

Messianic Judaism's Alternative to Supersession and the Ecclesia

Trevor (Aurora) Francis Rawlinson

Psychology B.S., Armstrong Atlantic State University

Submitted to the Department of Theology of
Loyola University Maryland
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Theological Studies

August 2020

ProQuest Number: 28093841

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent on the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 28093841

Published by ProQuest LLC (2020). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All Rights Reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I should thank Drs. Daniel McClain, and my thesis director, Robert Pomplun, for taking a chance and on me and admitting me into the program. Secondly, I should like to thank the entire theology faculty at Loyola of Maryland for their tolerance and support through my transition while attending the graduate program. Third, I should like to thank all those who are Messianic Jews giving this science graduate, turned an aspiring theologian, a novel emergent Jewish-Christian tradition of which to study. Fourth, I should like to thank my ex-team lead at Sam's Club, Jennifer, for helping me realize what I wanted – to finish this thesis. Fifth, I would like to thank all those who have been here for me: My favorite cat, Katie, who's been here with me while I've typed this entire paper allowing me to express my ideas and thoughts without stark criticism, and she has been the best bookmark/placeholder. I would like to thank my family and friends for their moral support. I would also like to thank my landlady, Ms. Seipp, for being such a kind and understanding person.

ABSTRACT

This thesis endeavored to introduce Messianic Judaism to the academic community and explore the notion of whether a supersessionist free form of Christianity is capable of existing. This question was posed by Wilhelmus Valkenberg and did not seem to have an answer; therefore, this paper set out in an attempt to answer that question. To assess the question concerning a supersessionist free form of Christianity, termed the *Valkenberg Question*, a set of assumptions were made to account for Messianic Judaism as a participant in the Christ-following community. Kinzer's paradigm is a bi-lateral ecclesiology by which both Jews and Gentiles are separate but participating in a *commonwealth*. Kinzer's commonwealth is compared to the older Lustiger model upon which Kinzer's is based. Under scrutiny operating off the premise of the previous term paper, it was determined that a new paradigm/modification was needed. The new paradigm encourages emphasis to be placed on Paul's statement in Ephesians 2:19 concerning citizenship. This paradigm allows for both Jewish and Gentiles parts of the ecclesia to communicate without danger of supersessionism occurring from Christian to Messianic Judaism. However, it does not account for supersessionism occurring at the inter-religious level between Judaism, Messianic Judaism, and Christianity. Messianic Judaism may also be prompted to supersede Christianity, which could result in unknown outcomes. It is suggested that further extensions continue to evaluate the validity of these claims on the basis of academic falsifiability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter I – The Emergence of Hebrew Christianity	3
Messianic Judaism Defined	3
Excursus: The Terms “Jew” and “Jewish” Defined	7
The Evolution from Hebrew Christianity to Messianic Judaism: Jewish Christianity in the Nineteenth Century	8
Supersessionism and the Jewish Believers of Yeshua.....	14
Supersessionism, a separation of the ecclesia.....	14
Supersessionism and its existence since the First Century	15
Judaism and its many different branches	19
Closing Introductory Notes on Modern Messianic Jewish Theology.....	19
Chapter II – Messianic Judaism and Its History with Supersessionism	23
A Paradox and Paradigm	23
A Paradoxical and a Paradigmatic Arguments	24
A paradox of typological interpretation.....	24
The paradigm against typological interpretation	26
The paradigm of joined communities	31
The paradigm of double fulfillment.....	36
The Valkenberg Question	36
Kinzer’s Bilateral Ecclesia.....	37
The sacrament of baptism and Yeshua	42
The sacrament of Jewish life.....	46
The two obstinate peoples.....	47
The Kinzer answer	49
The Lustiger Proposal	50
The Lustiger description of the problem.....	51
The person of Christ.....	52
The Lustiger answer.....	55
The Analogies of Marriage and Citizenship	56
Marriage	56

Citizenship	62
Chapter III – Discussion and Conclusion	69
An Alternative to Kinzer: Centralizing What He Bifurcates	70
Lustiger in Comparison to Kinzer.....	72
The Analogy of Marriage as an Ecclesial Model.....	76
A Return to the Valkenberg Question.....	78
Bibliography	82

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is an attempt to answer Pim Valkenberg's question: "Can there be a supersessionist free form of Christianity?" When posed in our comparative theological class in Spring 2018, the answer was then unknown. Forthwith, this thesis pushes the envelope of theological research into a novel field: Messianic Judaism. It was thought that Messianic Judaism would provide a non-supersessionist tradition of practice and theology. Initially, a hypothetical assumption was made that assumed communication was occurring between Judaism, Messianic Judaism, and Christianity; however, this was not the case. Evaluation of the situation showed that there was no instance whereby communication was occurring between Judaism, Messianic Judaism, and Christianity with any consensus. Therefore, an operational hypothesis was generated for a future extension paper. The hypothesis assumes that Messianic Judaism and Christianity are able to engage in dialogue on account of a shared set of beliefs. Thus, this paper is an attempt to answer Valkenberg's question under the operational assumption that dialogue, at this time, is only occurring between Messianic Judaism and Christianity. Furthermore, this paper will assume that supersessionism can only be ameliorated from this perspective under the current operational hypothesis concerning dialogue. In short, this paper will evaluate whether or not Messianic Judaism is free of supersessionism and, if so, can ecclesiastical relations be established.

First, this thesis will provide some historical information concerning the movement as well as some information on the ecclesia itself. Second, there must be a firm understanding of what supersessionism is and what the response of Messianic Judaism was to it then and is now. Two experts, Kinzer and Lustiger, will be influential

in providing paradigms to help solve the partition of supersessionism between the Messianic Jewish community and Gentile Christians. One perspective of concern, however, will be Kinzer's as it is more aggressively political and suggestive of Messianic Judaism superseding Christianity. Lustiger's perspective is more suggestive of the Pauline attitude of mixed ecclesiae. Both paradigms will be assessed, and one will be suggested as the preferred paradigm. In addition to their paradigms, the author of this thesis makes her own suggestions of theological extensions to the above paradigms. This thesis will hopefully make a strong argument of why the community should be one united ecclesia rather than two separate *catholic* ecclesiae.

CHAPTER I

The Emergence of Hebrew Christianity

Messianic Judaism Defined

Although it may seem to be a bit counter-intuitive, it is better to answer the question of what Messianic Judaism is by working backward. Some may mistakenly think that the Messianic movement started in the late 1970s and early 1980s with the Jews for Jesus Movement, but they would be errant. The first sparks of the movement were in the late-nineteenth century with four men: Rudolf Herman Gurland, Christian Lucky, Isaac Lichtenstein, and Joseph Rabinowitz.¹ These men lived during the same time frame and had a concurrent effect upon the development of Hebrew Christianity, the precursor to Messianic Judaism. Sobel points out that during this period, the Hebrew Christian movement was attached to Protestant churches, stating that the Hebrew Christianity was mainly a missionary endeavor.² By the mid-to-late-nineteenth century, there would be five predominant missions evangelizing Jews in Eastern Europe.³ This statement, though, is only partly true as Lichtenstein would remain in his community ministering to them, while Joseph Rabinowitz would go on to start his own synagogue.

¹ Though these men are credited with trailblazing the field of Jewish Christianity, the first established group of believers were the Sons of Abraham in 1813. B. Z. Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe* (Toronto, ON: John Wiley & Sons, 1933), 177.

² *Ibid.*, 180.

³ Raymond Lillevik, *Apostates, Hybrids, or True Jews: Jewish Christian and Jewish Identity in Eastern Europe 1860-1914* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014), 37-39. There were six primary missionary societies that evangelized to the Jews before the creation of Hebrew Christian Alliance of America in 1915: The London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, The Mildmay Mission to the Jews, Der Evangelisch-Lutherische Zentralverein für Mission unter Israel, The Hebrew-Christian Testimony, The Sabbath Tract Society and the Zion Society Minneapolis. The hope of these missions was to convert and to assimilate the Jewish converts into a Gentile-Christian way of life.

Nevertheless, Sobel is correct in noticing the struggle of the Hebrew Christian movement to not only establish its own identity but any collective goals.⁴

In the late-nineteenth century, Jewish self-identity was changing in response to the Enlightenment, and Jews were fleeing repressive ethnic and religious persecution resulting from Eastern European nationalism.⁵ This exodus coincided with the Jewish “enlightenment,” in which secular Jews were referred to as *maskilim*.⁶ This movement away from orthodox Judaism, though offering some variance and increased opportunity for obtaining both occupational and emigrant statuses, Jews were still thought to be tainted by their ancient religious and social ancestry. Upon emigrating to other countries, Jews had to adapt in a manner that offered an opportunity for advancement, especially in Christian nations like Germany, England, or the United States. Nonetheless, even long-term naturalized immigrant families were not immune from the persistent anti-Semitism from which the families had often fled, as was in the case of Leo Frank.⁷

While the educated and specific audience of this work in all likelihood already knows that Jews were persecuted during this era, there were also consequences for any Jew associating with Christianity. Conversion to Christianity, even the simple belief in Christ, was inherit apostasy. Joseph Rabinowitz was nearly killed while speaking and giving sermons in Russia.⁸ Lichtenstein encountered much resistance and was brought

⁴ Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity*, 182.

⁵ Raymond Lillevik, *Apostates, Hybrids or True Jews*, 30-31.

⁶ Lillevik, *Apostates, Hybrids, or True Jews*, 32.

⁷ For more information on the Leo Frank case, see Dinnerstein, *The Leo Frank Case*, rev. ed. (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press 2008).

⁸ Kai Kjær-Hansen, *Joseph Rabinowitz and the Messianic Movement* (Edinburgh, UK: Handel Press, 1995), 72-73.

before a rabbinate to answer for his beliefs.⁹ Lichtenstein never recanted and continued to serve at his post in Tápiószele until he left for Budapest in 1893, where he would lecture rabbinical students until he was reprimanded.¹⁰ The man who lost the most for Christ was Gurland, who was ostracized by his family as well as his community for believing in Christ.¹¹ The established Orthodox Jewish community opposed Gurland, as he was a progressive who supported reform of the Jewish model of education and held many progressive perspectives amongst the Eastern Jews. Lucky seems to have had it better, but when his theology supported the notion of Jewish obedience to the Law, the Hebrew Christian community refuted him.¹²

During this tumultuous period in the history of modern Judaism, Messianic Judaism encountered the Zionist movement. Many in Hebrew Christianity aspired to establish a new Israel. This new Israel, however, could not be reestablished in Israel as Jerusalem was held at by the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth-century. Gurland and Lucky created a scheme that would provide a place of fellowship for converted Jews to congregate: the Hebrew-Christian Fellowship was contrived. One of the first establishments of a fellowship that we should take notice of is the attempt of Joseph Rabinowitz to establish an “assembly hall.”¹³

Rabinowitz was not considered a rabbi; therefore, he could not technically preside over what we would consider a synagogue or a church. Though he was not a clergyman,

⁹ Lillevik, *Apostates, Hybrids, or True Jews*, 159.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 165.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 51-52.

¹² *Ibid.*, 138.

¹³ Kai Kjær-Hansen, *Joseph Rabinowitz and the Messianic Movement* (Edinburgh, UK: The Handsel Press, 1995), 143.

Rabinowitz crafted both a doctrine and a community. Rabinowitz contrived his own liturgy and established twelve articles then added ten more in addition to creating a Jewish-Christian creed.¹⁴ Sympathetic Scots endowed him with the funds¹⁵ needed to construct Somerville Hall, where he would minister to both believing Jews as well as curious, unbelieving Jews. Rabinowitz encouraged many Jews to come and listen to his sermons. An estimated community of at least fifty members and perhaps between 100 and 150 on high holidays attended his assembly hall. There have been many reasons proposed as to why the movement subsided after the death of Rabinowitz on May 17, 1899. One reason why things settled down was that Jewish-Christianity was not an officially recognized religion. Thus, it would have been difficult for anyone else to minister to the group of Jewish-Christians.¹⁶ Another distinct possibility, as Sobel suggests, is that Rabinowitz instituted a radical religious separation from the norm and isolated it by preserving its Jewishness.¹⁷ Another possibility is that believers joined with Gurland's congregation in Odessa and became Lutherans under his leadership. What we know as fact is that for nearly eighty years, there would not be such a distinct group of people participating in communal worship in such a manner that would reflect their Jewish-Christian identity. No Hebrew Christian fellowship would ever be able to compare with such a substantial singularity in the history of Hebrew-Christianity until

¹⁴ Ibid., chapter 8.

¹⁵ Ibid., More specifically, a financial council was convened to discuss the continual funding of his group.

¹⁶ In fact, Rabinowitz's son had difficulty finding any man willing to come and preside over the congregation.

¹⁷ Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity*, see endnote 8, 207.

1978. Nevertheless, in the later modern era, Jewish-Christian fellowships would attempt to provide some form of identity to Jews participating in Gentile congregations.

Excursus: On Defining the terms “Jew” and “Jewish”

Many would stipulate that one is either a Jew or a Christian, and this stark definition has evolved over the past 1600 years of polemical encounters between Jews and Christians. However, many Messianic Jews would identify as having one foot in Judaism and one foot in Christianity, but they would not self-identify as Christians due to its Gentile connotation.

To precisely answer the question of who is considered a Jew, I should point out that unless one is an Orthodox Jew, one is not Jewish, at least as far as Orthodox Judaism is concerned.¹⁸ Fruchtenbaum's text *Hebrew Christianity* also briefly touches on the nationalistic definition of one being Jewish and a believer; however, such a topic as defining Jewishness is out of the scope of this paper.¹⁹ In short, this paper does not concern itself with answering the question of who is and is not a Jew, just as it does not

¹⁸ Sherbok clearly explains that while the Messianic Jew is inherently considered Jewish along maternal birth lines, they are not religiously deemed to be religiously Jewish. Sherbok is clear in his statement regarding the prevalent attitude of Orthodox Judaism, “In addition, Orthodox Judaism rejects any form of conversion other than its own. As a result, Conservative, Reform, and Reconstructionist converts and the children of female converts are regarded non-Jews.” Dan Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism* (New York, NY: Continuum, 2000), 203, 203-205.

¹⁹ Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, *Hebrew Christianity* (Tustin, CA: Ariel Ministries, 1995), 2-8. Fruchtenbaum provides an obstructed view of what is considered a Jew. Admittedly, there are many ways in which Jews are defined. The most recent manner in which to define a Jew is a national secularized definition, and this has been further defined and revised since Fruchtenbaum's writing of *Hebrew Christianity*. To be considered a Jew by the state of Israel, one may be naturalized, born within Israel, or born to Israeli citizens, see <https://mfa.gov.il/mfa/aboutisrael/state/pages/acquisition%20of%20israeli%20nationality.aspx>. However, before the millennium, the Orthodox rabbinate defined Jewishness as well as national identity. Fruchtenbaum offers a simplistic solution, Scripture. Fruchtenbaum cites the Abrahamic covenant for a definition of Jewishness.

attempt to explain who is and is not a Christian; though both are subjective in definition, they are not relative.

In the case of Messianic Jews, one is of genetic Jewish decent, practices Judaism, and believes that Jesus Christ is the Messiah. By our current definitions of Judaism and Christianity, this definition seems paradoxical. Therefore, neither mainstream Judaism nor Christianity has accepted the Messianic community. Also, the community would be post-Talmudic, and as for practice, the Messianic community has not settled on halakhic practices.²⁰ Though the most prominent Messianic theologian has rendered his opinion, each congregation has its own rabbi to make such advisements to their congregation. Local congregations also differ in their adherence to the law based upon their association (e.g., IMACS, MJAA, etc.). Because of these issues, I decided to steer clear of any discussion of the law, but as far as holidays and traditions go, Messianic Jews do keep them. Unlike the Jews for Jesus and Hebrew Christian stances, the traditions and the law are still beholden upon the Jews whether they believe in Christ or not, as far as Messianic Judaism is concerned.²¹ One respect with which Messianic Judaism does differ from Jews for Jesus is in the evangelization of other non-believing Jews. The question of salvation separates Messianic Jews from the typical Jewish community. In the Messianic community, if one does not believe and profess Christ, one is unsaved.

The Evolution from Hebrew Christianity to Messianic Judaism Jewish Christianity in the Nineteenth Century

²⁰ Kinzer has written a proposal and guide on the Messianic Jewish Rabbinical Council's website (http://ourrabbis.org/main/documents/Oral_Torah_Kinzer.pdf and http://ourrabbis.org/main/documents/MJRC_Standards_Aug2014.pdf)

²¹ Richard Harvey, *Mapping Messianic Jewish Theology: A Constructive Approach*, (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2009), 18.

None of these fellowships had any clear direction and were themselves considered an aid to already-established missionary tactics.²² Aside from the Episcopalians, no other Christian tradition embraced the Jewish convert's desire to retain their traditions. Cohn-Sherbok infers what Sobel overtly states: the Christian fear concerning Hebrew Christianity's deliberation to separate itself from the Gentile churches. Therefore, the Episcopalians sympathetically allowed Jewish converts to keep their high holy days while also remaining Episcopalian. Nevertheless, there was mounting pressure from Gurland and Philip Cohen to create fellowship centers for Hebrew Christians.

As Sobel pointed out, these fellowship centers would be associated with either a particular mission or tradition.²³ In the 1900s, however, the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America (HCAA) would predominate their fellow organization, the Hebrew Christian Alliance of Great Britain. When the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America was founded, the charter clearly stated that its purpose was the evangelizing the Jews; furthermore, the organization served as a resource for strategies and tactics in missions to Jews.²⁴ More specifically, it was thought that converted Jews would serve as a more efficient witness to the Jews than Gentiles.²⁵ The critical relationship between peoplehood and identity was one aspect of missionary tactics that needed to be understood. The problem for the Jewish community was that once Jews converted to Christianity, they ceased to be Jews.²⁶ Mark Levy proposed that the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America should embrace its history,

²² Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity*, 185.

²³ *Ibid.*, 177-178.

²⁴ Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism*, 31.

²⁵ Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity*, 189-191.

²⁶ Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism*, 33.

even more so the traditions of the Jewish people. Levy's measure, however, failed, making the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America little more than a stagnate footnote in history until its transition to the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America (MJAA).²⁷

Sobel identifies four approaches to syncretism that are responsible for the failure of Hebrew Christianity: Zionism, the syncretization of Jewish practices/symbolism with Christian beliefs, the creation of a Hebrew-Christian denomination, and the "institutional expression" of Zionism and syncretization.²⁸ The overall tactic was to provide a "framework" with which Jews would be familiar and provide legitimization for Hebrew Christianity as being Jewish.²⁹ The way that Hebrew Christianity did this was to persuade other Jews that Hebrew Christians supported the establishment of a national Israel. Furthermore, both Jew and Hebrew Christians could live and operate in the same environment without "compromising" belief or national identity."³⁰ However, Sobel notes that the assumption that Hebrew Christianity would attract Jews in Jerusalem as an alternative to secularism was "naïve."³¹ The second assertion that Sobel contributes to understanding the failure of Hebrew Christianity as a movement was the volitional syncretistic attempt to intertwine Law and Christianity. It was thought that the integration of festivals and liturgy would provide a substantial basis for the argument of Hebrew Christianity being the continuation of Judaism.³² Philp Levertoff and Mark Levey stipulated that these traditions demonstrated the complete fulfillment of all promises by

²⁷ Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism*, 33. This should be understood to convey the celebration and upholding of all laws except halakha and sacrificial traditions.

²⁸ Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity*, 221.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 216, 233.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 222.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 226.

³² *Ibid.*, 227-228.

Christ and were furthermore appointed by Adonai³³ and therefore are not subject to abrogation by men of the Church.³⁴ The counter-argument was that these traditions served a purpose for the weak in faith and grace but not for the strong in faith and grace.³⁵ Sobel contends that modern Hebrew Christianity's Judaization should be rejected and agrees with the previous contentions.³⁶ His basis is that Judaizing Christianity strengthens Judaism and erodes justification by faith.³⁷ Sobel makes his third assertion very clear: any formation of a Hebrew congregation would, by definition, incur a "schism."³⁸ He believes that this schism would rebuild the "dividing wall" that Paul had tried to dissolve.³⁹ Perhaps within the context of the state of Israel, this makes sense; otherwise, it does not. Sobel does acknowledge the counter-argument to this point, being that an institution such as a Hebrew Christian church provides a place for ritual, dogma, practice, and observances that supports recent converts.⁴⁰ None of these approaches helped Hebrew Christianity, especially since Jews at large inferred that these approaches were an attempt to minimize anti-Semitism.⁴¹

³³ Adonai is a term used in place of the name of God out of reverence.

³⁴ Ibid., 228-229.

³⁵ This was Max Rich's perspective on Jewish customs in Hebrew-Christianity. Sobel also cites Hort's concern that many were dangers in indulging too much into the law. However, on account of those who could not separate themselves from the law, Hort sides with Paul. Paul allows those who are weak in faith to continue in observation of the law. Even in modern Messianic Judaism, there is respect for the fine lines that were drawn by Peter and Paul. One must balance grace, along with the potential danger of Judaization. See Sobel's n. 38 in chapter 5.

³⁶ Sobel published before the modern Messianic Judaism movement in the 1980s and before the transition from the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America to the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America.

³⁷ Ibid., 230.

³⁸ Ibid., 232

³⁹ Ibid., 232.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 233.

⁴¹ This paragraph summarizes chapter five of Sobel's book, *The Thirteenth Tribe*. The last section of Sobel's chapter deals specifically with anti-Semitism. As a sociologist, Sobel probes the attitudes of converts and the motive behind the conversion of Jews to Christianity. Sobel believes that anti-Semitism, as

There are a couple of reasons that could be proposed for the failure of the Hebrew-Christian movement: both World Wars, Vatican II, the formation of the state of Israel, and secularization. While the first World War would have been quite disruptive to any mission endeavor to the Jews, it was the Second World War that stymied subsequent mission and evangelical endeavors. In hindsight of the holocaust, the question of Jewish national identity became central. Those Jews who were believers had a significant desire to reconnect with their Jewish past.⁴² Once again, this attempt to reintroduce Jewish customs into the Christian belief system failed; this attitude continued through the mid-century. As the 1970s approached, however, youth attitudes began to change, and there was a shift from assimilation and incorporation into the Church towards Jewish practice/lifestyle, prompting a cultural and religious paradigm.⁴³ This youth movement gave way to the formation of Jews for Jesus.⁴⁴ Furthermore, Jews for Jesus became socially aggressive in their evangelical campaign. Cohn-Sherbok quietly indicates that the Jews for Jesus movement was the transition from Hebrew Christianity to Messianic Judaism. After the transition of the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America to the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America and its new constitution, Marty Chernoff would take leadership and start the first Messianic congregation in Cincinnati. In the 1980s, the International Alliance of Messianic Congregations and Synagogues (IAMCS) was

aversion to any other religious system, is motivation for conversion. He states that a missionary could believe that any other religious system is "evil, wrong, and deficient."

Sobel, *Hebrew Christianity The Thirteenth Tribe*, 238. Furthermore, proselytes would eventually disassociate themselves from their previous religious system and view themselves as outsiders to a faith in which they were once insiders.

⁴² Cohn-Sherbok, *Messianic Judaism*, 51.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 59. The HCAA formed a youth group (YHCA) which spurred this movement.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 60.

formed to assist in the instruction of Messianic pastors and rabbis. The second problem facing Messianic Judaism after its birth was how to revive practices that have not been integrated for nearly 1800 years.

From what we know above, community and identity were at the heart of the Messianic movement. Messianics, “did not find Christian nor Jewish modes of worship and prayer” representative of the movement.⁴⁵ Furthermore, the new worship and practice were in protest of Christian supersessionism, yet providing a way for Messianic Jews to connect with the broader Jewish community.⁴⁶ Richard Harvey notes that Messianic Judaism enmeshes the symbolism of Judaism and Christianity.⁴⁷ New Messianic Jewish liturgies were developed upon traditional Jewish services. These new services had many additions of Jesus, and many prayer books were modified to account for the addition of *Yeshua*, as they referred to Him. Dauermann stipulates that most Jews expected some form of liturgy, and therefore the liturgy itself served as a ministry to non-believing Jews.⁴⁸ The holidays point toward the fulfillment of Scripture by Yeshua.⁴⁹ Kasdan, in the introduction of his book *God's Appointed Times*, explains that the holidays are God's “revealed” holidays and teach us about God and Messiah. As will be discussed below,

⁴⁵ Seth Klayman, “Messianic Jewish Worship and Prayer,” in *Introduction to Messianic Judaism: Its Ecclesial Context and Biblical Foundations*, eds. David Rudolph and Joel Willitts (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013), 52.

⁴⁶ Sturt Dauermann, “Messianic Outreach,” in *Introduction to Messianic Judaism: Its ecclesial Context and Biblical Foundations*, eds. David Rudolph and Joel Willitts (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013), 91.

⁴⁷ Harvey, *Mapping Messianic Jewish Theology*, 19.

⁴⁸ Stuart Dauermann, “The Importance of Jewish Liturgy” in *Voices of Messianic Judaism: Confronting Critical Issues Facing a Maturing Movement*, eds. Dan Cohn-Sherbok (Baltimore, MD: Lederer Books, 2001), 6-7.

⁴⁹ Note that the translated modern Hebrew for a savior is *Yeshua* and will be used interchangeably with Jesus. This term began to be used in the 1970s, as Dan Cohn-Sherbok indicates.

Mark Kinzer attempted to recognize these holidays as being divinely established and, therefore, unalienable by the Church's efforts to diminish them.

Supersessionism and the Jewish Believers of Yeshua

Supersessionism has effected Jewish believers of Yeshua by separating them from the Gentile-Christian community. This separation has affected the entire Christ/Yeshua believing ecclesia over a significant period of history. In recent history, the revival of a Jewish Christ believing community has been prevented from organically integrating into either Judaism or Christianity.

Supersessionism, a separation of the ecclesia. The history of both supersessionism and Messianic Judaism must be unentangled. This prospect is tricky, as trying to disentangle Judaism from Christianity is not easy. This section will focus on the history of the Christian supersessionism of Messianic Judaism and will attempt to expound upon the development of Messianic Judaism. The first historical introduction attempts to explore the concepts of *Bilateral Ecclesiology*.

Messianic Judaism begins not in the modern era with Jews for Jesus, but in the first-century C.E./A.D., The movement as indicated in Scripture was Jewish, with notable exceptions.⁵⁰ It was not until Philip and Peter begin encountering Gentiles that the Commission in Acts 1:8, 10:1-11 is executed. From the moment that these men, such as Cornelius and their families, entered the community, questions were raised on how to integrate Gentiles into the circumcised Jewish community. It is not until Acts 15, when the numbers of Gentiles grew in participation within the Jewish community, that

⁵⁰ A prime example is Acts 2:5-11. A couple of notable examples of exceptions are when Christ frees Gentiles from demonic possession or offering healing of ailments.

remediation occurred to determine the community standards of practice governing Jews and Gentiles. This apostolic counsel inherently created a paradigm in which Jews and Gentiles operated differently. Nevertheless, what is seen here—from Kinzer's perspective—is the emergence of the first “schism” between Jewish and Gentile believers.⁵¹

Supersessionism and its existence since the First Century. History shows that Christianity diverged from the earlier mixed Jew and Gentile communities. The difficulty that presented itself was not an overt form of supersessionism but a covert form. We must understand the foundation of the belief of supersessionism as well as what category of supersessionism we are dealing with throughout this paper. Therefore, this section will introduce the concept of supersessionism and attempt to define it as well as provide a brief history of its progression.

Michael Vlach has established three categories of supersessionism: punitive, economic, and structural.⁵² Punitive supersessionism is defined as a situation in which one believes that due to Israel's sin of killing Christ, God has both destroyed the nation and revoked the blessings of its faith.⁵³ A believer of this sort would logically conclude that the Church has completely replaced Israel. Economic supersessionism is the belief that Israel participated in only one-half of the history of salvation. After the first coming of Christ, the Church carries the fire of salvation through eschatological completion, the

⁵¹ Mark Kinzer, “Bilateral Ecclesiology in Solidarity with Israel” in *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism: Redefining Christian Engagement with the Jewish People*, (Grand Rapid, MI: BrazosPress), 151-181.

⁵² Michael Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel: An Analysis of Supersessionism* (Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang, 2009), 27-32.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 27-29.

second-half of the history of salvation.⁵⁴ Structural supersessionism occurs in a situation in which hermeneutics and interpretation lead one to conclude that Christ has instituted a wholly new faith. Vlach notes that within these categories, there is a spectrum.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, this spectrum is defined by the extremity of its borders of supersessionism and non-supersessionism. In his text, Vlach supports Messianic arguments against supersessionism and gives a brief, concise history of supersessionism that will be highlighted.

It was assumed, especially by Augustine, that Gentile Christians had economically superseded the Jews. Schonfield states that after the destruction of the Temple, the Gentiles were “free to develop a philosophy of their own better suited to the Gentile temperament.”⁵⁶ In the work of Justin Martyr, as claimed by Vlach, there is the reconfiguring of Old Testament Scripture to assert that the Church has taken the Jews’ place as the recipient of God’s blessings to Israel.⁵⁷ While most hold that Justin’s view was supersessionist, Mark Kinzer gives Justin the benefit of the doubt and sees him as an apologist.⁵⁸ Later, Origen believed that when the Jews conspired against Christ, they

⁵⁴ Ibid., 29-31. It should be noted that Israel may be portrayed as also having once again a role in the eschaton, but that role that the Jewish people and the nation of Israel play is circumstantial.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 31-32.

⁵⁶ Hugh Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity: From the First to the Twentieth Century* (London, UK: Duckworth, 1936), 40.

⁵⁷ Vlach, *The Church as Replacement of Israel*, 52, n. 58 in chapter 2.

⁵⁸ Kinzer, *Postmessianic Judaism*, 190-193. Justin is attempting to interpret the OT allegorically, demonstrating that the Jews misinterpreted the commandments. Israel was supposed to keep the ordinances due to their inability to remember God. So, the new spiritual Israel is no longer under such a law because Yeshua has freed all believers. His death on the cross also served to sever ethnic divisions, which Justin also saw as being the purpose of the law. Kinzer continues with his interpretation of Justin in stipulating that Justin believes that all believing Jew should give up the law. What is interesting is that here there is mention of early dispensation theology where eternal Israel is filled with Christians, not Jews. Kinzer’s interpretation of Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho, however, is that Justin is willing to accept Jewish believers who are ardent law-keepers, so long as those Jews do not impose their perspective, legal beliefs upon Gentile believers.

forfeited their place and gave it to the Gentiles.⁵⁹ The “reversal of roles...involves a redefinition of Israel.”⁶⁰ Of course, Origen never thought of Israel being physical, but rather a spiritual nation of people. Furthermore, Origen believed that Israel served as a physical type for the spiritual type of Church.⁶¹ Irenaeus was also an apologist as he believed that the Jews were given the law for their “education” until the Messiah’s arrival.⁶²

Both Schonfield and Wilken agree that by the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, Gentile and Jewish Christians could not agree on how best to settle their cultural and *legal* differences. Both Ignatius and Victor, bishop of Rome, chastised and demeaned a group of Christians from Asia Minor for celebrating Easter during the same calendar day as the Jews celebrated Pesach.⁶³ Kinzer is a bit more descriptive of the deciding attitudes of the preceding centuries. Kinzer describes an argument between Jerome and Augustine concerning the sincerity of Jewish practice during the life of Christ. Jerome believed that the Apostles did not believe that Jewish custom held any viable purpose beyond being a benefit for the conversion of Jews to Christianity. Augustine, on the other hand, felt that first-century Jews were extended the benefit of observing their customs, so long as they did not intend to enforce them upon Gentiles.⁶⁴ Sometime after the argument between Augustine and Jerome, the policy was to eliminate Jews and their customs from the Church. The idea that one could respect Judaism through

⁵⁹ Vlach, *The Church as Replacment of Israel*, 53.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., 54.

⁶² Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 197.

⁶³ Wilken, *The Thousand Years: A Global History of Christianity* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2012), 38.

⁶⁴ Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 202-203.

practice was censored. Sometime later in the seventh century, a profession of faith required that all Jewish converts renounce all Jewish ties and anything in their own spiritual essence that could be misperceived as being Jewish under penalty of hellfire.⁶⁵

It was not until the sixteenth century that new interests were stirred concerning the Jews and their relationship with Christianity. Luther is well known for his ambivalent attitude towards the Jews. During the beginning of the Reformation, Luther had thought that the Jews were a target audience for conversion.⁶⁶ Luther thought that the *Reformation* would appeal to the Jewish community, but to his dismay and contempt, they did not. Vlach contends that Luther became more punitive towards the Jews during his later years.⁶⁷ Luther's later contemporary, John Calvin was a bit capricious in his views of the Jews. Vlach states that Calvin, at times, made statements in line with replacement theology, and he made statements at other times, which indicated "he believed in a future for the Jews in the plan of God."⁶⁸ Calvin believed that the Church had replaced Israel, yet at the same time, he also believed that the Jews continued or would continue to have a function in the history of salvation.⁶⁹ Vlach concludes that John Calvin was an economic supersessionist. The theology of the time became a bit more abstract after the lifetime of Calvin. Kant, as Vlach describes, disregarded the things that he believed that hindered the "vehicle for moral religion" in Christianity, which so also happened to be the "Jewish elements" of the faith.⁷⁰ As quoted by Vlach, Soulen

⁶⁵ Schonfield quotes two resources for the title of this renunciation: "Some Profession of Faith Required of Jewish Converts, from the Church of Constantinople" 77.

⁶⁶ Vlach, 60.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Vlach, 62-63.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 63.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 69.

describes Kant's view that "purifying Christian doctrine of its residual Jewishness is, therefore, no distortion of the Christian faith but the necessary expression of its basic genius."⁷¹ Soulen, as referenced by Vlach, describes a scenario in which God was no longer seen as working in the world through Israel; and, once the Jewishness of Christ was minimized, it was possible to dissociate any Jewish relation to Christianity.

Accordingly, both Kant and Schleiermacher were punitive supersessionists. Barth saw Israel in the way that the Church fathers did within the terms of a relationship. Israel represented "judgment," whereas the Church consisted of people who accepted "divine mercy."⁷² Barth was an economic supersessionist viewing the advent of salvation as the starting point of the Church.

Judaism and its many different branches. Though contemporary Judaism exhibits many variants in observance and hence, is comprised of a variety of communities (Orthodox, Conservative, Reform Judaism, for example), it does not identify nor accept Hebrew Christianity nor Messianic Judaism as being Jewish in any shape or form. All denominations of Judaism agree that Messianic Judaism is Christianity and that all forms of Messianic Judaism are a deceptive conversion mission targeted against all Jews. Sobel has touched on the notion that ultimately the movement attempted to isolate itself from Christianity to form its own identity. This movement for Messianic Judaism to establish itself as something separate from Christianity and Judaism has ingrained in it a notion that it is in itself superseding Christianity.

Closing Introductory Notes on Modern Messianic Jewish Theology

⁷¹ Ibid., 68.

⁷² Ibid., 70.

A whole new system of thinking developed in the late twentieth century. This Jewish revival of believers created a need for a new theology based on the platform of Judaism. One part of the Messianic Jewish theology that had to be grappled with was how the law applied to believers. One of the most immediate issues for non-believing Jews is Jewish education, even more, so it became an issue for Messianic Judaism. The Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations (UMJC) was established to assist in the formation of Yeshivas and educate future Messianic rabbis. There is a concern that while the education remains Jewish in nature, it also retains Yeshua-centered beliefs and therefore conveys an active belief system and not just a cultural practice. Part of the Messianic Jewish lifestyle is to be Jewish, thereby creating an issue for any Gentiles in the congregation.⁷³ This Gentile question has to be dealt with, and in part, this thesis may provide some options for a contiguous theology of *ecclesia*. David Juster believes that incorporating Yeshua into Jewish beliefs need not interfere with the traditional interpretation of the law and that it helps with the growth of the community. One person who has attempted to answer some of these questions and has become a titan of the field is Mark Kinzer, a scholar who began his career in the late 1970s and was influenced by Catholicism and the Church to such a great extent that it prompted him to believe that Jesus Christ was the Messiah. However, such belief in Jesus did not prompt him to join a church; instead, he was motivated to continue in his own manner of believing in Christ.

⁷³ There is no one established opinion of how Gentiles should be integrated within the Jewish believing community. In fact, Messianic Judaism had no clear stance on the topic of conversion, other than to shun all who have converted to Judaism. In some cases, Jewish women in the community have more say and weight than Gentile men. Though some congregations may be led by a Gentile in participation with Jews, the Gentile is never perceived as a Rabbi. In most congregations, Gentiles are associate members.

Though it is not my intention to criticize Kinzer, I do hope to offer an alternative to his theology of *ecclesia*.

Mark Kinzer is unmatched in his reflection of practical Messianic Judaism. He addresses questions of oral law, identity, worship, and ecumenism. It is the latter to which this paper will attempt to offer alternative modified paradigmatic attitudes. Over the past two decades, Kinzer has proposed a political terminology as well as a methodology to categorize the Jewish and Gentile aspects of the mystical Body of Christ. Kinzer argues that Paul's ideal community was a sort of *commonwealth* in which Gentiles became attached to God through Israel's relationship to God through the means of Yeshua. This commonwealth leads to what he calls a bilateral ecclesiology, a dual/split community of Jews and Gentiles serving in different capacities. Bilateral ecclesiology is the concept that two communities are separate, yet one. Kinzer looks back at Paul and the Apostles' example of managing the two different communities. Kinzer stipulates that there is one *ecclesia*, "...of two subcommunities each with its own formal or informal governmental structures...one reality subsisting in two forms."⁷⁴ Moreover, this *reality* is of one politic of a "...multinational commonwealth of Israel."⁷⁵ In *Post Messianic Judaism*, Kinzer does a decent job of explaining his concept of an *Israeli commonwealth reality*.

A more articulate expression is in Kinzer's text *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish People and the Identity of the Church* in which he expounds upon bilateral ecclesiology. In his later book, Kinzer more narrowly defines his ecclesiology by citing John Paul II wherein, "...The Jewish religion is...intrinsic to our

⁷⁴ Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 152.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

own.”⁷⁶ He also cites Neuhaus in suggesting that the Church will engage more in its own identity by “[engaging] Jews.”⁷⁷ Dealing with the Catholic Church, and more specifically *Nostra Aetate*, Kinzer demonstrates that the Church comes into “relation with the Jewish people” through Jesus. The interesting focus that Kinzer places upon both the Jews and Jesus is that while the Jews followed the Torah, Jesus was the incarnate Torah, binding Gentiles and Jews together.

It seems that these communities, Messianic Judaism and Christianity, are separate while being, at the same time, connected through their belief in Yeshua; furthermore, it is as if the Gentiles are to look to Israel as a sort of metaphorical elder brother and see their salvation coming through Israel as through the metaphorical birth of Isaac. Kinzer’s theology places Messianic Judaism at the top and attempts to change how Gentiles view themselves and Church governance. This paper proposes that such thinking is a form of Messianic supersessionism of Christianity and attempts to propose a theology of one body.

⁷⁶ Mark Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery Nostra Aetate: The Jewish People and the Identity of the Church*, (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2015), 5.

⁷⁷ *Ibid*, 6.

CHAPTER II

Messianic Judaism and Its History with Supersessionism

A Paradox and Paradigm

The paradox of concern is supersessionism. Supersessionism is not anyone sort of 'ism, but it has been for some time a predominate Christian universalism. The paradigms proposed are expansive and complex, but also hypothetical. It is important to explain the various 'ism of supersessionism and pose alternatives that will not ingeminate the paradoxes.

Can there be a non-supersessionist form of Christianity? In short, yes and no. This question can only be answered from different perspectives. For Kinzer, Messianic Judaism is the only real supersessionist-free form of Christianity.⁷⁸ The consolidation of the Gentile community of believers in Jesus coincided—or led to—the disintegration of the community of Jewish believers. If that had not been the case, if a Jewish community was believing in Jesus as the Messiah had survived, this might have resulted in a bilateral ecclesiology such that one would not be able to say that Christianity superseded Judaism. Instead, what we have is the emergence of an ancient community into modern Christianity, which presents us with either a paradox or a paradigm for a new understanding of Jewish and Christian relatedness.

While in centuries past, there appears to have been little need for consideration of a Jewish believing community, the twentieth and twenty-first centuries have introduced considerations of a bilateral future. This paradox is what Kinzer tries to obviate in

⁷⁸ While Kinzer would shy away from referring to Messianic Judaism as Christianity, he would likely assent to the notion of common belief.

Postmissionary Messianic Judaism.⁷⁹ The paradox is a situation that Vlach also attempts to alleviate. Vlach presents reasonable doubt for those exegeses that spiritualize Israel and forfeit Israel's blessings and divine covenants. The pertinent question is how two communities are supposed to exist together while functioning as one? Subsuming Jewish believers into Christianity would simply repeat the error of supersessionism, which has already existed earlier in history. Contrasted with the above, a paradigm for an alternate type of relationship would allow for the existence of one Jewish and one Gentile community to share in the blessings of Israel together. There is considerable disagreement as to what defines Israel, ecclesia, the Church, and how all relate to each other. However, before introducing the alternative to the paradox, one must know what the paradox is and what other paradigms have been suggested to solve them.

Paradoxical and Paradigmatic Arguments

This chapter section discusses various kinds of supersessionism and the various ways in which supersessionism is expressed.

A paradox of typological interpretation. The supersessionist argument is a scattered multi-pronged theology just as the critical responses to it are. Vlach, in chapter four, concerns himself with non-supersessionism. Vlach contends that there are two types of non-supersessionism: dual-covenant and future salvation. The basis for non-supersessionism is constructed by a theology that is counter to supersessionism, in which the New Testament does not always serve to reinterpret the Old Testament, nor is Israel a type. Progressive revelation does not negate the promises of God, and the promises of the Old Testament may have a double interpretation and/or double function in the lives of the

⁷⁹ Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 14-16.

Church and nation of Israel.⁸⁰ This section will introduce both the supersessionist and non-supersessionist perspectives that have been proposed throughout the past 1,200 years.

The place where Vlach starts is in defining supersessionism, the non-literal fulfillment of Scripture. Non-literal fulfillment is the concept that is inclusive of typological fulfillment. The use of typology, as Vlach describes regarding his argument, is mainly concerned with types that point toward a future prophecy. These prophecies are viewed through the lens of the New Testament. Supersessionist theology gives interpretative priority to the New Testament over the Old Testament in the analysis of the canon of Scripture. This interpretive priority gives way to a typological belief that Israel was a type of the Church. Such interpretative priority crafts the environment of “nonliteral fulfillments of some [Old Testament] texts.”⁸¹

Those who place the priority of the New Testament over the Old Testament argue that the *grammatical-historical*⁸² approach to Scripture (i.e., historical-critical methodologies) is insufficient to account for theological transcendence of the events of the New Testament over the Old Testament.⁸³ The events in the Old Testament are not to

⁸⁰ Michael Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel: An Analysis of Supersessionism* (Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang, 2009), 122-123.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁸² Kaiser carefully describes the unified meaning of this term glued together by a hyphen. First the grammatical part of the word concerns the “plain, ordinary, and literal sense of the phrases, clauses, and sentences. The historical sense is that sense which is determined by a careful consideration of the time and circumstances in which the author wrote....” furthermore Kaiser cites, “grammatico-historical exposition is that words and sentences can have only one signification in one and the same connection,” see, Walter C. Kaiser, *Toward an Exegetical Theology*, (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1998), 87-88. The alternative and most common academic method, in contrast, is the *historical-grammatical method*, which is composed of multiple approaches such as source, form, historical, cultural, sociological, archaeological, text, redaction, narrative, rhetorical, etc. It is assumed that most readers of the paper are familiar with the above forms, but may not have recognized the grammatico-historical methodology. For further reading, see Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral*, 202-221, 359-361, 492-493.

⁸³ Vlach, *Church as Replacement of Israel*, 93.

be taken literally; rather, those events are completely fulfilled in the Church/New Testament. Typology goes hand in hand with the precedence of the New Testament over the Old Testament; Vlach's use of typological interpretation is concerned type vs. anti-type, more specifically: "Typological interpretation is a hermeneutical approach that attempts to understand the connection between the Old and New Testaments based on the type/antitype relationships found in the two testaments."⁸⁴ Of course, Vlach points out that if both premises are followed to their logical conclusions, the people and nation of Israel never fulfilled their goal nor received the promises of God. Vlach demonstrates the atmosphere of the created environment by quoting Murdoch, "They were called to do a special work, but failed in their commission. In the New Testament, God called another group of people who were free from ethnic restrictions. Their faith and commitment centered in Christ."⁸⁵ Proponents of non-literal interpretation believe that Scripture is either fulfilled in ways other than written in Scripture or that it is fulfilled in a manner of type. At the center of non-literal fulfillment is the belief that God rejected the people of Israel.⁸⁶

The paradigm against typological interpretation. Vlach further expounds upon the punitive supersessionist reading of Matt 21:43 and Rom 11:26 to communicate the theological premise of God's rejection of the Jews as His elect people. The punitive supersessionist perspective focuses on God's rejection of Israel and the transference of

⁸⁴ Ibid., 75.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 93

⁸⁶ There have been reasonable objections to this perspective. The dissenting opinion is that this would potentially limit one to being an economic supersessionist. To reiterate Vlach's constructed definition of economic supersessionism, Israel could play a role in later eschatology, but uncertainty still exists.

the national promises to the Church, along with its spiritual blessings such that Israel and the Jews would serve no purpose moving forward. This interpretive perspective was initially held by Origen, Irenaeus, and Chrysostom.⁸⁷ Davie and Allison stipulate that it is still the dominant interpretation of punitive supersessionism. This theological contrivance has led Rahner to believe that the “*true Israel*” is composed of “Jews and Pagans who believe in Jesus.”⁸⁸ The interpretation of Rom 11:26 is dependent upon how the words “all Israel” function in this verse. There are two most pertinent possibilities: God has saved Israel, or He is saving and will continue to save Israel. “All Israel” may also refer to all those who believe and are *elected*, and who as such, follow Christ and shall be saved. The alternative to the previous interpretation is that only the Jewish elect, throughout the history of salvation, constituting some arbitrary number are the elected, which constitutes “all Israel.” The potential third interpretation is a future potentiality in which there will be a “large-scale conversion” of Jews to Christianity.⁸⁹ Aside from a New Testament interpretive lens, many supersessionists argue that certain silences of the New Testament Scripture imply a lack of God’s willingness to reaffirm the promises to Israel.

Many modern non-supersessionist theologians contend that the Old Testament stands independently without reinterpretation by the New Testament. On the first topic, the irony comes from the fact that some people who hold this belief are dispensationalists. However, holders of this view stipulate that the New Testament builds

⁸⁷ Ibid., 78.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 100.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 103.

upon the Old and does not “alter” or “transcend” the promises of the Old Testament.⁹⁰ Furthermore, those who do hold this perspective are most likely to read the Old Testament in a grammatical-historical manner. The question asked by grammatical-historical theologians is why God must repeat Himself in both the Old and New Testaments for such information and/or promises to be binding.⁹¹ The contention raised by Messianic Jews and grammatical-historical theologians is that no new revelation given by Christ needs to reiterate the fact that God’s original promises are still binding; thus, no new expansion or revelation is needed.⁹² The main point, as pointed out by Vlach, is that the Old Testament is the starting point, or rather the foundation of the New Testament, and is perfectly capable of standing on its own without re-interpretation. The second topic concerning typology is entirely dependent upon the argument above: The alternative that is offered against an argument of supersessionism is correspondence.

In such typological theologies, “parallels and correspondence” occur between Israel and the Church throughout time. In this case, parallelism does not imply causation (i.e., typology) where it is assumed that the Church takes on the identity of Israel. Sometimes the Church may be so confused in its role as to assume the identity of Israel. It is understandable that the Church, in the absence of Israel, could take on the role of Israel, but in and of itself, the Church is not considered to be Israel. It may be that the

⁹⁰ Ibid., 124.

⁹¹ Ibid., 125.

⁹² If one were to imagine the very word of God as being eternal, meaning that once spoken, those words are eternally echoing throughout time and space. Why would God need to repeat himself for our benefit? This analogy is very similar to the one used by Augustine in Confessions. Another example to be to consider a legal scenario in which a judge makes a judgment, should we assume that the judge must continue to renew that same judgment for it to be carried out? No, once recorded, that judgment is carried out without constant reminders to the offender/s.

Church has a “similar [role] to Israel in the Old Testament.”⁹³ “Imagery of Israel may be applied”⁹⁴ to the Church or other Gentiles as in the Old Testament, but the Gentiles “are not identified as Israel.”⁹⁵ Vlach elucidates Glenn’s *typological-prophetic* hermeneutics in stating, “Peter uses the Old Testament texts...as a pattern for God’s relationship with the Church under the New Testament.”⁹⁶ A more convincing argument that supersessionists present is Gal 6:16.

Interpretation of Galatians 6:16 is dependent upon the interpretation of a single conjunction. What is proposed is that the Greek *kai* should be read as “even” not as “and.”⁹⁷ This renders the verse to be interpreted to mean “even the Israel of God” (NASB), which is argued by Hoekema to communicate to us that the true Israel is to be explicitly read as “...All who follow this rule, even to the Israel of God.” Therefore, Israel is constituted by the believers who follow “this rule.” Scripture alludes to a single group of people, a new multinational group of people. Paul, the supersessionists argue, is trying to create unity and therefore does not acknowledge any ethnic distinctions. The Israel of God is referenced as possibly being all one community constituted of believers, not necessarily the nation of Israel, but the ecclesia of Israel. Vlach citing, Robertson states that Paul’s cannot be distinguishing Jews due to the fact that Paul would be proclaiming “‘peace and mercy’ over the people regardless of their faith in Christ.”⁹⁸ Robertson, from the studious reader’s perspective, applies aspects of Calvinism to

⁹³ Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 178.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 178.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 86.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁹⁸ Vlach, *Church as Replacement of Israel*, n.112, 108.

Scripture, especially those which can be summed up in *TULIP*.⁹⁹ The aspects to which Robertson alludes are the *unconditional election of the saints*, *limited atonement*, and *irresistible grace*. R.C. Sproul has perhaps said it better, “Christ’s atonement is sufficient for all but efficient only for some.”¹⁰⁰ Robertson is short-sighted: Christ died even for those without faith; however, salvation is only useful to those with faith or those who may potentially have faith. Though it may be a bit early in the text to unpack Kinzer’s main assertion fully, it would be beneficial to have a response to typological ethnicity.

In Romans 9:6-8, Paul mentions a remnant of Israel. This remnant was understood by Paul to be of Israel, not *Goyim*. Fruchtenbaum explains that the term *Israel*, being referred to in Romans 9:6-8 is double, one ethnically constituted of all Jews and the other of believing Jews.¹⁰¹ Fruchtenbaum claims that “Israel” in Galatians 6:16 is referencing Yeshua, more so being upon Yeshua than Israel itself. Thus, a correct interpretation would lead us to conclude that salvation is through Yeshua of Israel. Kinzer takes Fruchtenbaum’s conclusions further by extending representation to and of the remnant.

When speaking of the Jewish people, and their ethnic promises in lieu of the remnant, Kinzer considers two things: the remnant itself and the Christomorphic suffering of the remnant. By extension, the two above apply to the Gentiles and their salvation. Like Fruchtenbaum, Kinzer believes that within the nation of Israel, there is a group of Jews who are sanctified by their belief in Yeshua and, in turn, sanctify the

⁹⁹ R.C. Sproul, *Essential Truths of the Christian Faith* (Carroll Stream, IL: Tyndale, 1992), 183. TULIP is a Calvinist acronym earmarking the five points of fundamental Calvinist theology: Total Depravity, Unconditional Election, Limited Atonement, Irresistible Grace, and the Preservation of the Saints.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 183.

¹⁰¹ Arnold Fruchtenbaum, *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology*, 38.

nation of Israel. This group is representative of the *First Fruits* of Israel, Yeshua, both on behalf of non-believing Israel as well as on behalf of the Gentiles. Kinzer claims that the *Remnant* serves in a priestly role representing all of Israel before Adonai on behalf of all promises and covenants given by thereof. The remnant continues to represent all of Israel, while the very heart of Israel is hardened against Yeshua. However, as argued by Kinzer, this hardening of the heart allows the Great Commission to go forth to all four corners of the Earth. If not for this partial hardening of their heart, would not God's promise to Israel be fulfilled? Donaldson is quoted by Kinzer saying, "If Israel's acceptance of Christ will accompany – indeed, precipitate – the Parousia, and if the Parousia represents the termination of the Gentiles' opportunity for salvation, then Israel's immediate acceptance of the Gospel would have meant the closing of the door to the Gentiles."¹⁰² Imperative to the meaning of ingrafting of the Gentiles described in Romans 11, is the belief in the Remnant of Jews, which in turn unifies the Gentiles together into the Olive tree as the unbelieving Jews are cut off from Israel.

The paradigm of joined communities. The relationship between Old and New Testament promises may be understood to "reveal a close relationship" between the Church and Israel.¹⁰³ At times the term Israel could probably be taken to mean ecclesia, but at other times it could mean Jewish believers or the nation. It is not clear as to the specific meaning in Gal 6:16. It could be that Paul concerns himself with believers who do indeed live by the rule of grace, which would include both Jews and Gentiles.¹⁰⁴ The alternative is that his response to the Judaizers only concerns the Jewish believers. Vlach

¹⁰² Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 127.

¹⁰³ Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 129.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 173.

makes the case that Paul does not intend to subsume Gentiles into Israel¹⁰⁵ nor make a distinction between a spiritual or physical Jews.¹⁰⁶ In Galatians 3, there is a case to be argued that Gentiles are spiritual Jews. However, both Fruchtenbaum and Saucy rebuff such a notion on the grounds that though Abraham may be the father of the Jews, his seed does not physically account for Gentiles. Though Vlach does not fully credit Fruchtenbaum, Fruchtenbaum thinks that Paul may be collectively referring to both Jews and Gentiles as the seed of Abraham.¹⁰⁷ If one (Fruchtenbaum reasons) were to think like Paul, who thinks linguistically in Hebrew and Aramaic and theologically in terms of Judaism, the Greek term *ecclesia* could in Paul's Hebrew mind be *Kahal* (קהל Heb. meaning assembly).¹⁰⁸ Now, taking a pause and thinking from a Jewish understanding of the word, we are not able to denote that such an assembly has any connotation of either Jewishness or Gentileness. There is a universal historical meaning for the word *congregation* and *assembly*.¹⁰⁹ If we take the stem and turn it into a verb, it may connote an assembly for either war or worship.¹¹⁰ Fruchtenbaum makes a strong case against Hodge's, Bottner's, and Grudem's understanding of the term Church as derived from Paul's translation of Jewish concepts into Greek texts.¹¹¹ Saucy thinks that while

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 175-177.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 175.

¹⁰⁷ Fruchtenbaum's mind, where concerned, is upon the concept of adoption. If we suppose in terms of legal inheritance is akin to *per capita* in which the rest of Humanity becomes an heir post-resurrection. The imagery of adoption, as noted by Westbrook and Wells, also works in terms of marriage manumission in which a love slave would be adopted so that she could be given to another heir. Though the form of adoption just mentioned was common in the ancient middle east, it could be applied to the Gentile situation in which Gentiles are joined to Israel, the Jews, and to married to Christ. Thus, Gentiles would be adopted from sin and death, merged with the body of Jews, and given to as an heir to Christ within the marriage analogy, of which more will be explained later in this thesis.

¹⁰⁸ F. Brown, et al., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2017) 874.

¹⁰⁹ Fruchtenbaum, *Israelology*, 29.

¹¹⁰ F. Brown, et al., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, 874.

¹¹¹ Fruchtenbaum, *Israelology*, 34.

both may be referenced, there is not yet any reason to envelop any one identity into another.¹¹² Nevertheless, Fruchtenbaum claims that typical soteriology and covenant theology attempts to this.

Both Romans 2:28-29 and 9:6 may be read similarly to the verse above. Romans 2:28-29 concerns the “inward commitment to obey God.”¹¹³ Paul explicitly in this verse states that a Jew is not one who is of outward appearance but is instead inwardly a Jew. This is, as Scott states, “a redefinition of what it means to be a Jew.”¹¹⁴ In Romans 9:6, we should know that Israel does not concern ethnic groups; it is a transcendental concept. Grudem illustrates this by elucidating that the children of God are the faithful children of Abraham, not law-keeping Jews. Instead, Jews are people who claim Christ as their saviors. Fruchtenbaum retorts by exegeting Gal. 3:7; 28-29; he explains that stipulating that only two groups of people exist after the advent of Yeshua is an oversimplification. Instead, Paul sees the world post-first coming of the Messiah as being constituted by the Jews, Gentiles, and the Church [ecclesia].¹¹⁵ Furthermore, in the same reference above, Fruchtenbaum states that the Church, or as Paul would have most likely thought, the ecclesia is formed of both Jews and Gentiles. Continuing his exegesis of Galatians 3, Fruchtenbaum concedes that salvation is agreed upon as coming through Yeshua but does not eliminate distinctions.¹¹⁶

¹¹² Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 111-112.

¹¹³ Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 111.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Fruchtenbaum, *Israelology*, 45.

¹¹⁶ For more information, see Fruchtenbaum's *Israelology* in which he describes predominant perspectives of Israel and the Jewish people in depth. Fruchtenbaum points out many discrepancies with the current interpretations and definitions concerning the nature of *Israel*.

1 Peter 2:9, as many supersessionists want to claim, applies to the Church. The reuse of the language of Exodus and Isaiah could indicate that the Church is the new Israel. However, chapter two of Peter could also be written to address a Jewish audience. Why use Scripture with which Gentiles would be unfamiliar? Howard thinks that Peter is stating that the Jews are no longer God's people. We must also remember that 1 Peter may be pseudonymous; therefore, the real writer may be attributing the language of Exodus to the Church after the incidents of both 70 and 135 C.E.

Ephesians 2:9-10, as interpreted by Grudem and Hoekema, argue against the role of Israel in the future.¹¹⁷ Grudem goes as far as to say, “[Ephesians 2] gives no indication of any distinctive plan for Jewish people ever to be saved apart from inclusion in the body of Christ, the Church.”¹¹⁸ Hoekema states a contradiction to Romans 11, “To suggest that God has in mind a separate future for Israel, in distinction from the future he has planned for Gentiles, actually goes contrary to God's purpose”¹¹⁹ It seems as if God has the salvation of the Gentiles in mind and salvation flowing from the Gentiles to the rest of the world -- including Jews. This is an apparent reversal of Fruchtenbaum's purposed dispensational theology, and it also seems to conflict with the notion of eschatological fulfillment where salvation was intended to flow through the Jews to the Gentiles.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 116.

¹¹⁸ Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan, 1994), 862.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Though this text has not necessarily made clear the difference between Covenantal Theology and Dispensational Theology, a brief summary will be provided here: For the sake of a simplified and time-saving explanation, Dispensational theology has nothing to do with Scofield, in this case. Instead, Dispensational theology in regard to Israel accounts for an inclusive will for both the Jews and Gentiles. Covenantal theology, on the other hand, stipulates that Israel's part ends with the close of the OT and that the Gentile Church takes center stage throughout the eschatology.

It seems as if Matthew and Luke align in their accounts of Christ's promise to the disciples during His last Passover. In both Matt 19:28 and Luke 22:30, the disciples are promised to be allowed to sit at the table with Christ and to rule over the twelve tribes of Israel. Now the point is this: If Israel were going to be replaced by the Church, why would Christ promise the disciples they would rule over the twelve tribes of Israel? Hoekema's proposition would imply that the twelve tribes of Israel are the Church, yet this is not the case as the grammar does not allow for such a conclusion.

The second set of pericopes used is Matt 23:37-39 and Luke 13:34-35; 21:24. These two texts denote Christ leaving only to return at a later time. After Christ leaves, Jerusalem will be destroyed, and it will not be as it was until the time of the Gentiles has come to an end, and the Jews bless Christ. This is interpreted by non-supersessionists as the judgment and redemption of Israel. There are two questions posed by these texts and their prophecies: Why would Christ refer to Israel if He meant a spiritual Church? Why would there be a temporal reference to the Gentiles and His return? Why would there be references, restoration, and distinctions if the Church had replaced Israel? The references of Matt 23 and Luke 13 are understood to relate to the Psalm 118:26 the time when Rabbis thought that Israel would be restored. This relates to the Scripture in Luke 21 as it is understood that the Gentile nations would be judged, and the people of God, along with their land, would be restored and governed by God. This Scripture marks the beginning of the eschaton.

In Acts, the disciples begin to question Christ after his resurrection concerning the *times*, and Christ tells them not to concern themselves, yet Christ does not rebuke their reference to Israel. Now, we know that Christ was a rabbi who did not fear to correct

errant doctrine; thus, the presumption is that Christ would have corrected them if their reference to Israel would have been spiritually amiss -- He did not.¹²¹ Therefore, Paul's statement concerning the nation of Israel and the Jews seems to indicate a national restoration as well as the full salvation of the Jews. To tie in with the inferences as noted by Vlach, a silent acknowledgment of the supersession of the nation of Israel is no "explicit reference to a restoration of national Israel."¹²² Unlike the Old Testament, where there are many references to a restoration of Israel, it may be assumed that such a lack of an indication of an "earthly reign" points to a more spiritual existence of the nation of Israel.¹²³ Such silence leads supersessionists to stipulate that there is no literal fulfillment of the restoration of the nation of Israel. Non-supersessionists also offer an alternative to the supersessionist refutation of New Testament silence, and such refutation comes in a solution that sometimes is mis-termed as dual-covenant theology, *double fulfillment*.

The paradigm of double fulfillment. As far as double fulfillment goes, non-supersessionists seem to think that the Church is the spiritual successor to Israel, but that Israel will receive the physical promises in the future.¹²⁴ Citing Hoch, Vlach points out that the Church shares with Israel, it never replaces Israel, nor does the Church join into any political entity with Israel.¹²⁵ The New Man defies all earthly categories, yet there is no clarification offered to explain the New Man within either the Church or Israel.

The Valkenberg Question

¹²¹ Vlach, *The Church as a Replacement of Israel*, 146.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 104.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 104.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 152.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 151.

From the perspective of supersessionism, Christianity supersedes Judaism along with all promises given to Israel. The Church, in this instance, is like Jacob stealing Esau's birthright. However, from the arguments above, we see that there may be a potential paradigm in which both may continue to exist together. Of course, the question that Valkenberg raised, "Is there a supersessionist free form of Christianity" may be answered in one of three ways. The first presented will be one of Mark Kinzer and his bilateral ecclesia, Lustiger's slightly different opinion, then finally my own modification to Kinzer's bilateral ecclesia based upon Lustiger's theology.

Kinzer's Bilateral Ecclesia

Kinzer's paradigm is Israel-centric. Instead of Israel being replaced, as Kinzer stipulates in *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, the ecclesia includes a core remnant of Jews faithful to Yeshua, again serving to mediate and sanctify the rest of Israel.¹²⁶ To continue to mediate for Israel, the believing Jews need to continue in their covenantal agreement with Adonai. The Gentiles must also be *grafted* onto the whole community; thus, each community should have its own "*sub-governmental* and communal communities," forming "one reality subsisting in two forms."¹²⁷ Kinzer's third inference is that, like the Pauline analogy above, the Gentile community is brought into a relationship with Israel. The faithful portion of Israel participating within the Jewish life and *lawful practices* of the covenants also mediate the Gentile portion within the whole *olive tree*. To portray the ideal relationship between the two bodies, Kinzer goes back to

¹²⁶ Mark Kinzer, *Post Missionary Messianic Judaism: Redefining Christian Engagement with the Jewish People* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2005), 151.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 152.

Acts and the Council of Jerusalem. Before the apostolic council, Gentiles and Jews participated in one community and government until the community began to grow apart.

The Council of Jerusalem settled the matter by decreeing that all Jews were under the covenantal agreements made before and after those made between Moses and Adonai, while the Gentiles were under the one covenant made between Noah and Adonai. While separate, these communities were tied together through their support system of synagogues and small communities, and here it is clear that Kinzer believes that Gentiles share in Israel “without full membership.”¹²⁸ Kinzer also interprets Markus Barth’s commentary of Ephesians 2, stating that while separate, the two communities are unified as man and wife in “one *typological* flesh.”¹²⁹ This flesh has two distinctions while also having separate functions. Citing Karl Barth, Kinzer continues the point that both Jew and Gentiles are “‘indissolubly one’ and ‘ineffaceably two.’”¹³⁰ Furthermore, he explains that Markus Barth also thought that Israel was connected to the Messiah and that its election could not be “cut-off.”¹³¹ Nevertheless, this relationship can be succinctly described by Barth as the “gathering of Jews and Gentiles called on the ground of its [(i.e., the ecclesia’s)] election.”¹³²

Though the long paragraph above serves to introduce Kinzer’s viewpoint, his functional perspective is elucidated more in his text *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish People, and the Identity of the Church*. Before ending *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, Kinzer makes it explicitly clear what the standards should be

¹²⁸ Ibid., 165.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 170.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 175.

¹³¹ Ibid., 176.

¹³² Ibid., 176.

regarding the establishment of Messianic Judaism: Any bilateral-ecclesial theology must be in “solidarity with Israel’s covenant, Torah, and Religious tradition.”¹³³ Yet, the Hebrew Catholic Association (HCA) has not been able to meet his qualification, leaving only the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations (UMJC) to define what a proper Messianic Congregation is. Furthermore, of which much is elucidated upon, Kinzer believes that the Jewish witness needs to be witnessed to both the Gentiles as well as the Jews. In *Searching Her Own Mystery*, Kinzer proposes the proper relationship. Kinzer feels that he must do this on account of the ineffectual ability to describe the Church’s relationship to both the believing and non-believing by critiquing *Lumen Gentium*.

While making his critique, Kinzer develops a complex socio-political soteriology. He stipulates that Israel’s pre-existing relationship with Adonai precluded Gentile relations and that a Gentile relationship with Adonai is established through Israel via the new covenant, forming an Israel-Commonwealth. In short, salvation flows through Israel by proxy through Christ.¹³⁴ Since it is the Jews who are already in contract with God, they have no choice in the acknowledgment of their identity, they are the people of God, and when they embrace the Messiahship of Yeshua, they confirm their identity and His position of leadership as king, priest, and prophet. It is when the Gentiles acknowledge this that they come into being one of the people of God. The most explicit indicator of his position that Kinzer gives is a direct statement, “...the Church’s identity as the ‘new people of God’ is bound with the identity of the Jews...”¹³⁵

¹³³ Ibid., 156.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 53.

¹³⁵ Mark Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish people, and the Identity of the Church* (Eugene OR: Cascade Book, 2015), 10.

The second volume of Kinzer's series, *Searching Her Own Mystery*, explores the Israel-Commonwealth relationship to both Adonai and the Gentiles from a sacramental perspective. The place to start is the priesthood, and for the sake of time and clarity it is better to start with the conclusion of Kinzer's fourth chapter of *Searching Her Own Mystery*: "...the priestly vocation of Jesus and his apostles was itself bound up with their identity as Jews, and with the priestly vocation of the Jewish people as a whole."¹³⁶ To expound what he so elegantly sums up, we must understand that Kinzer begins in Ephesians 1-2 and exegetes these chapters to establish both a non-transcendental and transcendental essence to the vocation of priesthood. It is recognized as fact and is clearly salient that the Israel/ites were to be the priests, as explicitly stated in Exodus 19:6a "And you will be to/for me as a kingdom of priests and a holy people/nation." Yeshua would save not only the nation of Israel itself but redeem the rest of the world to God the Father. He specifically exegetes Ephesians 2:11-12 to stipulate that Israel is physically being connected "'with Christ' and 'having hope.'" The initiation of the relationship of Gentiles being united to Christ only becomes apparent with the second person pronoun 'you' in Ephesians 1:18, thereby joining the Gentiles with the remnant Israel, and this is what constitutes the Israel-Commonwealth. Kinzer wants to be clear that the Israel-Commonwealth is Christocentric. Both groups are saved together by Christ, but Kinzer wishes to analyze the relationship between Jews, Gentiles, and Yeshua by using his own interpretation of Ephesians 2. In Ephesians 2:14-16, Kinzer argues that when the two groups are made one, Israel is "reconfigured in a new eschatological form;"¹³⁷ the

¹³⁶ Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery*, 36.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 77.

Gentiles are brought near to God, and both are given priestly access to the Father. This forms the apostolic and prophetic “sum-politia . . . The inextricable connection between the apostolic office and the people of Israel . . . extend[s] Israel’s holy social-and-political-order and bring[s] it to eschatological fullness by mediating the Messiah to the Gentile nations and by summoning Israel to acknowledge its priestly king.”¹³⁸ Kinzer compares this to a political description of “politeia.”¹³⁹ This politeia from his perspective involves linking the apostolic office to the saints of Israel. Going still further, the two-part process described in Ephesians is what Kinzer refers to as the *catholicization* of Israel.¹⁴⁰ Again, as in his previous work *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, Kinzer ties secular Israel and the Gentiles to the sanctified priestly remnant. Before concluding chapter four, Kinzer really thrusts a point against Catholicism. He describes the Catholic institution of the priesthood as being independent of Israel’s priesthood whereby “The true analogue to these sacraments (i.e., holy order and baptism) among the Jewish people is neither the office of the rabbinate nor the commandment of circumcision, but fleshy reproduction within the framework of communal Jewish life.”¹⁴¹ In short, while the Gentile believers are represented by an episcopate, Jewish believers are genealogically connected to Yeshua.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 77-79. Kinzer is trying to convey the idea that Yeshua has officially joined the Gentiles together with the Jews as one ecclesia. Though the author of this text is not a Latin scholar, the household of God in Ephesians 2:19 is most probably what Paul is referring to as a socio-legal form of household management known as *paterfamilias*. What Kinzer conveys is the Gentiles join the already established community and people of God, thus his use of “sum-politia.” It will be later discussed that this is too inordinate and a much simpler, yet still legal and political alternative is citizenship and adoption.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 77.

¹⁴⁰ Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 81.

¹⁴¹ Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery*, 87.

The Sacrament of Baptism and Yeshua. The historical and theological purpose of baptizing Jewish people was to rescind their covenantal identity as Jews and reinitiate them in the Church as Christians.¹⁴² Kinzer argues against this use of baptism by citing Scripture itself and establishing Yeshua's solidarity with the Jewish people. If such were the case, then Yeshua or Jesus would not be the savior of His people.¹⁴³ There are three aspects of baptism that are established: baptism by water, spirit, and fire. Before Yeshua can baptize His own people, He must first be baptized. Kinzer cites Ezekiel 36:24-28, supporting that Israel through Yeshua is purified through His baptism. He cites Malachi 4:1, 5-6 for the exegetical representation of the baptism of fire, a baptism which would represent judgment and death. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is signified most by Yeshua's resurrection.

¹⁴² While some may object to such a substantial charge, historically, Christianity has been hostile to the Jew regarding anything Jewish that could be seen as Judaism. While it may seem to be the simple act of establishing a calendar, the Quartodeciman argument served to create an "identity independent of the Jews," see Wilken, *The First Thousand Years of Christianity* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 2012), 39. Fonrobert, tells us about various accounts of anti-Jewish texts and sermons denouncing Christians from intermingling such as the *Didascalia Apostolorum* ~ 3 B.C.E., and John Chrysostom; see Fonrobert "Jewish Christian, Judaizers, and Christian Anti-Judaism" in *Late Ancient Christianity*, ed. Virginia Burrus (Augsburg Fortress, MI: Augsburg Press, 2005), 234-254. More specifically concerned with this statement, is the confession of faith from the Church of Constantinople, that required one as a Jew was to renounce all relations to being Jewish: "I renounce all customs, rites, legalism, unleavened breads and sacrifice of lambs of the Hebrews, purifications, sanctifications, and propitiations, and fasts, and new moons, and Sabbaths, and superstitions, and hymns and chants and observances and synagogues, and the food and drink of the Hebrew; in one word, I renounce absolutely everything Jewish, every law, rite, custom, and above all I renounce the Antichrist, whom all the Jews await in the figure and form of Christ..." see Schonfield, *The History of Jewish Christianity: From the First to the Twentieth Century* (London, UK: Duckworth, 1936), 77. The Spanish Inquisition is also a demonstration of the extent to which Christianity would go to erase any religious identity than Christian. There were again sermons devised against the Jews as well as an ultimatum given by Queen Isabel: convert, leave, or face execution, see MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 60, 59-65. From this tangent, some compelling evidence has been cited to support that there was developed within Christianity a militant attitude against Judaism. Therefore, the requirement that any convert to Christianity from Judaism wholly reject their Jewish identity existed solely to affirm Christianity as the correct way to God and salvation. Nowhere is this so extraordinarily found than in the confession of faith required in the historical Church of Constantinople.

¹⁴³ Kinzer, *Postmissionary Messianic Judaism*, 97; 101-102.

In the act of receiving baptism, it is Yeshua who submits to the law and the prophecy. Kinzer claims that Yeshua, “demonstrates that He is the son of God—the true representative of Israel—not by working signs and wonders, but by obeying the Torah as Israel was commanded to do.”¹⁴⁴ Yeshua has done what the first Adam has failed to do—submit to the law of God.

Ultimately Kinzer states, that Jesus’ baptism in water points forward to his death and resurrection and also to creation’s final judgment and ultimate eschatological liberation from bondage and decay. Our baptism in water points backward to His death and resurrection and binds us to those definitive acts of divine intervention while also anticipating their future eschatological realization. When disciples are baptized into the Messiah, they are baptized into the one who in His suffering and death represented the people of Israel, and who in His resurrection life still represents that people. As such, baptism signifies and requires the same sort of radical identification with the Jewish people that Jesus Himself displayed.¹⁴⁵

Therefore, what Kinzer is guiding us to understand is that Yeshua identifies with Israel not as something separate, such as Christian or Gentile, but as a Jew. Instead, it is the Gentiles who come to the Father through Yeshua and through His baptism. A Gentile identifies him/herself with the Israel-Commonwealth when one become baptized. The Jew, on the other hand, is renewing and solidifying his/her covenantal agreement with God and “obligates Jews to a radical commitment to Jewish life....”¹⁴⁶ In short, a Jew’s

¹⁴⁴ Kinzer, *Searching Her Own Mystery*, 98.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 100.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 105.

life is in an *executory* state and is only *executed* in their participation in obedience with Yeshua observance of the law and in His baptism.

The baptism of Yeshua gives Him solidarity with his people, as does His last meal. More important for the purpose of sacramental parallelism, Kinzer is establishing through all of this "...the existence and religious life of the Jewish people" as a sacrament.¹⁴⁷ However, before this point, Kinzer feels the need to prevent a conflation of what defines the *new covenant* and last Passover meal of Yeshua. One interesting point that Kinzer brings up is that the third cup to which James, John, and Yeshua refer is a cup of judgment. He links this cup as the one which is associated with the baptism of Yeshua. This action is taken for the salvation of all Israel, and the "new covenant" is established as a sacrifice for all peoples. The last meal is symbolically ordered by Kinzer in the following manner: "His [Yeshua's] People," including those participating through the diaspora, and those who are not His people, the Gentiles, are "joined through the baptism of Israel's Messiah."¹⁴⁸ Even the eucharistic Body of Christ, as referred to by Bardes-Saye, as cited by Kinzer, "consumes the body [of the one receiving communion]" and the body of Christ is, of course, a Jewish body.¹⁴⁹ Nevertheless, the cup of judgment and salvation is given first to Israel as the Mosaic covenant is renewed then proceeds to the Gentiles.

Kinzer follows up with this by describing the sacramental life of the Israelites. The Gentiles are brought into the sacramental life of Israel through Yeshua. In protest to the notion that the Catholic Church is the only institution with sacraments, Kinzer

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 148.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 119.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 122.

describes the festivals/meal, prayers, and sacrifices of Israel being in-and-of-themselves communal sacraments. During the life of Yeshua, the priests in the temple would conduct the lighting of incense and conduct sacrifices all while praying for the whole of Israel, and when praying during the daily sacrifices, the people would face the Temple. In the manner just described, it was thought that a person would be able to pray for the remission of sin, in lieu of being physically in Jerusalem, to convey a personal sacrifice.¹⁵⁰ For the context of modernity and *nostra aetate*, Kinzer describes both the work and blessing of the priests as being the historical basis of the Eucharistic blessing and meal.¹⁵¹ Boyer, as cited by Kinzer, believes that the eucharistic meal had initially been a communal meal held amongst believers, and the blessing of priests was recited before meals, as the *BirKat HaMazon* was recited after meals.¹⁵² However, after a time and the straining of relations between Jews and Christian, the eucharist is believed to have been separated from the Jewish prayers. Though it is unclear when this specifically occurred, it occurred when references to Israel in prayers were removed and when the officiator no longer faced toward Jerusalem.¹⁵³ Within 1 Corinthians 11:20-34, these are prayers recited during the meals with which Paul concerns himself; however, Kinzer mentions that later, these meals became impractical as the population and diversity of the ecclesia grew, thus the conception of the eucharist service.¹⁵⁴ Furthermore, Kinzer claims

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 129-124. Kinzer describes the process by which the priests would prepare a communal sacrifice service as well as what is entailed in the prayer presence sacrifices.

¹⁵¹ After the seventeenth century, it was referred to as the *Amidah*. This prayer would have been recited facing away from the congregation and towards the altar, much like eucharistic prayer.

¹⁵² Ibid., 138.

¹⁵³ The *Amidah* and the eucharist are both communal and parallel each other with one being the historical root of the other. Ibid., 140-141.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 144-145.

that observant Jews celebrating the festival meals and prayers are participating in the eschatological fulfillment of the eucharist.

The sacrament of Jewish life. Kinzer stipulates that God has sanctified the people themselves as the whole of Israel, the Sabbath, the land of Israel, the Torah as the Word of God, as well as the *mitzvot*.¹⁵⁵ To summarize his main points: The people of Israel are sanctified by the presence of Adonai dwelling among them.¹⁵⁶ The Sabbath is as he says a “foretaste of what is come,” a day “apart to belong to God” and is “aligned with [Israel’s] holiness.”¹⁵⁷ God had already consecrated the land into which He had intended to lead Moses and Joshua.¹⁵⁸ This holy land had in it the Temple, which was “The proleptic sign of what God desires for the entire creation.”¹⁵⁹ The Torah, as Kinzer states, is rendered holy due to the transcription of God’s holy name. However, translations (i.e., copies) of the original text are profane in a way that the original text is not.¹⁶⁰ The *mitzvot*, as Kinzer has said, are the fulfillment of the priestly vocation, and of course, an essential part of the Torah. Kinzer states, “[obedience] becomes [a] means of sanctification rather than a result,” and whereby “God will join with us in our actions.”¹⁶¹ Ultimately, in terms of the law, he believes that *mitzvot* are the means by which Jews sanctify both themselves and the world at large.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 180.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 154.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 155-156.

¹⁵⁸ Kinzer makes the argument using Leviticus 18:24-28 as his basis. The perplexing question to ask is why he would not have cited Genesis 15-17? Part of the promise was to give the land of Canaan to Abraham.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 137.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 158-160.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 161.

¹⁶² Ibid., 162.

The trouble Kinzer runs into is how he plans to relate all this to the sacraments of the Church. However, he does realize that he may be placing more emphasis upon works rather than grace. He states that these 'Jewish' sacraments, if one will, are realized in Yeshua's life, death and resurrection, but again reverts to stating, "Christian theology has traditionally treated these five Jewish expressions of holiness under the heading of typology."¹⁶³ No, instead, these are specific imperative sacraments for the Jews as a people to uphold.¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, these Jewish sacraments are also engaged in the ecumenical and ecclesial life of the Jew-Gentile identity in Yeshua. The sacraments are specific boundaries that denote how "God views these two bodies as one complex reality, locked together against their will for a joint future that neither can evade."¹⁶⁵

The two obstinate peoples. Kinzer feels as if John Paul II did not quite acknowledge the sacramental relationship that Messianic/Hebrew Christian Jews have to Catholicism.¹⁶⁶ Yet, Pope John Paul II connects both groups of people through Christ. As established in his first volume and through his citation of Cardinal Lustiger, Kinzer makes the point that God through Yeshua dwelt among His people, His people dwell in Him (i.e., genealogical Israel), and now through baptism Gentiles do. Furthermore, he claims the spiritual indwelling of Yeshua gives Israel its vocation, whereby a believing Jew living observantly, along with the believing community, becomes a sacramental sign of the spiritual bond joining the two communities.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 163.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 168.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 169.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 170.

Consolidating his ecumenical thoughts, Kinzer argues that his approach is not syncretistic but Scriptural. Kinzer cites the first apostolic council in Acts 15 and argues that Jews are in covenant with God and that their continued obedience to the law is in no way incongruent with the teachings of Yeshua. He points out that the concern here is the Gentiles' integration into the ecclesia, which subjects the Gentiles the laws of Leviticus 17-18. Thus, Kinzer suggests that it would be of great benefit if Jews and the Catholic Church were to be encouraged to live obediently to their respective covenants as both religious and ethnic people. This is the proposal in mind when Kinzer states that the Church should begin its search for its own mystery in the covenants. As in his previous volume, Kinzer believes that Catholic Jews need more of an evangelical expression of their faith and a more aggressive embrace of their Jewish identity. Yet, in this instance, it would appear as if he faults Messianic Jews for not being more "ecumenical."¹⁶⁷ Ultimately, Jewish Catholics have the benefit of realizing the significance of the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. In closing the second volume concerning the "wider Jewish community," Kinzer believes 1) His work allows Catholics to affirm Judaism "without betraying the cardinal tenants of their own faith" as well as 2) "to see Jesus in the midst of the Jewish people and the Jewish religious life without falling prey to condescension and triumphalism."¹⁶⁸ Continuing, he also thinks 3) that Catholics/Christians should seriously consider Jewish identity both outside and within the ecclesia; 4) that many will see his text as a missionary rather than ecclesiological, though

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 181.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 185.

it is meant in the former; and 5) the believing Hebrew community, whether it be Catholic or otherwise, should be enjoined with the Catholic Church together for Jewish causes.

The Kinzer answer. Though this will be discussed at length in the “discussions and conclusion” section of the thesis, a review in light of the question will be presented here. First, Kinzer believes that there are two communities, one Jewish and one Gentile, both saved through the grace of Christ. Because of the events of the past and the formation of the Jewish state, Kinzer’s perspective is typical of modern Messianic Judaism. Second, everything in the post-apostolic and post-temple era, the era of the Gentile Church, has come through the promises given to Israel. Since we cannot say that God has rescinded his agreement/s with Israel and the Jewish people, we must then assume that the Church cannot take these upon itself. Instead, the new covenant joins Gentiles to Israel and the Jewish people creating the instance of the *Israel-Commonwealth* and by virtue a *bi-lateral-ecclesiology*. These two communities have different functions within the Body of Christ. Both groups have had and continue to have parallel functions. His premise would be that without the Israel-Commonwealth and bilateral-ecclesiology, one group would supersede the other and subsume serving to eradicate the other’s identity. In short, it is like Jim Crow, or like when two chemical solutes must remain separate until needed. What Kinzer proposes, is almost like *separate but equal service*. It is the attitude that places emphasis specifically upon Israel that is suggestive of supersessionism. Such is not as God has intended. Instead, God’s *house* is a place of worship for all nations that are joined in Christ. There is not a separate city in the eschaton, one for Jews and the other for Gentiles, but one city of Jerusalem in which both

participate together in the eternal worship of Adonai. This is the case wherein both the tree itself, and the grafted branches share the same roots in Christ.

The Lustiger Proposal

The most significant difference between Lustiger and Kinzer is the respective complexity of their theologies. As discussed above, Kinzer's theology is not only spiritual but also somewhat political and social. Lustiger, by contrast, was a Jew turned Catholic¹⁶⁹ and Messianic theologian. Lustiger starts from the inception of the Church, Israel. Israel "was to be the 'Mother-Church'" and allowed access to the promises given to Israel through Christ.¹⁷⁰ The Church, as Lustiger defines it, is not by any means a supersessionist institution, but,

She fulfills the mystery of the salvation of all nations because she brings together the two groups according to whom history is divided: those who participate in the Election, Israel, and those who had not, the pagans. For both groups, salvation is given as an unmerited grace. She can exist as a Church only within the mystery of the grace given to Israel. In this mystery, the pagans have to recognize a gift that is freely given to them, through no merit of their own. Reciprocally, by recognizing God's gift to the pagans, Israel has to acknowledge that what it has received is not its due, but a grace of God.¹⁷¹

This paragraph is a very clear non-political and non-preferential emphasis; rather, Lustiger is defining the Church as an organism that began as an incomplete entity that upon the crafting of the covenant of Christ, and the ingrafting of Gentiles, was made

¹⁶⁹ It is not uncommon for a person like Lustiger to be referred to as a Hebrew Catholic.

¹⁷⁰ Cardinal Jean-Marie Lustiger, *The Promise* (Cambridge, UK: Eerdsmans Publishing, 2015), 5.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 6.

complete. Christ is the linking factor between the Jews and the Gentiles, and more implicitly, the Church cannot exist one without the other. However, the erasing of the Jewish identity is something with which he credits the church of Constantinople and, more specifically, later Christians. He stipulates that the Church did not erase itself, but a group of people constituting the Church did so. Lustiger's *The Promise*, as with Kinzer's work, attempts to propose a pathway for reconciliation with the Jewish half of the Church. Therefore, a summary will be presented and explicated to convey his potential supersessionist-free form of Christianity.

The Lustiger description of the problem. First, Lustiger must explain the human condition and the redeeming power of Christ. This serves to establish a level playing field for both Jewish and Gentile parties. Both must have complete obedience to God by virtue of keeping the Torah. These laws were initially given to the Jewish people to show the complete futility of humanity; therefore, God entered into humanity, becoming a partner, keeping the absolute essence of the Torah.¹⁷² It is Christ who enables us to perfectly observe the law through the Spirit, as He Himself did. Christ, through His life, death, and resurrection, “reveals how God acts,”¹⁷³ and thus, the “greatest good of the Church” is “to observe the will of God and that is to obey the commandments.”¹⁷⁴ This is specifically on account of our regeneration¹⁷⁵ through which God grants life and forgiveness that is in distinct contrast from “physical and carnal death and “sin.”¹⁷⁶ This

¹⁷² Ibid., 14-15.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 15.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ This term is not meant to be understood in the typical Calvinistic theological definition; rather, it should be understood that in this case, “regeneration” is a process of spiritual renewal granted by the Holy Spirit, enabling one to live obediently to God's commandments.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 16.

second chapter includes a large extension of Lustiger's ecumenical theology expanding on his theology of the ecclesia.

The ecclesia itself is completely incapable of keeping the ordinances that God has given and is completely dependent upon God for its salvation. In particular, Lustiger cites the ten commandments as being the landmark ordinances. Humanity cannot remain in its current state without Christ. We are unable to keep even the simple decalogue, but these commands, along with the other 613, are fulfilled only in Christ. The Ten Commandments reveal things about how God acts and how God expects us to act. Ultimately, a sin against a neighbor is a sin against God.

The person of Christ. For Gentiles, Christ is the destroyer of worlds, because He “overturns all power [i.e., all human authority] in this world.”¹⁷⁷ The example the Lustiger cites is the account of Herod, a “pagan ruler”¹⁷⁸ appointed by the Romans, in Matthew. Herod's sin, of which the pagan world is guilty, is “the refusal of Israel's Election, and his sin is revealed as a source of death.”¹⁷⁹ Moreover, Herod's sin, the sin of all men, is more heinous in that it is the very denial of God and His powers of creation. We have to come to Christ and “contemplate the grace given to us in having our sins forgiven and in that we too can recognize the King.”¹⁸⁰ Though it is odd how he structures his text, Lustiger pushes his point in the middle of his book: “The Church has cut herself off from her Jewish roots by transforming Christ into the form of her own paganism, into a pagan deity.”¹⁸¹ The Christian portion of the Church became *pretenders*

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 34.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 33.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 37.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 40.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 57.

in their faith, as in Herod's deception. The Christians blamed and persecuted the Jews for the death of Christ, but all of humanity was guilty of deicide. Therefore, the persecution of Israel is the persecution of Christ, and by extension, "[the Christian faith and] the Messiah become unrecognizable."¹⁸² In short, the Gentiles cannot deny their part in the murder of Christ on the cross and that such acknowledgment leads to forgiveness and healing. It is this acknowledgment and identification with the murder of Christ that both Gentile Christians and Messianic Jews are unified in the organism of the Church. In the past and even now, the "Church tries to reject Israel as the enemy, it is, in fact, her Christ that she is refusing . . . The Church can receive Christ only if she recognizes Israel because Christ is the Messiah of Israel."¹⁸³ It is when the Church comes to such a realization "that she must bear witness to Christ before both Jews and Gentiles" through whom she must also share in His "condition."¹⁸⁴ True Christianity is the witness of discipleship with the Jews in Christ, our Lord.

The grace of having a new heart is the condition in which Christians must exist. Pagans and Jews alike must have hearts that release all control of their own will.¹⁸⁵ The vocation of Christians is to be filially received as brothers and sisters into their adoption of Israel and receive its blessings. It is this control of their own destiny (i.e., the Gentiles) that leads to the paganization of Christianity. The state, an image of the power of man, became an idol, a substitute for God.¹⁸⁶ Thus in a Christian state, Christ becomes "an

¹⁸² Ibid., 101.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 57.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 97.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 110-111.

idol” crafted into a god of human perception,¹⁸⁷ and therefore, by saving the Gentiles, God fulfills His promise to save the world from false gods/idols.

However, Scripture does not just concern Gentiles as being degenerates; they also share with Israel in their blessings. As Gentiles, we share in Israel’s blessings not as physical “descendants of Abraham” but as spiritual descendants through the act of Christ.¹⁸⁸ Here Lustiger disagrees with Kinzer. By accepting Christ, Gentiles are grafted and incorporated into Israel, thereby making them spiritual children. Through Christ, Gentiles are given the creative history, the law, the prayers, feasts, the Kingdom of God, and the redemptive representative work of which all was promised and given to Israel fulfilled in Christ.

The parable of the two servants, as told by Christ, concerns both Jews and Gentiles. The first two servants are charged with managing the “deposits” as investments, but the third servant follows the rabbinical law of deposits and returns the deposit to the depositor. The believers, Jew and Gentile, alike are the servants who properly invested the deposits and acquired profits while the non-believer is the one who followed the law and made no gains.¹⁸⁹ The parable of the nations also concerns believers of both Jewish and Gentile descent, to whom are counted the same blessing. The nations, or rather the believing *goyim*, are blessed sheep as are the Children of Israel who have already been judged. The Gentiles are counted as being blessed and as sharing the same blessing as the Jews. The Jews, though having been already promised the blessing, broke the covenant.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 96-97.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 105-106.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 44.

Like the Gentiles, the Jews are humans and suffer the trauma of sin. The sin most predominately described as being the homicide of creation and life. It is the very refusal of God's divine power and intention. Therefore, Lustiger agrees with Kinzer in that the baptism of Christ was very important. The Jews were incapable of keeping the law because their hearts were hardened, just as the Gentiles "broke the covenant."¹⁹⁰ So, as with the pagans, John the Baptist was baptizing Jews as if they needed to be converted to Judaism. This demonstrated that the Jews were like the *God-fearers* having no special legal privilege before God.¹⁹¹ It is this submission to the law and God in which Christ is in solidarity with and fulfilling the vocation of the Jews.¹⁹² It is in the complete fulfillment of the law that Christ fulfills Israel's requirements and through whom is revealed to be love and grace.

The Lustiger answer. The fulfillment of pagan salvation is a "Double sign, mutually given by each other to the other: The pagans must recognize in Jesus the grace given to Israel because they share in that grace, and Israel must welcome the hope manifested by the wonders that God accomplishes among the pagans."¹⁹³ Therefore, there cannot be one without the other.

Lustiger, as mentioned at the beginning of this section, starts his theology with a non-supersessionist interpretation of the Church. The Church is conceived with the birth of Abraham's children and is fulfilled through Christ and the salvation of the Gentile Christians. The law is the precedent by which all must live to receive life, a gift given by

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 61.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 61; 64.

¹⁹² Ibid., 62.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 101.

God. Yet, no Jew can keep the entirety of the law, failing in their mission; thus, God sends another gift, the Messiah, who can keep the whole of the Torah. The sin/homicidal/suicidal tendencies of humanity rose up to destroy the divine law keeper, a condition, and desire within all human beings. Death neither at the beginning nor the end of the Messiah's life could prevail against Him. Christ made a new covenant that permitted the Gentiles to share in the blessings of Israel, and the law was imprinted upon their hearts. Nevertheless, the Gentile admission into the Jewish community led to an eventual Gentile denial of the Jewishness of its Messiah. It is this denial that is supersessionism and, more specifically, the cause of the charge that the Jews are *Christ-killers*.¹⁹⁴

The paradigm that solves this involves a sort of unification. If supersessionism is the distortion of our identity as Christians, then we need to see ourselves through the lens of Christ. When we see ourselves as having killed Christ, Christians are just as guilty for the death of Christ and are not only responsible but have access to the grace and reconciliation of Christ. Just as the Jews, the Gentiles have access to everything which the people of Israel possess. If this is the case, Lustiger sees no need for a complex social and political construction like Kinzer. Nevertheless, both see an ecumenical unification as being the cure for supersessionism. The present author agrees and, in the succeeding section, proposes a practical theological analogy.

The Analogies of Marriage and Citizenship

¹⁹⁴ It appears that this term has been used in a manner by Gentiles to justify persecution of the Jews based on the accusation that Jews were solely responsible for the death of Christ. However, Lustiger makes his use of this term, as well as mine, non-biased. *Christ-killers*, in the theology of Lustiger, refer to the whole of Humanity that is constituted by both Jew and Gentile. The non-biased but poignant use of the term conveys Lustiger's archetypal, ecumenical, and ecclesial worldview.

The alternative modifications to Kinzer's and Lustiger would be to parallel the relationship of the joined ecclesia as being united in marriage or modify's Kinzer's interpretation of commonwealth and citizenship.

Marriage. The challenge of using marriage in this section is the integration of metaphors and their potential use. Paul was probably the most notable apostle at integrating his Jewish thoughts into a Christianized form for Gentile and Jewish communities to understand. The exercise of this section is an attempt to add information to the academic community for the purpose of increasing the repertoire. Therefore, this section should be viewed as being novel and minimally speculative. Also, there are some assumptions that will be made as well as the framing of the mindset of Paul for the purpose of extrapolation for the use of the proposed analogies.

First, the thought that marriage should be a metaphor or an analogy is logical, especially for Paul's audience. Paul does speak of and references the Church in relation to marriage. However, this reference is to how a man is to treat his wife.¹⁹⁵ Paul uses the analogy of a tree for how Jewish and Gentile believers are to live together in one community, which in many ways is analogous to marriage. Now, while this paper will not actively speculate as to the *state of mind* of why Paul did not use this analogy, it will attempt to construct a Pauline-inspired argument concerning both marriage and citizenship. What could be proposed here is that he simply did not believe that we, as Gentiles, at that time, could comprehend such an analogy. Therefore, what proceeds has been briefly and hypothetically extrapolated.

¹⁹⁵ It is acknowledged that this is extremely important, but at this time, the implications as related to this paper are restricted by time and length of this thesis.

While anthropology shows that marriage customs change, it may be assumed that geographically interconnected regions may share similar customs. Thus, it may be inferred that most of the ancient near eastern marriage customs were shared amongst the Semitic people, including the Hebrews.¹⁹⁶ The marriage customs of the Israelites may have emerged from the ancient Mesopotamian cultures¹⁹⁷ but were later shaped by Adonai for the purpose of reflecting His covenantal relationship with Israel. This is a comparison Paul probably would have reached if he were to have explicitly described a Jewish and Gentile as operating in a long-term covenantal community. The Gentiles, being only concerned with the *laws of nature*¹⁹⁸, Noah, and the Spirit, would perhaps have understood Paul's integrated thoughts, but a new Christian would most likely not have grasped a complex understanding of Paul's thoughts. Therefore, in hindsight, we must begin with the concept of the covenant of marriage and its perception in Israel. On its face value, marriage in ancient Israel was for the purpose of creating social, political, and economic bonds. In some cases, adoption and marriage served to free slaves; however, there is not a clear biblical nor rabbinic example of this occurring, except in the case of Abraham and Sarah.¹⁹⁹ Marriage on its face value is pragmatic, yet many spiritual and ecclesial concepts may be drawn from it.

¹⁹⁶ While this seems to be a broad contextual statement, there is sufficient evidence of shared marriage customs within the Middle East. These customs would have potentially become synchronized amongst shared empirical conquests, see Matthews "Marriage and Family in the Ancient Near East" and Block "Marriage in Ancient Israel" in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*.

¹⁹⁷ It is in the shared similarities between the customs of the dowry and the establishment of a marriage contract there is the prospect to suggest the shared origin of these customs, see Matthews "Marriage and Family in the Ancient Near East" in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*, 6-14.

¹⁹⁸ Paul references natural law in Rom 2:14 (NRSV).

¹⁹⁹ Abraham believes that he is not going to sire children due to his age and stipulates his slave Elizaer will inherit, to which god corrects him, see Gen 15:2-4 (NRSV). However, the implication in Scripture gives testimony to this process of adoption occurring elsewhere in the ancient Middle East. The second account of adoption is the process whereby a slave woman would be impregnated. The slave would bear that child who would, in turn, be legitimized by the couple seeking an heir/s. People could also be

The covenant of marriage is a unifying act joining two separate individuals together not only in a social, political, and economic union but as “one flesh.”²⁰⁰ In the prophets, it seems as if Adonai speaks as if Israel were unfaithful in both morality and belief; thus, it is as if God divorces Israel. In the New Testament, Christ at the Last Supper mentions that He “[goes] to prepare a place for us,”²⁰¹ something that only a betrothed husband would do for his wife.²⁰² Furthermore, theological precepts exist that equate Christ’s death as a ransom paid for a captive; however, it could also be viewed in the same theological vein as a dowry paid to a bride’s family. We are also told that “what God has joined together, let no one divide [separate].”²⁰³ Proposed here is the soteriological notion that if a concubine were to bear a child, the man could marry her and redeem the woman from slavery; thus, changing her status as a result from slave to freed-woman. Christ, during the account of the Last Supper, drew upon ancient and then modern concepts of betrothal. As with Joseph and Mary, the husband builds a home for his betrothed wife, so Christ builds a place for the ecclesia. Christ did this for all humanity, changing our status as Jews and Gentiles in bondage to death and sin to freed people.

adopted to partner in a third-party exchange of property. In the case of adult adoption, a fatherless male could be adopted by a childless couple of whom favored the young man, so long as the young man stayed in good favor the couple he would inherit everything of the elderly couple, see Matthews, “Marriage and Family in the Ancient Near East” in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*, 18-21.

²⁰⁰ Genesis 2:24 (NRSV).

²⁰¹ John 14:2-3 (NRSV).

²⁰² This is remarkably similar to the customs of the ancient Mesopotamian peoples, as described by Matthews, in which the fiancé would prepare herself for her husband and prepare the home to receive him for consummation. However, Block explains in ancient Hebrew culture, instead of the woman preparing herself and home, it was the husband who would prepare the home for his betrothed, see Block, “Marriage in Ancient Israel” in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*, 44-45.

²⁰³ Matt 19:6; Mark 10:9 (NRSV).

The ecclesia is like a union of marriage between a man and a woman. One-half of humanity was separated from the other and had to be married to be redeemed. We, as one flesh coming from the Earth, are able to worship and minister as one. Paul thought that Jews and Gentiles were to be and function as one community, but how? Should we consider the first-century community, we see that there was no prohibition against Jews and Gentiles inter-marrying²⁰⁴; thus, we shall start contriving a hypothetical situation: For simplicity sake, we shall assume the groom to be a Jew of upstanding character and a Nazarene²⁰⁵ and his bride a Gentile believer. They do not become a geo-political duo forming a commonwealth. Instead, they have been consummated as one flesh. Because the bride believes in Yeshua, the blessings associated with the Jewish groom are hers within which to also enjoy and participate through their mutual relationship. The bride, perhaps being unfamiliar with the customs, would have had to have learned from another how to reverently fulfill her role. One represents the other in their duties amongst the gates and housekeeping. If one passed, the other would be required to take on the responsibility of the other until the opportunity of remarriage presented itself. In the Christological and Pauline perspectives, divorce is inconceivable as the two are covenantally, physically, and spiritually one household focused on the work of Christ spreading the Gospel. How does this equate into an ecclesiastical context?

²⁰⁴ There is need to pause here and clarify that this scenario does not consider Pauline privilege, nor does it consider Gentiles to be Christian. Instead, this scenario considers both the Jews and Gentiles involved to be of a Yeshua/Christ-following community that may be heterogeneous rather than homogeneous. Therefore, it only assumes that a Yeshua/Christ believer is marrying one another.

²⁰⁵ Nazarenes in Judaism and Jewish culture are considered apostates who have become believers in Yeshua.

The Jewish and Gentile believers as one fleshly representative on Earth. The Gentile bride is joined to her Jewish groom creating a unified Church as Lustiger envisions. This unified Church of Jews and Gentiles is supposed to testify to the world that Christ is a unifying salvific person. This message is supposed to be represented to both Jewish and Gentile communities, but this need not be done by each one specifically for their own ethnic groups. Each group, as the marriage example proposes, is supposed to represent the other in the absence of one. Within the context of the marriage example, the Church does not observe the customs of her husband but has Christianized her previous customs. Instead, though not possibly outright celebrating the high holy days, the Church should have observed these days in unison with her Jewish groom. After almost 1600 years, this attitude of punitive supersessionism seems to have been ameliorated, yet there seems to be a sort of divorce at large within Christianity to identify itself as a sect of Gentile Judaism. If the marriage context serves its purpose, then as one flesh, the Church should identify itself not only as Christian but Jewish through its relationship to its originating roots and mixed community. While there may be questions regarding what Jewish identity this Christianity would take on and vice versa, we should stop and realize that perhaps this is what Paul has meant when he said, "...everything has become new."²⁰⁶ Christ creates a new person, a new identity, a new ecclesia by taking the old Gentile and old Jew and marrying them together, thereby creating a new entity of one flesh.

²⁰⁶ 2 Cor 5:17b (NRSV). While it is not debated that individually we are made new, what could be asked is, are we not made new together? If we remain separate, are we still not the old? We function as Jew or Gentile, but in Christ, we are together something else entirely transcendent of our own individual ontological understanding.

The Church as the bride of Messianic Judaism. If the Church is both the bride of Judaism (i.e., Messianic Judaism) and Christ, then it would not be analogically impossible to supersede her groom as it would be for the groom to supersede his bride. As Lustiger proposes, both the Church and Messianic Judaism must be focused upon the life and resurrection of Christ for their marriage to be one, else Christianity will continue to be spiritually divorced from its Jewish husband. The blessings of the Church are her blessings only because of its relationship to Christ, as are the Jews'. Now that both Jews and Gentiles are one ecclesia in Christ, both are only truly blessed in their ecclesiastical marriage. Rather than the Christians inheriting the land of Israel through some complex geo-political behemoth, the land is the Church's because it belongs collectively to both partners of the marriage.²⁰⁷ This avoids supersessionism and integrates both communities as one collective community that accepts responsibility for the persecution and crucifixion of Christ, resulting in the repentance to which Lustiger refers. The practical significance of this perspective, as will be discussed below in the concluding chapter, is that it meshes with Cardinal Lustiger's paradigm and offers a non-political alternative to Kinzer's paradigm.

Citizenship. We as theologians have formed a schema derived from tradition, being separated in time from Apostles, so that our fundamental understanding of what was meant by Paul may not have been what Paul had meant nor what he was thinking. Therefore, this section undertakes the opportunity to understand the historical concept of both Roman and Jewish institutions of citizenship. After a brief explanation concerning

²⁰⁷ Of course, this begs the question of what we mean by "the land," including what its borders would be.

both institutions, the historical framework of citizenship will be used to extrapolate an understanding of ecclesiastical citizenship.

The stratified system of Roman citizenship in the era of Paul. Before Paul, and still, during his lifetime, provincial citizenship was the focus of freedman/men citizenship.²⁰⁸ Slaves, in addition to their freedom, could be granted citizenship by the process of manumission. Often times, a previous slave became a part of their previous owner's household. Though people freed from slavery were free and granted certain rights, they were socially treated as something less than full citizens.²⁰⁹

People living in their own provinces functioned and operated under the laws established by provincial governors and councils. This is the level of citizenship that most Jews would have held. The oddity that people living in these provinces would face is their geography. Living under the concept of a free state, those living in Israel would have been subject to *dual citizenship* only at the emperor's graces; therefore, only certain influential subjects may have been eligible for full Roman citizenship. Domicile during the era of the Republic defined citizenship. If a man lived in an area outside of Roman provincial rule, he simply was considered a barbarian. However, the mindset of domicile residency changed with the concept of *enfranchisement* whereby a man could leave his

²⁰⁸ Sherwin White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1980), 182, 187, 267, 272. The definition of a free Roman state is one in which there is no garrison nor taxation while provincial states were required to pay taxes. Those of the allied/free states were integrated into the provincial rule. This process would become linked to *municipalization*. As time would pass by, citizenship became more integrated into civil life and was thus defined by civil service.

²⁰⁹ Henrik Mouritsen, "Manumission," in *The Oxford Handbook to Roman Law and Society*, eds. Paul J. du Plessis, Clifford Ando, Kaius Tuori, (Oxford UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), 402-415. In the earlier times of the republic, slaves were freed similarly in legal terms as provincial citizens with such rights granted accordingly. In times of empire, when a slave was freed, he was given full citizenship being enfranchised, but only being eligible after the age of 30 and of good character. Freed slaves were often considered to be second-class citizens having their rights restricted (e.g., ineligible to run for public office). Thus, there was a reason for a freed slave to re-enter the *patres familias*, under which he would have a relationship similar to a child of the *head of household*.

state and move to another becoming an *extern* in the foreign country upon returning back to Roman territory resumed his citizenship.²¹⁰ Paul would have had the benefit of inheriting citizenship while also maintaining his provincial identity of a Jew.²¹¹ The enjoyment of local culture and responsibilities is not the only benefit of Roman citizenship. The higher the level of social stratification and citizenship, the more civil rights were endowed to those of that particular level of citizenship.²¹² The highest level of citizenship was that of the *senatorial* class, and there is reason to believe that Paul was a full citizen of Rome. Nevertheless, during the time that Paul was living, dual/provincial citizenship was an accepted practice.²¹³ Thus, we must consider that Paul, who references himself not only as a Roman but also as a Jew, thought of his citizenship in duality.

The concept of transferrable citizenship in the Middle East. This concept was totally foreign and completely unknown to people in the ancient Near East. One was a part of their tribe and nation according to their god.²¹⁴ However, even the notion of changing the god that you worshiped was not enough to wholly change your citizenship; one was always tainted by the worship of their previous god. The previous statement also

²¹⁰ White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 292-293.

²¹¹ Ibid., 297-305. While there was debate among the ancient orators, what is clear is that there were cases in the time of Augustan whereby people would have been able to participate in both local and specific Roman responsibilities. However, during times of the republic, dual citizenship would have been instituted only on a case-by-case basis.

²¹² Tristan Taylor, "Social Status, Legal Status, and Legal Privilege," in *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Law and Society*, eds. Paul J. du Plessis, Clifford Ando, Kaius Tuori (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), 349-360. These social groups experienced legal stratification that could influence the outcome of legal verdicts of both civil and criminal proceedings. While the elite citizens could afford their own legal services, any citizen of Roman, be them provincial or full citizens, could bring litigation. Those of lesser social status and citizenship may have needed a legal patron.

²¹³ White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 318-322. The provincial citizenship later became *ius italicum*, whereby those living in certain municipalities were able to exercise more legal rights than those in under *ius italicum*.

²¹⁴ Reuven Firestone, *Who are the Real Chosen People: The Meaning of Closeness in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths Publishing, 2008), 12. Firestone points out that the nation was formed by tribal units of "nuclear" families.

works in reverse, as it was impossible to change one's citizenship as it was impossible for one to change one's god.²¹⁵ A person and nation were chosen by their gods and goddesses.²¹⁶ In the Middle East, it is not the changing one's citizenship was unfeasible, rather it was the case that citizenship was mutable under inordinate circumstances.²¹⁷ It was not until the time of Alexander and the Jews' exposure to Greek concepts of citizenship that this perspective began to change.²¹⁸ This concept of change in citizenship was due to assimilation through conquests by other nations.²¹⁹ The Greeks and Romans unsuccessfully conquered the Jews as their religion and faith never wavered. Their terms of citizenship were defined by the ancestry of Abraham and circumcision. Knowing these things concerning citizenship and how Jewish citizenship was defined, could it be proposed that Ephesians 2 contains the ecclesiastical thoughts of Paul as analogically represented by dual citizenship?

Paul writes the letter of Ephesians so that the residents may, in this instance, concerned, have unity.²²⁰ Paul in Ephesians 2:11-22 was concerned with the notion of unity and was apparently searching for a way to convey that the heavenly life with Adonai was formed of one ecclesia.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 20, 25-29.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 12.

²¹⁷ Though this thesis does not consider all the facets of ancient transferrable citizenship as a major focus, some of the exceptions to the rule generally include: marriage, circumcision, wartime, ancestry.

²¹⁸ Ibid., 29.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 28-29.

²²⁰ D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to The New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005), 488-491. There is debate on whether the letter of Ephesians is specifically directed to counter a heresy or given to instruct novel believers in their new faith. There is also debate on whether the letter was destined for the Ephesians or if it was a circular letter.

So then, remember that at one time you Gentiles by birth, called “the uncircumcision”—a physical circumcision made in the flesh by human hands—remember that you were at that time without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new humanity in place of two, thus making peace, and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it. So he came and proclaimed peace to you who were far off and peace to those who were near; for through him both of us have access in one Spirit to the Father. So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are citizens with the saints and also members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the cornerstone. In him the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built together spiritually into a dwelling place for God.

Paul states that we as Gentiles were once foreigners and strangers, but that Christ has brought us together in a union with the Jews. This division is demonstrated by the analogy of the *soreg*, the partition that separated the Court of the Gentiles from the inner courts of the Temple. The Gentiles could not pass beyond the *soreg* into the Temple. Christ has effectively removed this barrier in both the physical and the spiritual realms.

Paul does not stop at such an analogy; he states that Gentiles were excluded or estranged from the People of God are now no longer strangers or foreigners but are citizens and members of the *household of God*.

Paul is effectively joining two communities together as one. Paul skillfully articulates that the citizenship that Jews possessed through their covenants, granting them access to the House of God, could be endowed to Gentiles. More specifically, to be considered a member of the household of Adonai, manumission is the implied analogical use where Gentiles are granted both freedom and citizenship, all the while becoming members of the household of God. For Gentile God-fearers, this would have been understood in the physical analogical sense of having not only the full citizenship of a Roman but all the legal rights. The Jew, on the other hand, would have to understand that circumcision and physical descent from Abraham was no longer a restriction on Jewish citizenship. Instead, Christ made something new, a people of which both Jews and Gentiles are believers in Christ, both citizens of the household of God, all having been granted citizenship. Jew and Gentile could no longer be divided, humanity itself was universally saved from damnation. This new body of citizens was the fulfilled ecclesia of the Church.

It is essential to understand that this paper would not seek to develop a New Man theology of assimilation. Thomas Lancaster, in his commentary on Galatians, deals with such a problem. On account of dealing with assimilation, Lancaster suggests that oneness and sameness are not equivalents in their meaning.²²¹ The fault of Gentile

²²¹ Thomas Lancaster, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Marshfield, MI: First Fruits of Zion, 2014), 194.

supersessionism has been to historically account oneness and sameness as a single, unilaterally-equivalent meaning.²²² Markus Barth agrees that the “new man” in v.15 is created in a manner by which two dead groups of people are resurrected and reconciled.²²³ This new man is, in reality, the bride of Christ, the Church. The Church, “Consists of distinct members, not an amalgamation...” this new man was not before but only after the death of Christ.²²⁴ Therefore, the creation of the new bride parallels the creation of the universe; Christ takes something of Himself and crafts the new man out of two old groups.²²⁵ Ultimately, Barth believes that the new man is one constituted of many different people being both distinct and tolerant. While most Messianic theology would disparage the idea of the assimilation of Jews into the Church, Barth maintains that the new man need not assimilate or subsume both Jew and Gentile. Lustiger states that this is what makes what Christ did so miraculous and mysterious, almost as mysterious as the person of Jesus Christ. This is the most compatible paradigmatic aspect of Lustiger’s theology.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Markus Barth, *The Anchor Bible: Ephesians* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc., 1985), 309.

²²⁴ Ibid., 310.

²²⁵ Ibid., 311.

CHAPTER III

Discussion and Conclusion

Ending this thesis is difficult on account that there is substantial information that could augment the perspectives of the author, Kinzer, and other modern scholars. This thesis is limited by the political environment, disease, time, perspective, scope, and technical allowances. It is the author's hope to address what is lacking in this paper at a better time and in a better environment. Further consideration would be to include a more substantial historical description of ancient Messianic Judaism within the developmental context of Christianity, Judaism, and Paganism. Also, further ecclesiology will be needed to address classical and rabbinical Jewish responses to Messianic Judaism. Nevertheless, this section will attempt to summarize and then discuss further considerations for future expansion.

First, Messianic Judaism is by its self-definition, not Gentile Christianity, nor would it be logical to call anyone identifying as Jewish-Christian. Since Messianic Judaism is not Gentile Christianity, it could be a form of Judaism, though that remains to be seen. What we are able to assent to for the purposes of this paper, and for the sake of making an argument, is that Messianic Judaism is a sort of hybrid. Second, it is not clear that Kinzer has answered the question of whether or not a supersessionist form of Christianity can exist. If Judaism and Christianity are two sides of the same coin, then a bi-lateral ecclesia is the coin upon which the two faces are imprinted. Collective participation in this bi-lateral ecclesia would convince Kinzer that, yes, a form of belief in Christ could be free of supersessionism. However, Kinzer's answer is only operationally valid within terms of bilateral ecclesiology; else, this answer becomes subject depending

upon the party making the inquiry. Nevertheless, what is disturbing about the proposal that Kinzer makes is that it introduces an opportunity for Messianic supersessionism to obfuscate its relationship with Christianity.

Messianic Judaism can supersede Christianity via its own religiously centric perspective on the selectivity of God's grace. By specifying Christ's solidarity with Israel, this places emphasis on a very Israel-centrist soteriology and eschatology, which could lead Messianic Judaism to have a basis to supersede Christianity. Though Kinzer tries to argue against this kind of attitude, it could easily become problematic. Kinzer paints an idyllic, potential, alternative reality which the Church could have been attached to Israel and have had a very Jewish theology. To Kinzer's credit, he deals with the issue of supersessionism and with ecclesiology; however, as discussed above, his ecclesiastical solution suffers from potential *reverse-supersessionism*. Nevertheless, what Kinzer has depicted is true. These Jewish believers in Christ and the Gentile Church will not be anything but bilateral unless an alternative can be posed.

An Alternative: Centralizing What Kinzer Bifurcates

Kinzer would counter that his Israel-Commonwealth is a centralized solution where both groups participate in their separate but common purpose. The problem is that these two groups are almost in a federation of sorts agreeing to recognize the sovereignty of each other and not tread upon each other's territory, like a demilitarized zone. In his second appendices, Kinzer attempts to convince Messianic Jews that the Nicene Creed, though contravening to Jewish identity, is theologically respecting of Christ. We must remember within the actual text of *Searching Her Own Mystery* that Kinzer has previously walked us through how an observant Messianic Jewish life is parallel to an

observant Catholic life. Therefore, while Kinzer poses a somewhat inordinate paradigm, what he does is minimize the later statement that Paul makes concerning our status within the commonwealth.

Paul makes the argument that we are citizens of God's household²²⁶. As previously stated in the previous chapter, this argument and proposal may be implemented as a modification to Kinzer's theology to encompass both parties as one ecclesia. If we extend Jewish privilege to the claim that God considers Jews natural children, then Christians are akin to freedmen/women incorporating themselves into the *patus manus*. However, this is not where Paul stops. The direct implication is that Gentiles are citizens in the holy place, heaven; furthermore, we are citizens of God's household. In essence, we are something adopted and made like the Jew becoming citizens, and citizens in the Roman imperial era possessed certain legal rights that freedmen/women did not.²²⁷ Thus, the conclusion that we are brought to is that this citizenship is transcendent, emancipating, and equalizing among the Jew and the Gentile. Is this what Paul also means in Romans? Since this may be the case, we are drawn to say that there is no difference between the Jew and Gentile, yet this is not precisely the case. It is clear from many authors such as Frutchenbaum, Kinzer, and even Lustiger that Israel is still special and continues to play a role in the eschaton. However, this transcendent citizenship links both Jews and Gentile believers of Jesus in one ecclesia. This is corrective in nature, preventing either community from seeing itself as better than the

²²⁶ Ephesians 2:19.

²²⁷ This statement should be understood in the light of Galatians 3:28. Paul is attempting to unify and equivate what had not been equivated, the relationship between God and humanity.

other and would prevent supersessionism. As citizens of the same household, how could they supersede the other?

The concession is that they indeed could do so. However, if we bear in mind that we are citizens of one community, then we should be able to contrive a new unified identity. Yet how do we contrive a unified language and terminology after nearly a millennia and a half existing without Messianic Jews? This requires an ecclesiastical theology that does not yet exist. Kinzer's theology, in modern analogical terms, is useful for a more confederate type of relationship, but we would need federal language, and this civil approach would require an overall shift in perspective. Could there be an opportunity for Christians and Messianic Jews to jointly observe holy days? We should identify ourselves as a joint community by acknowledging our shared blessings, not through Israel itself but through Christ. As Lustiger, below, argues, we will only understand our citizenship and relationship one to another by seeing Christ. While Kinzer's apology in his appendices argues that Christians respect Christ and the triune relationship in the Nicene articulation, he does not argue that Messianic Jews should recite the creed, nor that Christians should adopt Messianic Jewish liturgy. However, this would, in itself, seem to be why Kinzer maintains bi-lateral ecclesiology. Nevertheless, if we are to unify the ecclesiae, we must establish a shared link across traditions and customs to create a federal civil, spiritual identity. This is how we would be able to make Kinzer's proposal work via this paper's proposed modification. This proposal requires more sociological and theological study, and for further study, this would have to be implemented.

Lustiger in comparison to Kinzer

In Kinzer's paradigm, the Jews and Gentiles are in a sort of linear relationship whereby the Gentiles receive everything from Christ through the Jews. Lustiger's paradigm connects both the Jewish and Gentile communities to Christ in a triune triangle, with Christ at the top and the Jews and Christians from the base corners. Lustiger believed that the Church was initially formed by the initial relationship and covenants that the Jews had with God, but that it was not complete in its existence till the Gentiles were united to it through Christ. Lustiger's concept of ecclesia is wholly based on the notion of Christ's mercy and grace given first to the Jews then to the Gentiles. This grace facilitates forgiveness so long as members of both parties face Christ's death and accept His graceful forgiveness and for their guilt in His crucifixion. Unlike Kinzer, Lustiger believed that both are saved equally by the grace of Christ. Nothing equivalent to an Israel-Commonwealth is needed to facilitate salvation nor form the ecclesia/ae. Where Kinzer sees two separate, distinct groups of believers, Lustiger would see them as one community united in their belief in the salvation and grace of Christ. The Christians, as Lustiger believes, "paganized" Christ into the shape of their own image of who Christ is. This process ultimately resulted in the dissociation of the Jewish identity of Christ from the Jews, thereby causing a schism between the Jewish Church and the Gentile Church.

The eventual results of that separation served to separate the Jews and Gentiles from each other, and it left the Church devoid of its *significant Jewish other*. Centuries later, the Gentile Church would begin to twist the image of Christ into their own image, denying any part in the crucifixion of Christ. This, in turn, led to their placing of blame upon the Jewish people leading to anti-Semitism infiltrating doctrine and theology. The Jews, as described by Lustiger, have denied their own blessing and potential messiah.

Lustiger argues that both Gentiles and Jews embraced their secular human condition in killing Christ.

The process that Lustiger proposes concerning the healing and unification of the Church is initialized in the realization of both parties having a role in the murder of Christ. When Messianic Jews and Gentiles realize that they killed their God, both are consummated and joined together through the forgiveness of Yeshua granted to them. Both parties are made one, and as one, minister to all the world. All the blessings of Israel, as argued by Lustiger, are claimed by the Gentiles as both are made one through Christ. Lustiger's argument is that Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ are made one ecclesia compromising the catholic Church because of Christ. Furthermore, it is not only the Church that comes out of Christ, but it is the law, the nation of Israel, and then the blessings. As such, the House of Adonai becomes a place of worship for all nations, and Christ becomes the universal savior. This soteriology categorizes Jews and Gentiles as two groups of people that when joining the Church (i.e., either the Messianic or Gentile community) categorically become one – the Church.

Lustiger sees the unified ecclesia as fulfilling the eschaton, whereas Kinzer sees two segregated groups under one *Israel-Commonwealth* in the eschaton. One group is the rightful heir for which Yeshua came to redeem and save; the other ultimately receives everything through Israel's existence. Lustiger's model is in contrast to Kinzer's. Instead, both receive everything through Christ. Lustiger's model offsets any sociological and religious *cultural relativism*,²²⁸ thus, preventing supersessionism by predicting

²²⁸ Christopher Doob, *Sociology: An Introduction* (Toronto, ON: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2000), 87.

everything on Christ. While both agree that everything was given to Israel first, Kinzer and Lustiger differ on their focal points. Kinzer is linear in how he deals with the relation of Yeshua, Israel, Jews, and the Gentiles, whereas Lustiger is more Christologically synergistic than his contemporary. Bi-ecclesia is more segregational, whereby the synergistic effect is diminished through an over-emphasized secular existence of Israel. Lustiger is more ontological than Kinzer in his focus upon the centrality of Christ in the formation and heart of a Jew/Gentile Church. Kinzer seems to have separated the ontological relation of Yeshua to the whole ecclesia and the ecclesia's relation one to another. He states that Ephesians 2:15 "advocates for bi-ecclesial" theology, but could it be that being a "citizen of heaven" transcends Jew or Gentile?

For the Church, the body, or even the Temple to be correctly perceived, it seems that Paul thought that salvation had to be defined as something analogically and ontologically transcendent. Citizenship in the context of Paul's understanding was a privilege.

Blending his understanding of Jewish and Roman citizenship, Paul argues that the Jews legally inherited their soteriological citizenship but that the Gentiles lacked any such citizenship. Therefore, in order to bring the entire house together, Christ transcends secular Israel, allowing Gentiles to be granted citizenship in the household of Adonai. This household transcends our infinitesimal understanding of being a Jew or Gentile, it does not, however, negate it. Could it be that instead of being Jews or Gentiles, both are "seeds of Abraham?"²²⁹ Are the seeds of Abraham the new man? Else, both could be all considered Jews, yet this has been categorically refuted just as we may discern that not all are to become Gentiles. Lustiger refers to this joined community as being mysterious.

²²⁹ Frutchenbaum, *Isrealology*, 72.

Nevertheless, again, in this case, citizenship is a helpful analogy. However, the analogy of marriage has not been discussed in either of the previous models.

The Analogy of Marriage as an Ecclesial Model

As argued above, there seems to be a natural niche in both Kinzer's and Lustiger's work that allows for their models to be augmented with analogical citizenship. An alternative analogy is that of a marriage. This was explained in the last section of chapter two; thus, its premise will not be discussed here. Rather, here I would like to raise a probable issue with that analogy. Though certainly, marriage is a union, from a biblical perspective, within that union, the husband is the head of the household. This relationship in human terms is analogically complicated. If we were to assume that Messianic Judaism was the analogical husband, then how do we rectify this with 1600 years of Gentile Christianity? Do we let Messianic Judaism lead the way in Jewish evangelism and Jewish relations? Do we let them become a predominant participant? That would only be supersessionism of the established order of what exists. While marriage is beautiful, it presupposes a form of supersessionism where a woman of her own volition gives up her sovereign volition to her husband in matrimony. If the relationship among Messianic Jews and Christians is analogous to a divine marriage; however, then that considers both Jewish and Gentile believers of Christ to be the bride, and Christ the bridegroom, or husband. If a theologian and a community wish to continue to answer this question and determine which analogical perspective functions better, they do so at their own risk.

As an aspiring theologian, I cannot in good consciousness, recommend a model that would potentially invert a religious institution that has existed for over a thousand years. I cannot suggest it based on the unknown factor of protestant Messianic Judaism.

This use of the personal pronoun is absolutely intentional in this closing section of this thesis. As I, an American, look at evangelical fundamentalism, my heart quickens with fear. People in their fundamental beliefs walk out without fear of imposing their own reality upon the one that exists, endangering the civil liberties and lives of everyone around them. Disease is amongst us, and our civil rights are eroding, and there is much vitriol against people of different races, genders, sexes, and nationalities. Like many religions, Christianity has been used to suppress the rights of women, people of color, Jews, and the LGBTQ community. This pattern of behavior must stop. Therefore, I must caution that Christian fundamentalism and supersessionism may quickly develop into a zero-sum game. Thus, this researcher cannot suggest any methodology that could either advertently or inadvertently cause more disunity within the ecclesiae. In light of the recent events in political and religious history, we should strive for unity in our heavenly citizenship. It is in one voice that we are unified in solidarity against hate, fear, supersessionism, racism, antisemitism, and all other 'isms that face us.

To view ourselves as citizens, we have solidarity, but with bi-lateral ecclesiology, we still have division. To be a Messianic Jew or a Christian is to not just be an image-bearer of Adonai, it is to be a reflection of Christ – the perfect image of Humanity. This solidarity as one ecclesia need not be discriminatory nor blasphemously syncretistic. As citizens, Christians can celebrate Passover with Messianic Jews, and Messianic Jews can celebrate Easter with Messianic Gentiles, Christians. Solidarity frees us not only from the law but to be free within the law. Lustiger states that this is the mystery Christ performs on the cross. Christ fulfills the works for the Gentiles and awards Gentiles citizenship. The trouble is that we have trouble making sense of this beautiful miracle. The counter

questions to ask comparatively is, don't we already have solidarity with both Jews and specifically with Messianic Jews? That could be easily answered by falling back on Kinzer, Lustiger, Fruchtenabum, and others in the field are working to improve relations between Christians and Messianic Jews. However, a more precise answer is that rabbinical Judaism does not share its solidarity with Christianity in its basic theology. Messianic Judaism is the only group comparatively outside of Gentile Christianity that we share a common set of Scriptures and theology. However, this does not mean that Messianic Judaism nor Christianity should superimpose identities one upon the other then subsume one group of people into another, else this is not citizenship nor solidarity but conquering supersessionism. It is furthermore unclear how a more nuclear relationship between Messianic Judaism and Christianity will affect comparative dialogue. Many authors in Messianic Judaism suggest that Messianic Judaism should interface with other faiths on behalf of representing Jewish perspectives in Christianity. It is unnecessary at this time in the development of Christianity that Messianic Judaism provides inter-religious or evangelical representation. What both parties do gain from a stronger unified relationship is better intra-denominational dialogue and self-exploration, which Kinzer has argued in his publications *Post Missionary Messianic Judaism* and *Searching Her Own Mystery*. Therefore, it is finally suggested that should a paradigm be adopted, whether it be Kinzer or Lustiger, our faith in either model should be understood in terms of citizenship within these models.

A Return to the Valkenberg Question

In concluding remarks, this paper set out to explore Messianic Judaism and to explore paradigms for the paradox of supersessionism. It is also possible to answer Pim

Valkenberg's question: Can there be a supersessionist-free form of Christianity? The answer, as it stands now, is maybe it is possible. The problem that has ultimately presented itself is the controlled omission of the rabbinical perspective in this paper. As it would seem in the field, Judaism is not ready to engage Messianic Judaism, nor accept their self-definition. While it may seem to be a brushing statement, the question of the dialogue was asked in the same course that Valkenberg asked his question concerning a supersessionist free form of Christianity. The preliminary response was that dialogue was not taking place between Judaism and Messianic Judaism; therefore, it was more feasible to pursue the expanded topic of Messianic and Christian dialogue in this follow-up extension. The limitation in attempting to answer this question is that it would vastly exceed the breadth of a master's thesis project. Future extension projects should focus on attempting to determine if there is room for Jewish and Messianic dialogue by determining if common theological language can be established between the two parties. Consideration for dialogue between Judaism, Messianic Judaism, and Christianity is needed, but there is no consensus in the field as to how best to achieve dialogue. However, for the purposes of the project, it was necessary to isolate one aspect where limited dialogue was occurring and attempt to evaluate it and expand the field of knowledge and offer alternative paradigms. The more efficacious paradigm could be offered between the Messianic Jewish and Christian dialogue.

From the Christian perspective, there are tough questions to answer, which have not been completely addressed by this thesis. Messianic Judaism self-identifies as something that claims to be Jewish yet proclaims Christ. As stated in the above paragraph, Judaism has not been willing to consider the Messianics to be Jewish and have

not reached out for dialogue. As with Judaism, it appears that Christianity has not determined how to classify Messianic Judaism. It has been the hope that this thesis has provided clarity that Christianity should consider the Messianic Jews part of the Christ believing ecclesia. Now, what the paradigm in this paper solves is an obstruction to inter-religious and intra-religious dialogue whereby Messianic Judaism shifts from an unknown factor into broader Christianity without Christianity subsuming it. Like a one-way variable test, this paper has only accounted for one rational, religious, and philosophical independent variable (i.e., Judaism) by making certain assumptions from a previous paper that dialogue is only possible between Messianic Judaism and Christianity. This would only allow us to say that due to Messianic representation in the ecclesia that Christianity is not superseding itself, but this would also infer that Christianity is something other than Gentile. To prevent Christianity from subsuming Messianic Judaism and superseding it, implementing Paul's conceptual citizenship is a necessary control factor. This preserves the Jew and Gentile identities while unifying them in one overarching system of spiritual enfranchisement. However, an affirmative answer could be considered a type of null-hypothesis testing error in the future. Testing the falsifiability of the conclusion that dialogue is only occurring between Messianic Judaism and Christianity would require a re-evaluation of Judaism's relationship to Messianic Judaism. Nevertheless, even working under the assumption that the null hypothesis that dialogue is only occurring between Messianic Judaism and Christianity is true, there is room for opposition from Messianic Judaism itself.

No, if Messianic Judaism is part of the Christ believing ecclesia, then, in theory, Messianic Judaism could also attempt to supersede Christianity. From this perspective,

Messianic Judaism becomes a confounding variable. The Kinzer perspective infers that the Gentile relationship to God is predicated on the Jewish relation to both God and the Gentiles. This places mediation beyond belief in Christ and, more so, upon the state of the *commonwealth* that exists between Messianic Jews, Christians, and God. However, this poses problems for the ecclesia as it would invert the history of Christianity and pose a new understanding that Christianity can only be understood in light of Messianic Judaism. This inversion would result in Christianity's understand and self-identity being reinterpreted by Messianic Judaism. The danger is that this kind of thinking could become generalized and then lead to a replacement theology whereby Messianic Judaism supersedes Christianity. It is unclear if Mark Kinzer's appeal of bi-lateral ecclesiology will be able to prevent a *commonwealth* theology from superseding Christianity. If such is the case, it could also be inferred that Messianic Judaism would supersede Judaism if it supersedes Christianity. Therefore, it is suggested that a follow-up be attempted in the future to continue to test this hypothesis.

Bibliography

Barth, Markus. *The Anchor Bible: Ephesians*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc, 1985.

Block, Daniel. "Marriage in Ancient Israel" in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*. Ed. Campbell, Ken, M. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2003.

Boyarin, Daniel. *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. New York, NY: New Press, 2011.

F. Brown, et al., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2017

Fonrobert, Charlotte, E. *A People's History of Christianity: Late Ancient Christianity*, edited by Burrus, Virginia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.

Carson, D.A., Moo, Douglas J. *An Introduction to The New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005.

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. *Messianic Judaism*. New York, NY: Continuum, 2000.

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan, ed. *Voices of Messianic Judaism: Confronting Critical Issues Facing a Maturing Movement*. Baltimore, MD: Lederer Books, 2001.

Dauermann, Sturt. "Messianic Outreach," in *Introduction to Messianic Judaism: Its ecclesial Context and Biblical Foundations*. Eds. David Rudolph and Joel Willitts. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013.

Doob, Christopher. *Sociology: An Introduction*. Ontario, ON: Thompson Publishing, 2000.

Firestone, Ruven. *Who are the Real Chosen People: The Meaning of Closeness in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths Publishing, 2008.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold. *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology*. Tustin, CA: Aerial Ministries Press, 2016.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold. *Hebrew Christianity Its Theology, History, and Philosophy*. Tustin, CA: Aerial Ministries Press, 1995.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold. *The Remnant of Israel: The History, Theology, and Philosophy of the Messianic Jewish Community*. Tustin, CA: Aerial Ministries Press, 1994.

Grudem, Wayne. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994.

Harvey, Richard. *Mapping Messianic Jewish Theology: A Constructive Approach*. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2009

Kjær-Hansen, Kai. *Joseph Rabinowitz and the Messianic Movement*. Edinburgh, UK: Handsel Press. 1995.

Klayman, Seth. "Messianic Jewish Worship and Prayer," in *Introduction to Messianic Judaism: Its ecclesial Context and Biblical Foundations*. Eds. David Rudolph and Joel Willitts. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2013.

Kinzer, Mark. *Post-Messianic Judaism: Redefining Christian Engagement with the Jewish People*. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2005.

Kinzer, Mark. *Searching Her Own Mystery: Nostra Aetate, the Jewish people, and the Identity of the Church*. Eugene OR: Cascade Book, 2015.

Lancaster, Thomas. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Marshfield, MI: First Fruits of Zion, 2014.

Lillevik, Raymond. *Apostates, Hybrids, or True Jews: Jewish Christians and Jewish Identity in Eastern Europe 1860-1914*. Eugen, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2014.

Lustiger, Cardinal Jean-Marie. *The Promise*. Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans Publishing, 2015.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation: A History*. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2004.

Matthews, Victor, H. "Marriage and Family in the Ancient Near East" in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World*. Ed. Campbell, Ken, M. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2003.

Mouritsen, Henrik. "Manumission," in *The Oxford Handbook to Roman Law and Society*. Eds. Paul J. du Plessis, Clifford Ando, Kaius Tuori. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Osborne, Grant, R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2006.

Schonfield, Hugh J. *The History of Jewish Christianity: From the First to the Twentieth Century*. London, UK: Duckworth, 1936.

Sobel, B.Z., *Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe*. Toronto, CAN: Wiley & Sons, 1974.

Sproul, R.C. *Essential Truths of the Christian Faith*. Carroll Stream, IL: Tyndale, 1992.

Taylor, Tristan. "Social Status, Legal Status, and Legal Privilege," in *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Law and Society*. Eds. Paul J. du Plessis, Clifford Ando, Kaius Tuori. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Vlach, Michael J. *The Church as a Replacement of Israel: An Analysis of Supersessionism*. Leipzig, Ger: Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, 2009.

Kaiser, Walter C. *Toward an Exegetical Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1998.

Wells, Bruce, Raymond Westbrook. *Everyday Law in Biblical Israel: An Introduction*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.

White, Sherwin. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Wilken, Robert L. *The First Thousand Years: Global History of Christianity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 2012.