. However this is unsatisfactory given that it requires Matthew to present two variations within the same book (cf. 19:9). Also, our transmission model suggests significant stability within the JT.

Option 2: She is “made to look” as if she were an adulteress, when in fact she is not (France 2007, 211; Powers 2012, 169). The weaknesses associated with this option are significant (4.2.1.3.b).

Following 7.3, where we concluded that Jesus is discussing Deut 24, we are inclined to explore Option 1. It accords with Pauline Particularity 1 and avoids the unlikely option 2.

However is it a legitimate interpretation? We noted the possible weakness here that a divorced woman may not have needed to remarry for financial reasons because some had other options (e.g. 1 Cor 7:8; cf. Lev 22:13; Gen 38:11). A second weakness is that it was unlikely that the divorcing husband remained unmarried (see 7.1). Hence, according to Particularity 3, the woman would not be “enslaved” to her first husband and her subsequent marriage would therefore probably not technically be adulterous (see 7.2).

However two observations may assuage these concerns. First is the fact that women usually did remarry (e.g. Rosner and Ciampa 2010, 303). Second is the Deut 24:1–4 background to the discussion. In actual practice the husband was likely to remarry and, in some cases, the wife may not have remarried. However, as we have argued, Jesus is addressing the interpretation of Deut 24:1, in which the man *does not remarry* (see 7.4), and Deut 24:2, in which the wife is *remarried* (see 7.3). The point is that situations similar to Deut 24, in which divorce-and-remarriage are closely associated, result in adultery because (as Uncertainty 2) the wife is remarried while her former marriage union still has some *de facto* reality. Divorcing illegitimately while looking to Deut 24 for

defense is a form of “righteousness” that Jesus’ disciples must “surpass” (Matt 5:20; cf. Feinberg and Feinberg 2010, 627).

This explanation of Uncertainties 3, 4 and 5 may have weaknesses. For example, it is significantly dependent on Deut 24. However our reading of 1 Cor 7 and arguments concerning the stability of JT require something like these readings. These Matthean variations (as with Paul’s) are not deviations from the JT. Indeed they emphasise it. For example, the variation “makes her commit adultery” actually emphasises the sense of the legal saying as it is recorded in Matt 19:9, Mark 10:11 and Luke 16:18. The husband’s actions result in adultery in a way that extends beyond himself. Thus, in relation to Matt 5:32, Dunn concludes that “Matthew was a faithful tradent of the Jesus tradition” (2015, 275).

7.6 Uncertainty #6: Matthew 19:9 – What is the scope of the Exception?

The sixth interpretive uncertainty is the scope of the exception clause in Matthew 19:9. There Jesus says, “whoever divorces his wife, except for sexual immorality, and marries another, commits adultery.” Does the exception relate to divorce only or also to remarriage?

Option 1: The “harder” reading limits the exception to divorce (G. Wenham 1984, 99). If one’s spouse commits sexual immorality, one may divorce them but not remarry.

Option 2: The exception applies to both divorce *and* remarriage (e.g. France 2007, 212).

Particularity 3 suggests that Paul left open the possibility of remarriage for a deserted believer. Though it is not beyond doubt, we argued that “not enslaved” (1 Cor 7:15) means that the marriage union of the deserted believer is actually dissolved and they are free to remarry. In a parallel way, if the exception clause permits divorce in the case of πορνεία, signaling an actual dissolution of the marriage union, then remarriage is likely also permitted.¹⁰² This suggests Option 2 above.

A common argument against such a reading is that it aligns Jesus with the Shammaite view and therefore does not explain the disciples’ amazement in Matt 19:10 (e.g. Hagner 2008, 2:549; Heth and Wenham 1984, 18; Luz 2007 [2002], 1:255). Despite the apparent similarities in practical outcomes, this conclusion is not necessary.¹⁰³ Taking Matthew 5 and 19 together we see that Jesus argues in a different way, from different assumptions, and reaches different conclusions.

- The Rabbinic debate centred on the legitimate grounds for divorce (19:3). The practice of divorce itself “seems to have been taken for granted” (France 2007, 207). Jesus, on the other hand, before making any comment on “grounds,” queries “the assumption that any divorce could be acceptable in the first place” (France 2007, 208).

¹⁰² In 7.3 we argued that the case in 1 Cor 7:15 can also be applied to the marriage of believers.

¹⁰³ Even apparent similarities are questionable. Jesus appears to have limited πορνεία to sexual immorality. The Shammaites however included such practices as, “going outside with hair unfastened, spinning cloth in the street with armpits uncovered, and bathing in the same place as men” (France 2007, 209. n. 108; cf. Osborne 2010, 201).

- Jesus' argument does not concern the meaning of "something indecent" (Deut 24:1), but the reality of "one-flesh" and the creation narrative. "Jesus does not conceive of marriage on the grounds of its dissolution but on the grounds of its architectural design and purpose by God" (Edwards 2015b, 305; cf. Köstenberger 2004, 234).
- From this basis, as we have argued, Jesus concludes that certain divorces are invalid, whereas Shammaites considered all divorces to be valid, even if undertaken on illegitimate grounds (Edwards 2015a, 465; Keener 1993, 59). For Shammaites, after a divorce, "the former wife is no longer considered his wife" (Keener 1993, 7).
- Whereas for Shammaites, "exceptions" gave men "the right to initiate divorce," for Jesus the "exception" simply acknowledges "that the marriage has already been broken" (France 2007, 721).
- Whereas Shammai *required* divorce in cases of πορνεία, Jesus only *permitted* it (e.g. Köstenberger 2004, 234).

Therefore suggesting that Jesus allowed divorce and remarriage in cases of πορνεία is not to position Jesus with the Shammaites. Despite surface similarities, Jesus' position on divorce in Matthew is quite distinct from that of

the Shammaites. It fits squarely within the flow of his narrative and accounts for the response of the disciples (v. 10).¹⁰⁴

7.7 Uncertainty #7: What is the explanation for the existence of Matthew's Exceptions?

The final interpretive uncertainty is the simple presence of Matthew's exception clauses. How might they be explained?

Option 1: The exceptions are adaptations to make Jesus' unrealistic teaching "workable" for Matthew's audience. They embody Matthew's struggle "to be both faithful to Jesus' teaching and pastorally sensitive" (Culpepper 2007, 331).

Option 2: Mark and Luke state the JT in an exaggerated or generalised way.

Option 3: Mark and Luke assume the exception because they understood divorce due to πορνεία to be a separate category of divorce.

As noted in Chapter 4, each option has weaknesses. According to Particularity 3, Paul seems to leave open the possibility of remarriage for Christians who have been deserted by an unbeliever.¹⁰⁵ In order to explain why this is the case (in contrast to vv. 10–11) we determined that the most likely reason was that the

¹⁰⁴ As France notes, even if Matthew's view was Shammaite, it would nonetheless have been radical, as the Shammaite view was "in all probability... largely forgotten" (2007, 209. n. 109; cf. Köstenberger 2004, 230).

¹⁰⁵ Again, we have argued (7.3) that this may also be applied to the marriages of believers.

unbeliever has remarried or at least engaged in sexual activity (6.2.2.3.c). That is, Paul seems to assume that remarriage (or at least sexual activity with a new partner) brings the continuance of a “one-flesh union” into question.¹⁰⁶

If this is the case, Paul agrees with Matthew here. That is, broadly speaking, when sexual immorality takes place while a couple is married (Matthew) or after desertion by an unbeliever (Paul), the usual prohibition on remarriage does not hold. Therefore we could pursue Option 1 above and extend the charge of “softening” to both Matthew and Paul. However neither wears the charge comfortably. For example, Matthew presents a radical view of marriage in 19:4–8 and Paul in no way “softens” his ethical demands in chapter 5 or 6. Thus we are inclined away from both Option 1 and 2 and towards an examination of Option 3. The obvious question is, why would Mark and Luke *assume* the exception clause?

One reason they might do so is the common pattern of *requiring* divorce for adultery. “Jewish and Roman law alike required a husband who learned of his wife’s affair to divorce her immediately” (Keener 1993, 9; cf. Loader 2015, 67, 70; Zhekov 2009, 350; Köstenberger 2004, 230; Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493; R. Collins 1992, 194).¹⁰⁷ This practice was enshrined in Roman law. *Lex Iulia de Adulteriis Coercendis* (18 B.C.) required a husband “to repudiate” a wife caught in adultery, and to “make the situation known to the proper magistrate” (R. Collins 1992, 196-97). In Jewish thought, continuing with the marriage would, “contradict God’s commandment” (Luz 2007 [2002], 255). The evidence of numerous pre-mishnaic texts suggests to Bockmuehl (1989) that this command

¹⁰⁶ We noted that this is more explicit in 1 Cor 6:15–17.

¹⁰⁷ Indeed a Roman man who failed to divorce his wife could be charged with “pimping” (Keener 1993, 9).

even held true if the wife was the victim of rape (e.g. m.Ned 11.12; m.Sot 5.1; y.Sot 1.1 16b27; b.Sanh 41a). Luz states that “the earliest Christian history of the reception of the Matthean clause” understands Matthew this way (2001 [1990, 1997], 2:493). The logic undergirding this practice (and the basis of Jesus’ argument in Matt 19:1–12, Mark 10:1–12) is that adultery “invalidated” a marriage union (Osborne 2010, 705). “In Jewish thought [a] second ‘one-flesh’ union was understood to violate the original one so radically that the subsequent continuation of the original marriage was unthinkable; it was officially dissolved” (France 2007, 210).¹⁰⁸

The story of Joseph provides an example. In Matt 1:19, two participial clauses describe Joseph’s motivations for the two parts of his plan. First, he is righteous. Second, he does not want to disgrace Mary. Joseph’s plan to divorce Mary “quietly,” thus saving her from public disgrace, is not motivated by his righteousness.¹⁰⁹ Rather, in righteousness he intended to act in accordance with his understanding of the law. He must divorce Mary (e.g. Abrahams 1912, 231).

Against this background divorce following *πορνεία* seems to be a separate category from divorce *for* remarriage (or possibly divorce *and* “Pauline prohibited remarriages”). To be clear, we are not arguing for exaggeration or generalization (Option 2) but a difference in category.

The termination of a marriage already destroyed by the act of adultery was thus not so much “divorce” (a man’s voluntary repudiation of his wife) as the

¹⁰⁸ France points to m. Yebam. 2:8; cf. Soṭah 5:1; Ketub. 3:5 as evidence.

¹⁰⁹ For a distinction between “any cause” or “quiet” divorce and the alternative, see e.g. Keener (1993, 47) or Treggiari (2003, 165).

necessary recognition that the original marriage no longer existed. (France 2007, 211)¹¹⁰

This being the case, it is possible that neither Mark nor Luke thought it necessary to spell the exception out. It was assumed. Though not without weaknesses, this explanation avoids the difficulties associated with Options 1 and 2. It draws on what appears to have been a common cultural practice to show why Mark and Luke might assume an exception.

The question that follows is: why did Matthew feel the need to be explicit about this “exception” when Mark and Luke did not? There are two possible (and possibly complementary) answers.

Firstly, Matthew has already said that Joseph, a “righteous man,” had planned to divorce Mary (1:19). He therefore (in 5:32 and 19:9) makes it explicit that Joseph’s divorce plans were within the boundaries of righteousness.

Secondly, Matthew was seeking to make it clear for his Jewish audience that Jesus was fulfilling the OT law. France (2007, 11; cf. Scaer 2015, 242) identifies fulfillment of the law as Matthew’s “central theme.” In Matthew alone Jesus “came not come to abolish the law ... but to fulfill it (5:17).” Whereas Mark 10:4–9 could be seen as rejecting Deut 24:1–4, Matthew’s rendering makes it clear that he “does not interpret Jesus’ teaching as conflicting with the law” (Stein 1992, 197; cf. Luz 2001 [1990, 1997], 492; Witherington 2001, 275).

¹¹⁰ Similarly, “In the limited case of porneia, when both Jewish practice and Roman law ... required a man to leave his wife, a man was not to be judged adulterous if he divorced the wife from whom he was required to separate” (R. Collins 1992, 211).

Concerning the actual saying itself, the exception clause is best understood as a Matthean interpretative addition to help show his Jewish-Christian readers that Jesus was not seeking in his divorce statement “to abolish the Law” (Mt 5:17).
(Stein 1992, 196)

In conclusion then, for the sake of his audience and in line with his consistent rhetorical concerns, Matthew makes explicit what Mark and Luke do not. That is, divorces due to πορνεία belong to a separate category that does not fall under Jesus’ absolute prohibition.

7.8 Conclusion

We have sought to demonstrate how Paul’s use of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Corinthians 7 does indeed shed light on interpretive uncertainties in the Synoptics. Three particularities of Paul’s reading suggest particular interpretations over others. We have argued that these interpretations generally make good sense in their Synoptic contexts.

1. The practice which the legal sayings (Matt 5:32; 19:9; Mark 10:11–12; Luke 16:18) equate with adultery is illegitimate divorce and prohibited remarriage. This includes: certainly divorce *for* remarriage; *probably* divorce and later remarriage when reconciliation is still possible; and *possibly* later remarriage when reconciliation is not possible, except when the former spouse has remarried.

2. Matt 19:9; Mark 10:11 and Luke 16:18 equate such practices with adultery (in the case of the first man) because his divorce is illegitimate. His marriage to the first woman has some ongoing reality.
3. Matt 5:32 and Luke 16:18 equate the second man's actions with adultery because he takes part in a divorce-for-remarriage situation like that modeled on and justified by the Pharisees' interpretation of Deut 24:1–4 (see 4.1.4.4.c).
4. Matthew 5:32 omits “and marries another” because it is addressing a misreading of Deut 24:1, in which the first man's remarriage is not in focus.
5. In Matthew 5:32 a husband's misuse of Deut 24 is said to “make” his wife commit adultery assuming that she remarries *as per* Deut 24:1–4.
6. The exception clause in Matt 19:9 pertains to both divorce and remarriage. However this does not make Jesus a Shammaite.
7. Exceptions to the legal sayings are assumed by Mark and Luke as divorce for πορνεία belongs to a different category.

These findings suggest that our stable core could be expanded and clarified to include the following:

- First, the *focus* of the JT is divorce *for* remarriage. It probably also relates to divorce and remarriage when reconciliation is still possible and

possibly also to cases when reconciliation is not possible (excepting cases when the former spouse has remarried).

- While the consistent teaching of the Synoptics and Paul is that couples must not divorce, divorce alone is not equated with adultery.
 - Remarriage is not *necessarily* problematic in every instance.
 - Divorce in the case of πορνεία belongs to a different category and is not the focus of the discussion.
- Second, illegitimate divorce does not end a marriage. Hence a remarriage that was the purpose for the preceding divorce is adulterous. Remarriage when reconciliation is still possible is probably adulterous also. Remarriage when reconciliation is not possible (excepting when the former spouse has remarried) is possibly adulterous also. In addition, a divorcing spouse's adulterous remarriage *does* ultimately dissolve the former marriage union, leaving the deserted spouse free from the former marriage union and probably eventually able to remarry.

Chapter 8: Conclusion of Study

Ehrman (2016, 200–201) and others (e.g. Knust 2012, 73) find the NT divorce/remarriage material irreconcilable. This study has come to a different conclusion. Through an examination of Paul's use of the divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7, we have been able to shed light on seven interpretive uncertainties present in the Synoptic accounts. We have seen that, not only *despite* the variations between the accounts, but *through* them, Paul and the Synoptists have maintained the core of the divorce/remarriage JT (in wording, setting and concepts) for their particular audience within their rhetorical program.

Our study began with a Literature Review (**Chapter 2**) that raised a number of possible roadblocks for the study, some related to JT generally while others related to Paul's use of JT more specifically. **Chapter 3** then sought answers to the roadblocks related to JT generally, which resulted in a method for identifying JT. In **Chapter 4** this method was applied to four Synoptic passages: Matthew 5:31–32; 19:1–12; Mark 10:1–12; Luke 16:18. In the process of identifying stable and flexible features of the JT, seven interpretive uncertainties were recognized.

The study then turned to Paul in order to ascertain whether it was possible that his use of the divorce/remarriage tradition might shed light on these uncertainties. **Chapter 5** addressed the roadblocks raised in the Literature Review related to Paul's use of JT. The model applied to the Synoptics was then applied to several passages from 1 Corinthians (with minor adjustments for genre), demonstrating that Paul's use of JT could be termed "legitimate development." **Chapter 6** followed the same method in relation to the

divorce/remarriage JT in 1 Cor 7. It was determined that, again, Paul “legitimately developed” the JT. Of special note was the way Paul, unlike the Synoptics, applied the JT to divorce separate from remarriage (v. 15). This examination also resulted in three particularities of Paul’s understanding of the divorce/remarriage JT.

Based on these foregoing chapters, **Chapter 7** then used these Pauline particularities to shed light on the interpretive uncertainties identified in the Synoptics. This suggested two features of the NT picture that are not explicit in the Synoptics but find agreement with them.

- First, the focus of the JT is neither divorce alone, remarriage alone, nor divorce in cases of πορνεία. Its primary focus is divorce *for* remarriage. It *probably* also relates to divorce and remarriage when reconciliation is still possible and *possibly* also to cases when reconciliation is not possible (excepting cases when the former spouse has remarried).
- Second, illegitimate divorce does not dissolve a marriage union. Hence a remarriage that was the purpose of the preceding divorce (divorce *for* remarriage) is adulterous. Remarriage when reconciliation is still possible is probably adulterous also. Remarriage when reconciliation is not possible (excepting when the former spouse has remarried) is possibly adulterous also. In addition, a divorcing spouse’s adulterous remarriage *does* have the ultimate effect of dissolving the former marriage union, leaving the deserted spouse free from the marriage union and probably able to eventually remarry.

It is hoped that this study might offer a possible avenue towards greater certainty in the scriptural witness as it is brought to bear on this delicate and painful topic. In an indirect way it also suggests that it is possible to legitimately extend JT beyond its original context in order to apply it to situations today. This is good news for the treacherously complex and varied pastoral situations related to divorce and remarriage. We can (carefully and prayerfully) use the JT flexibly, and in doing so actually emphasise the core of the tradition in our situations rather than distorting it (c.f. Hays 2011, 132; Luz 2007 [2002], 258).

Bibliography of Sources Cited

- Abasciano, Brian J. 2007. "Diamonds in the Rough: A Reply to Christopher Stanley Concerning the Reader Competency of Paul's Original Audiences." *Novum Testamentum* 49:153–83.
- Abrahams, Israel. 1911. "Forty-Fourth Day: November 21st, 1010." Pages 228–237 in *Minutes of Evidence Taken Before the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes*. Volume 3. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Adams, Jay E. 1980. *Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage in the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Ahearne-Kroll, Stephen P. 2010. "Audience Inclusion and Exclusion as Rhetorical Technique in the Gospel of Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129:717–35.
- Akenson, D. H. 2000. *Saint Saul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Allen, David M. 2013. *The Historical Character of Jesus: Canonical Insights From Outside the Gospels*. London: SPCK. Allison, Dale C. 1982. "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels." *New Testament Studies* 28:1–32. -----, 2009. *The Historical Christ and the Theological Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2010. *Constructing Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. 1930. *Studies in Matthew*. London: Constable.
- Bailey, Kenneth E. 1983. *Poet and Peasant*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 1991. "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *Asia Journal of Theology* 5:34–54.
- , 1995. "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *Expository Times* 106:363–67.
- , 2011. *Paul Through Mediterranean Eyes: Cultural Studies in 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK.
- Barclay, J. G. 1993. "Jesus and Paul." Pages 492–503 in *Dictionary of Paul and His*

- Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P Martin. Leicester: IVP.
- Barnett, Paul W. 2008. *Paul: Missionary of Jesus*. After Jesus volume 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1968. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Black.
- , 1982. "Cephas and Corinth." Pages 40–59 in *Essays on Paul*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox.
- Bauckham, Richard. 1999. *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge.
- , 2006. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2008. "In Response to My Respondents: Jesus and the Eyewitnesses in Review." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 8:225–53.
- , 2014. "Gospels Before Normativization: A Critique of Francis Watson's Gospel Writing." *Journal for the Study of the New Testamen*. 37:185–200.
- , 2017. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , ed. 1998. *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Baum, Armin D. 2008. "Matthew's Sources - Written or Oral? A Rabbinic Analogy and Empirical Insights." Pages 1–23 in *Built Upon the Rock: Studies in the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Daniel M. Gurtner and John Nolland. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. 1831. "Die Christus Partei in Der Korinthischen Gemeinde, Der Gegensatz Des Paulinischen Und Petrinischen Christentums in Der Ältesten Kirche, Der Apostel Petrus in Rom." Pages 61–206 in *Tübinger Zeitschrift Für Theologie*. 4. Tübingen: Osiander.
- , 1847. *Kritische Untersuchungen Über Die Kanonischen Evangelien, Ihr Verhältniss Zu Einander, Ihren Charakter Und Ursprung*. Tübingen: L. F.

Fues.

-----, 1873. "The Christ Party in the Corinthian Community, the Opposition of Pauline and Petrine Christianity in the Earliest Church, the Apostle Peter in Rome." Pages 267–320 in *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine. A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. Translated by Eduard Zeller and Allan Menzies. Second edition. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. Translation of "Die Christus Partei in Der Korinthischen Gemeinde, Der Gegensatz Des Paulinischen Und Petrinischen Christentums in Der Ältesten Kirche, Der Apostel Petrus in Rom." Pages 61–206 in *Tübinger Zeitschrift Für Theologie* 4. Tübingen: Osiander, 1831.

Bird, Michael F. 2011a. "Introduction." Pages 1–9 in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences*. Edited by Joel Willitts and Michael F Bird. Library of New Testament Studies 411. London: T & T Clark.

-----, 2011b. "Mark: Interpreter of Peter and Disciple of Paul." Pages 30–61 in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences*. Edited by Michael F Bird and Joel F Williams. Library of New Testament Studies 411. London: T & T Clark.

-----, 2014. *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Blomberg, Craig L. 1990. "Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage, and Celibacy: An Exegesis of Matthew 19:3-12." *Trinity Journal* 11:161–96.

-----, 1992. *Matthew*. New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman.

-----, 1994. *1 Corinthians*. New International Version Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Blount, Brian K. 1996. "Reading and Understanding the New Testament on Homosexuality." Pages 28–38 in *Homosexuality and the Christian Community*. Edited by Choon-Leong Seow. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Bock, Darrell L. 1994. *Luke*. Volume 2. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

- , 1998. *Luke*. New International Version Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. 1989. "Matthew 5.32, 19.9 in the Light of Pre-Rabbinic Halakhah." *New Testament Studies* 35:291–95.
- , 2007a. "New Testament Wirkungsgeschichte and the Early Christian Appeal to Living Memory." Pages 341–68 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- , 2007b. "Peter Between Jesus and Paul: The 'Third Quest' and the 'New Perspective' on the First Disciple." Pages 67–102 in *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways into an Old Debate*. Edited by Todd S. Still. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2010. "Whose Memory? Whose Orality? A Conversation with James D. G. Dunn on Jesus and the Gospels." Pages 31–44 in *Memories of Jesus: A Critical Appraisal of James D. G. Dunn's Jesus Remembered*. Edited by Robert B. Stewart and Gary R. Habermas. Nashville: B & H Publishing.
- Bolt, Peter G. 2014. *Matthew: A Great Light Dawns*. Sydney: Aquila.
- Bolt, Peter G., and Tony Payne, eds. 2014. *Women, Sermons and the Bible: Essays Interacting with John Dickson's Hearing Her Voice*. EBook only. Sydney: Matthias Media.
- Boring, M. Eugene. 2006. *Mark: A Commentary*. The New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Bovon, Francois. 2013. *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Donald S. Deer. Volume. 63B. *Hermeneia*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Brodie, Thomas L. 2004. *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings*. New Testament Monographs 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Brooten, B. J. 1983. "Zur Debatte Über Das Schneidungs Recht Der Jüdischen

- Frau." *Evangelische Theologie*. 43:466–78.
- Bruce, F. F. 1971. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Oliphants.
- , 1980. *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit*. Revised edition. Exeter: Paternoster.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. 1964. "Διδωμι." Pages 166–73 in Volume 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey William Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Translated from *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Volume 2. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. 10 Volumes. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1935.
- Bultmann, Rudolph Karl. 1935. *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by L. P. Smith and E. Huntress. New York: Scribner. Translation of *Jesus*. Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1926.
- , 1952. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Volume 1. London: SCM. Translation of *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1948.
- , 1963. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell. Translation of *Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- , 1964. "The Primitive Christian Kerygma and the Historical Jesus." Pages 15–42 in *The Historical Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ*. Edited by C. E. Braaten and R. A. Harrisville. New York: Abingdon.
- Burridge, Richard A. 1992. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series 70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrskog, Samuel. 1994. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. Coniectanea Biblica 24. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- , 2003. "Review: The History of the Synoptic Tradition." *Journal of Biblical*

Literature 122:549–55.

-----, 2004. "A New Perspective on the Jesus Tradition: Reflections on James D. G. Dunn's Jesus Remembered." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26:459–71.

-----, 2011. "The Transmission of the Jesus Tradition." Pages 1465–94 in *The Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Tom Holmen. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill.

Calvin, John. 1972. *A Harmony of the Gospels*. Edited by David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance. Translated by T. H. H. Parker. Volume 2. Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press.

Campbell, Constantine R. 2008. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Carson, D. A. 1984. "Matthew." Pages 1–599 in *Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Volume 8. Expositor's Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Catchpole, David R. 1974. "The Synoptic Divorce Material as a Traditio-Historical Problem." *Bulletin of John Rylands Library* 57:92–127.

Chang, Kai-Hsuan. 2019. "Questioning the Feasibility of the Major Synoptic Hypotheses: Scribal Memory as the Key to the Oral–Written Interface." *Journal of the Study of the New Testament* 41:407–32.

Ciampa, Roy E. 2011. "'Flee Sexual Immorality': Sex and the City of Corinth." Pages 100–133 in *The Wisdom of the Cross: Exploring 1 Corinthians*. Edited by Brian S. Rosner. Nottingham: IVP.

Ciampa, Roy E., and Brian S. Rosner. 2010. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, Adela. 2007. *Mark: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Second edition. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Collins, Raymond. 1992. *Divorce in the New Testament*. Good News Studies. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

- Conzelmann, Hans. 1975. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Hermeneia Commentary. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Cooper, Benedict. 2013. *Incorporated Servanthood: Commitment and Discipleship in the Gospel of Matthew*. Library of New Testament Studies 490. London: T & T Clark.
- Cornes, Andrew. 1998. *Questions about Divorce and Remarriage*. London: Monarch Books.
- Craigie, Peter C. 2007. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Crossan, John Dominic, and Richard G Watts. 1996. *Who Is Jesus? Answers to Your Questions About the Historical Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Crossley, James G. 2011. "Mark, Paul and the Question of Influences." Pages 10–29 in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joel F. Williams. Library of New Testament Studies 411. London: T & T Clark.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. 2007. *Mark*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon: Smyth & Helwys.
- Davies, W. D. 1948. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. London: SCM.
- Davies, Margaret, and Sanders, E. P. 1989. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM.
- Delling, G. 1967. "Λαμβάνω." Pages 5–15 in volume 4 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey William Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Translation of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Volume 4. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. 10 volumes. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1935.
- Dewey, Joanna. 2006. "Women in the Gospel of Mark." *Word World* 26:22–29. ----. 2013. *Oral Ethos of the Early Church: Speaking, Writing, and the Gospel of Mark*. Biblical Performance Criticism Series 8. Eugene: Cascade Books.

- Dickson, John P. 2014. *Hearing Her Voice: A Case for Women Giving Sermons*. Revised edition. Fresh Perspectives on Women in Ministry. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. 1938. *History and the Gospel*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- , 1947. "Matthew and Paul." *Expository Times* 58:293–98.
- Dungan, David L. 1971. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1982. "The Relationship Between Paul and Jerusalem According to Galatians 1 and 2." *New Testament Studies* 28:461–78.
- , 1990. "Paul's Knowledge of the Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of Romans." Pages 193–207 in *Christus Bezeugen: Für Wolfgang Trilling*. Edited by Karl Kertelge, Traugott Holtz and Claus-Peter Marz. Freiburg: Herder.
- , 1994. "Jesus Tradition in Paul." Pages 155–78 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. New York: Brill.
- , 1998. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. -----, 2003. *Jesus Remembered*. Volume 1. Christianity in the Making. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2004. "On History, Memory and Eyewitnesses: In Response to Bengt Holmberg and Samuel Byrskog." *Journal of the Study of the New Testament* 26:473–87.
- , 2005a. *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- , 2005b. "The Tradition." *The Historical Jesus in Recent Research*. Edited by Scott McKnight and James D. G. Dunn. Volume 10. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- , 2007. "Social Memory and the Oral Jesus Tradition." Pages 179–94 in

- Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Edited by Stephan C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Benjamin G. Wold. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- , 2008a. *Beginning from Jerusalem*. Volume 2. Christianity in the Making. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2008b. "Eyewitnesses and the Oral Jesus Tradition." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 6:85–105.
- , 2010. "In Grateful Dialogue: A Response to My Interlocutors." Pages 287–323 in *Memories of Jesus: A Critical Appraisal of James D. G. Dunn's Jesus Remembered*. Edited by Robert B. Stewart and Gary R. Habermas. Nashville: B & H Publishing.
- , 2011. *Jesus, Paul and the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2013. *The Oral Gospel Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. -----, 2015. *Neither Jew nor Greek: A Contested Identity*. Volume 3. Christianity in the Making. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Eddy, Paul Rhodes. 2013. "Orality and Oral Transmission." Pages 641–50 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Second edition. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.
- Edwards, James R. 2015a. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2015b. *The Gospel According to Mark*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos.
- Ehrman, Bart D. 2016a. *A Brief Introduction to the New Testament*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 2016b. *Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior*. New York: HarperOne.
- Ellis, E. Earle. 1986. "Traditions in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 32:481–502.
- Eriksson, Anders. 1998. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in*

- 1 Corinthians*. Coniectanea Biblica 29. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Eve, Eric. 2014. *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Fee, Gordon D. 2014. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Revised edition. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Feinberg, John S. and Paul D. Feinberg. 2010. *Ethics for a Brave New World*. Wheaton: Crossway.
- Fiensy, David A. 2010. "The Synoptic Logia of Jesus in the Ethical Teachings of Paul." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 13:81–98.
- Finnegan, Ruth. 1988. *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- , 2007. *The Oral and Beyond: Doing Things with Words in Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2008. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fjärstedt, Björn. 1974. *Synoptic Traditions in 1 Corinthians: Themes and Clusters of Theme Words in 1 Corinthians 1-4 and 9*. Uppsala: Theologiska Institutionen.
- Foley, John Miles. 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- , 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Voices in Performance and Text. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- , 2002. *How to Read an Oral Poem*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Foster, Paul. 2011. "Paul and Matthew: Two Strands of the Early Jesus Movement

- With Little Sign of Connection.” Pages 86–114 in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences*. Edited by Joel Willitts and Michael F. Bird. Library of New Testament Studies 411. London: T & T Clark.
- France, R. T. 2002. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Commentary on the Greek Text. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2007. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. 1989. “The Jesus-Paul Debate: From Baur to Bultmann.” Pages 11–50 in *Jesus and Paul: Collected Essays*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 37. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Garland, David E. 1996. *Mark*. New International Version Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- , 2003. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Gathercole, Simon J. 2006. “The Gospel of Paul and the Gospel of the Kingdom.” Pages 138–54 in *God’s Power to Save: One Gospel for a Complex World?* Edited by Christopher Green. Oak Hill Annual School of Theology. Leicester: Apollos.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. 1961. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 22. Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup. Translated from the author’s unpublished manuscript.
- Gibbs, Jeffrey A. 2006. *Matthew*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia.
- Gilmore, David D. 2010. *Misogyny: The Male Malady*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gorman, Michael J. 2012. “Cruciformity According to Jesus and Paul.” Pages 173–202 in *Unity and Diversity in the Gospels and Paul: Essays in Honour of Frank J. Matera*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner and Kelly R. Iverson. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

- Goulder, Michael D. 1974. *Midrash and Letion in Matthew*. London: SPCK. Green, Joel B. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Grudem, Wayne. 2020. "Grounds for Divorce: Why I Now Believe There Are More Than Two." *Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 2:70–79. Guenther, Allen R. 2002. "The Exception Phrases: Except, Including, or Excluding? (Matthew 5:32, 19:9)." *Tyndale Bulletin* 53:83–96.
- Hagner, Donald A. 1993. *Matthew 1 - 13*. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. Volume 1. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Nelson.
- , 2008. *Matthew 14 - 28*. Edited by Bruce M. Metzger. Volume 2. Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville: Nelson.
- Harnack, Adolf. 1902. *What Is Christianity?* Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. London: Williams and Norgate. Translation of *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Lectures, Berlin, 1900.
- Hauck, F. 1967. "Μοιχεύω." Pages 729–35 in volume 4 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey William Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Translation of *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Volume 4. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. 10 volumes. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1935.
- Hays, Richard B. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- , 1997. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*. London: T & T Clark.
- , 2002. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. Second edition. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2005. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2008. "The Story of God's Son: The Identity of Jesus in the Letters of Paul."

- Pages 180–99 in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Edited by Richard B. Hays and Beverly Roberts Gaventa. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2011. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation Commentary Series. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Heitmüller, D. 1912. "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 13:320–37.
- Hengel, Martin. 1979. *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM.
- , 1983. "The Origins of the Christian Mission." Pages 48–64 in *Between Jesus and Paul*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- , 2000. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. London: SCM.
- Heth, William A. 2002. "Jesus on Divorce: How My Mind Has Changed." *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 6:4–29.
- Heth, William A., and Gordon J Wenham. 1984. *Jesus and Divorce: The Problem with the Evangelical Consensus*. Nashville: Nelson.
- Hiestermann, Heinz Arnold. 2016. "Paul's Use of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition." PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria.
- Hollander, Harm W. 2000. "The Words of Jesus: From Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q." *Novum Testamentum* 42:340–57.
- Hugenberger, Gordon Paul. 1998. *Marriage as a Covenant: Biblical Law and Ethics as Developed from Malachi*. Biblical Studies Library. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 2004. "Jesus' Death as Paradigmatic in the New Testament." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57:413–33.
- Incigneri, Brian J. 2003. *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel*. Biblical Interpretation Series 65. Boston: Brill.
- Ingolfsland, Dennis. 2006. "Jesus Remembered: James Dunn and the Synoptic Problem." *Trinity Journal* 27:187–97.
- Instone-Brewer, David. 2002. *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and*

Literary Context. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Iverson, Kelly R. 2012. "An Enemy of the Gospel? Anti-Paulinisms and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 7–32 in *Unity and Diversity in the Gospels and Paul: Essays in Honour of Frank J. Matera*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner and Kelly R. Iverson. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Jacobi, Christine. 2015. *Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus? Analogien Zwischen den Echten Paulusbriefen und den Synoptischen Evangelien*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 213. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Johnson, Alan F. 2004. *1 Corinthians*. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Käsemann, Ernst. 1964. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London: SCM. Keener, Craig S. 1993. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove: IVP. -----, 1997. *Matthew*. IVP New Testament Commentary. Downers Grove: IVP.
- , 2009. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2019. *Christobiography: Memory, History, and the Reliability of the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Keith, Chris. 2007. "Review: Social Memory and Early Christianity. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher (Eds). Atlanta: Brill, 2005." *Expo. Times* 118:255.
- . 2015. "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part Two)." *Early Christ.* 6:517–42.
- . 2015. "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One)." *Early Christ.* 6:354–76.
- . 2016. "The Narratives of the Gospels and the Historical Jesus: Current Debates, Prior Debates and the Goal of Historical Jesus Research." *J. Study New Testam.* 38:426–55.

- Kelber, Werner H. 1983. *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Voices in Performance and Text. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- , 2005. "The Works of Memory: Christian Origins and Mnemohistory." Pages 221–48 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Alan Kirk. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kelber, Werner, and Samuel Byrskog, eds. 2009. *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Kim, Seyoon. 1993. "Sayings of Jesus." Pages 474–92 in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P Martin. Leicester: IVP.
- , 2002. *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Kirk, Alan. 2011. "Memory, Scribal Media, and the Synoptic Problem." Pages 459–82 in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg, Andrew Gregory and Joseph Verheyden. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 239. Leuven: Peeters.
- , 2016. *Q in Matthew: Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark.
- , 2017. "Ehrman, Bauckham and Bird on Memory and the Jesus Tradition." *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 15:88–114.
- Kirk, Alan, and Tom Thatcher. 2005. "Jesus Tradition as Social Memory." Pages 25–42 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. Semeia Studies 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. 1993. *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New Testament Commentary Series. Grand Rapids: Baker Books.
- Kleiveland, Øyvind Olav Sydow. 2017. *Till Divorce Do Us Part: How the Lack of*

Knowledge about Jewish Wedding Traditions Has Wreaked Havoc on Christian Marriages. EBook only. <https://www.amazon.com/Till-DIVORCE-part-knowledge-traditions-ebook/dp/B06Y15PV2K>.

Knust, Jennifer Wright. 2012. *Unprotected Texts: The Bible's Surprising Contradictions About Sex and Desire*. New York: HarperOne.

Koester, Helmut. 1990. *Ancient Christian Gospels: The History and Development*. London: SCM.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. 2004. *God, Marriage, and Family: Rebuilding the Biblical Foundation*. Wheaton: Crossway.

Lane, William L. 1974. *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Laney, J. Carl. 1990. "No Divorce and No Remarriage." Pages 15–53 in *Divorce and Remarriage: Four Christian Views*. Edited by H. Wayne House. Downers Grove: IVP.

-----, 1992. "Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and the Issue of Divorce." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149:3–15.

Le Donne, Anthony. 2007. "Theological Memory Distortion in the Jesus Tradition: A Study in Social Memory Theory." Pages 163–77 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Edited by Stephan C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Benjamin G. Wold. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

-----, 2011. *Historical Jesus: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lee, Yongbom. 2016. *Paul, Scribe of Old and New: Intertextual Insights for the Jesus-Paul Debate*. Library of New Testament Studies 512. London: T & T Clark.

Liefeld, Walter L. 1984. "Luke." Pages 797–1059 in *Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Volume 8. Expositors Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

- , 1999. *1 and 2 Timothy/Titus*. New International Version Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Loader, William R. G. 2015. "Did Adultery Mandate Divorce? A Reassessment of Jesus' Divorce Logia." *New Testament Studies* 61:67–78.
- Long, George. 1875. "Julia et Papia Poppaea." Pages 691–92 in *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. Edited by William Smith. Second edition. London: Walton and Maberly.
- Lord, Albert Bates. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Luz, Ulrich. 1989. *Matthew: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by James E. Crouch. Volume 2. Hermeneia Commentary. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- , 2001. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary on Matthew 8-20*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia Commentary. Minneapolis: Fortress. Translation of *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8-17)*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Zürich: Benziger, 1990.; and *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 18-25)*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Zürich: Benziger, 1997.
- , 2007. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by James E. Crouch. Revised edition. Hermeneia Commentary. Minneapolis: Fortress. Translation of *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus: 1-7*. Fifth edition. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Benziger, 2002.
- Malcolm, Matthew R. 2013. *The World of 1 Corinthians: An Exegetical Source Book of Literary and Visual Backgrounds*. Eugene: Cascade.
- Marcus, Joel. 2000. "Mark: Interpreter of Paul." *New Testament Studies* 46:473–87.
- , 2009. *Mark 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 27. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Matthews, Shelly. 2017. "Fleshly Resurrection, Authority Claims, and the Scriptural Practices of Lukan Christianity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 136:163–83.
- May, S. S. 2004. *"The Body for the Lord": Sex and Identity in 1 Corinthians 5-7*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 278. London: T & T Clark.
- McGrath, Alister E. 2005. *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*. Third edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGrath, James. 2009. "Written Islands in an Oral Stream: Gospel and Oral Traditions." Pages 3–12 in *Jesus and Paul: Global Perspectives in Honour of James D. G. Dunn. A Festschrift for His 70th Birthday*. Edited by B. J. Oropeza, C. K. Robertson and Douglas C. Mohrmann. Library of New Testament Studies 414. London: T & T Clark.
- McKnight, Scot. 2011. *The Letter of James*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- McRay, J. R. 2000. "Corinth." Pages 227–31 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Meier, John P. 1991. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies.
- Millard, Alan. 2000. *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Mitchell, Margaret Mary. 1991. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen Zur Theologie 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Moo, Douglas J. 1980. "1 Timothy 2:11-15 Meaning and Significance." *Trinity Journal* 1:62–83.

- Morgan, William. 1917. *The Religion and Theology of Paul: The Kerr Lectures*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Morris, Leon. 1985. *1 Corinthians*. Second edition. Tyndale New Testament Commentary. Nottingham: IVP.
- Mournet, Terence C. 2005. *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 195. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- , 2009. "The Jesus Tradition as Oral Tradition." Pages 39–62 in *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*. Edited by Samuel Byrskog and Werner H. Kelber. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. 1981. "The Divorced Woman in 1 Cor 7:10-11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100:601–6.
- Murray, John. 1961. *Divorce*. Phillipsburg: Prebyterian and Reformed.
- Nash, Scott. 2009. *1 Corinthians*. Smyth & Helwys Commentary. Macon: Smyth & Helwys.
- Neill, Stephen, and Nicholas Thomas Wright. 1988. *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Neirynck, Frans. 1996. "The Sayings of Jesus in 1 Corinthians." Pages 141–76 in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Edited by R. Bieringer. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Neisser, Ulrich. 1981. "John Dean's Memory: A Case Study." *Cognition* 9:1–22.
- Nelligan, Thomas P. 2015. *The Quest for Mark's Sources: An Exploration of the Case for Mark's Use of First Corinthians*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications.
- Nolland, John. 1995. "The Gospel Prohibition of Divorce: Tradition History and Meaning." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 17:19–35.
- , 2005. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- O'Brien, Peter Thomas. 1993. "Letters, Letter Forms." Pages 550–53 in *Dictionary*

of Paul and His Letters. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid. Leicester: IVP.

Olender, Robert G. 1998. "The Pauline Privilege: Inference or Exegesis?" *Faith Mission* 16:94–117.

Omerzu, Heike. 2014a. "Beyond the Fourfold Gospel: A Critical Reading of Francis Watson's Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 37:201–9.

-----, 2014b. "Paul and Mark - Mark and Paul: A Critical Outline of the History of Research." Pages 51-62 in *Mark and Paul : Comparative Essays Part II. For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Troels Engberg- Pedersen, Mogens Mueller and Eve-Marie Becker. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 199. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Ong, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. New Accents. London: Routledge.

Osborne, Grant R. 2010. *Matthew*. Edited by Clinton E. Arnold. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary Series on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Paret, Heinrich. 1858. "Paulus Und Jesus, Einige Bemerkungen Über Das Verhältnis Des Apostels Paulus Und Seiner Lehre Zu Der Person, Dem Leben Und Der Lehre Des Geschichtlichen Christus." *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* 3:1–85.

Pate, C. Marvin. 2013. *Apostle of the Last Days: The Life, Letters and Theology of Paul*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic.

Patrick, James E. 2010. "Matthew's Persher Gospel Structured Around Ten Messianic Citations of Isaiah." *Journal of Theological Studies* 63:43–81.

Peterson, Brian. 2018. "A Possible Scriptural Precedent for Paul's Teaching on Divorce (and Remarriage?) In 1 Corinthians 7:10-15." *Tyndale Bulletin* 69:43–62.

Porter, Stanley E. 2016. *When Paul Met Jesus: How an Idea Got Lost in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Powell, Mark Allan. 2009. "Literary Approaches and the Gospel of Matthew." Pages 44–82 in *Methods for Matthew*. Edited by Mark Allan Powell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2010. "Narrative Criticism." Pages 240–58 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Powers, B. Ward. 2012. *Divorce and Remarriage: The Bible's Law and Grace Approach*. Preston: Mosaic.
- Resch, D. Alfred. 1904. *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*. Repr. Charlston: Forgotten Books, 2016.
- Richardson, Peter. 1980. "'I say not the Lord': Personal Opinion, Apostolic Authority and the Development of Early Christian Halakah." *Tyndale Bulletin* 31:65-86.
- Riches, John K. 2005. "Introduction." Pages 1–8 in *The Gospel of Matthew in Its Roman Imperial Context*. Edited by John K. Riches and David C. Sim. London: T & T Clark.
- Riesner, Rainer. 1981. *Jesus Als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung Zum Ursprung Der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 7. Tübingen: Mohr.
- , 2011. "From the Messianic Teacher to the Gospels of Jesus Christ." Pages 405–46 in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Tom Holmen. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill.
- Rodríguez, Rafael. 2010. *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance, and Text*. Library of New Testament Studies 407. London: T & T Clark.
- , 2014. *Oral Tradition and the New Testament: A Guide for the Perplexed*. London: T & T Clark.
- Rosner, Brian S. 1994. *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

- Rothschild, Clare K. 2014. "‘Have I Not Seen Jesus Our Lord?!’ (1 Cor 9:1c): Faithlessness of Eyewitnesses in the Gospels of Mark and Paul." *Annali di Storia Dell'Esegesi* 31:29–51.
- Sanders, E. P. 1969. *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 9. London: Cambridge University Press.
- , 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. London: SCM.
- Scaer, David P. 2015. "Matthew as the Foundation for the New Testament Canon." *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 79:233–44.
- Schaller, Berndt. 1972. "‘Commits Adultery With Her’, Not ‘Against Her’, Mk. 10.11." *Expository Times* 83:107–8.
- Schoberg, Gerry. 2014. *Perspectives of Jesus in the Writings of Paul: A Historical Examination of Shared Core Commitments With a View to Determining the Extent of Paul’s Dependence on Jesus*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.
- Schweitzer, Albert. 1912. *Paul and His Interpreters: Critical History*. Translated by William Montgomery. London: Adam and Charles Black. Translation of *Geschiichte der Paulinischen Forschung von der Reformation bis auf die Gegenwart*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1911.
- Sciarabba, David. 2017. "The Issue of Divorce and Remarriage in 1 Corinthians 7:15 in the Light of the Dominical Logion of 7:10." *Papers* 11. <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/papers/11>.
- Sim, David C. 2009. "Matthew and the Pauline Corpus: A Preliminary Intertextual Study." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31:401–22.
- Simmons, William A. 1996. *A Theology of Inclusion in Jesus and Paul: The God of Outcasts and Sinners*. Lewistown: Edwin Mellen.
- Small, Jocelyn Penny. 1997. *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Claire Seymour. 2012. *Pauline Communities as ‘Scholastic Communities.’* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- , 2014. "Unchanged 'Teaching': The Meaning of Didaskō in 1 Timothy 2: 12." *Women, Sermons and the Bible: Essays Interacting with John Dicksons Hearing Her Voice*. Edited by Peter G. Bolt and Tony Payne. EBook only. Sydney: Matthias Media.
- Smith, Murray J. 2010. "The Gospels in Early Christian Literature." Pages 181–208 in *The Content and Setting of the Gospel Tradition*. Edited by Mark Harding and Alanna Nobbs. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Stein, Robert H. 1992. "Divorce." Pages 192–99 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Leicester: IVP.
- , 2008. *Mark*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Stout, Stephen O. 2011. *The Man Christ Jesus: The Humanity of Jesus in the Teaching of the Apostle Paul*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- Strauss, Mark L. 2014. *Mark*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Sturm, W. 1900. "Der Apostel Paulus Und Die Evangelische Ueberlieferung." *Wissenschaftliche Beilage Zum Jahresbericht Der 2. Städtischen Realschule Zu Berlin*. Berlin: Gartner.
- Sumney, Jerry L. 2017. *Steward of God's Mysteries: Paul and Early Church Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. 1991. "Oral Transmission and Written Transmission, Or the Heard and Seen Word in Judaism of the Second Temple Period." Pages 132–33 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by Henry Wansbrough. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 64. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Tannehill, Robert C. 1996. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Tew, W. Mark. 2012. *Luke: Gospel to the Nameless and Faceless*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

- Thiselton, Anthony C. 2000. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Thompson, Michael B. 1991. *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1 - 15.13*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 59. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Treggiari, S. 2003. "Marriage and Family in Roman Society." Pages 132–82 in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*. Edited by K. M. Campbell. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Turner, David L. 2010. "Matthew among the Dispensationalists." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53:697–716.
- Turner, Nigel. 1956. "The Translation of Moichatai Ep Authn in Mark 10.11." *The Bible Translator* 7:151–52.
- Vig Skoven, Anne. 2014. "Mark as Allegorical Rewriting of Paul: Gustav Volkmar's Understanding of the Gospel of Mark." Pages 13–28 in *Comparative Essays Part II. For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Mogens Mueller and Eve-Marie Becker. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 199. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Voelz, James W. 2013. *Mark 1:1-8:26*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia.
- Wallace, Daniel B. 1996. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Walter, N. 1989. "Paul and the Early Christian Jesus-Tradition." *Paul and Jesus*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn and C. Wolff. Sheffield: JSOT.
- Walton, Steve. 2015. "What Are the Gospels? Richard Burridge's Impact on Scholarly Understanding of the Genre of the Gospels." *Currents in Biblical Research* 14:81–93.
- Warden, Duane. 1997. "The Words of Jesus on Divorce." *Restoration Quarterly* 39:141–53.

- Watson, Francis. 2013. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2016. *The Fourfold Gospel: A Theological Reading of the New Testament Portraits of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Wegenast, Klaus. 1971. "Teach, Instruct, Tradition, Education, Discipline." Pages 759–75 in *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology: Translated, with Additions and Revisions, from the German Theologisches Begriffslexikon Zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by Colin Brown. Volume 3. Exeter: Paternoster.
- Weibling, James M. 2001. "Reconciling Matthew and Mark on Divorce." *Trinity Journal* 22:219–35.
- Welborn, L. L. 1997. *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles*. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- Wenham, David. 1995. *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- , 2002. *Paul and Jesus: The True Story*. London: SPCK.
- , 2011. "Jesus Tradition in the Letters of the New Testament." Pages 2041–58 in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Tom Holmen. Volume 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Wenham, Gordon J. 1984. "Matthew and Divorce: An Old Crux Revisited." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22:95–107.
- , 1986. "The Syntax of Matthew 19:9." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28:17–23.
- , 2017. "Foreward." *Till Divorce Do Us Part: How the Lack of Knowledge about Jewish Wedding Traditions Has Wreaked Havoc on Christian Marriages*. EBook only.
- Wenham, John William. 1965. *The Elements of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Werner, M. 1923. *Der Einfluss Paulinischer Theologie Im Markusevangelium*.

Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 1. Giessen: Töpelmann.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. 1872. *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*. Fourth edition. London: Macmillan.

Williams, Ritva. 2011. "Social Memory." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 41:189–200.

Willitts, Joel. 2011. "Paul and Matthew: A Descriptive Approach from a Post-New-Perspective Interpretive Framework." Pages 62–85 in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences*. Edited by Joel Willitts and Michael F Bird. Library of New Testament Studies 411. London: T & T Clark.

Wilson, S. G. 1984. "From Jesus to Paul: The Contours and Consequences of a Debate." Pages 1–21 in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare*. Edited by P. Richardson and J. C. Hurd. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Wimbush, Vincent L. 1987. *Paul, the Worldly Ascetic: Response to the World and Self-Understanding According to 1 Corinthians 7*. Macon: Mercer University Press.

Winter, Bruce W. 1994. "1 Corinthians." Pages 1160–86 in *New Bible Commentary*. 21st Century edition. Edited by Donald A Carson, Richard Thomas France, J. A. Motyer, and Gordon J Wenham. Leicester: IVP.

-----, 2001. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Witherington, Ben III. 1996. *Women in the Earliest Churches*. Reprinted edition. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----, 2001. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

-----, 2006. *Matthew*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon: Smyth & Helwys.

-----, 2010. "'Christianity in the Making': Oral Mystery or Eyewitness History?"

Pages 197–226 in *Memories of Jesus: A Critical Appraisal of James D. G. Dunn's Jesus Remembered*. Edited by Robert B. Stewart and Gary R. Habermas. Nashville: B & H Publishing.

Wolff, Christian. 1989. "True Apostolic Knowledge of Christ: Exegetical Reflections on 2 Corinthians 5:14ff." Pages 81–98 in *Paul and Jesus: Collected Essays*. Edited by A. J. M. Wedderburn. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 37. Sheffield: JSOT.

Wong, Eric K. C. 2001. "The De-Radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in Romans." *Novum Testamentum* 43:245–63.

-----, 2002. "The De-Radicalization of Jesus' Ethical Sayings in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 48:181–94.

Woodhouse, John. 2014. "Divorce and Remarriage: An Exploration of My Understanding of What the Bible Teaches on This Issue." Paper presented at the annual conference of the *Priscilla and Aquila Centre*. Sydney, 2014.

Wrede, William. 1908. *Paul*. Translated by Edward Lummis. Boston: American Unitarian Association. Translation of *Paulus*. Halle: Gebauer-Schwetschke, 1905.

-----, 1971. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J. C. G. Grieg. Library of Theological Translations. Cambridge: J. Clarke. Translation of *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht. 1901.

Wright, N. T. 1996. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Volume 2. Christian Origins and the Question of God. London: SPCK.

-----, 2015. *Paul and His Recent Interpreters: Some Contemporary Debates*. London: SPCK.

Yeung, Maureen W. 2002. *Faith in Jesus and Paul: A Comparison with Special Reference to "Faith That Can Remove Mountains" and "Your Faith Has Healed / Saved You."* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 147. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Zhekov, Yordan Kalev. 2009. *Defining the New Testament Logia on Divorce and*

Remarriage in a Pluralistic Context. Eugene: Pickwick.

Zvi, Ehud Ben. 2017. "Chronicles and Social Memory." *Stud. Theol. - Nord. J. Theol.* 71:69–90.