

The Antisemitism Dispositive

Emergence and Dissemination in Early Christianity

vorgelegt von
Dipl. Pol. Wiss.
Maximilian Ruben Czollek
geb. in Berlin

von der Fakultät I – Geistes- und Bildungswissenschaften
der Technischen Universität Berlin
zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

Doktor der Philosophie
- Dr. Phil. -

genehmigte Dissertation

Promotionsausschuss:

Vorsitzende: Prof. Dr. Helga Marburger
Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Werner Bergmann
Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Michael Daxner

Tag der wissenschaftlichen Aussprache: 18. Mai 2016

Berlin 2017

ABSTRACT:

This work is concerned with the emergence of a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism. While the roots of a Christian image of “the Jews” reach as far back as the first century C.E., the second century triggered a development in which “the Jews” became ever more central for a proto-Catholic self-construction. This dynamic was accelerated by multiple factors, central among them theological debates on the right interpretation of the faith (e.g. Marcion and his opponents). In those debates, “the Jews” assume an epistemic quality. However, this epistemic quality may have remained a feature of some groups in early Christianity. The rise of proto-Catholicism to Roman state religion by the end of the fourth century created a situation where the episteme of antisemitism became a part of an encompassing and universal world-view, thus gaining the quality of a dispositive. The present work attempts to trace this development from emergence to dissemination of a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism.

Die vorliegende Arbeit befasst sich mit der Emergenz eines proto-katholischen Antisemitismusepistems. Während die Wurzeln eines christlichen Bildes von „den Juden“ bis in das erste Jahrhundert u.Z. zurückreichen, ist das zweite Jahrhundert entscheidend für eine Entwicklung, in der „die Juden“ zu einem zentralen Element proto-katholischer Selbstkonstruktion wurden. Die Dynamik dieser Entwicklung wurde durch eine Vielzahl an Faktoren beeinflusst, unter ihnen theologische Debatten über die richtige Interpretation des Glaubens (z.B. zwischen Marcion und seinen Gegnern). Dabei hätte die epistemische Qualität, welche „die Juden“ in diesen Debatten gewannen, das Charakteristikum einiger frühchristlicher Gruppen bleiben können. Erst der Aufstieg des proto-Katholizismus zur römischen Staatsreligion im vierten Jahrhundert erzeugte eine Situation, in welcher dieses Epistem Teil einer umfassenden und universellen Weltanschauung wurde und sich so zum Dispositiv verfestigte. Die vorliegende Arbeit versucht diese Entwicklung eines proto-katholischen Antisemitismusepistems von der Emergenz zur Dissemination nachzuvollziehen.

Contents

1. Introduction	6
I. Analytical Framework	9
2. Terminology, Methodology and Theoretical Background	9
2.1 The Antisemitism Dispositive	9
2.1.1 Antisemitism (Literature Review)	10
2.1.2 Antisemitism – Proposed Definitions	15
2.1.3 Antisemitism/Anti-Judaism – The Question of Difference.....	19
2.2 Early Christian Antisemitism (Literature Review).....	25
2.2.1 The Beginning of Critique – Moore, Parkes & Isaac	25
2.2.2 Simon, Ruether and the Religious Vitality of Judaism.....	27
2.2.3 A Belated Development – Theology in Germany after 1945.....	29
2.3 Methodological Approach	33
2.3.1 Terminology – Judaism, Jews, Christians and Gentiles	33
2.3.2 Hypothesis – Emergence of Christian anti-Judaism	38
2.3.3 Scientific Perspective	41
2.4 Source Criticism: The New Testament	45
2.4.1 The Process of Canonization	45
2.4.2 Interpreting the New Testament.....	51
2.4.3 The Question of Anti-Judaism	55
2.5 The Course of this Work.....	58
II. Case-Studies	63
3. Paul and the beginning of Christian faith	63
3.1 Paul and his Interpreters	63
3.1.1 A short History of interpreting Paul	64
3.1.2 Paul's Theologizing - Continuity and Separation	67
3.1.3 The Reaction of the New Perspectives.....	70
3.2 The Pauline Epistles	71
3.2.1 Control of Interpretation – Galatians and Acts	71
3.2.2 The Expansion of Israel – Romans and Galatians.....	77
3.2.3 Israel, Jesus & the Jews.....	84
3.3 Conclusion – Supplying the Hammer.....	87

4. The Gospels.....	90
4.1 Historical Background.....	90
4.1.1 The Jerusalem Community.....	90
4.1.2 Wars of the Jews.....	92
4.1.3 The Parting of Ways?	94
4.2 The Texts	98
4.2.1 The Gospel of Mark.....	100
4.2.2 The Gospel of Matthew	103
4.2.3 The Gospel of Luke & Acts.....	107
4.2.4 The Gospel of John	113
4.3 Overwriting the Empirical – Jews, Romans and Theology	120
4.3.1 Fading out of Focus – The Romans in the Passion Narrative	120
4.3.2 Overwriting the Empirical – History and Intertextuality.....	126
4.3.3 Interpreting Scripture/Scripting History	133
4.3.4 “The Jews” in the New Testament	137
4.4 Conclusion - Is the New Testament anti-Judaic?	143
5. The Patristic Period – Marcion & the proto-Catholic Reaction	147
5.1 Marcion (85-160 C.E.).....	150
5.1.1 Marcion and the Renaissance of Paul	152
5.1.2 “The Jews” and the Question of Antisemitism.....	157
5.1.3 Marcion and the Canon of the New Testament	163
5.2 The Proto-Orthodox Reaction – Against Marcion, Against the Jews... 167	
5.2.1 Justin Martyr – Dialogue with Trypho the Jew.....	170
5.2.2 Tertullian – Adversus Marcionem.....	179
5.2.3 Luke's Acts – A Reaction to Marcionism?	186
5.3 Conclusion – Dissemination and Intensification	190
6. The Rise of Christianity – From Persecution to State Religion	196
6.1 Entering Politics – the 2nd to the 4th century C.E.	196
6.1.1 On the “Persecution” of Christians.....	196
6.1.2 The Conversion of Constantine	203
6.1.3 The Nicaean Council	207
6.1.4 Excuse: Jews in Roman Law – The Impact of Christianity.....	212
6.2 Adversus Iudaeos Revisited	217

6.2.1 Justin Martyr – Filling the Toolbox	221
6.2.2 Tertullian – Appropriating Scripture.....	225
6.2.3 John Chrysostom – A Bid for Internal Stratification	231
6.3. Conclusion – Proto-Catholicism & “the Jews”	241
7. <i>Changing the Frame – From Judaism to Paganism</i>	245
7.1 Transmission & Dissemination – Gentile Attitudes towards Judaism .	245
7.1.1 Pagan Attitudes towards Judaism in Antiquity.....	245
7.1.2 Elitist and Popular Attitudes – Curiosity and Rejection.....	251
7.1.3 “The Jews” between Paganism and Christianity	255
7.2 Modes of Integration – Means of Cohesion	259
7.2.1 Sociology and the Episteme of Antisemitism	259
7.2.2 Problems of Diversity – The Two Edges of Success.....	262
7.2.3 “The Jews” as a Means of Social Cohesion.....	267
7.3 Conclusion – Dawn of the Dispositive	270
8. <i>Results</i>	272
8.1 Rethinking the Causal Framework	272
8.1.1 On the Notion of “Judaizing” – Simon Reconsidered	273
8.1.2 Discursive and Empirical “Jews” – Image and Reality	277
8.1.3 An Episteme of Antisemitism – Towards an Alternative Causality	280
8.2 The Antisemitism Dispositive	283
8.2.1 Discursive Formations – Formations of Antisemitism.....	284
8.2.2 On Genealogy – Emergence and Dissemination	287
8.2.3 The Antisemitism Dispositive	290
8.3 Towards a Definition of Antisemitism?	292
<i>Bibliography</i>	294

1. Introduction

During the previous decade, Germany has seen the somewhat belated arrival of *Critical Whiteness* as a radical approach in the critique of racism. *Critical Whiteness* assumes the connection of (German) language and racism from a colonial past until the present time. Scholars argue that language reflects the structure of a society dominated by White subjects, their perspectives and desires. This structure in turn assumes a central position in the production of (White) subjects. Reviewing these assumptions, one may find similar notions in contemporary (queer-)feminist positions on the question of sexism/heteronormative society. The effect of centuries of oppression, sexism remains central to the structure of society until the present day. Against this background, questions of language, representation and recognition are declared crucial objectives in a modern political fight for more equality.

I have referred to these two examples to illustrate what struck me most when I first entered the field of German scholarship on antisemitism: a lack of focus on those questions of language, structure and subject-positions. I had expected to find a critical reflection of the popular German self-image as non-antisemitic¹. I was surprised to find instead an almost complete lack of theoretical approaches that would provide this critique or integrate contemporary insights from other fields of research on discrimination. This was especially remarkable because one of the leading figures of Antisemitism Studies in Germany, Wolfgang Benz, had recently declared its centrality for any study of discrimination (“Leitfunktion”, Benz 2010: 28):

“Die Leitfunktion der Antisemitismusforschung im engeren Sinne in einer erweiterten Vorurteilsforschung ergibt sich aus der Tatsache, dass Judenfeindschaft das älteste existierende politische, kulturelle, religiöse, soziale und ökonomische Vorurteil mit der katastrophalen Folge des bislang größten Genozids der Menschheitsgeschichte ist“ (ibid.).

Why, I wondered, was there not a conception of antisemitism in contemporary German

¹ A contemporary German self-image is constructed against a National Socialist position. In this process, the self-construction as non-antisemitic takes a central place. Although this idea is interrupted occasionally by scandals (Grass, Sarrazin, Mohr, etc.) and although it is highly improbable that antisemitism simply disappeared after 1945, German society continues to entertain a self-image untainted by the question of continuity of antisemitism.

scholarship, which would focus on continuity, language and subject-position the same way that I had been taught to ponder the question of an internalized racism or sexism? As a student of political sciences, I was trained to distrust the systematic absence of knowledge, taste or perspective in a certain field. To speak with Bourdieu: while any single person may give preference to whatever he or she chooses, the pattern points to a system governing those individual preferences and expressions (*habitus*²).

The absence of a certain interest in the continuity of antisemitism thus led me to the question of in what way scientific analysis and knowledge-production continue to be complicit to a German post-1945 self-image. Could it be, I asked myself, that scholarship on antisemitism unconsciously took a part in reproducing the (German) self-construction after 1945 as discontinuous to Nazism and, therefore, antisemitism? Karen King comments on the political relevance of historical analysis with reference to Bourdieu in much the same way:

“In short, the enterprises of academic analysis are thoroughly involved in politics, whether acknowledged or not. Insofar as academics and religious adherents alike claim the right to say how the world is, enterprises designed to defend those claims are as much involved in politics as are those designed to contest them. [...] It is in this sense that writing history requires engaging in the politics of current regimes and power relations of knowledge” (King 2003: 345).

The dominance of an approach highlighting discontinuity sparked my interest in alternative theoretical approaches to antisemitism. I thus became interested in a conception that would allow for a notion of continuity without compromising on the specificity of a given formation of antisemitism. After I had finished my Diploma with a work on antisemitism in the Soviet Occupation Zone/GDR across 1945 to 1953, I felt that I had to return and focus on this theoretical lack by looking for alternative models able to explain the development and reappearance of antisemitism throughout European history.

² Bourdieu defines *Habitus* as a socially constituted system of structured and structuring dispositions acquired through praxis and constantly directed towards practical functions (“ein sozial konstituiertes System von strukturierten und strukturierenden Dispositionen, das durch Praxis erworben wird und konstant auf praktische Funktionen ausgerichtet ist”, Bourdieu/Wacquant 2006a: 154). Insofar as those dispositions and the fields in which they apply have developed over time, “*Habitus*” describes the manifestation of a process in which those historical developments are carved into the individual. Bourdieu notes: “Als Produkt der Geschichte produziert der *Habitus* individuelle und kollektive Praktiken, also Geschichte, nach den von der Geschichte erzeugten Schemata; er gewährleistet die aktive Präsenz früherer Erfahrungen, die sich in jedem Organismus in Gestalt von Wahrnehmungs-, Denk- und Handlungsschemata niederschlagen und die Übereinstimmung und Konstanz der Praktiken im Zeitverlauf viel sicherer als alle formalen Regeln und expliziten Normen zu gewährleisten suchen” (Bourdieu 1993: 101).

With the following case-study, I want to demonstrate the potential a post-structuralist conception has for the study of antisemitism. Thereby, I do not intend to discover a truer meaning of antisemitism but rather to demonstrate a possible way to explain its dissemination and enduring presence. Following Steven Katz' remark that "the Jews" as antithesis to a non-Jewish position are "rooted in the pattern established by patristic theology" (Katz 1991: 50), I have decided to concentrate on the first four centuries of Christianity's existence.

In the following analysis, I will work with material largely foreign to my training as political scientist. Therefore, I do not engage in theological disputations nor claim to provide better translations of the Greek, Latin or Hebrew texts than the ones that already exist. Instead, the analysis intends to take a fresh view on the way those sources have been interpreted in scholarship on the emergence of a Christian antisemitism/anti-Judaism. A discussion of scientific perspectives on antisemitism and their potentials and limits is thus central to the following case-studies. Its main innovation lies with the antisemitism dispositive as a new conceptual approach. Thereby, I hope to propose fresh answers to old questions and, possibly, to open new ones. The potential of a work like this is reflected in John Gager's comment that "new answers arise not so much from new data as from new questions; and new questions, I wish to argue, arise from new theories, new hypotheses, and new assumptions" (Gager 1982: 260).

It is my pleasure to acknowledge the assistance I received from my colleagues, friends and family. This work benefited from their criticism and comments. I owe a special debt of gratitude to my supervisors Prof. Werner Bergmann and Prof. Michael Daxner, who provided me with guidance through a project that at times felt like an opened Pandora's box. I also want to thank Prof. David Feldman at the Pears Institute, Birkbeck College for his initial support during my visit in 2010. Above all, my gratitude belongs to Corinne Kaszner for her invaluable advice and her insistence on coffee breaks.

I. Analytical Framework

2. Terminology, Methodology and Theoretical Background

2.1 *The Antisemitism Dispositive*

In a newsletter of the European Sociological Association from 2012, the renowned British scholar Robert Fine described his experience as a researcher in the field of antisemitism research (“Antisemitismusforschung”). Considering recent publications on the subject, Fine lamented a “tendency in sociology to treat antisemitism as always in the past” (Fine 2012: 4). This preoccupation with the past, Fine noted, is accompanied by a tendency to underscore the relevance of antisemitism for the time following 1945. As an example, symptomatic for this tendency among scholars, Fine referred to the work of Matti Bunzl, Professor of Anthropology, Illinois who discusses the convergence of antisemitism and islamophobia in Europe.

For Bunzl, Islamophobia has replaced antisemitism as a central strategy in making the European Union a fortress against migrants (see Bunzl 2007: 12f.). Bunzl defines antisemitism as a strategy established in the 19th century to police the ethnically pure nation-state (ibid.). Thereby, he does not need to reject the idea of antisemitism after 1945 but lets his definition do the work. Unsurprisingly, Bunzl concludes on the “thorough insignificance” (Bunzl 2007: 14) of *this type of antisemitism* today. Fine calls this tendency to render antisemitism as a problem of the past by definition the “pastification of antisemitism” (Fine 2012: 4). “Pastification”, one could summarize Fine's notion, accomplishes the dissolution of antisemitism by scientific proposition³.

Today, an active identification with the antisemitism of Marr and others has indeed sunk into insignificance (though recent political developments in the EU shed doubt on the assumption that “old” forms of antisemitism have been delegitimized completely). For many European countries, opposing antisemitism is at the center of their post-1945 self-

³ Alon Confino proposes an inspiring inversion of this process of pastification when noting that “[i]t is the Nazis who made sense of, and gave new meaning to, past anti-Semitism, not so much the other way around” (Confino 2014: 11). Confino argues that the Nazis are not the culmination of a history of antisemitism but that this history of antisemitism is the culmination of a reinterpretation of “the past of Jewish, German, and Christian relations” (ibid.).

definition⁴. At the same time, the British scholar Brian Klug comments that, while this affirmative type of antisemitism is withering, “the figure of ‘the Jew’ is still alive and kicking in various nooks and crannies of European culture” (Klug 2007a: 58). In this sense, then, scientific analysis should reflect its connection to a modern European self-image. Merely using an outdated definition and proclaiming the demise of traditional forms of antisemitism is simply not enough.

An empirical study commissioned by the German Parliament, published in 2011, underlines this point. The study finds that 20 percent of the German population shows antisemitic attitudes (see Deutscher Bundestag 2011: 173). At the same time, the study laments that antisemitism is mostly taught in school as a subject exclusively connected to National Socialism (see *ibid.*: 84). This combination of “pastification” and continued prevalence is symptomatic of a specific perspective on the topic of antisemitism in Germany today. Especially its dissonance to a German self-image as non-antisemitic produces two problems: (1) It blurs the fact that antisemitism is not only restricted to the margins of society but present at its very center (an aspect recent scholarship has become more sensitive to) and (2) it forecloses a reflection on historical awareness insofar as history is understood as something that defines who we are and where we come from. Scholarship should be careful to avoid those pitfalls.

2.1.1 Antisemitism (Literature Review)

In 1896, an Austro-Hungarian journalist published a book called *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State/The Jew's State). The author claimed the book to be a response to the “Jewish Question”. Introduced in 1753 in Great Britain (“The Jew Bill”), the “question” resurfaced during the time of the French Revolution in 1789 before being introduced in the German-speaking sphere by Bruno Bauer’s treatise *Die Judenfrage* in 1843 (“The Jewish question”; see Bauer 1843). The “Jewish Question” had thus haunted European minds for more than 150 years when the journalist Benjamin Ze’ev Herzl, also known as Theodor Herzl, set out to give his answer. Herzl interprets the “Jewish Question” (concurrent for him with “antisemitism”) as a remnant of the Middle Ages (see Herzl

⁴ The tendency of post-war Germany to disassociate from its immediate past can be observed in both the former East and West Germanies from the onset of their formation. Both cases differ only in the historical material they make use of to construct their alternative and “new” German identity (see Lepsius 1991; Messerschmidt 2008).

1920: 12) present wherever Jews live in considerable numbers. The very appearance of Jewish immigrants, Herzl continues, *leads* to their persecution (see *ibid.*) and to intense Jewish misery (see *ibid.*: 5).

Herzl's conception of antisemitism can be summarized as follows: Antisemitism is a set of prejudices against Jews, deeply engrained into the host-nations (see *ibid.*: 29) and intensified by the development of capitalism (see *ibid.*: 34). For Herzl, antisemitism originates in the Christian Middle Ages, but as the Enlightenment progressed, it has transformed to become the rejection of Jewish emancipation and its ascent to the bourgeoisie (see *ibid.*). Together with other early Zionist thinkers, Herzl thus defines antisemitism as a problem of a *national* minority within other nation-states (see *ibid.*: 13; cf. Ahad Ha'am 1912; Pinsker 1917) that has had a decisive influence on a Jewish self-understanding ("Wir sind, wozu man uns in den Ghetti gemacht hat", Herzl 1920: 29) and prevented Jews from assimilating (see *ibid.*: 37f.). From this, Herzl reached his famous conclusion that the only solution to the "Jewish Question" lay in the creation of a Jewish nation state (see *ibid.*: 135; cf. Goldmann 1924: 12f. for an early critique).

Of course, there are many problematic aspects in Herzl's Zionism, e.g. its employment of the dichotomous construction of European culture against Asian barbarism (see Herzl 1920: 43), the employment of terminology related to race-theory and social Darwinism (see *ibid.*: 19) and his "ethnic nationalism" (Klug 2007b). However, the present analysis is not concerned with judging Herzl's legacy, but with a reflection on different theoretical conceptions for antisemitism. As shown above, Herzl's *Judenstaat* reveals a constructivist element in his assessment of the empirical Jews as products of the antisemite's gaze. An idea originating in an essay by the critical Zionist Ahad Ha'am from 1892 (see Ha'am 1912: 195-204), this builds a bridge to Jean-Paul Sartre's essay *Réflexions sur la question juive* ("Anti-Semite and Jew", Sartre 1995). Published in 1944, Sartre's well-known assessment "it is the anti-Semite who creates the Jew" (Sarte 1995: 103) reflects a modern version of Herzl's and Ahad Ha'am's insight (though Sartre focuses on the construction of "the Jews" while Zionism was concerned with the very real misery of Jews living in Eastern Europe).

While the early days of the Israeli state seemed to prove Herzl's optimism that "Israel would constitute a completely new beginning and by its very existence lead to the gradual disappearance of antisemitism" (Wistrich 1988: 175) the "opposite [...] happened" (*ibid.*) in the following decades. Or, as Brian Klug puts it in a letter to Robert Wistrich in 2005:

“Yet, far from ending it, Israel is now the focus of what some people call a new anti-Semitism” (Wistrich/Klug 2005: 1). Israel did not solve the Jewish question, as antisemitism persists not only in countries where there is a Jewish population but also “where there is no longer a Jewish community of any substance” (Dulzin 1988: 3). One must conclude from this development that history has refuted the Zionists’ basic theoretical assumption on antisemitism being a problem of a minority group among Christian host-societies. Herzl’s definition of antisemitism as social or religious “friction” (Strauss 1988: 132) between majority and Jewish community can therefore not be regarded a sufficient explanation for antisemitism.

*

The scientific analysis of antisemitism originates in sociology and psychology (see Hoffmann 1994: 296). Early scholars include Fritz Bernstein, Arnold Zweig, Kurt Wawrzinek and Sigmund Freud (1939). After the war, the hypothesis of the “authoritarian personality” gained popularity as an explanation for the susceptibility of individuals to antisemitism (see Adorno 1982). Adorno and his team located the reason in an incomplete integration of internal and external conflicts by the individual. The socio-psychological perspective has since then remained influential on studies of antisemitism. It was developed further in works by Loewenstein (1951); Mitscherlich/Mitscherlich (1973), Simmel (1993), Fenichel (1993), Auchter (2004) and Frosh (2005). The strength of this perspective lies in answering when and under what condition individuals adhere to antisemitic patterns and arguments. Its focus does not, however, lie on the *availability* of antisemitism to those individuals. In this sense, it is a reply to the question *why do people adopt antisemitic ideas?* but not *Why the Jews?* (cf. Ettinger 1988: 4-7).

Another branch in contemporary analysis of antisemitism explains antisemitism by considering the empirical Jews the central variable (correspondence-theory or “corresponsibility”, see Flannery 1973: 585). Not unlike Theodor Herzl who took antisemitism as the friction between majority and minority Jewish culture (cf. Strauss 1988: 132) Claussen and Fenichel define antisemitism as the unjust generalization of *historical facts* (see Claussen 1987: 26ff., Fenichel 1993: 41). Only recently, the British historian Tony Kushner has demanded that historical analysis of antisemitism should focus on “not only the groups who attack Jews but the Jews themselves, the economic and social background of the conflict” (see Kushner 1989: 7; cf. Flannery 1965: 275f.; Katz 1989: 240ff.). Likewise, Bauer points to the importance of a relationship between

Jews and non-Jews and the cultural, religious, social and economic differences between Jews and their surrounding culture (see Bauer 2003: 2f.). Another example for a correspondence-theory can be found in Hannah Arendt's update of Bernard Lazare's claim that Jews had partially been responsible for their own discrimination (Arendt 2008: 22ff.; cf. Voigt 2015: 155f.).

One does not have to refute the idea that a discourse interacts with external factors to reject the assumption that empirical Jews explain the development of antisemitism. Not least because other fields have long surpassed the notion of correspondence-theory – e.g. are women payed less because their work is less precious or are black people more often a subject to police violence because they commit more crimes? Those questions would disqualify the research as based on sexist/racist assumptions. Rather, the situation of empirical women or black people should be treated as an *effect* of discrimination, not its *cause*. The treatment of the discursive “Jews” as if automatically related to the empirical group may also imply a fallacy of the historian. Applying standards usually employed for the analysis of historical sources disregards that the mode of generating texts is fundamentally different in antisemitism. Rather than just assuming a correspondence between the discourse and the empirical group, the scholar would first have to outline a conception of antisemitism that would allow for this identification⁵.

It is at this point that I return to a question asked a few passages earlier, namely: *Why the Jews?* The scholar Shmuel Ettinger notes that scholarship focusing on this question tends to decenter the role of empirical Jews or their status in society. Instead, they “direct most of their attention to the psychological, social, or political structure of the surrounding majority of peoples” (Ettinger 1988: 6). From being a factor in Jewish history, the question of antisemitism is thus reframed to become a question of the history of host-societies. As this phenomenon encompasses all of Europe, it becomes a question of European history, and thus, the history of Christianity itself.

*

Two studies by German scholars have recently attempted to develop a theoretical framework for an analysis focusing on the structural level of antisemitism– *Nationaler*

⁵ The antisemite's aim is to convince his or her believers that their own discursive images are identical with the (hidden) empirical reality (cf. Ettinger 1988: 3). One should be careful not to adopt this identification light-handedly. Thus, Kushner does not solve the problem when noting that “the Jewish role does not need to be great for it to be taken into account” (Kushner 1989: 6).

Antisemitismus (“National Antisemitism”) by Klaus Holz (2001) and Thomas Haury’s *Antisemitismus von Links* (“Antisemitism from the Left”, Haury, 2002). Employing elements of Niklas Luhmann’s system-theory to analyze the cultural semantic of texts, Klaus Holz provides a compelling concept for the analysis of antisemitism (see Holz 2001: 33). Modern antisemitism, Holz proposes, is necessarily “national”. In his meticulous study, he demonstrates how texts construct “the Jews” as Others and how this construct becomes a *necessary condition* of group-formation (see *ibid.*: 17). In a way, Haury’s study can be regarded as a continuation of Holz’s analysis as it sets out to develop a universal and systematic conception of antisemitism as a heuristic instrument for text-analysis (see Haury 2002: 13). In his work, Haury introduces the term “structural antisemitism” (“struktureller Antisemitismusbegriff”, *ibid.*: 105ff.) qualifying personification, construction of collective identities, and Manichaeism as necessary determinants for an antisemitic discourse (see *ibid.*: 158).

Both works should be applauded for employing a structuralist framework that interprets antisemitism as a body of knowledge expressed in a set of discourses. With this perspective, both concepts distance themselves from the socio-psychological approach and its focus on the individual’s psyche pointed out above. However, both works also pose problems connected to aspects already discussed regarding Bunzl and the problem of “pastification”. Holz’s focus on the nation-state is not able to integrate anything before the rise of nationalism or besides the formation of nation-states (after all, modern forms of antisemitism have taken very different forms throughout the last few centuries, from racist to socialist, from state-affirmation to its subversion, see e.g. Sterling 1969: 132ff.; Volkov 2000b: 60; Klug 2007a: 56f.). As Holz himself admits, his work focuses less on change than on continuities (Holz 2001: 45). A similar problem emerges in Thomas Haury’s writing, who derives his general concept from the type of antisemitism leading up to National Socialism (“völkischer Antisemitismus”). This is understandable for a German scholar trying to deal with his nation’s past, but a universalization of this specific formation of antisemitism ultimately fails to provide what it promises – a general heuristic for the analysis of antisemitism.

In this sense, it seems as if Langmuir’s assertion can still claim validity today that most of the contemporary concepts regarding antisemitism are constructed “looking backward from Hitler rather than forward from Jesus of Nazareth” (Langmuir 1990b: 5). It is nevertheless important to underline that those works yield important results as long as they regard the limits of their respective definition: Langmuir’s focus on National

Socialist antisemitism to explain its antecedents in the Middle Ages; Bunzl's focus on 19th century nationalism to explain the limits of this specific type/formation of antisemitism; Adorno's focus on the individual disposition in order to explain the attraction of National Socialism and Holz's focus on the connection of antisemitism and the nation state. While these concepts fail to provide a thorough conception of antisemitism in that they do not account for its variation over time they can help to understand why antisemitism reappears throughout (European) history.

2.1.2 Antisemitism – Proposed Definitions

In his paper "The collective Jew: Israel and the new antisemitism", Brian Klug (2003), Senior Research Fellow in Oxford, discusses Tony Kushner's definition of antisemitism as "hostility to Jews as Jews" (Kushner 1989: 7). Kushner's definition builds on the assumption that "the Jews" of the antisemitic discourse and the Jewish subject addressed are entities meeting on the same plane – the antisemite actually *means* the person he or she is attacking. In this sense, one may call an attack on a Jewish person antisemitic *because* he or she is attacked as a Jew, not because he or she is smoking in a public space, dealing drugs or is taking part in an illegal demonstration (see Klug 2003: 5). Kushner's definition tends to identify "the Jews" of antisemitic assaults, policies or images or attacks with the empirical Jews.

Against this identification of the empirical Jews with their discursive counterparts, Klug argues that Kushner's definition of "hostility towards Jews as Jews" confuses "the Jews" (of antisemitic discourses) with the "real" Jews (see Klug 2003: 6). Klug maintains that the "underlying assumption that Jews are really 'Jews' is precisely the core of antisemitism" (ibid.). Such an identification means accepting and perpetuating the antisemitic suggestion that its discourse on "Jews" is ultimately about empirical Jews. Against this, Klug maintains that "the Jews" of antisemitism and the empirical Jewish subjects are not situated on one causal plane. On the opposite, *it is the very function of antisemitism to detach the discursive "Jews" from this empirical group of Jewish subjects.*

The problem with Kushner's definition is that it identifies the discursive "Jews" with the empirical subjects while their detachment should be at the center of an analysis of antisemitism. The hypothesis of detachment reaches as far back as to Leo Pinsker's well-

known essay *Auto-Emancipation!* (1917) first published in 1882⁶. Pinsker observed that the antisemitic accusations against “Jews” seem to exist “a priori” (Pinsker 1917: 11f.). He therefore arrived at a definition of “Judophobie” as an incurable psychosis fearing the Jewish ghosts (“Judengespenst”, see *ibid.*: 12). In the same spirit, Simon N. Herman notes that the “course of antisemitism is not affected by what is termed 'Jewish Behaviour'” (Herman 1988: 285; cf. Horkheimer/Adorno 2003: 210f.). This detachment from the empirical behavior of Jewish individuals or communities is echoed in the presence of an “antisemitism without Jews” (see Lendvai 1971; cf. Wistrich 1991: xx).

If the things said about the construction of “the Jews” in antisemitic discourses are correct, Klug continues, it should be “defined not by an attitude to Jews but by a definition of 'Jew'” (Klug 2003: 6). Klug therefore suggests rewriting Kushner’s definition as “hostility towards Jews as 'Jews'” (*ibid.*). This definition has enjoyed wide employment, as it marks an important step forward in the definition of antisemitism. Its central ideas echo in the working definition of antisemitism developed by the European Union Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) in 2004 and adopted as official definition in 2005:

“Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities”.⁷

While helpful when one intends to analyze the effects antisemitism has on empirical Jews, Klug’s definition leaves open a crucial question when it comes to a historical analysis of antisemitism: Why and how does antisemitism construct “the Jews” as its specific discursive element? The traditional answer is that the empirical Jews had their share in the emergence of (Pagan/Christian) anti-Judaism which in turn provided a background for the emergence of (modern) antisemitism.

Klug is certainly right when stressing that antisemitism discriminates Jews as “Jews”, i.e. by an image that has no causal connection with empirical Jews. As this work is concerned

⁶ The recently-published volume *Beschreibungsversuche der Judenfeindschaft. Zur Geschichte der Antisemitismusforschung vor 1944* (Hahn/Kistenmacher 2015) reconstructs a history of the theoretical reflection on antisemitism before the Second World War.

⁷ The definition was taken offline in 2013 by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) (the institution following the EUMC in 2007) over rows whether a vilification of Israel should be part of the definition (see Times of Israel, Dec. 5th, 2013, <http://www.timesofisrael.com/eu-drops-its-working-definition-of-anti-semitism/>, viewed 29.09.15). The definition cited above has been taken from the Website of the “European Forum on Antisemitism”: <http://www.european-forum-on-antisemitism.org/working-definition-of-antisemitism/english/> (viewed 29.09.15).

with the history of antisemitism, I propose to extend Klug's definition. Antisemitism suggests a correspondence of image and reality while it actually detaches "the Jews" from the empirical group of Jews. An analysis of antisemitism that does not accept the assumption of correspondence should focus on identifying alternative factors for the construction and dissemination of the discursive Jews. With the present study, I want to maintain that it is indeed possible to explain the development of early Christian antisemitism/anti-Judaism with reference to factors other than the empirical Jews. This is not to say that interaction between Jews and Christians did not take place but that there is good reason to doubt a *causal relation* between this interaction and the emergence of a Catholic formation of antisemitism⁸.

*

The present work does not intend to provide a universal and encompassing explanation for antisemitism but a framework to grasp a complex phenomenon in its diversity (see Benz 2015: 247). Its starting point is the observation that "the Jews" resurface in the center of discursive formations at the end of the era of formative Catholicism by the fourth century. The frequent recurrence of antisemitism ever since has sparked discussions as to whether one can speak of an "eternal antisemitism" ("ewiger Antisemitismus"). Proponents of this notion highlight the persistence with which Jew-hatred has accompanied the development of Western civilizations for the last centuries (see e.g. Almog 1988b). Accordingly, Simmel describes it as a malicious ulcer on the body of civilization ("bösesartiges Geschwür am Körper der Zivilisation", Simmel 1993: 59; cf. Baumann 1992). Situating antisemitism within the dialectics of Western societies as in Horkheimer and Adorno's *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Horkheimer/Adorno 2003) may add further fuel to a tendency to explain the occurrence of antisemitism as part of a general societal dynamic. Opponents of the notion of "eternal antisemitism" criticize the static conception of "eternal" situating "the Jews" in the position of the teleological victim

⁸ Certainly, antisemitism and the empirical Jews do interact. There are important and inspiring works on the inverse effect (Christian) antisemitism has and continues to have on Jewish subjection (see e.g. Gilman 1990). Those effects, however, are secondary to antisemitism itself. Rather than being a part of *Antisemitismusstudien*, they belong to the sphere of "Jewish studies" (in a way, Kinzig is making a similar argument when rejecting antisemitism as hermeneutical key-category for an analysis of Judaeo-Christian relations, see Kinzig 2002: 15). Furthermore, the behavior of a Jewish individual may well serve as an initial spark for the outbreak of antisemitism (e.g. the case of Herschel Grynszpan). Katz comments: "diese Formen, diese Bilder wären nicht entstanden, wenn sie nicht wenigstens in ihrem Kern über das kulturelle Erbe von früheren Generationen überkommen wären. Und sie hätten nicht gedauert, sie wären nicht wieder neu aufpoliert worden, hätte die jüdische Gemeinschaft nicht als separate Einheit gegenüber der allgemeinen Gesellschaft bestanden" (Katz 1989: 252f.). The presence of empirical Jews may trigger antisemitism, it does not, however, shape the function it has within the discourse community ("Diskursgemeinschaft").

(“teleologischen Opferrolle”, Benz 2004: 241). Hannah Arendt has commented that the conception of an eternal antisemitism could end up providing an alibi for the Shoah (see Arendt 2008: 38).

In the same spirit as Arendt, Princeton-professor Gavin I. Langmuir notes that the common use of the term antisemitism “carries over from Aryan myth the implication that hostility toward Jews is an enduring [...] reaction of non-Jews to some unique and unchanging [...] real characteristics of Jews” (Langmuir 1990d: 314). He maintains that the term “antisemitism” implies “that there has been something peculiar about hostility against Jews” (ibid.: 341). Langmuir rejects such a conception as inappropriate and static because it suggests that antisemitism has “always inspired the same kind of hostility in non-Jews of very different kinds” (Langmuir 1990b: 5). For Langmuir, such a definition rests on “the unproven assumption that for centuries, and despite innumerable changes on both sides, there has been a distinctive kind of reaction of non-Jews directed only at Jews that corresponds to the concept presently evoked by the word 'antisemitism.'” (Langmuir 1990d: 315). Such a definition (e.g. in Grosser and Halperin 1979⁹), Langmuir argues, treats the general occurrence of xenophobia in European societies as something specifically directed against empirical Jews. He concludes that such an ethnocentric framework which has been appealing to people, Jewish scholars and racists alike, sharing the assumption that “something uniquely valuable in Jewishness” (Langmuir 1990d: 315) evokes a unique type of hostility (see ibid.).

The renowned scholar and former head of the *Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung*, Wolfgang Benz, follows Langmuir when arguing that the very variability of the phenomenon contradicts the notion of eternal (see Benz 2004: 240). For Ernst Simmel, on the other hand, this variability serves as evidence for a consistent structure underlying the single manifestations (see Simmel 1993: 58). Simmel then points to the central question scholars such as Arendt, Langmuir and Benz must answer – why do “the Jews” reappear in so many different political, social and religious settings? Surely, one option is to explain each resurgence with the encounter between discourse-community and empirical Jews. While Arendt surely moves within such a framework of the correspondence-theory, Langmuir seems to be led by the right intuition falling short, however, in acknowledging the specificity of “antisemitism” that could itself allow for variation. If pushed, I would side with Simmel’s proposal to take the variability of

⁹ Grosser/Halperin define antisemitism as “[a]ttitudes and actions against Jews based on the belief that Jews are uniquely inferior, evil or deserving of condemnation by their very nature or by historical or supernatural dictates” (Grosser/Halperin 1979: 5).

antisemitism as evidence for an underlying structure.

2.1.3 Antisemitism/Anti-Judaism – The Question of Difference

The term antisemitism was first used in 1879 in an essay by Journalist Wilhelm Marr (1819-1904) titled *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum. Vom nicht confessionellen Standpunkt aus betrachtet* (“The triumph of Judaism over Germanism. Seen from a non-religious standpoint”, see Marr 1879). Taken from linguistics, “antisemitism” evoked scientific relevance and opened itself to the influence of social Darwinism, Nietzschean motives and pseudo-biological discourses on race (see Volkov 2000a: 27). The title of Marr’s essay already demonstrates that the term intended to translate the traditional religious Jew-hatred (“Judenhass”) into a context free of theological i.e. Christian influence (see Bauer 2003: 1). This demarcation mirrors the changing configuration of the political discourse in Germany in which “national awakening” (“nationales Erwachen”) was constructed against the “old” and supposed “colonial” Christian religion of which Judaism was seen as a prototype and embodiment (see Tal 2004: 178). On the other hand, scholars have repeatedly shown that Christian stereotypes, images and fantasies were in fact integrated into this new conception (see Klug 2007a: 57).

Seen in the historical context of its emergence, it is hardly surprising that many scholars remain critical of an employment of the term “antisemitism” for historical research of anti-Jewish actions and politics, especially before the 19th century. A strong current in modern scholarship argues accordingly that the term should apply only to the time between the late 19th century and 1945, during which period antisemitic discourses emerged and became inherently connected to “the Aryan myth, [...] biological racism, white supremacy or ultra-populist ethno-nationalism” (Judaken 2008: 536; cf. Taguieff 2004: 11; Bauer 2003: 1¹⁰). Scholars have warned against an indiscriminate employment of the term antisemitism for historical research. Bauer argues,

“there is no differentiation [...] between periods, between mild, moderate, and radical Jew hatred, between phenomena that can easily be explained by referring to a general

¹⁰ Shmuel Almog takes the opposite view when noting that after Marr, the term “came into such widespread use that it no longer refers to a specific category of Jew-hatred, such as racial antisemitism, or even modern antisemitism as such” (Almog 1988b: xi).

dislike of strangers, to hatred or dislike concentrated especially against Jews” (Bauer 2003: 1).

Bauer then states the failure of antisemitism as a scientific term to reflect internal distinctions deriving from different formations, e.g. “mixture of Christian and Moslem theological opposition to Jews, traditional economic jealousy and competitiveness, and racial biological and nationalistic ideological motives” (ibid.). Judaken shares Bauer's concern when noting the term “antisemitism [...] occludes the distinctions between different epistemic configurations and the differing social forces that were and are at work in ancient Judaeophobia” (Judaken 2008: 537¹¹).

Scholars working in the field of historical research on antisemitism in (early) Christianity have thus proposed the term anti-Judaism to distinguish earlier occurrences from (modern) antisemitism. In *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (1983), John Gager outlines the traditional and most prominent argument for this distinction: “Unlike pagan anti-Semitism, Christian anti-Judaism is primarily a matter of religious and theological disagreement” (Gager 1983: 8; cf. Hoffmann 1994: 294; Benz 2015: 14¹²). Johannes Heil, director of the Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg, follows the general thrust of the argument but introduces a slight shift when arguing that the term “antisemitism” should be reserved for the modern type of *racial and annihilationist* hatred against Jews. The term “anti-Judaism” should be used to describe a Christian form of Jew-hatred because it implied – at least in theory – the physical survival of Jewish communities (see Heil 1997: 106; cf. Flannery 1965: 60f.).

In an alternative attempt to differentiate antisemitism from other forms of Jew-hatred, Langmuir proposes a conception that defines anti-Judaism as a “total or partial opposition to Judaism – and to Jews as adherents of it – by people who accept a competing system of beliefs and practices and consider certain genuine Judaic beliefs and practices as

¹¹ David Sidorsky objects to the use of the term on a theoretical level (see Sidorsky 1988). He assumes that a “projection of symbols identified with the Jew within the framework of language concedes an element of continuity to the reflection in language of Jewish historical experience” (ibid.: 169). This symbolic continuation of talking about “the Jew”, Sidorsky notes, may “not be judged to be sufficient” (ibid.) to adopt a term like antisemitism and “to relate [it] to diverse patterns of the historical record” (ibid.). For Sidorsky, the extreme case of Nazism demonstrates the “relational inadequacy” (ibid.) between the symbolic i.e. discursive continuity and their adaption in history. Rather than taking this as an argument for continuation, it should be seen as a transcendence of antisemitic paradigms. Consequently, he proposes an approach that contextualizes incidents as “genus within its appropriate species in its environment rather than by reference to historical patterns or antecedents” (ibid.: 170). This leads Sidorsky to demand a “limitation of the use of the term ‘antisemitism,’” with its connotations of historical continuity, in favor of a description of the particular kind of conflict or tension taking place between the Jewish and non-Jewish communities” (ibid.; cf. Langmuir 1990d: 314).

¹² Bernard Lazare was probably the first scholar to underline this difference between modern and traditional Jew-hatred in the late 19th century, see Voigt 2015: 156f.

inferior” (Langmuir 1990a: 57). The mere occurrence of this type of xenophobia is not sufficient to qualify the term “antisemitism”, Langmuir argues, because it is not unusual enough to allow the employment of a different term (see Langmuir 1990d: 315; cf. Wistrich 1991: xixf.). Instead, Langmuir turns to the most drastic example of violence directed against Jews – the Holocaust – to support his conception, admitting that he is “looking backward from Hitler rather than forward from Jesus of Nazareth” (Langmuir 1990b: 5). Tracing the history of the National Socialist antisemitism back to its medieval roots Langmuir comes to define the term antisemitism as “socially significant chimerical hostility” (Langmuir 1990d: 341¹³).

Thus, three conceptual approaches of distinguishing anti-Judaism from antisemitism have been identified. For Gager and Hoffmann, anti-Judaism and antisemitism must be differentiated according to the discursive surface of emergence (religious hatred vs. modern racism or Pagan superstition). For Heil and Flannery, the two terms can also be divided along the lines of the policies implicated and adopted – while anti-Judaism insists on the survival of Jews (modern) antisemitism does not. Langmuir, on the other hand, proposes a definition oriented towards the relation between discourse (“Jews”) and world (Jews). Langmuir’s distinction between rational forms (anti-Judaism) and chimerical forms of Jew-hatred (antisemitism) is ultimately decided by asking about the empirical behavior of the Jewish communities of the respective time (see Schäfer 1998: 202). It thus stays within the correspondence-theoretical framework.

*

All three attempts to differentiation are theoretically problematic. Starting with the notion of antisemitism as a modern phenomenon: If one does not intend to use a very narrow definition omitting anything but Wilhelm Marr and his disciples in the German conservative political camp, the surface of emergence of antisemitism has *never* been restricted to racism. Racially founded antisemitism coexisted with other forms of

¹³ For a critical discussion of the heuristic quality of Langmuir’s differentiation in historical research, see Schäfer 1998: 198-204. Schäfer uncovers that a conception of quantity (i.e. the intensity of Jew-hatred) is underlying many attempts to differentiate anti-Judaism from antisemitism. Thereby, those conceptions ultimately fail to provide a useful analytical differentiation (see *ibid.*: 198-211). One recent example for this conception can be found in David Berger’s introduction to *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue* (2010). Berger introduces the notion of “proportionality” (Berger 2010: 4) as the decisive threshold separating antisemitism from anti-Judaism. He defines antisemitism as the “hostility towards Jews as a group which results from no legitimate cause or greatly exceeds any reasonable, ethical response to genuine provocation” (*ibid.*: 3). Schäfer proposes the term “Judeophobia” for a Roman attitude that was “peculiar not only in that it projects onto the Jews an irrational feeling of being threatened by some mysterious conspiracy but also, and mainly, in that it responds to the very real success of the Jews in the midst of Roman society” (Schäfer 1998: 210).

antisemitism that continued to mutually inspire each other (see Judakin 2008: 547, 550). It can be found among the German Social Democrats (SPD) during the late 19th century, who presented themselves as politically *opposing* Marr's conservative antisemitism. It can also be found in anarchist and communist circles in France, Germany and Soviet Russia, although they presented themselves as an alternative to the antisemitic Czarist Russia. This strain of antisemitism developed into a formation of its own, especially in Soviet Russia, identifying “the Jews” with capitalism, rejecting Jewish claims to peoplehood and accusing them of Zionist internationalism. Modern antisemitism is a diverse phenomenon without a common denominator except its focus on “the Jews”.

Likewise, the differentiation between antisemitism and anti-Judaism is not without pitfalls. John Gager, author of the seminal study *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*, notes that the distinction between anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism “became a standard apologetic device” (Gager 1983: 18) in Anglophone theology after 1945 “for refuting the charge that the New Testament contains the seeds of anti-Semitism” (ibid.; cf. Levine 1999: 13). The German scholar Luise Schottroff observes a similar apologetic function for German theology. After 1945, the occupation of German theologians with the anti-Judaic roots of Christianity had long remained at the margins of scholarship. Rejecting any Christian responsibility for the emergence of modern antisemitism, the larger number of German theologians justified religious anti-Judaism as normal for the nascent religion. This culminated in the claim: “Theologischer Antijudaismus bedeutet ja nicht Antisemitismus” („theological anti-Judaism is not the same as antisemitism“, Schottroff 1990: 217¹⁴). The Jewish-American scholar Susannah Heschel formulates a Jewish perspective on this distinction:

“Aus jüdischer Perspektive verblaßt der Unterschied zwischen Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Gehaßt zu werden, verhöhnt zu werden, verfolgt zu werden ist für die Betroffenen – unabhängig von den Motiven des Täters – im Ergebnis dasselbe” (Heschel 1988: 71).

Even if one decides to reject Heschel’s focus on the effects of Jew-hatred to turn towards the discourses themselves, the attempts to differentiate (modern) antisemitism from (Christian) anti-Judaism remain unsatisfactory. To start with, the underlying assumption

¹⁴ The apologetic dimension of the term “anti-Judaism” was also noticed by Joseph Goebbels, minister of propaganda in the Third Reich, who demanded in 1935 that the term “antisemitic” be exchanged with the term “anti-Jewish” (see Broer 1992: 5, fn. 5, referring to Denzler, *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 23.10.1989, p. 14).

of a unified modern antisemitism cannot stand empirical examination. Conservative antisemitism and its focus on race-theory is different from a Socialist formation of antisemitism based on Marxist terminology or a liberal antisemitism focusing on assimilation. All three are rooted in Enlightenment but do not share their basic assumptions. One is thus led to conclude that the surface of emergence is not of much service in differentiating between Christianity and modern forms of antisemitism.

Likewise, Heil's distinction between a deadly antisemitism and a degrading anti-Judaism whose repressive tolerance allowed for Jewish survival is misleading. Not only was there a time of repressive tolerance in Soviet Russia, Liberal antisemites also did not want to annihilate the Jews but demanded their complete assimilation. To be sure, the traditional Christian idea that Jews had to survive as witnesses to the end of days originates in an Augustine conception and was adopted by Pope Gregory I "the Great". The idea of repressive tolerance thus marks a specific policy of the Church institutionalized in the sixth century. However, it cannot be considered representative of the centuries predating Augustine and does not describe the general attitude of other (religious or mundane) institutions besides the Christian Papacy (whose adherence to this idea was patchy at best). The survival of Jews was never more than one option within the catalogue of anti-Jewish policies.

To be sure, if one was to adopt an alternative and narrower definition of antisemitism one could decide to designate the term only to Marr's Jew-hatred and his direct follow-ups. That would leave scholars with the task of designing new names for all other anti-Judaic formations. This seems to be the aim of Langmuir's critique when noting that the use of additional adjectives "only distinguish secondary characteristics of the hostility" (Langmuir 1990d: 314) but "do not imply a fundamental difference in its nature" (ibid.). Why is this problematic for Langmuir? It is because such a universal terminology implies "that there was nothing uniquely evil in quality about the Final Solution" (ibid.). In a way, this continuity is exactly the aspect the "antisemitism dispositive" wants to focus on. Why do discourses on "the Jews" reappear in the history of Western societies without an obvious or necessary link to the presence or behavior of empirical Jewish communities? Why the Jews?

The present study uses the term "antisemitism" in connection with adjectives because I do not see any convincing argument to introduce a fundamental difference in the *nature* of alternative formations of antisemitism. Rather, the terminological difference between

antisemitism and anti-Judaism appears to perpetuate the apologetic separation between Christian forms of Jew-hatred and other formations of antisemitism. Instead, the present study assumes that there is a detachment of the discursive “Jews” from their empirical counterparts already prepared for in some of the earliest Christian texts (see Baron 1964: 8). As demonstrated below, this detachment is supported by the finding that Christian writers are concerned not so much with empirical Judaism than with Christology, theological disputes and socio-political struggles. The decisive focus of those writings is on the Jewish scriptures and prophecy, not on any empirical group of Jews or “Judaism” (which did not, in any case, yet exist).

Peter Schäfer, director of the Jewish Museum in Berlin, is quite right when noting that “one should argue for a more specific vocabulary, reserving the more common and neutral terms ‘hostility,’ ‘hatred,’ and ‘anti-Judaism’ for expressions of hostility which the Jews share with other ethnic groups” (Schäfer 1998: 197). The term “antisemitism” should indeed be reserved for a discourse on “the Jews” whose decisive characteristic lies on the epistemological level. This leads me to the following definitions: *(Christian) antisemitism is a way to perceive the world and self through “the Jews”. By this epistemic quality, it constitutes a universe of possible knowledge of history, eschatology and the Jewish Other*¹⁵. *“Anti-Judaism”, on the other hand, designates a group of negative statements about Jews that consider certain Judaic beliefs and practices as inferior but has a restricted position regarding a conception of world and self*¹⁶.

To be sure, anti-Judaism and antisemitism remain permeable as long as the Catholic Church has not yet risen to install its perspective on “the Jews” as universal framework for the Roman Empire. This creates the necessary conditions in which the “antisemitism dispositive” emerges, a term describing the endurance of the epistemic quality of (Christian) antisemitism (and thus its potential to resurface at different points in an endless number of variations). It should thus be obvious that a non-Jewish framework is an important prerequisite for antisemitism and anti-Judaism to develop. At the same time, one should not dismiss references to Jewish polemics (e.g. prophetic criticism in the Jewish scriptures) as evidence for an inner-Jewish critique. This may well point to an

¹⁵ This definition of antisemitism includes conceptions such as antisemitism as a world view (“Weltanschauung”), i.e. “an explanation of how the world works” (Diner 2007: 49) or the idea of antisemitism as a “cultural code” (Volkov 2000a), i.e. as an “empty signifier[...]” (Ziemann 2005: 313) for central problems of a society.

¹⁶ I have decided to move the conceptional chapter to the end of this work to grant more space to the argumentative force of historical analysis. I thereby hope to respond to Davies mistrust against speculative theories of antisemitism “which either turn a blind eye toward history, or else tailor the evidence in a subtle fashion to fit their own assumptions” (Davies 1969: 31).

appropriation of the Jewish scriptures by the respective author, e.g. the proto-Catholic strategy of highlighting continuity while rejecting the empirical Judaism of its day. This underlines the importance context has for a proper evaluation of a respective source.

2.2 Early Christian Antisemitism (Literature Review)

2.2.1 The Beginning of Critique – Moore, Parkes & Isaac

The New Testament scholar George Foot Moore and the Christian clergyman and scholar James Parkes were among the first who drew attention to what they considered systematic anti-Judaism within the early Church. In 1921 Moore published his article *Christian writers on Judaism* in the Harvard Theological Review (see Moore 1921). The first paragraph gives a good impression of what was to become an important focus of critical scholarship on Christian perceptions of Judaism. “Christian interest in Jewish literature” (More 1921: 197), More starts, “has always been apologetic or polemic rather than historical” (ibid.). Only a few years after More’s publication, Parkes began his work on Christianity and antisemitism (see Parkes 1979: vii) materializing first in his 1930-essay *The Jew and his Neighbour* (Parkes 1938) and culminated in his seminal doctoral thesis *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A study in the origins of antisemitism* (Parkes 1934) submitted at Oxford University. Becker/Reed comment:

“Insofar as *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* analysed the period of Christian Origins as part of a broader inquiry into the causes of modern anti-Semitism, this book represented a radical departure from contemporaneous research on the New Testament, ‘late Judaism,’ and early Christianity, which continued to view these topics through the lens of Christian beliefs about the church’s deserved status as the new and true Israel” (Becker/Reeds 2003: 9).

For Parkes and Moore, antagonism arose in early Christianity not so much because of a historical confrontation of two religions but because of an ideological conflict on the Christian side. Parkes concludes:

“if we had to explain events on the basis of casual happenings alone, we should be forced to the conclusion that there was far more reason for the Jew to hate the Christian than for the Christian to hate the Jew – and this is on the evidence of the Christian sources alone”

Flanked by Christian scholars such as Robert Travers Herford (1962, o. 1924) or Arthur Lukyn Williams (1935) and Solomon Schechter (1915) from the Jewish side¹⁷, those works opened a way for a critical reassessment of a Christian perspective on “the Jews” as legalistic, violent and stubborn. An encompassing critique of this traditional depiction of Judaism in Christian sources was undertaken right after the Second World War by the Jewish historian Jules Isaac (1968 [1946]). Antisemitism, Isaac maintained, arose as the result of a tradition of Christian (mis-)representation of Judaism culminating in the Shoah (see Isaac 1968: 53; 288-305; 460-463). To Isaac, the task of the critical historian was to stop reproducing this tradition of antisemitism by focusing on the contemporary setting of the Gospels and pointing out their Jewish background (see *ibid.*: 454).

Isaac’s work marks the beginning of a wider occupation with the Christian tradition of antisemitism in post-war scholarship (see Gager 1983: 15f.). For this critical revision of traditional Christian positions, the Shoah served as a central motivational factor. Klassen notes accordingly that “there can be no doubt that the present wave of interest in anti-Semitism in the New Testament is determined to a large extent by the wave of quite justified shame that Christian interpreters have with respect to the Holocaust” (Klassen 1986: 15). The fact that Germany, the land of the Reformation, had organized and executed the murder of millions of Jews (amongst many others) led Christian and non-Christian scholars to wonder whether “the roots of the Holocaust extend back into the Christian ages?” (Davies 1979b: xiv).

In *Antisemitism and the Christian Mind: The Crisis of Conscience after Auschwitz* (Davies 1969), the Canadian scholar Alan T. Davies identifies the Shoah as a central reason for a continuous and intensifying engagement of Christian authors with the question of (early) Christian antisemitism (see Davies 1969: 40ff.; cf. Gager 1983: 14)¹⁸. Much of the works on early Christian anti-Judaism published after 1945 confirm this

¹⁷ Jewish scholarship during the 19th century had been very sensitive in detecting what Schechter calls “the philosophic Hep-Hep” (Schechter 1915: 36) or “Higher antisemitism” (*ibid.*: 37). For an encompassing analysis of the reaction of German-Jewish scholars to antisemitism during the 19th century, see Christian Wiese’s magisterial work *Wissenschaft des Judentums und Protestantische Theologie im Wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere?* (Wiese 1999).

¹⁸ Consult Brandon (1967) for an interesting extension of this argument. Brandon argues that the time of imperialistic rule had muffled interest in the internal contradictions of Christendom. The Second World War and the accompanying positive reassessment of anti-state rebellion, however, sparked interest in Jesus as a political figure – the reassessment of early Christian history and a gradual change in exegetic works followed suit (see Brandon 1967: 24).

impression¹⁹.

2.2.2 Simon, Ruether and the Religious Vitality of Judaism

From its onset, post-war scholarship on early Christian antisemitism assumed a close relationship between discourse on the Jews and social interaction among Jews and Christians. Published in 1948, Simon's *Verus Israel* can be considered the “foundational work” (Taylor 1995: 1) for a scholarship maintaining that Christian-Jewish relations form the basis for the emergence of early Christian anti-Judaism²⁰. Simon considers social interaction the decisive factor for the perpetuation of anti-Jewish sentiments in early Christianity. Against the traditional Christian portrayal of Judaism as an outdated, passive and moribund religion abandoned by God, Simon drew the image of a vital Judaism competing for converts and persecuting early Christians (see Lieu 1992: 82f.). *Verus Israel* thus combines a critical reassessment of the responsibility of Christian anti-Judaism for modern forms of antisemitism with a conflict theoretical model. This conflictual model shifted analysis away from Christian self-construction to a supposed Judaeo-Christian conflict. Thereby, Simon opposes not only Adolf von Harnack's negative portrayal of Judaism²¹ but also his well-known assumption that “the Jews” of Christian anti-Jewish literature did not reflect a genuine encounter but were the “straw men” for Christian theologizing (see Harnack 1883: 63; Simon 1986: 138). Taking up an impulse of Jules Isaac, Simon concludes “the most compelling reason for anti-Semitism was the religious vitality of Israel” (ibid.: 232; cf. Isaac 1968: 462).

In his 1969 book *Antisemitism and the Christian Mind*, Davies notes that the overwhelming majority of theologians working on Christian anti-Judaism after the Second World War had not gone beyond the level of a superficial critique of a Christian anti-Judaic tradition (see Davies 1969: 47ff.). Joined by Charlotte Klein's *Anti-Judaism*

¹⁹ For an array of works mentioning the Shoah as a central motivation, see Baron 1946; Baum 1963, 1974; Eckardt 1967; Eckert/Levinson/Stöhr 1967b; Sandmel 1978; Davies 1979; Koenig 1979; Rendtorff/Stegemann 1980; Metz 1984; Richardson/Granskou 1986; Gaston 1987; Almog 1988b; Mußner 1988; 1991; Langmuir 1990; Schottroff 1990; Broer 1992: 2; Tyson 1992: vii; Leighton 1994; Ruether 1997; cf. Gager 1983: 15; Klassen 1986: 19; Smiga 1992: 6; Fischel/Ortmann 2004.

²⁰ For scholars that have adopted Simon's conflictual assumptions, see Grayzel 1946; Flannery 1965: 62f.; Isaac 1968: 462; Meagher 1979; Gager 1983; Klassen 1986; Lieu 1992; 1996; Feldman 1993; Wilson 1995; Dunn 1996; Ruether 1997; McLaren 2013.

²¹ Certainly, Simone intended to refute Harnack's (antisemitic) assumption that Judaism had been a passive and harmless actor after the emergence of Christianity. However, a refutation of this image of Judaism does not necessarily demand a conflictual framework. I will return to this question at the end of this work.

in *Christian Theology* (1978, German original 1975) and Rosemary Ruether's work *Faith and Fratricide* (Ruether 1997, o. 1974), Davies' criticism paved the road for a more profound critique of Christian anti-Judaism in the Anglophone sphere (for the development in German theology, see next chapter).

The Catholic Theologian Rosemary Ruether picked up the pace of critical examination that had started with Marcel Simon's *Verus Israel* about 25 years earlier. In *Faith and Fratricide* (1997), Ruether demonstrated forcefully that Christian anti-Judaism was not only to be understood against the background of a defense against a vital Judaism. Rather than being merely a historical by-product of this empirical encounter (Simon), the refutation of Judaism soon became the core of Christian exegesis and self-construction (see Ruether 1997: 121). This led Ruether to her famous question: "Is it possible to say 'Jesus is the Messiah' without, implicitly or explicitly, saying at the same time 'and the Jews be damned'?" (Ruether 1997: 246).

Ruether's claim that a Christian anti-Judaism was the left hand of Christology was not easy to digest. Christian scholars tried to demonstrate that early Christian texts could not be a source of anti-Judaism. They tried to substantiate this claim on three levels: (1) by demonstrating that antisemitism roots in Pagan anti-Jewish imagery (see Wilde 1949: 231; Baum 1963: 13), (2) by claiming that it is a legitimate act of theological distinction (see Wilckens 1974: 604-606) and (3) by arguing that an anti-Jewish interpretation of the Scriptures was a later distortion (see Baum 1963: 14f.; Isaac 1968: 454; Kampling 2002a: 96-98; Stegemann 2004: 59f.;). One of Ruether's prominent opponents, the Canadian theologian Gregory Baum, can be taken as an example for how traditional positions came under pressure as the discussion progressed. In his 1961 publication *The Jews and the Gospel*, Baum conceded that Jules Isaac's writing had forced him to dismiss earlier assumptions as uncritical (see Baum 1963: 13). In his introduction to Ruether's *Faith and Fratricide* in 1974, he also abandoned earlier attempts to defend the New Testament against the charge of antisemitism and confessed that he now agreed with Ruether's main insights (see Baum 1974: 4; repeated in his introduction to Charlotte Klein's critical assessment of German theology after the Shoah, see Baum 1975; cf. Klein 1975).

In her doctoral thesis *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity. A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus* (1995), Miriam S. Taylor took Ruether's hypothesis to its logical extreme. An inspiring and sharp refutation of what she calls the "conflict theory" of antisemitism (Taylor 1995: 3), Taylor questions the very basis of Simon's theoretical

assumption (Ruether had still accepted them for her work) and argued that it had led to a “distorted reading of the early Christian anti-Judaic passages” (see Taylor 1995: 189²²). One must credit Taylor for pointing to an apologetic tendency in the conflictual hypothesis:

“[T]he focus on Judaism as stimulator of antagonism effectively succeeds in shifting the focus away from internal soul-searching in the Christian camp, in order to distribute the blame and divide the responsibility in accounting for the generation of prejudice. For if anti-Judaism is described as emerging out of a social conflict, then it can be characterized as the by-product of a historical rivalry in which both parties might be said to be equally involved, and equally responsible” (Taylor 1995: 195).

Taylor’s work marks the limit scholarship on a Christian responsibility for a tradition of anti-Judaism has reached to this day. Only a year after Taylor’s book, Guy G. Stroumsa published an essay trying to reconcile Taylor’s and Simon’s position. This was an early attempt to move beyond the juxtaposition created between Marcel Simon and the “conflict theory” on the one, Taylor on the other side (see Stroumsa 1996). However, the opposition between the two camps continues to shape scholarly debates.

Looking at works released in the past two decades, one can conclude that it has led to a destabilization of basic conceptions of both, Simon’s argument and Taylor’s response. Among the most important aspects of this reassessment has been the deconstruction of a clear-cut opposition between Judaism and Christianity during the first three centuries (see Boyarin 2004; Mayer 2013: 15-17). This has inspired a shift in historical narrative from rupture to transformation (see *ibid.*). The present study integrates those insights when focusing on the way an image of “the Jews” emerged and disseminated in early Christian writing. Before discussing those questions, however, I turn to the specific path of German scientific writing on early Christian Jew-hatred.

2.2.3 A Belated Development – Theology in Germany after 1945

When compared with Anglophone scholarship, one cannot but note a delay in the

²² Scholars had previously cast doubt on the assumption that an empirical conflict between Church and Synagogue led to Christian anti-Judaism, see Hare 1967b; Rokeah 1982, Lieu/North/Rajak 1992b, Taylor 1995; and Mayer/Neil 2013.

emergence of a critical self-reflection in (West-)German theology after 1945²³. Designed after the US-American *National Council of Christians and Jews*, the US administration had encouraged the formation of *Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit* (Societies for German-Jewish cooperation) in different West-German cities after 1945 and in 1950, the *Deutscher Koordinierungsrat der Christen und Juden* was founded as an umbrella organization (see Foschepoth 1993: 70-79²⁴). However, the self-perception of German Christians remained one of common victimhood. For them, Jews and Christians had suffered together under the anti-religious regime of National Socialism. This made it difficult to discuss the question of a Christian responsibility beyond individual cases (see Foschepoth 1993: 21-29; 91-93). It should not be surprising, then, that critical (self-)reflection played a marginal role in the – mostly educational – work of the *Gesellschaften* (with the possible exception of Frankfurt; see *ibid.*: 84ff. ²⁵). The *Schwalbacher Thesen* from 1950 are a notable exception (see Thieme 1963a: 74-79; Foschepoth 1993: 130-134).

The self-perception of German Christians continued to thwart substantial reflection on a Christian share in modern antisemitism. Upon the trial against Eichmann in 1961, attitudes started to change at last (see Foschepoth 1993: 26). In 1960, the Protestant Church passed a resolution that condemned the Christian tradition of anti-Judaism (“Gesamtdeutsche Synode der Evangelischen Kirche”). From 1962 – 1965, the Catholic Church followed suit when the *Second Vatican Council* condemned a Christian tradition of anti-Judaism (see Schottroff 1990: 331; Kampling 2004: 70f.; 77²⁶). At about the same time, interest in this topic started to mount among German theologians. Together with Eckert and Ehrlich’s *Judenhaß – Schuld der Christen* (1964), Thieme’s *Judenfeindschaft*

²³ One of the few theological works before 1945 critical of an anti-Jewish interpretation of the New Testament is Erich Petersens’ *Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden* (1933). On the Jewish side, reactions had been more explicit. For a record of the German-Jewish opposition against anti-Jewish tendencies in German (Protestant) theology during the 19th century, see Wiese 1994, 1999.

²⁴ Foschepoth notes the importance of this external stimulus: “Die Tatsache, daß die Gesellschaften von außen, von einem Amerikaner, und von oben, als Vorstandsgesellschaften und nicht etwa als Mitgliedergesellschaften, gegründet wurden, zeigte, daß christlich-jüdische Zusammenarbeit keineswegs einem elementaren Bedürfnis der Deutschen nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg entsprach” (Foschepoth 1993: 195).

²⁵ For the – in some cases substantial – differences among the local organizations, see *ibid.*: 80-116. Discussing the example of Berlin, Foschepoth also points to the difficult situation of Jews who felt German (“deutsch fühlender Juden”). It was not uncommon for those Jews to support declarations of the *Gesellschaften* demanding a future-oriented and positive approach to the question of Jewish-Christian interaction. That future-oriented approach in some cases included a rejection of a continued reflection upon the roots of national socialist antisemitism and a lack of support for a restitution of property to Jews living outside Germany (see *ibid.*: 114-116).

²⁶ Scholars documenting the mounting occupation of the Christian Churches with the question of antisemitism in German theology include Rendtorff/Stegemann (1980), Rendtorff (1989), Ginze/Fessler (1997), compare also the extensive documentation in Rendtorff/Henrix (1988), Henrix/Kraus (2001) and the continuously updated online-publication Henrix/Boschki (2011).

(1963b) focused more on the correction of *mutual* prejudices than on a tradition of *Christian* anti-Judaism²⁷. It was not until three/four years later that a group of Jewish and Christian scholars published a volume debating the Christian involvement in the history of anti-Judaism/anti-Semitism (see Eckert/Levinson/Stöhr 1967, cf. Goldstein 1979).

While the first phase after 1945 is marked by an almost complete silence on the topic of Christian anti-Judaism, the 1960s saw a renewed interest in the Christian-Jewish dialogue. The basic assumption behind this interest remained the idea that mutual misperceptions had (mis)shaped the Jewish-Christian relations. An *internal* critique of a Christian tradition of anti-Jewish exegesis developed only hesitantly and alongside a continued discussion. Scholars helping to pave the way for this second phase include the aforementioned Karl Thieme (1963b), Günther Harder, head of the *Institut Kirche und Judentum*²⁸ from 1960-1974 and Helmut Gollwitzer, editor of the *Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog* and chair of the “Arbeitsgemeinschaft Juden und Christen beim Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchentag”²⁹.

A fierce debate about the continuing presence of anti-Judaism/antisemitism in (contemporary) Christianity arose after Ulrich Wilckens had published his translation and commentary of the New Testament (see Wilckens 1970). Among his various critiques, David Flusser stands out (see Flusser 1974; cf. Wilckens 1974). These discussions gained further momentum with the translation of Ruether’s *Faith and Fratricide* (1978) and the arrival of German feminist critiques during the second half of the 1980s, among them Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz (1994b [1982]; 1988; 1994a), Luise Schottroff (1990) and Marie-Theres Wacker (Schottroff/Wacker 1996; cf. Valtnik 1996³⁰). While Siegele-Wenschkewitz set out to outline a feminist, anti-antisemitic theology, Schottroff joined Charlotte Klein in her critical assessment of German theology after 1945. Klein lamented

²⁷ Kampe introduces Eckert and Ehrlich’s volume with a note on the mutual prejudices that have shaped the Judaeo-Christian relations (see Kampe 1964: 9). Thieme’s compendium (1963b) opens with an essay by Johann Maier who notes that a Christian polemic against Jews should not be taken as a sign of anti-Judaism but as a theologically justified demarcation (see Maier 1963: 22).

²⁸ For a short account on the history of the *Institut Kirche und Judentum*, see Osten-Sacken 2005.

²⁹ More scholars flanking this development include Paul Winter (1974, o. 1961; 1967), Erich Grässer (1965; 1967), Friedrich Heer (1967, 1968), Michael Brocke (1971), David Flusser (1974, 1980), Charlotte Klein (1975), Johann Baptist Metz (1984); Franz Mußner (1988 [1979]; 1991; 1995) and Peter von der Osten-Sacken (1976; 1977; 1978) who succeeded Harder as head of the *Institut Kirche und Judentum* 1974-2007. This development was accompanied by a rise of academic and public interest in the history and persistence of antisemitism. The establishment of the *Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung* in 1982 serves as further evidence for this increasing interest (for information on the institute, see e.g. Bergmann/Körte 2004; Benz 2010; 2015).

³⁰ This critique was accompanied by an inner-feminist debate among Anglophone and German-speaking scholars about antisemitic imagery in a feminist reconstruction of Western history, e.g. the “Jewish roots” of patriarchy, the murder of the Goddess, the scapegoating of Judaism in general, etc. (see the essays in Heschel 1988, Kohn-Ley/Korotin 1994; Wacker 1996; Plaskow 2005).

the fact that German theologians that had partaken in the perpetuation of antisemitic knowledge were still being widely read (see Klein 1975: 12; 18-21; cf. Kampling 1984: 2, fn. 8). Consequently, Klein and Schottroff argued that the necessary theological self-criticism had not yet reached the centers of German Christian theology (see Klein 1975: 14-18; Schottroff 1990: 339)³¹. Together with theologians such as Wolfgang and Ekkehard Stegemann (1997; 2004) and Rainer Kampling (1984; 1990; 1999; 2002b, c; 2004), those works marked a crucial step in the development of a higher sensitivity for the question of an anti-Judaism in contemporary Christian theology³².

Regarding the present study, the volume “*Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...*” *Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus* (1999), edited by Rainer Kampling, seems of special importance. It gives a good impression of the state of the discussion within the German Catholic Church by the turn of the century (including a list of official statements on the issue of Christian anti-Judaism). Kampling’s assessment of the debate is two-folded in his acknowledgement of a growing self-critical reflection of a Catholic position but also of a continuing neglect of the historical responsibility and presence of a Christian tradition of anti-Judaism (see Kampling 1999c: 11-13; cf. Frankenmölle 1999: 79, fn. 23). A Protestant, albeit more pragmatic pendant can be found in Kraus’ 1997-volume *Christen und Juden. Perspektiven einer Annäherung* (Kraus 1997a). One can say that today, the belated discussion of Christian anti-Judaism has finally reached eye-level with Anglo-Saxon theology. The Judaeo-Christian “encounter”³³ has triggered a Christian reflection of its position towards Judaism to an extent that editors of a recent volume concede a turning-point in the Jewish-Christian relations (see Kortzfleisch/Grünberg/Schramm 2009: 11).

³¹ As an example, Schottroff points to a negative reception of Sanders’ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977, tr. 1985) in German scholarship. This rejection, Schottroff notes, focussed entirely on methodological issues but remained silent about Sanders’ thorough critique of a traditional perspective on Paul and his relation to Judaism (for an example, see Klein 1988).

³² This development has not been without setbacks. The discussion around the Protestant Professor Georg Strecker and his insistence on a Jewish mission (“Judenmission”) in 1992 (see Kraus 1997: 29f.) and the discussion around the 1998-Declaration of a Papal Commission for religious relations to the Jews (“Päpstliche Kommission für die religiösen Beziehungen zu den Juden”) called “Wir erinnern. Eine Reflexion über die Shoah” (<https://stjosef.at/dokumente/shoah-reflexion.htm>, viewed 7.10.2015) has led to significant irritation. In 1999, Scholtissek therefore concluded that the process of theological and ecclesiastical reflection remains a continuous challenge (see Scholtissek 1999: 152).

³³ In his book *Freude an der Tora - Freude am Dialog* (Brandt 2002), the renowned German rabbi Henry G. Brandt discusses whether the Christian-Jewish interaction is a conversation among equal partners and can thus really be called a “dialogue” (see Brandt 2002: 229ff.). Sharing this scepticism, I use the term “encounter” instead.

2.3 Methodological Approach

2.3.1 Terminology – Judaism, Jews, Christians and Gentiles

David C. Sim notes since the publication of E. P. Sander's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* in 1977 it became custom among theologians to define the "Judaism" of the first century as "convental nomism"³⁴. Against this, scholars such as Boyarin or Mason have pointed out that a conception of "religion" arises only in later centuries³⁵. Thus, it has become increasingly difficult to employ the term "Judaism" in its present meaning. Steve Mason has shaken the foundation of traditional conceptions further by demonstrating that the proper translation of the Greek terms "Ioudaioi"/"Ioudaismos" is not "Jews" or "Judaism" but that "Ioudaioi" designates "an ethnic group comparable to other ethnic groups with their distinctive laws, traditions, customs, and God" (Mason 2007: 457) until late antiquity. Mason and Boyarin locate this (modern) conception of "Jews" and "Judaism" in an inner-Christian confrontation. Boyarin comments:

"Speaking historically [...] Judaism is the name of a group of Christians, anathematized from the very beginning of the name by gentiles trying to establish their legitimacy and the exclusive legitimacy of their antidocetic theologies and anti-Torah-based practices" (Boyarin 2009: 30; cf. Mason 2007: 468ff.).

Starting with Tertullian, "Judaism" emerges in the writings of the Church Fathers as a negative term designating a belief system overcome by the early third century (see Mason 2007: 471f.). As far as they mark separate and unified religious groups, the terms "Christian", "Jewish" and "Gentile" result from "the ideological church apparatuses of orthodox Christianity" (Boyarin 2004: 27). Projecting this understanding of "Judaism" back to earlier centuries testifies to the enduring and encompassing influence of a Christian perspective (see *ibid.*: 10f.; cf. Stowers 1994: 26-29). Against this, Boyarin proposes that the terms "Judaism" and "Christianity" should be understood as a multifaceted and undivided continuum whose one end is marked by Marcion and his

³⁴ Sim defines it as follows: "The Hebrew scriptures detailed that God had chosen the Jews to be his elect people and that the two parties had entered into a holy covenant. The election of Israel gave this people special status *vis-à-vis* the other nations of the world; in simple terms those born Jews were immediately members of the elect, while those born into other nations were not. Accompanying this privileged position of the Jews came great responsibility. The Jews, both individually and collectively, were expected to uphold the commandments of God, which were collected in their sacred writings. This means effectively that while Jews belonged to the covenant community by virtue of birth, they maintained their membership only by obedience to the Torah which God had given specifically to them" (Sim 1998: 12f.).

³⁵ see Boyarin 1999: 7-16; 2004: 10f.; 2009: 8f.; Mason 2007: 457, 480-488; cf. Blank 1990: 50f.; Carter 2007: 156-160; see Piovaneli 2013: 89, fn. 5 for a critical assessment.

followers, the other by Jews that do not believe in Jesus (see Boyarin 1999: 8f.; 2004: 18). This underlines a situation of identitarian diversity that only slowly gave way to dogma, orthodoxy and a conception of religion.

Taking those insights into account, a new consensus has emerged in contemporary scholarship that the earliest communities of believers were made up not of “Christians”³⁶ but of Judeans who believed that the Messiah had come. Gager expresses this consensus with the following words:

“[T]here was no Christianity at all until well after the time of Jesus, his earliest followers, and Paul [...]: the fact that his followers proclaimed Jesus the Messiah [...] does not place them outside the pale of Judaism. They become Christians only when they begin to view themselves, and are viewed by others, as standing outside the pale of Judaism” (Gager 2000: viii³⁷).

Rejecting the term “Christians”, Theißen calls this group of early followers *Jesusbewegung* (Jesus movement), a terminological choice analogous to Campbell’s term “Christ-followers” (see Campbell 2008: 12). Theißen and Campbell define those Christ-followers as an inner-Jewish movement peaking from 30 C.E. to 70 C.E., thus falling under the time of Paul’s activity (see Theißen 2004: 11f.; Campbell 2008: 12).

On the background of this critique, the term “Jewish Christianity”³⁸ has similarly come under attack³⁹. Scholars such as Paget note that there has never been anybody in antiquity who would have called him- or herself a “Jewish Christian” (Paget 2007: 48). Others prefer the term “Christian Jews” to describe the Jews that follow Jewish Law and consider themselves Jewish but belong to the early communities of Christ-followers (see Malina 1976: 50; Boyarin 1999: 11; 2012: 7f.). Malina, for instance, situates Christian Judaism in the first century defining it as “a phase of the Christian movement comprised of Jews (by birth or conversion) who accept Jesus of Nazareth as Messiah to come” (Malina 1976:

³⁶ The word “Christians” does not appear in the New Testament, except as an external label. See Acts 11:26, 26:28. *Christ* is the Greek word for the Hebrew word *Mashiach*, pointing to the Jewish eschatological background of Jesus’ early followers.

³⁷ For some of the methodological problems connected to the terminological separation of “Judaism” and “Christianity”, see Jackson-McCabe 2007b: 35.

³⁸ In what has become one of the “most influential works on the subject written in the history of scholarship” (McCabe 2007b: 24), the French theologian and historian Jean Daniélou set out to analyse *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (1964). For a discussion of other approaches to the terminological distinction between Christian Judaism and Jewish Christianity, see Malina 1976. Consult further Schoeps’ *Theologie und Geschichte des Frühchristentums* (1949) for a seminal work on early Jewish Christianity. Compare also his later *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (1956) for important amendments.

³⁹ see Malina 1976; Jackson-McCabe 2007b; Paget 2007; Boyarin 1999; 2004; 2009; 2012.

50⁴⁰). Starting in the East Roman cities of Antioch and Damascus, communities of believers soon spread to urban centers all over the Empire (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 219ff.). Those communities developed in dependency from the Judean communities, as Stegemann/Stegemann note:

“Die Transformation der Jesusnachfolge in den Bereich des Diasporajudentums bzw. v. a. auch des Nicht-Judentums hängt [...] mit der Ausstrahlung der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde bis nach Antiochia in Syrien zusammen” (ibid.: 221; cf. chapter 4.1.1).

While initially made-up of members from the Jewish diaspora and converts from Paganism, the latter element soon gained dominance among those communities (see ibid.: 219). In analogy to the discussion of the difference “Christian Jews”/“Jewish Christians”, the Pagans among the Christ-followers not adhering to Jewish laws can be marked as “Christian Gentiles”. This term would then underline the difference between the Judean communities (whose followers were of Jewish ethnicity) and those Gentile converts to Christianity representing the majority in most of the communities outside of Judea.

The term “Gentile Christianity” has to be reserved for a later point in time when Gentile and Jewish believers alike no longer regarded themselves as converts to a redeemed Judaism. This goes hand in hand with the emergence of “Christianity” as a Gentile religion. Boyarin defines the term “Gentile Christianity” accordingly:

“Christian converts from among non-Jews (and their descendants) who have neither a sense of genealogical attachment to the historical, physical people of Israel (Israel according to the flesh), nor an attachment (and frequently the exact opposite of one) to the fleshly practices of that historical community” (Boyarin 2004: 29).

To be sure, just as there is no solidified Judaism, there is no single phenomenon known as “Christianity” during the first centuries C.E. (and until the present day!). Boyarin tries to grasp this multiplicity of Christian communities and faiths before their stratification with the help of a wave-theory metaphor as

“a continuum from the Marcionites, who followed the second-century Marcion in believing that the Hebrew Bible had been written by an inferior God and had no standing for Christians, and who completely denied the ‘Jewishness’ of Christianity, on one end, to many Jews on the other end for whom Jesus meant nothing” (Boyarin 2003: 74).

⁴⁰ For a more elaborate discussion of this term and its background, see Sim 1998: 25f.

It took the development of proto-Catholic⁴¹ dogma and its rise to Roman state religion to put an end to this heterodox mindset⁴². Likewise, Judaism went through a process of stratification after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E. This led to a significant reconfiguration of its previous shape (see Neusner 1987: xf.; Boyarin 2003: 66).

⁴¹ While Ehrman advocates the term “proto-Orthodox” (see Ehrman 2003: 13), Fredriksen favours the use of “orthodox catholic”, arguing that this reflects the claim of the fourth-century Christian victors “especially in the age after Constantine to represent universal (*catholica*) and right-thinking (*orthodox*) Christianity” (Fredriksen 2010: XXII). The present work will follow Fredriksen’s proposition instead referring to canonized authors as “proto-Catholic” or “proto-Orthodox” writers respectively. As the following is concerned with the reconstruction of the Latin Catholic tradition, the term “proto-Catholic” dominates the text.

⁴² This development is closely connected to the emergence of a notion of “heresy”. Before its establishment, Knox notes in the tradition of Walter Bauer (1964, o. 1934) “there was, strictly speaking, no such thing as heresy and orthodoxy. There was the greatest diversity of belief among churches and among Christians, and the beliefs of no particular group had achieved real pre-eminence” (Knox 1942: 4). Boyarin adds “Christian groups [...] had no need to define ‘heresy’ as long as their own self-definition did not fundamentally challenge the notion of Jewish peoplehood, that is, as long as they understood themselves as Jews and not as a ‘new Israel’” (Boyarin 2004: 66). Only after Justin Martyr, i.e. during the middle of the second century was the term “heresy” (deriving from the Greek word for “choice”) developed to mark off a heterodox position as derivation from a preordained orthodox truth (see Boyarin 2004: 3f.). Tertullian called those theological opinions he deemed mistaken “heresies” (Greek *haireseis*) to point to the fact that “people choose them (Greek *hairein*) of their own free will” (Rives 2001: 276). The term “heresy” was thus closely bound to its semantic counterpart “orthodoxy” and its underlying conception of continuity. While the term “orthodoxy” had formerly been “used to define the *locus* of the true church among the competing sects, it was now becoming the name for teaching at variance with its obverse, an emerging ‘orthodoxy’” (Markus 1980: 10; cf. Henderson 1998; Boyarin 2004). The temporal and positional character of the term “heretic” demands a careful scientific employment to designate deviating interpretations of Christianity (see Piovanelli 2013 for an overview). In the discussion of the term “heresy”, Boyarin differentiates between an essentialist perspective claiming that it marks a real empirical difference and a constructivist understanding regarding the terms as meaningful only in juxtaposition to each other (see Boyarin 2004: 3). As this work adopts a constructivist perspective, it uses the term “heretic” only in quotation marks. If referring to other groups than the proto-Catholics, the name of their most famous proponents will be used, e.g. Marcionites (the followers of Marcion), Manichaeans (the followers of Mani) and the like (cf. Fredriksen 2010: XXI). In any case, the present study agrees with Fredriksen that “[t]he reader should remember, however, that in their own eyes, all of these people were simply followers of Christ and, therefore, ‘Christians’” (ibid.).

As with the term “heresy”, Boyarin notes a process regarding the construction of “Judaism” and “Paganism” as a religious Other for the Catholic Church (see Boyarin 2004: 9-11). On the convergence of the notion of “heresy” and “Judaizing”, he notes “[a]t least one major impetus for the formation of the discourse of heresiology, on my reading, is the construction of a Christianity that would not be Judaism. The ‘Jews’ (for this context, heretics so named), the Judaizers, and the Jewish Christians – whether they existed or to what extent is irrelevant in this context – thus mark a space of threatening hybridity, which it is the task of the religion police to do away with” (Boyarin 2004: 14). Koester and King also point to the connection of the term “heretic” to “Judaism” noting that too much heresy was called “Judaizing”, too little “Gnosticism” (see Koester 1980: 393-401; cf. King 2003). Harnack’s observation that the term “Judaizing” appears in the second century fits neatly into this scheme (see Harnack 1883: 63f.). The verb “Judaizing” is usually used in Christian texts to designate “the adoption by Gentiles of certain Jewish customs without conversion” (Gaston 1986b: 35). Marcel Simon thus defines “Judaizing Christians” as members of the Catholic Church who “took it upon themselves to keep some of the Mosaic rules” (Simon 1986: 239). Ruether defines it slightly different as “a Christian, not necessarily of Jewish background, who was attracted to Jewish rites and traditions, while remaining within the mainstream Church” (Ruether 1997: 170). However, Miriam Taylor notes that the word soon underwent a profound revision. In the writings of the Patristics it reappears as an instrument one Christian group used to subdue the other in theological polemics, disregarding its actual position towards empirical Judaism or Jewish rituals (see Taylor 1995: 182). This detachment makes it increasingly harder to identify any realistic referent for the accusation (for a discussion of the relation of “Judaizing” to “Orthodoxy”, see chapter 6.2.3).

The division of the world into religions gains prominence with the establishment of “proto-Catholic”⁴³ thought as the dominant force in the Roman Empire (see Boyarin 2004 26ff.). With its triumph, the groups that had remained within the pale of Judaism and once harbored Christianity’s spiritual authorities came into an increasing contradiction to the Christian mainstream. This process culminated in an official denouncement of Jewish rituals by the early fourth century C.E. (see chapter 6.1.3). Those communities that continued to regard themselves as Jewish must in turn be understood as a “*spectrum [...] a diverse phenomenon*” (Dunn 1990: 263⁴⁴). As opposed to “Christian Jews”, the term “Jewish Christians” is thus reserved for those believers who continued to maintain a line of continuity with the Jewish people by keeping Jewish rituals *after* Christianity had left the pale of Judaism (see Skarsaune 2007a: 5). This conception follows Miriam Taylor in her insistence on Jewish praxis as a decisive factor in the division (see Taylor 1990: 327). However, it extends the scope to include Christians with a Gentile origin who adhered to a framework of Jewish ritual⁴⁵.

The historical distance from the time-period under scrutiny in this work and the (almost exclusively Catholic) channels of distribution makes it all the more difficult to decide on the shape of the earliest communities. The reader should therefore note that terms such as “Christian Jewish”, “Jewish Christian”, “Christian Gentile” and “Gentile Christian” are but semantic constructions introduced to signal major historical shifts. Operating with these categories helps to mark changes during the first four centuries of developing Christianity – however, their employment is not intended as a fully differentiated representation of a historical reality.

⁴³ The term “proto-Catholic” refers to those writers that came to be accepted as heirs to the Catholic Church (Patristic writers). When using this term one should keep two things in mind: (1) there existed a variety of Orthodoxies in the second century that only slowly gave way to a Catholic stratification (see Brakke 2006: 260) and (2) many of the authors subsumed under the term “proto-Catholic” would have been regarded “heretics” if measured against later Catholic doctrine. John Knox comments: “All the great Christian teachers of the period – the authors of the Fourth Gospel, of Hebrews and of Revelation, Ignatius, Polycarp, Clement, Papias, Marcion, Tatian, and many others – were orthodox or heretical, according to the point of view of the critic” (Knox 1942: 4). In a way, then, the term “proto-Catholic” integrates the retrospective construction of a line of tradition by later Catholic writers. This question is discussed in the chapters on Patristic writers below.

⁴⁴ cf. Taylor 1990, Paget 2007: 48-52; Boyarin 2003: 73; Broadhead 2010.

⁴⁵ One can find traces of those Jewish Christians in the invectives of John Chrysostom discussed in this work (see chapter 6.2.3).

2.3.2 Hypothesis – Emergence of Christian anti-Judaism

With the notion of “apostolic succession” (going back to Eusebius, see Markus 1980: 3f.), the Catholic Church claims “an unbroken chain of tradition from a foundational moment of revelation and a founding figure of the religious group” (Boyarin 2004: 30). From Gottfried Arnold’s *Unparteyische Kirchen- und Ketzer Historie* (1699), to Harnack’s *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (1888) to Walter Bauer’s seminal *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (1934) to J.D. Dunn *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (1990), scholars have labored to demonstrate that this Catholic claim is incorrect. In 1909, Rudolf Sohm noted “Es ist zweifellos, daß das Urchristentum nicht katholisch war“ (Sohm 1909: 335). Contemporary historians therefore maintain that the character of Christianity known today follows the parameters and theological needs of proto-Catholic Orthodoxy as the victorious fraction (see Fredriksen 2006: 587-589; cf. Ehrman 2003, 2011).

It has become common to assume that a multitude of early Christian confessions and faithful practices existed in the first centuries (see Bienert 2001: 197; Fredriksen 2006: 593-605). The Christian Bible has thus increasingly become an archaeologic ground to uncover traces of this diversity (see chapter 2.4). Some scholars argue that faith in Christ forms the unifying core of these confessions (see Dunn 1990: 369; Theißen 2004: 98) others reject the idea of unity and highlight the disparate character of those early congregations (see Boyarin 2004: 22f.) reflected in a variety of attitudes towards the Jewish framework. What seems clear, however, is that the most important authorities of the first century until 70 C.E. were based in Jerusalem, i.e. they were Judeans and did not see this as an obstacle to their faith in Jesus as the new Messiah. Following the demise of the Jerusalem group after 70 C. E., the power-base dispersed (see chapter 4.1.2). It took centuries of fierce inner-Christian debates until the Christian Catholic Orthodoxy and its anti-Judaism rose to dominance within Western Christianity.

Across the extensive scholarship on early Christianity, authors have wondered whether the initial closeness constitutes a reason for the development of a Christian anti-Judaism/antisemitism (see e.g. Lanmguir 1990b⁴⁶). The already mentioned Gevin I.

⁴⁶ Marcel Simon comments: “the position of Christianity itself [...] made it necessary for the Church, as the new Israel, to establish its rights as against those people whom it claimed to dispossess. It had to explain why, in taking over the heritage, it rejected part of it, accepting the name and the book, but refusing to be subjected to the observances that authenticated that name and that the book laid down” (Simon 1986: 369; cf. Ruether 1997: 23f.).

Langmuir concluded famously that Christianity was especially prone to develop a strong anti-Judaic tendency *because* it “grew out of Judaism” (Langmuir 1990a: 57). An initial conflict, he argues, was carried into Christian adulthood as a kind of “birth trauma” (ibid.⁴⁷). However, if a multiplicity of faiths did indeed exist for the first centuries⁴⁸, then the notion of birth trauma is misleading, as it imposes the universalism of a psychological reaction onto a context- and group-specific position. The notion of “birth trauma” must therefore be rejected as it treats the relation between Church and Judaism *as if it had always been a necessary and pathological relation to its father religion*.

An alternative model explains the emergence of Christian anti-Judaism by a socio-political confrontation between Christians and *Jews* (see Jacobs 1893: xii; cf. Simon 1986; Ruether 1997). For the proponents of this popular approach, early Christian anti-Jewish invective originated in a self-defense against Jewish attack, persecution and an active proselytizing (see Wilken 1967: 328; Simon 1986: 129f.). The conflictual approach rests on the assumption that there was an early separation between Christianity and Judaism. It assumes further that the Church became anti-Jewish as an effect of aggressive behavior by Jewish individuals or communities. This second assumption is based on an identification of the discursive level with empirical reality. Faced by a lack of sources, scholars like Simon tend to identify the semantic structure of the Christian text with the socio-historical context of its composition. The present study does not dispute the idea that a text contains such traces. However, it deems it inappropriate to merely identify the

⁴⁷ Further evidence for the popularity of psychoanalytical concepts for the explanation of antisemitism can be found in Gager’s *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (1983). Drawing on Rudolph Loewenstein, Gager extends the idea of “trauma” into a full socio-psychoanalytical argument: “In short, *if* we are dealing with a religious community whose view of its own legitimacy is fundamentally dependent on a set of symbols, viz., the Hebrew Scriptures, which are simultaneously claimed by another religious community; *if*, in addition, this other religious community is able to present arguments which appear at least initially to establish the priority of these claims (continuity of ritual observance, use of scriptures in the original language, and so forth); and *if* this other community not only continues to flourish but exercise an appeal among the faithful of the new religion, then, under these circumstances, the task of conceptual annihilation will appear all the more urgent and continuous. Or, as the psychoanalyst Rudolph Loewenstein puts it in *Christians and Jews. A Psychoanalytical Study*, the negative image of Jews and Judaism within the Christian tradition are indicative of ‘the Christian reaction to their moral debt to the Jews [...]’” (Gager 1983: 22f., citing Loewenstein 1951: 199). The “birth trauma” also echoes in the employment of kinship-metaphors, e.g. in Ruether’s notion of “fratricide” (Ruether 1997) or Arthur Roy Eckardt’s *Elder and Younger Brothers* (1967), cf. Horkheimer/Adorno 2003: 188. Ruether’s hypothesis that anti-Judaism forms the negative side of Christology introduces the discursive level to analysis. This appropriation and reinterpretation of Jewish concepts, Ruether notes, *necessarily* involves hostility against Jews who refuse to accept this reinterpretation (see Ruether 1997: 64; 94). This culminates in Ruether’s comment: “For Christianity, anti-Judaism was not merely a defense against attack, but an intrinsic need of Christian self-affirmation” (Ruether 1997: 181).

⁴⁸ see e.g. the seminal work of Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Bauer 1964, o. 1934). Consider also the works of those scholars that testify to the slow development of an image of “the Jews” in Christian theology, among them Isaac 1969: 110ff., Ruether 1978: 167, Gager 1983: 135, Simon 1986: 369, Richmond 1992: 56 and recently Nirenberg 2013: 91.

discursive “Jew” with an empirical Jewish group⁴⁹.

Some of the more severe objections to Rosemary Ruether’s *Faith and Fratricide* rejects her notion of necessity. Since, as Gager and Hare note, there existed an initial multitude of inner-Christian positions, the rejection of “the Jews” was neither natural nor intrinsic to the early believer in Jesus (see Hare 1979: 28; Gager 1983: 26). The contingent character of the Christian construction of “the Jews” sheds further doubt on any notion of necessity (see Nirenberg 2013). While early communities of Christ-believers regarded themselves as Jewish, the end of the first century provides first evidence for the creation of a distinct self-image different from a Jewish belief system. This proto-Christian self-image, however, still allowed for a variety of positions towards Judaism. Therefore, one is once again led to conclude that anti-Judaism/antisemitism was not the necessary outcome of a faith in Christ but the result of a slow process within the development of theology during the following centuries.

To be sure, we will point to the way early Christian writers disagreed on their position towards Judaism – Paul, the Gospels, Marcion and Tertullian each formulate positions towards the Jewish Scriptures, “the Jews” and their own position as believers in Christ that are irreconcilable. Only when one considers the Patristic writings of the second century onwards, one finds that those writers subsequently appropriate narratives and symbols from the Jewish Scriptures⁵⁰ and from earlier Christian sources such as Paul or the Gospels (see Boyarin 2012: 157). This serves a growing tendency to portray Judaism and “the Jews” as the “intimate and enduring threat to their [Christian] sense of identity” (Langmuir 1990b: 7; cf. Ruether 1997: 94; 121).

This leads to the following working hypothesis: *the development of antisemitism accompanies the development of proto-Catholicism as a specific group within early Christianity rising to dominance by the fourth century. It develops gradually over the first four centuries and results from internal and external challenges and the specific strategies proto-Catholic writers developed to meet them.* Since the hypothesis rests on

⁴⁹ For a critique, see Taylor 1995; Goodman 2007a; Binder 2012: 207. I return to a critique of the conflictual perspective in the concluding section of this work (see chapter 8.1).

⁵⁰ This work makes use of the term “Jewish scriptures” instead of “Old Testament” because the adjective “old” implies a supersessionary assumption vis-à-vis the “New Testament”. Furthermore, only in the trajectory of a Christianity self-understanding arising some time during the late second century does it appear as “old” (since there had to be a “new” scripture first). Since the overwhelming majority of Christian writers could not read Hebrew (see Ruether 1997: 122), they largely used the Greek translation, the *Septuagint*. This is the reason the term “Hebrew scriptures” used in other works is avoided. Regarding the canon of writings assembled and accepted by Catholic Christianity, this work uses the term “New Testament” as the term Catholic writers accept for themselves.

an analytical framework different from established approaches discussed above, this case-study sets out to identify an alternative set of explaining variables. If the causal network thus created can claim validity, it may help to provide an alternative to the well-established idea that a Christian anti-Judaism grew out of the Judeao-Christian encounter. In a way, then, this perspective inverts the notion of “birth trauma” by tracing the progressive self-construction of Christian Orthodoxy *as traumatized by Judaism*.

The primacy “the Jews” take in Christian writing from the second century onwards (see Baron 1964: 7-14) justifies a focus on their discursive genealogy. Judith Lieu underlines that a work such as this should focus on the individual texts and their contexts (see Lieu 1996: 2) whose historical and social situatedness is crucial for a proper understanding (see e.g. Esler 1994: 6ff. for the sociological basis). The following is thus a – albeit more detailed and theoretically reflected – exposition of the work Nirenberg has done in his encompassing analysis *Anti-Judaism. The Western Tradition* (2013). In respectful acknowledgment of this work, I hope that the present analysis amends Nirenberg’s analysis and supports its main thrust.

2.3.3 Scientific Perspective

“The historical narrative comes to us heavily censored (as the account of a dream is censored) but also heavily interpreted (as that same account is affected by the dogmatic presuppositions of the analyst [...]). The historian cannot write, nor can we read, without prejudice” (Kermode 1980: 118)

Tradition, the Canadian scholar Gevin I. Langmuir, author of the seminal work *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (1990) observes, “tends overwhelmingly to be ethnocentric and to emphasize continuity rather than change. Like prejudice, it is a handing down, a carrying over, and a reception of bits of information and misinformation, of attitudes and values, all without critical examination” (Langmuir 1990e: 42). Langmuir’s comment on tradition is just as true for a scientific work that is not founded on a self-critical examination of the socio-historical position of the scholar him- or herself. If this self-reflection is omitted the analytical perspective runs the danger of perpetuating contemporary values, attitudes and desires⁵¹. Following Bourdieu, those attitudes and

⁵¹ Cf. T.S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* (1996) for the concept of paradigm paraphrased by Gager: “Once established, a paradigm operates as much more than a set of consciously recognized points of agreement about matters of substance and procedure. At the unconscious level, it determines what we see in a text and what we fail to see; what we find meaningful, what we dismiss and what we

values may well be connected to a scholars' *Habitus*, determined by the whole scope of his or her socio-historical position (Class, Race, Gender, Nationality, Religion, etc.).

Bourdieu reacts to this challenge by demanding a “reflexive anthropology” (Bourdieu/Wacquant 2006b) as fundamental principle of (critical) scholarship. Social science is only adequate, Bourdieu maintains, if it employs a critical attitude not only regarding information from and about the past (as in Langmuir 1990e: 42) but also if it reflects on the position of the scientist and the scientific field within his contemporary socio-political context (see Bourdieu 1992: 51ff.). This danger seems especially strong when it comes to the analysis of forms of discrimination. Concerning antisemitism, it should be crucial to enquire into the role the discussion about antisemitism has in a German/Western self-definition after 1945.

(Anti-)antisemitism has been at the center of German identity since the aftermath of the Second World War. In fact, the present study will argue that “the Jews” have been at the center of a Christian understanding of self and world for much longer. Could it be that this closeness of identity and subject-matter influences the way scholars treat the issue in research situated in a post-Shoah environment? What is a scholar's share in the production of a German subject? The following research sets out to reconstruct the beginning of an order of knowledge, a structure of perception that has lingered on in European history since the advent of early Christianity. At the onset of his essay *Die Entstehung der Antisemitismustheorie aus der Debatte über die Judenemanzipation* (Weyand 2015), the German scholar Jan Weyand notes that modern scholarship agrees on the disconnection of antisemitism from empirical Jewish behavior:

“Auch wenn Theorien über Antisemitismus diesen unterschiedlich und teilweise einander widersprechend erklären, so basieren sie doch alle auf einer gemeinsamen Grundannahme: Judendfeindschaft ist nicht aus dem Handeln von Juden, sondern aus dem der Antisemiten zu verstehen und zu erklären” (Weyand 2015: 47).

In a footnote, he further points out that this assessment is only partly true for a

overlook as peripheral; how we make connections between isolated objects in our intellectual landscape; how it is possible to ignore or devalue the significance of anomalies in that same landscape. In brief, its fundamental and indispensable function is to create the conditions for normal science within a community of scholars. [...] Under such conditions, criticisms of the old tend to focus not on particular texts, questions, or results but rather on the paradigm itself, on its underlying assumption, on its failures rather than its achievements, and particularly on the manner in which it came to hold its position of prominence, that is, its growth and development in the history of scholarship and culture. Put differently, the goal of criticism at this point is to bring the existence of the paradigm into conscious awareness and to demonstrate the extent to which it governs the interpretative process” (Gager 1983: 198f.)

conflict/correspondence-theoretical assumption (see *ibid.*: 47, fn. 1). This study demonstrates that Weyand's assessment is not true for scholarship on early Christian antisemitism. In opposition to this dominance, the following analysis is led by the assumption that antisemitism divides the subject matter into discursive and empirical Jews. I wish to maintain with Weyand that the empirical Jews do not *cause* the discursive image of "the Jews". Rather, the following study will demonstrate how variables such as the socio-political and theological development shape Christian writing on "the Jews" during the first four centuries.

The analytical framework of the present study owes its share to Daniel Boyarin's methodology as developed in *Border Lines. The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (2004). Taking up Foucault's notion on the connection of discourse and power, Boyarin demands a "shift [...] from the specifics of what was thought or said to the *episteme* or universes of possible knowledge within which they were said and thought" (Boyarin 2004: 4⁵²). The difference of the present work to Boyarin's analysis is, of course, that it is not interested in the emergence of an "episteme of religions" (Boyarin 2004: 27) but of an episteme of antisemitism. In her book *What is Gnosticism* (2003), Karen King combines a Foucauldian notion with Bourdieu's concept of *Habitus*. King comments:

"It suggests that no narrative can offer an adequate representation of the past as an objective or objectified entity; that a genealogical history of Foucault's sort will display the working of discourse – charting gaps, incongruities, discontinuities, and transformations – and therefore cease to connect events causally or attempt to show that events follow any pattern leading to inevitable outcome" (King 2003: 235).

She continues to elaborate on the relevance of Bourdieu's *Habitus*-conception:

"Discourse analysis, it seems to me, provides a method to understand the processes of the regulated practices of *habitus* in operation. Bourdieu's work is more useful than Foucault's in understanding the practical aims and effects of discursive formations in the material and social world" (*ibid.*: 241).

Following King's impulses, the following work defines religion as a field⁵³, or, put in

⁵² The most recent work attempting to reconstruct such a discursive genealogy can be found in Nirenberg's *Anti-Judaism. The Western Tradition* (2013).

⁵³ King defines this field as "a site of struggle with its own goals, strategies, and institutions, as well as its own ideological-theoretical frameworks in which certain kinds of practices are rationalized and contested. Struggles within the religious field in question can then be analyzed to determine the discourses with which the field operates, the practices it generates, as well as whose interests and what ends it serves"

Foucault's terms, as a surface of emergence of the discourses analyzed in this work (cf. chapter 8.2). The aim of this retake on early Christian discourses on "the Jews", their emergence and dissemination, is not to outline a grand narrative on which to rest a new conception of antisemitism. Rather, it is to show that those discourses result from a series of events that, taken by themselves, were not destined to produce the outcome they eventually did. The notion of the "dispositive" lingers at the end of the following reconstruction. It points to the fact that the episteme of antisemitism reaches a stage in which a conception of "the Jews" is inscribed into the very substance of a (Catholic) Christian perception of self, world and time.

This study follows Brian Klug's proposition to use quotation marks whenever referring to the Jews of discourse. Its main objective is to trace the genealogy of the discursive "Jews" as they appear throughout early Christian texts. It rests on the assumption that this development is not shaped by the way the empirical Jews behave – e.g. if real Jews killed Jesus, persecuted his followers, corroded society with disease and unrest or cooperated with the devil. On the opposite, it will be argued that those images of persecution, prophet killing and evilness root in the development of discourse, itself resting on a causal network of its own.

For each given source, the present study the function the "Jews" perform within a given textual framework is scrutinized. Seen from a discourse-analytical perspective it treats textual sources "not as reflective of social realities but as social apparatuses that are understood to be complexly tied to other apparatuses via the notion of a discourse or a *dispositif*" (Boyarin 2004: 27). As far as a given enunciation is situated in a specific social reality and discursive context, the interpretation of samples can claim validity. At the same time, a sample does not only emerge within a context but also exerts an influence on its surrounding. It is in this sense that one can explain how discourses on the Jews ultimately came to determine the perception and treatment of the empirical Jewish communities in the Roman Empire (and not vice versa!).

It may well be an unavoidable feature to writing a *longue durée* that things are treated without the depth some may regard appropriate. This critique, rather than undermining the whole endeavor, highlights rightfully the limited scope of any such analysis. The following study is composed from the perspective of a political scientist scrutinizing the theoretical implications of a historical research on early Christian antisemitism. This

(King 2003: 242).

implies a critical review of scholarship and the (re)arrangement of historical materials. Thereby, the study hopes not only to raise awareness about theoretical anachronisms and inconsistencies but also to propose an alternative analytical framework for the emergence and dissemination of antisemitism in early Christianity and possibly beyond.

2.4 Source Criticism: The New Testament

2.4.1 The Process of Canonization

“The fact that the diversity of the NT documents is narrower than the diversity of the earliest churches should not be allowed to cloak the fact of the diversity of the NT itself. But neither should we ignore the fact that the narrower diversity of the NT documents functioned as a check on and limitation to the larger diversity” (Dunn 1990b: xx)

“We do not have the 'originals' of any of the books that came to be included in the New Testament, or indeed of any Christian book from antiquity. What we have are copies of the originals or, to be more accurate, copies made from copies of the copies of the originals. Most of these surviving copies are hundreds of years removed from the originals themselves” (Ehrman 2003: 217)

The texts of the New Testament have reached the present through a process of assemblage and authorization that lasted at least 350 years (“canonization”⁵⁴). Centuries of textual

⁵⁴ The term “canon” derives from a Semitic word originally meaning a stalk or reed growing along a riverbank (see McDonald 2010: 11). In its Hellenized form, it took on the meaning of a standard (see *ibid.*). The term was not used for the collection of the New Testament before the fourth century (see Zahn 1904: 1-11; Ulrich 2002: 22f.; Elliott 2010: 613; for the etymology and historical use of the word “canon” in early Christian literature, cf. Metzger 1987: 289-293; McDonald 2010: 11-16). McDonald notes that a “canon” describes a closed and unalterable collection of writings (see *ibid.*: 19). Campenhausen defines the “Christian canon” as a text or group of texts holding a distinguished and normative position on equal footing with the Jewish scriptures for a Christian community (see Campenhausen 1968: 123). The question of the date of formation of the Christian canon remains unsettled (see Barton 1997: 1, McDonald 2010: 9). An expression of the popular view, Campenhausen identifies the second half of the second century as the date when the consolidation of the Christian canon took place (see Campenhausen 1968: 123ff.). McDonald raises doubt as to this early dating and prefers the fourth century as more probable. Two arguments support this claim. (1) The term “canon” is not used until the fourth century to designate a closed collection of sacred literature (see McDonald 2010: 13) and (2) the 27 texts that comprise the New Testament in its Western Catholic form are mentioned for the first time by bishop Athanasius of Alexandria (c. 299-373 C.E.). In his Easter letter (usually referred to as *39th Festal Letter*, see Metzger 1987: 312f.), Athanasius mentions a list of books he calls “fountains of salvation” (Metzger 1987: 313) in which “alone the teaching of godliness is proclaimed” (*ibid.*). The letter ends with a note on the closure of the canon: “Let no one add to these; let nothing be taken away from them” (*ibid.*). Earlier lists in the Greek language include the *Muratorian Canon* during the late second century (see Sundberg 1973; Hahneman 1992 for a later dating concluding on a longer period of formation; cf. McDonald 2010: 19, fn. 43 for a discussion of what McDonald calls the “Achilles heel of second century development of the NT canon arguments”, *ibid.*: 18), the canon of Origen (c.185-254 C.E.) and Eusebius of Caesarea's (c. 265-340 C.E.) classification of New Testament Books in his *Ecclesiastical History* written through the first quarter of the fourth century, see Metzger 1987: 191-207; 305-310). Eusebius' collection was confirmed by Pope Damasus I, bishop of Rome, in 382 C.E. and repeated by synods in Hippo in 393 C.E. (without the Epistle to the Hebrews) and Carthage in 397 and 419 C.E. (see Alkier 2010: 21f.; Metzger 1987:

criticism have produced many insights on the importance this process had for the construction of the New Testament and its value as a scientific source (see Bauer 1964: 1f.; cf. Taylor 1933: 5-8; Parvis 1952 for a historical overview). However, the renowned scholar Bruce Metzger noted in 1987 “few works in English consider both the historical development of the New Testament canon and the persistent problems that pertain to its significance” (Metzger 1987: v; cf. 11-36). Recent works of New Testament scholars like Ehrman (2011) or Parker (2012) point to the problematic involved when working with versions of the New Testament as sources for a time preceding their creation. New digital technology, Parker asserts in his Lyell Lecture, encourages the scholar “to focus on the text as a process and on the edition as a narrative” (Parker 2012: 146). This leads to Parker’s demand not to attach analysis to one editorial text “which it mistakenly treats as a first-century authorial text” (ibid.). The work returns to this question below.

Central works on the genesis of the Western text of the New Testament include Theodor Zahn's *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (1901, critique in Harnack 1889), Kirsopp Lake's *The Influence of Textual criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* (1904), Adolf von Harnack's *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung* (1914), Edgar J. Goodspeed's *The Formation of the New Testament* (1927) and Bauer's *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (1964, o. 1934⁵⁵). The arrival of *Form-Criticism*⁵⁶ in its most prominent exponents Martin Dibelius (1967, o. 1919/1933⁵⁷) and Rudolph Bultmann (1925, 1931),

237f.). However, Alkier points to the local significance of these synods and maintains that the canon of the New Testament continued to be a matter of dispute well after 397 C.E. This is also apparent in the deviance among the first four known collections of the canon *Codex Sinaiticus*, and *Codex Vaticanus*, both 4th century; *Codex Alexandrinus* and *Codex Ephraemi rescriptus*, both 5th century; see Alkier 2010: 21f.). For the sphere of the Latin Church, Jerome's (c. 346 – 420) critique of the canon (see Metzger 1987: 234-236) and Augustinus' (354-430) *Libri quattuor de doctrina christiana* (397 C.E., completed in 426 C.E.) supported a settlement of the question of canonization. Nevertheless, questions such as the status of translation (septuaginta, vulgata, veritas hebraica) or matters of hierarchy (scripture, Church Fathers, council, pope) remained a matter of dispute well into the Middle Ages (see Metzger 1987: 229-247; Alkier 2010: 24f.).

⁵⁵ For the history of New Testament scholarship (“neutestamentliche Forschung”), see Kümmel 1970.

⁵⁶ Moule notes on the standpoint of *form criticism*, “that it is to the circumstances and needs of the worshipping, working, suffering community that one must look if one is to explain the genesis of Christian literature” (Moule 1966: 210). Moule continues that “at no stage within the New Testament period did a writer put pen to paper without the incentive of a pressing need” (ibid.). Bultmann and Dibelius interpreted the literary form of the Gospels to reflect upon these internal and external influences on early Christian communities (see e.g. Bultmann 1931: 4). Dibelius comments accordingly: “[E]s hat nie ein 'rein' geschichtliches Zeugnis von Jesus gegeben; was von Jesus an Worten und Taten berichtet wurde, war immer schon ein für Predigt und Mahnung bestimmtes Zeugnis des Glaubens, formuliert, um Ungläubige zu gewinnen und Gläubige zu festigen. Nicht das Wissen um einen geschichtlichen Ablauf hat das Christentum konstituiert, sondern das Trauen auf den Inhalt dieser Geschichte als der Heilsgeschichte, als des entscheidenden Anfangs der Endgeschichte” (Dibelius 1967: 295). For a more optimistic conclusion, see Bultmann 1931: 6ff. (cf. Taylor 1933: 13-15).

⁵⁷ Dibelius' work has been heavily criticised for the anti-Jewish perspective as in his 1939-book *Jesus*. There, he ventured to reject Jesus' Jewish origin (see Dibelius 1939: 32-34), thus aligning himself with the national socialist *German Christians* (Deutsche Christen). In 1975, Charlotte Klein pointed to the

gave further impulses to the scholarship on the formation of the New Testament until the Second World War (cf. Taylor 1933 as one of its earliest advocates in Anglo-Saxon scholarship⁵⁸).

Discussion continued after the war among scholars including E.C. Blackman (*Marcion and his Influence*, 1979, o. 1948), Bruce Metzger (*The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament*, 1950) and Kenneth W. Clark (*The Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament*, 1950). During this time, *form criticism* with its focus on the socio-historical context (“Sitz im Leben”) was increasingly contrasted to the method of *redaction criticism*⁵⁹, focusing on “the role of the evangelists as authors in their own right, who have each expressed a particular theological viewpoint, rather than treating them as collectors of traditional material” (Esler 1987: 3). Esler points out that both approaches “failed to utilize or generate a method for investigating social context” (Esler 1987: 4). Scholars such as John G. Gager (1975, 1982) or Gerd Theißen (1977, 1990, 2004) took up this challenge connecting their scholarship to earlier sociological works from Shirley Jackson Case (1923) and the “Chicago School” (Grant 1980: 19⁶⁰). The sociological perspective has enjoyed wide acclaim in contemporary scholarship⁶¹.

scandalous fact that said passages had not been erased until the third and last edition published in 1960 (see Dibelius 1960: 31-33). Klein thus argues that Dibelius’ perspective had remained virtually uncontested in German theology until the publication of her book (see Klein 1975: 19f.).

⁵⁸ Following John Gager, Bultmann can be seen as a central figure for a reflection of the positionality of any approach to New Testament interpretation. There is no such thing as an interpretation without presupposition: “The texts don’t speak to us until we begin to speak to them; and they always answer us in our own language” (see Gager 1975: 259f.). This is especially noteworthy because it echoes an argument made above on the positionality of contemporary research on antisemitism.

⁵⁹ For recent studies integrating insights of this redaction criticism (“Redaktionsgeschichtliche Arbeiten”), see Ehrman (2003) and Parker (2012).

⁶⁰ The “Chicago School” was marked by an employment of sociological methods to analyze the social life of Pagan and Christian societies (see Grant 1980: 19). Cases’ pupils Willoughby, *Pagan Regeneration* (1929) and Riddle, *The Martyrs. A Study in Social Control* (1931) developed this method further.

However, its effect on theology remained marginal and the potential of a sociological perspective was only starting to be employed by theologians in the 1970s (see Spence 2004: 5, fn. 9). Other authors that helped pave the road for an adoption of sociological insights for New Testament scholarship include Erich Fascher (*Textgeschichte als hermeneutisches Problem*, 1953), Krister Stendahl (*The School of St. Matthews*, 1954), C. F. D. Moule’s *The Birth of the New Testament* (1966), Campenhausen’s *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (1968), E.P. Sanders’ *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (1969) and Käsemann’s *Das Neue Testament als Kanon* (1970b). Sociological approaches have gained strength over the last decades (see Dunn 1990b: xvi; cf. Theißen 2004: 24-32 for a reconstruction). Recent contributions include Wayne Meeks, *Zur Soziologie des Urchristentums* (ed., 1979) and *Urchristentum und Stadtkultur* (1993, engl. 1983), Anton Mayer, *Der zensierte Jesus. Soziologie des Neuen Testaments* (1983), Ramsay MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (1984); Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (1984); John Esler’s *The first Christians in their Social Worlds* (1994), Rodney Stark’s *The Rise of Christianity* (1996), Wolfgang and Ekkehard W. Stegemann, *Urchristliche Sozialgeschichte* (1997), Blasi/Duhaime/Turcotte (2002), Watson (2007) and Campbell (2008; cf. the bibliographical notes in Spence 2004: 369).

⁶¹ Recent contributions include Bruce M. Metzger (1987), John Barton (1997), David C. Parker (1997; 2012), G. Aichele (2001), McDonald/Sanders (2002), Oeming/Klinghard (2003), Bart D. Ehrman (2003, 2011), Metzger/Ehrman (2005), McDonald (2007; 2010), Alkier (2010) and Becker/Scholz (2012).

One of the questions central to this Debate concerns the intentionality behind the development of the Christian canon. One side sees it as the result of *deliberate decision* triggered by the pressure exerted by figures such as Marcion and others (e.g. Harnack 1924, Barnikol 1933, Knox 1942: 32, Trobisch 1996: 11). To these scholars, the canon is the result of a series of strategic choices (see Käsemann 1970c: 402) possibly emerging from the initiative of a single author (see Trobisch 1996: 11). The other side argues that the development of the canon was an anonymous historical process that either grew from its consecutive habitual use in the early Christian communities⁶² or from dogmatic coercion exerted by the emerging church (see e.g. Turner 1978: 256). Metzger develops a middle ground when noting that the canon resulted from “the pressure of various kinds of circumstances and influences, some external [...] and others internal” (Metzger 1987: 7).

The question of when the canon emerged also depends on the definition of canon adopted (see Barton 1997: 12f., 31f.). While the argument for a gradual development of the canon of the Western Church is convincing (see Sanders, Metzger, Alkier), one should not dismiss the influence of individuals light-handedly. In the development of the canon, Alkier notes the increasing role of 1) normative aspects (*regula fidei*⁶³), 2) transregional employment and 3) supposed authenticity of the documents played in discussions concerning the “canonicity” of certain texts (see Alkier 2010: 19; Metzger 1987: 251-

⁶² See e.g. Zahn 1901: 35-40; Campenhausen 1968: 381f.; Dunn 1990; Oeming 2003: 56. Dunn notes that “the Gospels and Paul were being acknowledged and were already functioning as ‘canonical’ more or less from the beginning which made it inevitable that they would be recognized as canonical when the idea of a closed canon became important” (Dunn 1990: xxxi). This leads him to the conclusion that “in a very real and important sense the major NT documents chose themselves; the NT canon chose itself!” (ibid). This assertion does not uphold against recent scholarship. By the time Marcion developed his ideas during the early second century, the Epistles of Paul seem to have fallen into neglect in most of the Christian communities. This formed the very condition for Marcion to present himself as the real heir to Paul and therefore also to the true interpretation of Christianity (cf. the chapter 5.1.3).

⁶³ Just as the term “Terstamentum”, Tertullian coined the term “regula fidei”. Metzger notes that it was meant to signify “the common fundamental belief of the Church” (Metzger 1987: 158) of which it was said it had been “orally received by the churches from the apostles and orally transmitted from generation to generation as the baptismal creed” (ibid.; cf. Campenhausen 1995: 27). Martin Rist has noted the anti-Marcionite thrust of the *regula* (see Rist 1942: 40). Rives seconds: “Although developed as a guide for the orthodox, it also served as a tool to mark off the orthodox from the heretical, the acceptable from the unacceptable, those within from those without” (Rives 2001: 277). The *regula fidei* typically included “belief in only one God, the creator of the world, who created everything out of nothing; belief in his Son, Jesus Christ, predicted by the prophets to be born of the Virgin Mary; belief in his miraculous life, death, resurrection, and ascension; and belief in the Holy Spirit, who is present on earth until the end, when there will be a final judgment in which the righteous will be rewarded and the unrighteous condemned to eternal torment” (Ehrman 2003: 194). By the end of the fourth century, the *regula fidei* took the form of today's Nicene and the Apostles' Creed (see ibid; Metzger 1987: 158). Both, the creed and the *regula* were “formulated against specific heretical views” (Ehrman 2003: 194). Given that these rules were said to have been passed down from the apostles themselves, proto-Catholic authors demanded that “all Christians were to subscribe to [them]” (ibid.). This argument was sided by the conception of “apostolic succession” which established the idea of a succession of authority (sometimes also teaching) from the time of the apostles down to the proto-Catholic communities (see Ehrman 2003: 192f.).

254). At times, however, the development appears to have indeed crystallized around individuals, e.g. the debate triggered by Marcion and the subsequent influence of his teaching on the development of the proto-Catholic profile and canon (see chapter 5.1.3). Accepting the idea of gradual development, one must thus also agree with Gager's assessment that the process of canonization was "profoundly influenced by the various internal controversies of the second and third centuries" (Gager 1983: 190).

*

The following analysis moves mostly within the historical phase of "canonization" understood as *a process lasting at least until the fourth century that fixes versions of selected texts and assembles them in a closed collection of writings* known as the New Testament⁶⁴. This implies two essential steps in the development of those texts (see Overbeck 1919: 86). First, the authors of the Gospels themselves chose from a wider range of material. Why did they choose to introduce one thing and not the other? What does that choice and narrative tell the scholar about their background? Second, the canon itself is the result of a process of dissemination, alteration and selection spanning a few hundred years. Only centuries after their composition, proto-Catholic editors created a selection known today as the New Testament (acknowledging the temporal separation between development and selection has led scholars like Barton or McDonald to underline the temporal and local canonicity of different texts during the second century, see Barton 1997: 157f.; McDonald 2010: 22; cf. Sundberg 1968).

The texts of the New Testament must have therefore proven their relevance twice – to the authors of the Gospels transcribing an oral tradition and to the editors of the New Testament that chose them from a variety of texts. This double threshold should not lead one to bypass the process of alteration that took place along the way from the moment of compilation to the moment of canonization⁶⁵. Sanders notes accordingly that the pre-canonical development "frequently differs so widely from the canonical material that the two groups of material may have separate histories" (Sanders 1969: 280). Comparing the

⁶⁴ Certainly, the present work is focusing only on those earliest Christian writings included in the New Testament canon. If Sundberg is right that early Christian communities received the Jewish scriptures before their ultimate canonization, this demands a different line of examination (see Sundberg 1968). Furthermore, there were many "Christian" writings that remained below the threshold of canonicity, see Metzger 1987: 165-189.

⁶⁵ Lake notes that doctrinal alterations appear to have taken place very early in the development of the Christian canonical texts (see Lake 1904: 10f.), possibly even before the first textual fixation of the oral tradition feeding the Gospel accounts (see Taylor 1933: 1-3; Parvis 1952: 172).

differences between the materials cited or referred to by the Apostolic Fathers⁶⁶ to the (multiple) versions in the New Testament canon, Sanders and others reach the conclusion that the texts themselves “remained fluid for centuries” (Parker 1997: 205⁶⁷). It has been assumed that the changes made to the original accounts had two reasons: (1) to adjust its content to the (changing character of) Catholic theology (see Käsemann 1970c: 399⁶⁸) and (2) to improve the position of proto-Catholic Orthodoxy in its constant struggle against other interpretations (see Ehrman 2003: 221; 2011: 1ff.)⁶⁹.

By the time of its official canonization, proto-Catholic Orthodoxy had developed a sufficient strength and dogmatic stability to force its perspective onto Western Christianity. The canon is the self-expression of a group of writers *that only retrospectively came to comprise the tradition Catholic Christianity*⁷⁰. In a way, then, the following work traces the path of a proto-Catholic construction of its own history. In this sense, the term “proto-Catholic” remains a problematic albeit necessary ascription for different writers that only later came to be introduced as such. It is important to keep in mind at all times that those writers did not compose their texts knowing about the Catholic triumph while they still contributed to its progress and further development.

⁶⁶ Following Metzger, the term refers to “a circle of authors who are supposed to have had personal knowledge of some of the apostles, but did not actually belong to their number” (Metzger 1987: 39). Metzger notes that they do not represent one coherent tradition as “each of them has a separate literary history” (ibid.). Considering their time of composition, they “span the period from about A.D. 95 to about 150, and are witnesses to the development of different emphases and styles of Christianity” (ibid.). While there may have been later changes to the texts (see Metzger 1987: 73) Markus notes “that the New Testament canon itself [is] canonizing a number of disparate and sometimes divergent Christian traditions” (Markus 1980: 7). Only later did Catholicism develop a unified teaching – apostolic Christianity, however, was “comprising a range of options within limits defined by a central, unifying core” (Markus 1980: 8). For further discussions, see chapter 5.

⁶⁷ cf. Lake 1904: 10f.; Epp 1966: 37; Sanders 1969: 280; Metzger 1987: 39-73; Ehrman 2011: 342-350.

⁶⁸ “Die Kanonbildung ist nicht bloß ein Prozeß kirchlicher Tradition oder Verkündigung, sondern wenigstens auch der Niederschlag kirchlicher Lehrbildung“ (Käsemann 1970c: 399).

⁶⁹ In his foundational work *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (published 1934, English translation 1971), the German scholar Walter Bauer laid out the groundwork for what Boyarin calls the “dislodging [of] the traditional 'Eusebian' account of the origins of orthodoxy and heresy, within which orthodoxy was simply the teaching of Jesus as communicated to the apostles and passed down to bishops, while heresy was the later incursion of false and wicked error into Christian tradition under the influence of the Devil or his later secularized counterpart Greek philosophy” (Boyarin 2004: 3; cf. King 2003: 114f.). Walter Bauer warned scholars not to use these semantics of difference and authenticity without keeping in mind that it is constructed from the position of a victorious group among the diversity of early Christian communities (cf. Bauer 1964: 2-3; Ehrman 2003: 173; Fredriksen 2010: XXI). The scientific works following Bauer have demonstrated that “heretic” and “orthodox” accounts coexisted in the first centuries (heterodoxy) and that a Christian Catholic Orthodoxy only emerged as the dominant and authoritative stream in Western Christianity by the fourth century (see Boyarin 2004: 3). The writings that have reached the interpreter through the channels of Catholic transmission should therefore be regarded as partakers in and products of the representation of Catholic Orthodox theology.

⁷⁰ As demonstrated in the chapter on the Patristic writers, the Catholic authorities themselves did not comprise the theological unity they constructed retroactively. Ehrman notes: “as orthodox Christianity moved on to refine its theological views to a level unanticipated by its forebears, the views of proto-orthodoxy became not just surpassed but proscribed” (Ehrman 2003: 253).

2.4.2 Interpreting the New Testament

“At one stage of a movement a document may function in a specific way, have a certain meaning or influence on the movement; at a subsequent stage on the trajectory that document, unaltered, may function or cut in a different way, may mean in effect something different, may influence the movement differently” (Robinson 1971: 16)

There is no agreement on virtually anything regarding the development of the New Testament, including date, purpose, context and content. A relative consensus exists merely on formal questions, such as that the canon contains 27 books (of which thirteen are ascribed to Paul, and a fourteenth, Acts, to describing his career) whose collection started around the middle of the second century and took until the middle of the fourth. Furthermore, the New Testament is made up of four literary genres (gospels, acts, epistles, apocalypse) of which the epistolary genre “greatly predominates” (Metzger 1987: 180⁷¹). Elliott notes on their order that “there is little logic, chronological, theological or historical” (Elliott 2010: 613). The Epistles of Paul are usually assumed to be the earliest texts included in the New Testament, followed by the writings of Mark, Matthew, Luke and John. Yet this reconstruction of chronology of the Gospels is already a matter of constant debate as it relies on a decision of which factor to highlight in each text respectively.

In the previous section, it has been argued that the scholar should remain sensible to the fact that the shape of the New Testament is also an expression of the interest of the party that emerged victorious from these controversies – Christian Orthodoxy (see Metzger 1987: 24⁷²). It is thus crucial to assume that the texts that comprise the New Testament have survived in a specific version and through a process of selection and domestication as seen from a proto-Catholic orthodox perspective. This partisan character of the canon demands sensibility in the treatment of single texts. Gager reminds scholars:

⁷¹ About seven-ninths or twenty-one of the twenty-seven documents are epistles (see Metzger 1987: 180). Knox highlights further the significance of the epistolary genre for early Christianity beyond its canonization and notes “down to [...] A.D. 140 or 150, almost the whole of formal Christian writing seems to have been letter-writing” (Knox 1942: 56). Knox assumes, in agreement with Goodspeed, that a gap in perception of Paul’s epistles implicates a delay in the dissemination of the Pauline letters. The Epistles appear to have been circulating in one *Corpus Pauline* around the year 100 C.E., providing “both stimulus and model for subsequent Christian writing” (Knox 1942: 57; cf. Zahn 1901: 36f.; Goodspeed 1927: 20-32; Zuntz 1953: 14f.; Schmithals 1960: 236-245; Dahl 1962; Campenhausen 1986: 170; critical discussion in Gamble 1995: 58-65). As pointed out later, Knox further assumes that the Marcionite canon was built on this publication and served as a negative point of reference for the later Catholic appropriation of the original Pauline Epistles (see Knox 1942: 60ff.; cf. chapter 5).

⁷² It is therefore no proof to the contrary if Dunn notes “early Catholicism is to be found already in the NT” (Dunn 1990: 362). While this presence may indeed testify to tendencies already encapsulated in these writings, those early versions unfold in a heterodox framework that knew nothing of Catholic orthodoxy.

“We must [...] remember that the writings in the New Testament were not chosen at random or for the purpose of representing all points of view. By its structure and contents it expresses and conveys a particular image of what early Christianity should have been like. It is, if you will, a polemical statement” (Gager 1983: 161).

Edwards/Goodman/Price/Rowlands note that the “primary purpose” (Edwards/Goodman/Price/Rowlands 1999: 5) of these early texts “was to convince those who were already members of the small groups committed to Christ of the plausibility of the step they had taken” (ibid.). The way proto-Catholicism achieved this goal was by highlighting continuity with Judaism so that believers “could position themselves and their own beliefs with regard to an older story of the people of God” (Edwards/Goodman/Price/Rowlands 1999: 5f.). MacLennan comments on the value of the New Testament as historical evidence:

“it appears that the written texts from late antiquity are not reliable sources of the period they are supposed [to] reflect. They primarily reflect the concerns of the last redactor” (MacLennan 1990: 13).

In the introduction to his seminal *On the Trial of Jesus*, Paul Winter comments that the Gospels are “primary sources insofar as they reflect the situations in which their authors – members of certain early Christian communities – found themselves, and insofar as they express the beliefs current in those communities” (Winter 1974: 2⁷³). From this, Winter concludes that the Gospels “are direct evidence only for the significance attached to the actions, sayings, and the death of Jesus at the time the Gospels were written” (ibid.). Since we do not know of any original texts⁷⁴, the scholar must try to reconstruct the context and teaching as they helped form those texts. Analyzing the New Testament thus means unearthing the theological and political context of its many authors and, if in the scope of this work, its subsequent editors/interpreters⁷⁵.

⁷³ This echoes Albert Schweigler’s hypothesis from 1846 that the writings of the New Testament represent the genealogy of the apostolic and post-apostolic era in its different stages (see Schweigler 1846: 9).

⁷⁴ Lake comments: “[T]he situation which we must face is that we have to deal with a number of local texts, that no two localities used quite the same text, that no locality has yet been shown to have used a text which is demonstrably better than its rivals” (Lake 1904: 6; cf. Parker 1997: 205ff.; Metzger/Ehrman 2005: 272ff.).

⁷⁵ This underlines a point raised by Ehrman in his afterword to the revised version of his seminal *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Ehrman 2011). Ehrman challenges the long-living tradition of textual criticism to strive for a re-establishment of the original text. This original version, Ehrman maintains, is unattainable for the case of the New Testament as the question of originality may not even be decidable if scholars would be in full possession of all the information (see Ehrman 2011: 341-350). What scholars should focus on instead is the process of alteration and dissemination occurring during the first centuries. This has opened a new perspective for research followed by the *Institut für neutestamentarliche*

Recent scholarship has therefore criticized the notion of a unified canon, noting that the plurality in early Christianity may well manifest itself within the New Testament as “Conflict in the Canon” (Sim 2013). In those texts, linear developments stand besides revisions, disharmony, additions and contradictions⁷⁶. This reveals the diverse origins of the canon-texts themselves and testifies to different stages and streams within the early faith and reflecting positions in the development of Christian dogma. An attentive reader of the New Testament may therefore be able to detect echoes of voices muted by the “winning factions” (Dunn 1990: xxx) and disfigured by centuries of canonization - voices that have been “transmitted through a carefully tuned network of filters” (Gager 1983: 265) – The voices of early Christian Judaism and of the Jewish Christian Ebionites, of Marcionism, Gnosticism, Docetism, and Montanism, of Gentile sympathizers and an unknown variety of other interpretations (see Käsemann 1970c: 402⁷⁷).

Considering those sediments, some scholars maintain that the canon exceeds its ideological framework. To Hoffmann, the New Testament entails a procession of Christian self-construction whose traces the Catholic Church could never fully eradicate. This failure, Hoffmann supposes further, results from the proto-Catholic emphasis on the

Forschung in Münster and the *Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing* at the University of Birmingham. These institutes shift focus to the scribes and copyists of the New Testament texts and their respective socio-historical contexts. Accordingly, Ehrman concludes his analysis with a call for extended studies on of a range of issues connected to the theological position and the doctrinal debates of the scribes (see Ehrman 2011: 356).

⁷⁶ Dunn piously rejects the notion of “contradiction” and notes that “any and every statement of the gospel in the NT is historically conditioned and context specific. The word of God speaks to the human condition in its diverse specificity. That is why it is diverse and different in its varied expressions” (Dunn 1990b: xxi). However, there are statements in the New Testament that are contradictory if treated as historical evidence (e.g. the description of Paul in Acts and the record Paul gives of himself). Ehrman comments: “Theologically oriented changes coincide with, and in a sense highlight, the paradoxical nature of the proto-orthodox Christology itself. [...] proto-orthodox Christians had to defend – at one and the same time – Christ’s deity against adoptionists, his humanity against docetists, and his unity against separationists. This [...] is why scribes modified the New Testament text in seemingly contrary directions: some textual changes work to *emphasize* aspects of Christ’s human nature whereas others work to *de-emphasize* it; some work to *heighten* his divinity, whereas others work to *diminish* it” (Ehrman 2011: 324).

⁷⁷ On the early Christian debates between proto-Catholicism, Marcionism, Gnosticism, Montanism and the Ebionites, see Metzger 1987: 75-112; Ehrman 2003; for the “Gnosticism” as a category of Christian polemics, see King 2003; for an encompassing account on the Jewish voices within Christianity, see the seminal Schoeps 1949, and more recently Broadhead 2010. Dunn has proposed to interpret this multiplicity as proof for a Catholic recognition “of the validity of diversity” (Dunn 1990: 376; cf. Oeming 2003: 58). However, the present work objects to Dunn’s assessment that “the catholic church in its wisdom recognized the normative authority of a range of writings which actually document what true catholicity embraces – unity in and through diversity” (Dunn 1990: xxx; cf. Oeming 2003: 58). Proto-Catholic writers established the canon to counter competing interpretations. As Aichele underlines in *The Control of Biblical Meaning* (2001), a desire for the control of interpretation is the very function of a canon (see Aichele 2001: 2). At the same time, Aichele notes that “no canon (including the Bible) ever succeeds completely in satisfying these desires” (ibid.). The evidence of diversity in the Christian canon, then, does not proof the wisdom of the Catholic Church as Dunn maintains but testifies to the plurality of voices in early Christianity that could not be brought completely under the control of the canon.

“plurality of the apostolic witness as the warrant of consistent teaching [*e pluribus unum*]” (Hoffmann 1984: 142; cf. Knox 1942: 39ff.). The presence of diversity in the New Testament, one can conclude, is at once the characteristic of orthodox Christology and evidence of an inner-Christian struggle⁷⁸. It is also a central challenge to contemporary scientific analysis⁷⁹.

On a proper interpretation, MacLennan underlines the importance social context has for an analysis of texts ranging from the New Testament to Patristic writings: “If the context is changed, the meaning of the text is changed” (MacLennan 1990: 16; cf. Gager 1982: 259f.). While one should not push the editing history aside, MacLennan demands that any text-analysis answers the following questions: “Where was it written? When was it written and what seems to be the social reality that stimulated such a writing?” (MacLennan 1990: 16). This focus on context points to the “concept of the implied reader” (Tyson 1992: 181), i.e. the question who was the reader addressed within the respective texts. Historical context, implied readers and the theological position of the authors also form the initial questions for the present analysis of any given text.

The edition of the New Testament used for analysis

From the discussion above, one must conclude that there is no such thing as an original version of the New Testament texts. Rather, all texts that eventually came to be included in the New Testament existed and circulated beforehand in multiple versions. The interpretation and employment of those texts varied locally and was frequently altered according to the desire of the respective author and his/her community. The first complete edition of the New Testament that has survived, the *Codex Sinaiticus*, dates to the middle of the fourth century (though large parts of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures, are missing). However, the order of texts is different from today’s collections and includes two additional texts⁸⁰.

⁷⁸ Knox notes “It is my conviction that this method [of the church, M.C.] of answering the heretics not by rejecting their Scripture but by absorbing it into a larger whole not only explains the church’s acceptance of the principle of the New Testament but also accounts, in considerable part, for the particular contents of the catholic canon” (Knox 1942: 39).

⁷⁹ Analysis is complicated further by a tradition of exegesis itself that has moved well within the Christian anti-Jewish frame until fairly recently. Therefore, the hermeneutical lenses one adopts while looking at a given source has ramifications for the things one will see. While it is improbable that any given analysis can leave the whole of this tradition behind, there is still – I would hope – a way to trace the process of a construction of the Christian self- and world-perception through the image of “the Jews”.

⁸⁰ The *Codex Sinaiticus* itself was composed by three different writers and its ultimate form manifests to an editing history in itself (see Jongkind 2006). Ehrman comments that we cannot ascertain whether differences between the *Codex* and later versions were due to mistakes in copying, deliberate alterations or a different line of dissemination altogether (see Ehrman 2011).

Gager reminds scholars reading the Greek text of the Pauline Epistles that it “consisted of an unbroken series of letters – no spaces between words, no punctuation, no verses, and no chapters” (Gager 2000: 13). Their introduction, he notes, “reflects entrenched ways of understanding Paul’s letters” (ibid.). The problem with choosing the right issue for analysis is therefore that there is no secure information about the changes the New Testament underwent during the first centuries, stretching even beyond the time of its first canonization. I am neither equipped technically, nor would it serve the aim and scope of this work, to include original texts in Greek, Latin or Aramaic, such as the *Codex Sinaiticus*.

I have therefore decided to work with the King James Bible. As Parker remarks, this edition was produced in 17th century England and thus testifies to its context (see Parker 2012: 146). The reason I decided to omit newer translations like the Standard Revised Edition is that the King James Bible remains one of the most popular translations of the New Testament into English. Since the focus of this work is on reconstructing how a Christian perspective on “the Jews” shaped an understanding of the world and self, an older and widely popular translation of the New Testament seems to be the best starting point for analysis.

2.4.3 The Question of Anti-Judaism

Turning to the question of anti-Judaism in the New Testament, Rosemary Ruether finds a “supersessionary covenantal principle” (Ruether 1997: 56) in the idea that “one was not within the true people of God unless one adopted the faith in this form” (ibid.). In a 1979 critique of Ruether’s assertions, Douglas R. A. Hare outlines a popular counter-argument. Pointing out that the supersessionary principle was a general feature of Jewish messianic sects he argues that it does not yet imply its break away from Judaism (see Hare 1979: 31⁸¹). Frankemölle supports Hare’s point when underlining the closeness of early Christian groups to Hellenistic Judaism – in its beginning Christianity was Jewish (see Frankemölle 1999: 86). In his widely received *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte*

⁸¹ Stegemann/Stegemann comment that sociological exegesis increasingly focuses on Christianity as sectarian movement (“Sektensoziologie”, Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 213; cf. Spence 2004: 2, 352-357). After a discussion of its potential both authors opt for a theory of deviance (“Devianztheorie”) to explain the subsequent process of exclusion that hit the Jewish Christian groups after 70 C.E. from the Jewish (see ibid. 1997: 213-217; cf. Sanders 1993: 129-151) and Pagan mainstream (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 289).

und ihr historisches Umfeld (fourth edition, 1999) Schrekenberg rejects the very question:

“Die Frage nach Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus im Neuen Testament ist methodisch verfehlt und schon im Ansatz absurd. [...] Bis tief in die zweite Hälfte des 1. Jh. ist das Christentum eine innerjüdische Entwicklung und die vermeintlich antijüdische Apologetik und Polemik des Neuen Testaments ist vor allem Ausdruck eines Ringens inner-jüdischer Gruppierungen um die Messiasfrage und das Reich Gottes” (Schrekenberg 1999: 84).

This observation is certainly correct, though its applicability to the New Testament depends on the date one assumes for the composition of each text. Paul’s Epistles, for example, can be (re-)interpreted as moving within a Jewish framework. The Gospels mark a time when the self-understanding of those communities of Christ-believers had started to drift away from the Jewish fold. Hoping to clarify the issue, Hare introduces a frequently quoted distinction between three types of anti-Judaism in Christian writing (see Hare 1979: 29-32): (1) “Prophetic Anti-Judaism”, which he defines as a radical but internal critique of Judaism found in the writings of the Prophets such as Jeremiah or Ezekiel. This kind of anti-Judaism preceded Christianity and has no intrinsic connection to Christology. (2) “Jewish-Christian Anti-Judaism” in which Christology amends the prophetic polemic – Israel manifesting its apostasy by failing to recognize Christ as Messiah. For this type of anti-Judaism, repentance was still possible (as acceptance of Christ as Messiah) and God was not seen to have rejected his people. (3) “Gentilizing Anti-Judaism” representing the conviction that God has forsaken the empirical Jews/Israel of the flesh finally and irrevocably. Hare sees this last type as the root for Christian antisemitism (Hare 1979: 43).

Hare’s analytical framework focuses analysis on the form of the anti-Judaic statement. If it appears dressed in the framework of prophetic critique, it may serve as self-critical corrective. Once it entails a self-sustainable Gentile-Christian perspective, however, it changes its character⁸². In effect, he thus provides a definition of Christian anti-Judaism that dismisses the larger part of anti-Jewish invective in the New Testament as internal to Judaism.

There is good reason to object to this narrow definition: While the “intra-Jewish polemic”

⁸² For a critique of Hare’s employment of the Gentile-Christian division, see Smiga 1992: 15-18. Cf. the chapter on terminology above.

(Gager 1983: 9) may be *derived* from a Jewish source this reference does not *necessarily* prove its innocence! (Jewish) questions of God's relation to Israel, matters of supersession, appropriation or rejection, of the old and new covenant are at the very centre of theological debates during the first centuries. By the second century, a simultaneous emphasis of continuity (with the Jewish prophecy) and denigration (of the Jewish people) becomes the very feature of proto-Catholic anti-Judaism/antisemitism. Considering this development, references to Jewish scriptures and prophecy are understandably frequent. It would therefore be a mistake to take those references as simple evidence for a Jewish position of the respective author. Hare's distinction between types of supersession and appropriation can in fact coexist within a Christian framework as a (proto-Catholic) model of supersession (Israel has to recognize Christ as the new Messiah) and appropriation/rejection (Judaism has never been part of God's chosen people/true Israel) both construct Judaism as adversaries to the Christian self.

Scholars after Hare have repeatedly pointed to the fact that a solidified conception of "Judaism" did not exist in the first century but is the very result of an emerging Christian orthodoxy (see Boyarin 1999; 2003; 2004; Mason 2007). However, an argument that accepts a delineation of a "Christian" side from "Judaism" already assumes a historical situation that only emerged after the period the respective analysis focusses on. If one is to adopt a genealogical perspective on the construction of those oppositional terms and concepts instead, the Christian canon emerges as an expression of a dominant interpretation of faith emerging only after centuries of religious struggle. As pointed out above, those centuries left their traces on the texts comprising the New Testament. This is the reason one can take Jewish actors and "Jews" in New Testament texts as evidence for the respective historical and social context of *composition* (not necessarily the time of the historical Jesus). Turning to the way the "Jews" are constructed in each given text and how this may relate to the author's position on Jewish law and Christology, the present work hopes to gain an insight into the development of central discursive elements for the emergence of a proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism.

In the following analysis, the texts are addressed in their supposed chronology – Paul, The Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke, Luke-Acts and the Gospel of John. In the second part, the work turns to Marcion and a selection of Patristic writers (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Chrysostom). The text-samples are approached with three preliminary hypothesis:

- (1) Already in the New Testament one can find the idea of “the Jews” as the antagonist principle threatening the historical and symbolical body of Christ. It has therefore been regarded as one of “the oldest, and arguably the most unchanging, of all Christian perceptions of Jews and Judaism” (Stacey 1998: 11). “The Jews”/“Judaism” supply a conception of the Other to the formation of a Christian community (group-cohesion).
- (2) “The Jews” as a discursive image assume a specific function answering to needs arising from theological questions and socio-political challenges the respective authors and their addressees respond to. It is assumed that, as the demands changed, the functional position of “the Jews” changes as well. In this sense, a shift in position may mark a shift in the author’s context.
- (3) As past Christ-murderers and future witnesses of the resurrection, early Christianity develops a sense of history by the image of “the Jews”. Without them, there would be no concept of past and present suffering and future salvation, and thus no Christians. The discursive “Jew”, the study concludes in agreement with Ora Limor, is “the constitutor of the Christian identity” (Limor 1997: 77; cf. Boyarin 2004: 4).

2.5 The Course of this Work

Looking back through the smoke-screen of 1600 years of Catholic Christian dominance⁸³, one must suppose that much of the non-Catholic context a study of early Christianity must assume has been lost (see Fredriksen 2006: 588). Things seem natural today that once were a contested position among diverse interpretations of the faith in Jesus as the messiah. Is it improbable that this affects a (scientific) perspective on Judaism as well? Certainly, the assumption that “Judaism” took a hostile position towards “Christianity” has been proven to be an effect of the anti-Jewish tradition itself. Neither Judaism nor Christianity existed as separated entities for the time under scrutiny in the first part of this work. It is here that theoretical reflection becomes imperative.

To be sure, I do not intend to argue that there has never been any hostile interaction

⁸³ Regarding the focus of this work, Protestantism is a variation that takes place within the Catholic framework. It remains a task for another study to demonstrate that it does not transcend its boundaries, especially with regard to a perception of world and (Christian) self through “the Jews”.

between “Christians” and “Jews”. There is no need to refute Judith Lieu’s remark that early “Christians continued to be acutely aware of their Jewish neighbors and to interact with them, whether on friendly or on more hostile terms” (see Lieu 1996: 11). I agree further with Lieu’s notion that reality influences the construction of the discursive images (see *ibid.*: 2⁸⁴). Where I beg to differ is as to what *factors* should be considered relevant for those discursive images, in this case the Christian discourse on “the Jews”.

Towards the end of her book *Image and Reality. The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Lieu 1996), Lieu seems to be plagued by similar doubts regarding the relation of a discursive development to real empirical conflicts. During the second century and afterwards, she admits, “Christian authors constructed an image of the Jew which would meet their own needs, social, theological or political” (Lieu 1996: 289). The following work attempts to trace the history of this construction. It does not, however, deny the existence of empirical Jews or the reality of a Judaeo-Christian encounter but argues that this encounter is ultimately not decisive for the emergence of a proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism.

It was neither natural for Christianity to reject Judaism nor the direct result of Christian-Jewish encounter. Rather, the work proposes that a discursive image of “the Jews” developed in proto-Catholic theology that only slowly became a dominant stream within early Christianity. This work is thus attempting to trace a development that generated “the Jews” as a central element for reflection on theology, inner-Christian struggles and socio-political developments. Tracing this development, the present work establishes a set of causal factors that explain the development of proto-Catholic antisemitism culminating in the emergence of an antisemitism dispositive. In a way, then, this work takes the opposite theoretical side to Marcel Simon’s conflictual hypothesis.

However, I am not a theologian and I do not intend to engage in Christian theology more than the topic demands. Assessing the vast mass of scholarship that exists, I intend to identify wider streams of interpretation. Furthermore, I do not attempt a translation of the original texts. This work is concerned much more with providing a frame to interpret scholarship on early Christian relations to Judaism and to demonstrate the possibility to rethink the causal framework usually assumed. In the best possible way, I understand this study as complementary to the work of historians and theologians.

⁸⁴ “the image is the presentation, that which each text projects concerning Jews or Judaism; the reality is the actual position of Jews and Jewish communities in the context from which the literature comes, both in themselves and in relation to their Christian contemporaries” (Lieu 1996: 2).

The first part of this work has been dedicated to the vast amount of scholarship that has already been done early Christian relations to Judaism. A discussion of the term “antisemitism” and its different definitions was followed by an outline of the development of a critical discussion among theologians in the Anglo-Saxon sphere and Germany from the 1930s onwards. The intensive scholarly debate on virtually every single aspect under discussion makes it necessary to provide additional literature reviews at the beginning of each chapter. These usually start with providing an overview over those debates and then position the present work on the subject-matter (e.g. Paul, the Gospels, Marcion, the Patristics, etc.). The third section of the first section has been dedicated to methodological questions, including a discussion of terminology, hypothesis and scientific perspective. The fourth section was then dedicated to a critical reflection of the historical sources analyzed in the following.

The 2nd section of this work starts with the chapter that discusses the Epistles of Paul (3rd chapter). The earliest sources in the Christian canon (New Testament), the figure of “Paul” has been at the center of attention for debates surrounding early Christian antisemitism/anti-Judaism. Reviewing basic positions in this debate, the present study follows the “New Perspectives on Paul” in re-reading him as a Jewish rabbi who came to believe that the Messiah had come. “Paul” was not opposed to Judaism and his anti-Jewish interpretation results largely from a later appropriation by Marcionite and Catholic writers from the second century onwards. However, the analysis also demonstrates how those *intra muros* debates may have supplied some of the fuel for later interpretations.

The second case study (4th chapter) is dedicated to an analysis of the Gospels as an important step in the development of a self-consciousness within nascent Judaeo-Christianity. It starts off by a short introduction of the socio-historical context and a brief discussion of the analytical framework. After an analysis of each Gospel, the third and fourth section are dedicated to tendencies discernible among the four texts. A crucial observation of this section is the detachment of the historical events from the discursive personal. The motivation behind this detachment seems to lie in a desire to construct a specific image of Jesus (Christology) instead of giving an exact historical account. It is concluded that this detachment, together with the centrality of “the Jews” to those reflections, marks an important development in the emergence of a Christian formation

of antisemitism.

The third case-study (5th chapter) focuses on the theology of Marcion and his Patristic counterparts. Its ultimate aim is to reconstruct the way proto-Catholicism emerged during the second century against the challenge of competing claims to a Christian truth. Introducing Marcion as a crucial figure in this process, the analysis follows the Patristic arguments by putting special focus on the role of “the Jews”. The section culminates in the conclusion that the Marcionite challenge sparked a counter-strategy among Christian writers in which “the Jews” constitute an important point of reference. Appropriating elements of earlier Christian writings, this counter-strategy consisted in an increasing claim to continuity with the Jewish scriptures and prophecy and an intensifying denigration of and delineation from “the Jews”.

The fourth case-study (6th chapter) starts by giving a historical overview on the changing fate of Christians within Roman official policy until the fourth century. It asks, when and in what way Christians suffered under Roman official policies and how the Conversion of Constantine affected the young faith. This review culminates in the conclusion that what has somehow bluntly been coined “Christian” antisemitism/anti-Judaism should be understood as the victory of one particular group within the multiplicity of early Christianity. Analysis then proceeds to demonstrate in what way this process was accompanied by the installment of an anti-Jewish framework within the theological reflections of proto-Catholic writers, starting with Justin Martyr, continuing in Tertullian and culminating in the writings of John Chrysostom. The section concludes that theological development, internal stratification and political consolidation accounts for the increasing impact of a (proto-Catholic) formation of antisemitism.

The 7th chapter tests the insights won so far by exploring the question as to whether discursive elements in this proto-Catholic formation had originated in Pagan sources. It starts by tracing the history of Judaeo-Roman relations. While they remained stable until the first century, the Jewish Wars triggered animosities among the educated classes. However, this did not hurt Judaism’s legal status in the Roman Empire, which deteriorated only when Christianity had begun its rise to become the Roman state religion. At least a part of the populace appears to have been attracted to Judaism. The second section of this chapter focuses on the integration of Pagan anti-Jewish polemics into the Christian framework and the impact of a Gentile influx. The chapter culminates in the hypothesis that antisemitism fulfilled an important function as a means of cohesion for

early Christian communities.

The concluding section (8th chapter) revisits some of the central insights reached in the course of this work and returns to a discussion of the relationship between empirical and discursive Jews in early Christian antisemitism. While the paradigm of correspondence-theory produces many interesting results, its implicit identification of empirical and discursive Jews ultimately fails to provide a conception that is on eyelevel with contemporary theories on discrimination. The last part is then dedicated to an outline of the heuristic framework underlying the analysis of the present work. Relying on works of the French scholar Michel Foucault, it outlines a possible post-structuralist conception for the historical analysis of antisemitism.

II. Case-Studies

3. Paul and the beginning of Christian faith

3.1 *Paul and his Interpreters*

“Few figures in western history have been the subject of greater controversy than Saint Paul. Few have caused more dissension and hatred. None has suffered more misunderstanding at the hands of both friends and enemies. None has produced more animosity between Jews and Christians” (Gager 2000: 3)

Paul grew up as the son of Jewish-pharisaic parents in Tarsus, Cilicia (see Acts 21:39; 22:3; Phil. 3:5). Some claim that Paul continued to regard himself as a Jew even after the Damascus road incident (see Rom 11:1; 2 Cor 11:22; Phil 3:4-6; cf. Gager 2000: 53), though Paul's observance of the Law is a subject of debate (see 1 Cor. 9:19-23; cf. Sanders 1983: 185f.; Hagner 2007: 112-114). In any case, Paul describes his own turn to Jesus alluding to the prophetic calling of Isaiah and Jeremiah – he is *called* from among the Jews and as one of them to spread the Gospel of salvation to the Gentiles. Further evidence for Paul's continued identification with the Jewish community has been found in the punishments Paul received from the synagogue (see 2 Cor. 11:24) leading to E. P. Sanders' famous remark: “*Punishment implies inclusion*” (Sanders 1986: 87).

In his own understanding, therefore, Paul does not leave the realm of Judaism, but expands its scope (see Gal 1:15f.; Rom 1:1⁸⁵). Considering Paul's motivation in becoming Christianity's most prominent early missionary to the Gentiles, Kenneth Stow calls attention to three influences: Hellenistic mystery cults, Jewish dissident sects and Paul's own Jewish background (see Stow 1992: 10; Stendahl 1976: 7-11⁸⁶). Awareness of this Jewish background has given rise to a new strand in scholarship to interpret Paul's

⁸⁵ cf. Hagner 2007: 101f. for a discussion of the question conversion vs. call.

⁸⁶ On the difficulty of using the terms “Judaism” and “Christianity” for the first century, Hagner notes: “Neither term means what it will come to mean in the centuries following the time of Paul. Judaism is in a highly formative stage in the first two centuries (especially before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70). Similarly, first-century Christianity is not what it will become in the second century” (Hagner 2007: 97, fn. 3).

“theologizing”⁸⁷ in the frame of contemporary Judaism⁸⁸. With an eye on two millennia of interpretation, Gaston concludes that Pauline scholarship has “for centuries been the greatest driving force behind Christian calumny of and contempt for all things Jewish” (Gaston 2005: 250).

3.1.1 A short History of interpreting Paul

“The easy assumption among scholars that Paul had a clear-cut idea of the new religion or true religion of Christianity connects closely with the persistence of traditional Christian constructions of Judaism in New Testament studies” (Stowers 1994: 25)

With the advent of Baur and the *Tübingen School* from the mid-19th century onwards, new questions had opened up from authorship to soteriology. Using his source-critical method (*quellenkritische Methode*), Baur identified four *Hauptbriefe* as authentic – Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians (Baur 1968: 276). This selection has since then become the minimal consensus for most contemporary scholarship. Some, however, list the selection to include Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon assuming that all of them were written in a short time period (see Sanders 1977: 431f.; Bornkamm 1987: 11f.⁸⁹). Baur was lauded also for introducing the idea that Paul’s Epistles give expression to an opposition of (Jewish) Petrine and (Hellenistic) Pauline Christianity (see Baur 1831: 136; 1864: 43ff.; 1968: v).

The idea of an initial conflict was developed into a full hypothesis by one of Baur’s pupils, Albert Schweigler (1846⁹⁰). According to Schweigler, Catholicism had emerged as a synthesis between the Petrine and Pauline positions. This notion of an initial conflict among Christian fractions implied a critique of the universalizing Lutheran approach to Paul (see Watson 2007: 44; cf. Westerholm 2004 for a discussion). Challenging further

⁸⁷ On the difference between the terms “theology” and “theologizing”, Campbell notes: “Theology suggests something concrete, something already achieved and fully formulated that can be reapplied in a similar manner to successive differing situations, thus maintaining continuity and conformity. But this view of theology is anachronistic if applied to Paul who thought and wrote without the presence of what we understand as Christian theological tradition. We prefer to speak of Paul’s theologizing since for the apostle this is an activity rather than simply an acquired mode of thought” (Campbell 2008: 159).

⁸⁸ see Munck 1954; Davies 1967; Sanders 1977; Bornkamm 1987; Gaston 1987; Hengel 1992; Boyarin 1994; Dunn 2003; Hvalvik 2007; cf. Räisänen 2001 for an overview.

⁸⁹ The temporal order of composition according to Bornkamm is 1 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Philemon and Romans (see Bornkamm 1987: 11).

⁹⁰ This hypothesis was contested by A. Ritschl (1857), mentor of Adolf Harnack, who concluded that, in Dunn’s words, “Catholicism was not the consequence of a reconciliation between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, but was in fact ‘only a stage of Gentile Christianity’, the development of a popular Gentile Christianity independent of Paul” (Dunn 1990: 342).

the traditional Catholic conception of apostolic continuity, the notion of conflict opened the way for an appraisal of diversity in early Christianity. However, Baur and his pupils adopted the traditional portrayal of Paul as the point of departure from law-obeying Judaism (see Baur 1864 [o. 1853]: 46f.). This notion has remained central until recently. It echoes in the conclusion of the Jewish historian Salo W. Baron; “with Paul, the Christian Church begins” (Baron 1952: 86⁹¹).

From the 1960s onwards, Christian scholars increasingly called into doubt the traditional juxtaposition of Hellenistic and Judean Christianity, rejecting the idea that Paul had opposed Judaism and Jewish ritual practice⁹². This shift came about as a culmination of insights, among them the discovery of the rabbinical basis of Paul’s eschatology (see Sanders 1977⁹³), a critique of the Hellenistic/Judean opposition (see Hengel 1969) and a renewed focus on the social dimension of justification (see Barth 1968; 1973⁹⁴). As an effect, the new “Paul” moved closer to the Jewish reality of his own time. The renowned scholar James D.G. Dunn subsumed this development under the term the *New Perspectives on Paul* (see Dunn 1990a: 183⁹⁵).

The *New Perspectives* emphasize the relevance of historical context for an interpretation of Paul (see e.g. Campbell 2008: 10f.). For example, Mußner claims that Paul’s Epistles must be understood with regard to their addressees – a community of Gentile converts

⁹¹ cf. Klausner 1950: 289; Schoeps 1959: 275-278; Sanders 1977: 9; Kuula 1999: 95. Harnack puts it with vigor: “Paulus zertrümmerte mit dem Kreuz Christi die Religion Israels” (see Harnack 1924: 63). Harnack’s interpretation of Paul takes a crucial position in his general conception of early Christianity. In *Das Wesen des Christentums* (2005), published in 1900, Harnack outlines his idea of Christianity against the backdrop of an extremely negative image of (pharisaic) Judaism (echoed in Bultmann’s *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1984 [1948]: 10-21). Immediately after its publication a fierce controversy unfolded between Christian and Jewish scholars (see Wiese 1999: 132-139). Also today, Harnack’s anti-Judaism is subject to regular critique among scholars (see e.g. Tal 1975: 204-222; Wiese 1999: 133-139; Kinzig 2004: 128-144). Regarding the aim of the present study it is especially interesting to note the connection of Harnack’s anti-Judaism to a specific interpretation of the Pauline Epistles.

⁹² see Davies 1967; Stendahl 1976, Gager 1983, 2000; Gaston 1987; Mußner 1988 [1979]; Dunn 1990a, 1994, 2005; Westerholm 2004 and Campbell 2008; cf. Engberg-Pedersen 2001; Hagner 2007: 96-101 for an overview. This shift of perspective is reflected further in a change from opposition to an emphasis on Paul’s Jewishness in Jewish scholarship (see e.g. Ben-Chorin 1970; Flusser 1990; Wyschgorod 1991; Lapide 1993; Boyarin 1994). Early traces of this critique can be found in Overbeck (1919: 61f.) and Solomon Grayzel (1946). Grayzel reached the remarkable conclusion: “It is fairly safe to say that if Paul’s attitude had continued to predominate in Christian circles there would have been no anti-Jewishness in the Church” (Grayzel 1946: 80f.; for more works, see Barth 1977: 63-65; 71f.).

⁹³ E.P. Sanders’ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977) inspired a “decisive shift or stage in the reappraisal of relationships between the earliest Christians and the Judaism of which they were part” (Dunn 1990b: xvii). Dunn notes in the introduction to his revised edition of *Unity and Diversity in the new Testament* that this led to a change in the way Jesus and the original Gospels, especially Paul have been evaluated with regard to their relation to Judaism (see *ibid.*). Sanders’ work thus shifted attention towards the question of continuity. For more scholars highlighting the Jewish base of Paul’s thought, see Schweitzer 1930; Schoeps 1959; Davies 1967; 1977; 1980; Hays 1989.

⁹⁴ cf. Gager 2000: 70-74 for an overview.

⁹⁵ cf. Strecker 1996; Watson 2007: 1-26 for a discussion.

(see Mußner 1988: 227-229). From this focus on Gentile converts, scholars of the *New Perspectives* conclude that Paul's letters are concerned with defending the rights of Christian Gentiles as “full and genuine heirs to the promises of God to Israel” (Stendahl 1976: 2). Accordingly, Strecker identifies two central characteristics for the “New Perspectives” – (1) Focus on the soteriological status (and not individual salvation as in the Lutheran tradition) and (2) a critique of an anti-Judaic reading of Paul that is claimed to have emerged only during the second century onwards (see Stecker 1996: 4). The connection of the opposition Judaism/Christianity to the opposition law/faith = old/new = fallenness/election is thus understood *not* as a genuine Pauline position but as the result of a later development within (Lutheran) Christianity⁹⁶. This perspective has enjoyed growing acclaim over the past decades (see Hagner 2007: 99f.; critical e.g. Kuula 1999: 90-95).

The idea that a certain history of interpretation gave rise to an interpretation of Paul as anti-Jewish implies that the history of interpretation (rather than the “original”) forms “the theoretical structure for Christian anti-Judaism from Marcion through Luther and F. C. Baur down to Bultmann” (Gaston 1987: 15; cf. Schottroff 1990: 324-343). Stegemann comments:

“Die Bestimmung des Wesens des Christentums und zumal seiner Glaubensurkunde als essenziell antijüdisch geht zugleich von einer negativen Konstruktion des Judentums aus, die einem Diskurs mit jüdischem Selbstverständnis und seiner pluralistischen Entfaltung von vornherein ausweicht, ja geradezu zur Wahrung des eigenen essenzialistischen Selbstverständnisses, der Selbstkonstruktion des Christlichen, vor der geschichtlichen Vermitteltheit mit dem Judentum und der bleibenden Angewiesenheit auf sie flieht” (Stegemann 2004: 59f.).

The presence of other perspectives on Paul in early Christianity demonstrates that an anti-Jewish interpretation was not without alternative – and certainly not closer to the “Jewish Paul”⁹⁷. An anti-Jewish interpretation of Paul's Epistles therefore raises the question of the specific function anti-Judaism has for the respective Christian author. When turning

⁹⁶ see Davies 1967: 323; Gaston 1987: 123; cf. Campbell 2008: 15-32 for an overview. This recalls Baur's argument that the “real” Paul was muted in the course of the development of the early Church. The reference underlines the indebtedness of those scholars to Baur's work even though they reject his juxtaposition of (inferior) Judaism and (superior) Paulinism/Christianity (see Campbell 2008: 15-17).

⁹⁷ In scholarship, this “Jewish Paul” has also been called “the Paul of history” (Watson 2007: 350) or the “historical Paul” (e.g. in Hvalvik 2007: 123). Regarding the multiplication of the figure of “Paul” among the sources, the adjective “historical” does not seem to be precise enough in the context of this work. The addition “Jewish” on the other hand underlines an intention to “arrive [...] at a Paul closer to his time than to ours” (Gager 2000: vii).

to the Epistles themselves, the study focuses on the context in which Paul composed his Gospel until 64 C.E. and the way it communicated with its readership: To whom is Paul addressing in his letters? From where does he speak? To what situation does he respond? This discussion culminates in the question as to how Paul constructs an image of a Jewish past and conduct against the newness of the redemption brought by Jesus⁹⁸.

Before proceeding, however, one should keep a central paradox in mind. While Paul “as a missionary and a [...] theologian [...] had little direct and lasting influence on subsequent developments in the churches” (Hoffmann 1984: 99), the Pauline letters became a decisive field of inner Christian debates during the following centuries. This development – and not Paul’s position as a contested missionary to the Gentiles – catapulted the figure of “Paul” to the center of inner-Christian conflict from Marcion to Protestantism. A trench thus opens up between the context in which Paul worked and the way he was perceived by later generations of Christian interpreters (see chapter 5). For now, analysis is concerned with unearthing a Pauline position as it might have been perceived in Paul’s own time.

3.1.2 Paul’s Theologizing - Continuity and Separation

“In tiefgreifendem Unterschied zur nachfolgenden Kirchengeschichte bis hin zu uns ist für den Apostel ‘die Schrift’ identisch mit der Hebräischen bzw. Griechischen Bibel der Juden. Sie ist keineswegs ‘alt’ im Sinne von ‘veraltet’, sondern in Jesus Christus erfüllt, kommt also gerade nach Paulus in seiner Gegenwart zur Geltung” (Osten-Sacken 1978: 24f.)

While there is little discussion of the fact that the historical Jesus moved within the scope of Judaism (see Campenhausen 1968: 10f.⁹⁹), debate focuses instead on the way his ministry is portrayed in the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels. Did they accept Judaism as basic frame of reference? Did they believe that the original promise remained intact even after Jesus had redeemed the whole of humanity (This is closely connected to the question as to what status the Jewish faith retains for someone that accepts Jesus to be the Messiah)?

⁹⁸ The way the Pauline Epistles became a battle-field for an inner-Christian debate during the first half of the second century will be considered in chapter 5.

⁹⁹ Campenhausen, in his 1968 classic, lists the following universally accepted facts about the historical Jesus: (1) he accepted the law and the prophets as expression of the divine will; (2) he stressed the notion of *T'schuvah* (repentance) expecting and preaching the coming kingdom of God, highlighting personal agency, the possibility to start anew and to be forgiven; (3) he entertained the idea of a secret and unrevealed mandate (“Vollmacht”) given to him by God (see Campenhausen 1968: 10f.).

There is good reason to assume that the early Judean authorities stayed within those religious boundaries (cf. chapter 4.1.1). Matters are more complicated, however, when it comes to the Pauline Epistles.

The traditional view holds that Paul is antithetical to Judaism and its laws (for an overview, see Gager 2000: 21-42), culminating in Käsemann's statement that the "real opponent of the Apostle Paul is the pious Jew" (Käsemann 1969b: 184¹⁰⁰). In critique of this interpretation, Sanders's noted in his seminal *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Sanders 1977) that the image of "Judaism" emerging from the Pauline Epistles is heavily distorted (see Sanders 1977: 550). As pointed out above, scholars of the *New Perspective* have thus tried to integrate the tension between Paul and ancient Judaism by developing an alternative interpretation to bridge the gap between Paul's supposed antithetical position and the Judaism of his time (see Gager 2000: 5-7; Westerholm 2004: 443-445¹⁰¹).

Rosemary Ruether's *Faith and Fratricide* can be regarded as an example of a far-reaching variation of the traditional view on Paul. For Ruether, Paul's theologizing is basically anti-Judaic. There has never been more than one covenant given to Abraham manifested in Christ and separate from the Jewish law. To Paul, Ruether argues, the Jewish people have been "apostate from the beginning" (Ruether 1997: 104) and the true people of Israel are the ones that profess their belief in Jesus (Jews and Pagans alike¹⁰²). Christ is the fulfillment of prophecy and his followers have been freed from the slavery of the flesh/the law/death to enter the spiritual realm of grace, freedom and eternal life (see Ruether 1997: 102¹⁰³). With the murder of Christ, Judaism has not only fulfilled its destiny as a community of fallen, enslaved and carnal man whom God never intended to redeem, it is utterly overpowered – the finite, historical, carnal against the eternal, unchanging and spiritual. Instead of the Law, Jesus is now the guarantor for salvation. This is echoed in Sanders' famous conclusion: "*this is what Paul finds wrong in Judaism: it is not Christianity*" (Sanders 1977: 552¹⁰⁴).

¹⁰⁰ cf. Goppelt 1954, Eckardt 1967; Sanders 1983: 154f..

¹⁰¹ Dunn differentiates between an apocalyptic and a salvationary-historical (*heilsgeschichtliche*) interpretation of Paul. While the traditional perspective emphasizes discontinuity, the "New Perspectives" highlight continuity with Judaism (see Dunn 1994: 367-369). Truth may be found in the middle. To believe that the Messiah has come surely implies both – continuity with Jewish prophecy and the apocalyptic vision connected to the coming of the Messiah (e.g. resurrection from the dead, the fulfilment of promises, salvation of the world, etc.). Because Paul was a kind of messianic Jew (see Hagner 2007: 118) he therefore draws a line of continuity between Christ and Judaism *and* highlights the discontinuity of the situation before and after Christ (see Dunn 1994: 378, 387f.).

¹⁰² Gaston notes that Paul does not use the word "Christians" but phrases such as "belonging to Christ", "the believers", etc. (see Gaston 1987: 6).

¹⁰³ cf. Rom. 4:13-25; Gal. 3:15-29; 2 Cor. 3:6-17.

¹⁰⁴ Sanders concludes his discussion on Paul's position vis-à-vis Judaism with the statement: "What is wrong with Judaism is not that Jews seek to save themselves and become self-righteous about it, but that

There exist, of course, other interpretations of Paul's perspective on Judaism. Eckardt, for instance, adopts a more lenient position when arguing that for Paul, the covenant with "the Jews" as Chosen People has been *interrupted* through their failure to recognize Jesus as Christ (see Eckardt 1967: 57). With the advent of the Messiah, the law has been abrogated (see e.g. Rom. 10:4; Gal. 3:19-25). "The Jew's" status as the 'chosen people' has been shifted to those remnants (together with the faithful Gentiles) who believe in Christ (see e.g. Rom. 11:1-10¹⁰⁵). In this interpretation, Paul does not see Judaism as eternally condemned but awaits its conversion as last act of salvation only after the Gentile world has been offered the chance to enter the new faith (see Rom. 11:11f.; cf. Eckardt 1967: 58¹⁰⁶). The continued focus on religious law and rituals marks Judaism as a descendent of Hagar, Abraham's slave-woman (see Gal. 4:21-31; Rom 9:8) just as the subservient status of Judaism towards the new faith has been foretold in the story of Jacob and Esau (see Rom. 9:12f.). Further support for this hypothesis of covenant suspension can be found in Gal. 3:15-29, where Paul highlights that the law has been abrogated with the advent of Christ.

Both interpretations – of substitution (Rueher) and of temporary suspension (Eckardt) – assume that a form of rejection of Judaism is already detectable in Paul's Epistles. Among the passages most cited in support of this is Rom. chapters 1-4 (righteousness by faith, not by law¹⁰⁷), chapter 9-11 (the fate of Judaism after Christ) and 1Thess. 2:14-16 (see Sanders 1986: 75):

"For ye, brethren, became followers of the churches of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: *Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men:* Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the

their seeking is not directed toward the right goal. They are not enlightened. They do not know that, as far as salvation goes, Christ has put an end to the law and provides a different righteousness from that provided by Torah obedience" (Sanders 1977: 550). A page later, he adds: "*Paul in fact explicitly denies that the Jewish covenant can be effective for salvation, thus consciously denying the basis of Judaism*" (Sanders 1977: 551). Goppelt seconds: "Der Heilsweg des Gesetzes und der Glauben an den gekreuzigten Christus stellen sich [bei Paulus] als ausschließliche Gegensätze dar. Davon ist sein apostolisches Wirken geprägt" (Goppelt 1954: 88).

¹⁰⁵ see Hagner 2007: 104-112 for and overview.

¹⁰⁶ This complex position – Israel of the flesh as demonic, wrong and fallen to the carnal world *and* the idea of a conversion of all Jews to Christianity as the last event before salvation, i.e. the function of witnesses designated to Israel whose members therefore had to survive – mark the boundaries in which the Catholic Church formulated its position towards the Jews until Modern times.

¹⁰⁷ Sanders notes that by "law", Paul means the Jewish *Tanakh*, the Jewish Torah containing the Mosaic Law given to the Jewish people at Mount Sinai (see Sanders 1983: 3).

uttermost” (1 Thess. 2:14-16, italics added).

3.1.3 The Reaction of the New Perspectives

Scholars like Stendahl, Theißen and Gager reject interpretations suggesting that Paul opposed Judaism. Reproducing the traditional anti-Judaic Christian scheme such a dichotomous interpretation is pouring water on “the most vicious root of theological anti-Judaism” (Stendahl 1976: 127; cf. Theißen 1990: 536-537; Gager 2000: 50). Gager notes that Paul

“never speaks of Israel as rejected by God, he never speaks of the Torah as having been abrogated, and he never speaks of Gentiles or Christians as assuming Israel's place. To the contrary, he explicitly denies each one of these possibilities” (Gager 1983: 225).

Furthermore, Paul’s own Jewish background and his marked appreciation of the Torah and its law (see Rom. 3:31; 7:12; Gal. 3:21; 1Cor. 7:19) has led more scholars than the heralds of the “New Perspectives” to assume an outright rejection of Judaism an unlikely position (see Campenhausen 1968: 39f.; cf. Hays 1989¹⁰⁸). Furthermore, 1 Thess. 2:13-16 has remained a difficult passage for scholars proposing an alternative to the traditional interpretation of an anti-Judaic, Christian Paul. In a bid for a systematic re-reading of the New Testament after 1945, this passage has repeatedly been declared a later interpolation¹⁰⁹. For instance, Stegemann points to the amalgamation of inner-Jewish self-criticism (the Jews have killed the prophets), Christian anti-Judaism (the Jews have killed our savior) and Gentile anti-Judaism (the Jews are disliked by the Gods and enemies of the people) in this section (see Stegemann 2004: 55). Broer, on the other hand, highlights the continuity of this statement with passages in the Jewish scriptures, concluding that (the Jewish) Paul is only employing a traditional pattern (see Broer 1992: 8). The question whether one accepts this passage as Pauline or not can have a decisive influence on the way one answers to a supposed Pauline anti-Jewish attitude. Those scholars critical of the

¹⁰⁸ For a discussion of the Jewish background and peculiarity of Paul’s eschatology, see Schoeps 1959: 85-110. Schoeps notes: “Die Eschatologie des Paulus [...] unterscheidet sich aber von *allen* Formen der jüdischen Erwartung schlechthin durch die Tatsache, daß sie infolge der Auferstehung Jesu von den Toten das Eschaton schon im Rücken hat. Von der Zukunft ist nur noch seine Erfüllung zu erwarten” (Schoeps 1959: 96; cf. Ben-Chorin 1970).

¹⁰⁹ see Pearson 1971; Hurd 1986; Gaston 1987: 137; critical Davies 1977: 6-9; Ben-Chorin 1980: 204-207; Broer 1992: 8f.; Malherbe 2000: 164f. Doubt concerning the authenticity of this passage has its roots in mid-19th century German scholarship around Baur and the Tübingen School (see Pearson 1971: 79f.).

authenticity of 1Thess 2:14-16 also tend to doubt that the Pauline letters are concerned with opposing Judaism at all¹¹⁰.

Scholars of the New Perspective note the importance Jesus must have had for Paul. As a Jew who had come to believe that the Messiah had arrived, Jesus was the fulfillment of God's promise to redeem all of humanity, including Gentiles (see Gager 1983: 201). Based on this promise to salvation *of the whole world*, the central concern of the Pauline Epistles is the inclusion of Gentiles into the Jewish covenant. The themes of those letters – Jewish ritual observance, the continuity of the covenant, the opening of the covenant – unfold within this framework of salvation. This focus is further apparent in personal information (see Rom. 11:13; 15:16), but Paul also refers to the scriptures to support his claims, e.g. the uncircumcised Abraham as righteous by his faith (Rom. 4; Gal. 3:6-18). Pointing to God's promise to redeem all people by virtue of their faith alone, Paul strives to justify his anti-nomistic perspective on the *Gentile mission*. For proponents of the New perspectives on Paul, the Jewish and the Gentile sides are not mutually exclusive but concern – so to say – different surfaces of application – the Torah remains binding for Jews just as faith remains the only condition for a Gentile acceptance in the expanded covenant (see Rom. 3:21-26 cf. Campenhausen 1968: 35-40; Gager 1983: 201). Scholars of the “New Perspective” argue accordingly that Paul does not address the question of the relevance of the Law *for Judaism* (see Gaston 1987: 3) but for Gentiles.

3.2 The Pauline Epistles

3.2.1 Control of Interpretation – Galatians and Acts

“Das landläufige Paulusbild der kirchlichen Überlieferung hat [...] ganz überwiegend seine Prägung aus der Apostelgeschichte erhalten“ (Bornkamm 1987: 13)

“Paul was not writing to the church of Augustine in the fourth century, or to the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century, or to post-Holocaust Christians in the twentieth century. This sounds silly. Yet this is precisely how the apostle to the Gentiles has been read throughout Christian history” (Gager 2000: 66)

¹¹⁰ see Gaston 1986c: 37; cf. Munck 1954; Davies 1967: 321-324; Stendahl 1976; Koenig 1979: 37-59; Gager 1983; Gaston 1987: 3. Räisänen, on the other hand, refutes the position of the “New Perspectives” as unsupportable by the scriptures (especially Gager and Gaston). Instead, he insists that Paul refutes Judaism to the fullest (see Räisänen 189-192). Against this, one could comment with Gaston that if Paul's Epistles really are concerned with Judaism, his depiction is simply wrong or confused and should not be taken seriously (see Gaston 1987: 4; cf. Dunn 1990a: 215). In fact, this has been the conclusion of many scholars following the interpretation of Paul as anti-Judaic including Räisänen himself (cf. Schoeps 1959; Sanders 1983; Räisänen 1988). For a discussion, see Hagner 2007: 103ff.

The present section is concerned with outlining Paul's original theological position vis-à-vis his Christian contemporaries. It has been noted that the encounter that took place in Jerusalem around 50 C.E. is "crucial for any interpretation of Paul" (Gaston 1987: 21). Evidence on the meeting can be found in two places in the New Testament – the second chapter of Paul's letter to the Galatians and Luke's Acts, chapter 15 and 21. While in disagreement on theological issues, both sources note that Paul and Peter attended the council. The accounts differ on the supposed result. Let's hear what Paul has to say about the results of the meeting first:

"But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter; (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles;) And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. 2:7-9).

While Paul thus highlights the difference to the Jerusalem authorities, Acts tends to harmonize those positions concluding that Paul ultimately submits to the authority of the Apostles in Jerusalem (see Acts 15:29). A judgment on the quality of difference between Paul and Peter thus requires an evaluation of the historical credibility of Acts 15 and Galatians 2. On the one hand, Paul's letters are the oldest primary source included in the canon (see Hill 2007: 42). Originating in the first half of the first century C.E., most of the letters seem to have been preserved more or less in their original form (with the possible exception of 1 Thess 2:14-16, see above). On the other hand, Galatians has been called "perhaps the most polemical of all the Pauline correspondence" (Elmer 2011: 123) giving rise to doubts on the historical record it conveys (see Bornkamm 1987: 53; Sängner 2011: 155):

"The thrust of Paul's polemic is to tar them all with the same brush. His opponents in Galatia and his adversaries at Jerusalem and Antioch, along with James, Peter, Barnabas and the Antiochene Jews, are all of one mind and all have in Paul's opinion conspired to undermine the truth of the gospel that he preaches" (Elmer 2011: 150).

There are two tendencies in scholarship when it comes to evaluating the historical value of Acts, both of them with roots in 19th century theology. For Adolf von Harnack, Acts 15 comprises a valid historical account, possibly written by Luke, a fellow of Paul (see

Harnack 1906: 2ff.; Munck 1954:16; cf. Hvalvik 2007 for more sources, see Lüdemann 1987: 10f.). Harnack had opposed the earlier assessment of the Tübingen School around Baur that had doubted the historical value of Acts and decided to prefer the Pauline Epistles whenever they stood in contradiction to Acts (see Baur 1845: 4f.; cf. Schneckenburger 1841: 219-220; De Wette 1870: XXXff.¹¹¹). Those doubts were fuelled by a disagreement of the account with aspects in Paul's Epistles¹¹². This discussion continues to shape contemporary debates on the context of Act's composition. While some detect echoes of a Gentile Christian position after the demise of the early Judean, i.e. Christian Jewish community (see e.g. Bornkamm 1987: 13-17), others find a tendency to reclaim Paul for proto-Catholicism against his Marcionite interpreters (see e.g. Knox 1942: 139; 1950: 25f.; Gager 1983: 184-186¹¹³).

As should be apparent from the reflections above, the present study follows Hill's lead in giving preference to Paul's letter to the Galatians but include Acts whenever it converges with Paul's Epistles (see Hill 2007: 45¹¹⁴). What was the main issue Paul and Peter quarreled about? In agreement with Paul's own account, Acts 15 and 21 notes that the question of Torah-observance was the central concern of the meeting (see Schmithals 1963: 29). While the Jerusalem authorities saw the conversion of all Jews as primary prerequisite for the salvation of the Gentile world, Paul maintained that the conversion of Gentiles would predate the conversion of the people of Israel (see Hagner 2007: 117). Paul reminds his readers that the meeting in Jerusalem ended in the declaration of two missions – one to Jews and one to Gentiles: “the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter” (Gal. 2:7; cf. *ibid.*: 2:9).

A “conflictual” approach would assume that Paul had contradicted the position of the Jerusalem Church by minimizing obstacles for Gentile converts and heighten

¹¹¹ Regarding this opposition Lüdemann notes: “Die Differenz zwischen Harnack und der Bauschule in der Einschätzung des historischen Wertes der Apg könnte [...] kaum größer sein, und man mag die Tübinger und die Harnacksche Actaanalyse als die beiden großen Gegensätze in der deutschen protestantischen Forschung um die Jahrhundertwende bezeichnen [...]. Bauschule und Harnack scheinen mir freilich bis heute die großen Antipoden zu sein” (Lüdemann 1987: 10).

¹¹² see Campenhausen 1968: 36, fn. 27; Gager 1983: 184f.; Sanders 1983: 187f.; 1986: 172.

¹¹³ For Knox, Acts centers around Jerusalem because it “was the symbol of the continuity of Christianity with Judaism, of the fulfilment of Judaism in the church” (Knox 1950: 26). Gager follows this hypothesis noting that Acts reflects an effort by Orthodox author's to defend Paul against heretic interpretation (see Gager 1983: 184-186). Both scholars thus reach the conclusion that the author of Acts is trying to counter a detachment of Christianity from Judaism (as in Marcion, cf. chapter 4.2.3). For the ongoing debate among scholars about the value of Acts as a historical source, consult Lüdemann 1987; 1988.

¹¹⁴ cf. Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292. However, Acts is of great value as evidence for a post-apostolic Christian writing around the turn to the second century (see Bornkamm 1987: 13).

Christianity's attraction¹¹⁵. The “inclusive” approach on the other side would highlight the continuity of Paul's position with early Christian Jewish ideas¹¹⁶. The dispute thus focuses on the question of Paul's relation to the Jerusalem authorities. Peter Richardson takes a middle ground between the two positions, commenting:

“The concepts necessary for a complete breach [with Jesus teachings] are latent within Paul's writing but are not developed by him. He stands as a middle factor between Jesus and the early Church” (Richardson 1969: 71f.).

Schmithals notes that Gal. 2:7 highlights two elements for the Jerusalem meeting: a permission to preach a mission to the Gentiles without the law and the equally important decision to sustain a Torah-observant mission among the Jews. Gaston supposes that the meeting resulted in “an agreement on basic theology, an agreement to disagree on the priority of the Gentile mission” (Gaston 1987: 22; 115). Bauckham accepts this assessment but adds that the Jerusalem agreement was rather successful in settling issues of conversion and inclusion of Gentiles (see Bauckham 2007: 74f.). Thus, the Jerusalem meeting may have ultimately served as a confirmation of unity and internal peace for the first existential conflict the communities of Christ-believers had to endure (see Schmithals 1963: 35; Bornkamm 1987: 52f.).

*

On another level, the discussion of the historical value of the Pauline and Lukan account is made more complicated by the question of what meaning the terms “Jerusalem authorities” and “Paul” actually convey (see Hill 2007: 41f.; Jackson-McCabe 2007a). Both accounts testify to a polemical and temporal setting that has an effect on the (in)commensurability of the sources, the successive processing of earlier sources (Paul) in the newer (Acts) and the changing discursive parameters of the account itself. As

¹¹⁵ see Baron 1952, Goppelt 1954, Simon 1986. By putting faith in the place of the law (see e.g. Gal. 2:21, Rom. 10:4, Acts 13:38-39), Paul is supposed to open up a possibility for non-Jews to enter the community without having to go through the strenuous procedure of conversion and circumcision. In denying the election of Israel and faithfulness to the Mosaic law as precondition to salvation, Paul ultimately tears the early Church away from the synagogue and establishes it as an entity of its own (see Goppelt 1954: 90; Sanders 1983: 207ff.). With the coming of Christ, then, Judaism is made obsolete and “replaced by a more universal body of men, Israel in the spirit” (Baron 1952: 78).

¹¹⁶ see Munck 1954; Farmer 1980; Gaston 1986c. Paul saw himself as “fulfilling Israel's calling to be the light to the Gentiles” (Gaston 1986c: 56) based on the conviction that with Christ the time had arrived to gather Gentiles under the state of righteousness “without in any sense denying the righteousness of God expressed in Torah for Israel” (Gaston 1986c: 57). He therefore envisions a new covenant within which the divine grace would be expanded to include Judaism and Gentile Christianity alike. In this latter sense, Paul's mission to the Gentiles would be complementary to the Jerusalem Church.

Stowers notes:

“To approximate the readings given to a text in the first or fourth centuries, modern scholars must grasp the codes of meaning belonging to the practical social activities of the time and place in question” (Stowers 1994: 7f.).

Judging by the way the “Paul” of the Epistles and the “Paul” of Acts are situated in their respective temporal and contextual frameworks, one has to be careful not to compare apples and oranges¹¹⁷. This skepticism on diagonal evidence, e.g. relating the “Paul” in Acts to the “Jerusalem authorities” in Galatians, demands a reconstruction sensible to the functional position of specific discursive elements within the discursive fabric of the text and its socio-historical context (see Stowers 1994: 7; Gager 2000: 66).

On a second level, this reconstruction also demands awareness about the question of who controls the interpretation: “Since the practical contexts change as the communities change, the meanings of the texts change” (Stowers 1994: 7). After their composition, various early Christian groups used the Pauline Epistles to justify their claims. The Pauline letters thus became “the focus of major disputes within the circles of emergent Christianity” (Gager 2000: 70), an arena for conflict of different traditions within early Christianity – one exemplified in a Jewish reading of Paul (the *New Perspectives*), one in Marcion and its radical refutation of Judaism and one in a second century anti-Marcion re-appropriation of Paul (cf. chapter 5). This has led to a multiplication of the character of “Paul”¹¹⁸:

“The original practical context of Paul’s letters is not the same as the practical contexts of the letters as scripture in the worship, moral instruction, and doctrinal controversy of the fourth-century imperial church” (Stowers 1994: 7).

A few pages later, Stowers notes:

¹¹⁷ “It would be a mistake to read into Paul the Lukan concept that Gentile mission presupposes the failure of Jewish mission. It would be an even greater mistake to suppose that the Lukan portrait represents Paul’s actual practice” (Gaston 1987: 149).

¹¹⁸ This overlapping of different fields regarding time and theology may be one central reason for the difficulty in reconstructing Paul from either point of view. The *New Perspectives* suggest a differentiation on this matter which could be marked as Paul’ (Jewish Paul), Paul” (Marcion’s Paul), Paul” (Luke’s Paul), Paul” (the Gnostic Paul), Paul” (the Pastoral Paul) and so on (see Gager 2000: 12; cf. Wiles 1967; Pagel 1975; MacDonald 1984; Bornkamm 1987 [1969]). This differentiation would help to keep things apart without decreasing complexity or judging certain insights to be wrong that might actually belong to another Paul (cf. Haenchen 1982: 113ff.). Of the multiple modes of appropriation this work focusses on three – the “Jewish Paul” (this chapter), the “Marcionite Paul” and the “proto-Catholic Paul” (both chapter 5).

“The letters of Paul that survive from antiquity take the form of letter collections, or ‘New Testaments.’ These should be viewed not as copies of autographs but as literary genres that have substantially reshaped the letters. They represent so-called orthodox Christian interpretations of Paul” (Stowers 1994: 10).

The fact that the texts of the New Testament were not canonized until the fourth century raises further doubts on their value as historical evidence for anything other than its immediate context. The “Jerusalem community” in Acts testifies to Luke’s perspective and his interpretation/appropriation of “Paul”. Only on its margins can one expect to find an account of historical events. The same is true for “the Jews” or Jewish characters in Luke, Paul or any other text of the New Testament.

*

Scholars have interpreted both Galatians and Acts as manifestation of an ongoing inner-Christian struggle (see Goppelt 1954: 90; Sanders 1986: 88f.). Paul writes for a messianic Jewish community that thought the Messiah had come. His polemics are directed towards defending his interpretation of this messianic event (fulfillment of the divine promise of redemption to the Gentiles). However, this eschatological position becomes inconceivable once Christianity had left the Jewish framework (see Schweitzer 1930). Davies notes:

“[W]hen his [Paul’s] letters came to be read by Gentiles who little understood Judaism, the misinterpretation of Paul became almost inevitable. These Gentiles often approached the epistles as outsiders incapable of appreciating their setting within what we may call a family dispute, which could explain both their extreme bitterness and, at times, their fine sensibilities” (Davies 1977: 22).

Luke emerges as a proponent of a Christian interpretation that highlights continuity with the Jewish scriptures (cf. Baur 1864: 125-128). As demonstrated in a later chapter, this strategy testifies to a state of development within proto-Catholic Christian theology¹¹⁹. The narrative underpinning of Jewish persecution and vengeance supports the

¹¹⁹ While the Marcionite position argued that true (“Pauline”) Christianity “had no connection or continuity whatsoever with Israel, Judaism, or the Mosaic commandments” (Gager 1983: 185) Acts (and the proto-Orthodox counter-reaction) swings to the other side installing an “exaggerated sense of continuity of the church with Israel and a radical discontinuity with contemporary Jews, the election of the church as the people of God and the rejection of the Jews as those cut off from that people” (see Lloyd Gaston 1986a: 152). This will be discussed in chapter 5.

hypothesis further that Acts is composed during a time antedating Paul (e.g. Acts 18:12-17; and the contradiction of Acts 9:23-25 vs. 2 Cor. 11:32f.¹²⁰). The polemical background of those charges can hardly be connected to a community of Jewish believers whose central authority was a group of observant Jews in Jerusalem. Gager notes: “since official Christianity has persistently defined itself against Judaism, Christian readers have assumed that the great apostle must also have been writing against Judaism” (Gager 2000: 67). While this may well have been “the setting in which Paul’s letters have been read from that day till this” (ibid.: 68) it most likely is historically incorrect.

3.2.2 The Expansion of Israel – Romans and Galatians

“In accepting the Jew, Jesus, as the Messiah, Paul did not think in terms of moving into a new religion but of having found the final expression and intent of the Jewish tradition within which he himself had been born. For him the gospel was according to the scriptures” (Davies 1977: 20)

Paul's Epistle to the Romans has been called “one of the most influential writings in the past fifteen hundred years of Western culture” (Stowers 1994: 1). Its main objective appears to be a strengthening of the community’s “awareness and assurance of God's election” (Fraikin 1986: 93). The letter also contains some of the most trenchant passages on “Judaism” and Jewish election. As pointed out above, there is a long tradition of interpreting Paul’s letters as *contra Iudaeos*. Contemporary scholarship has criticized this (Lutheran) reading of Paul’s Epistles juxtaposing a pre-messianic Judaism (law, ritual, particularity) to a post-messianic situation of salvation (see Westerholm 2004; Watson 2007: 27-50). In a way, the Catholic authors Simon and Ruether adopt this line of interpretation when concluding that Paul’s Epistle to the Romans is an example for his rejection of a supposed Jewish unfaithfulness, viciousness and stubbornness to accept that Jesus is the Christ/Messiah (see Ruether 1997: 96-107; cf. Simon 1986: 73f.).

The question of the addressee of the Epistles has serious consequences on the way one perceives the letter. Does Paul really intend to refute Judaism and Jewish election? Is it an outright attack on Jewish authorities in general and Christian Jews, ritual practice and faith in particular? As all the other Epistles, the letter to the Romans is addressed to

¹²⁰ “Gerade die genannte Damaskusepisode [...] legt nahe, daß es Lukas in seiner Darstellung der ‚Mission‘ des Paulus weniger um historische Akribie, sondern deutlich um eine *Tendenz* geht, insofern er immer wieder ‚die‘ Juden als das kritische, ablehnende, ja verfolgende und sogar zum Mord-Komplott bereite Element kennzeichnet“ (Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292).

Christians Gentiles *expressis verbis*¹²¹. Its concern with questions of divine provenance, question of the old and new covenant and the relevance of Jesus may well refer to the most pressing needs within this group of addressees (cf. Gaston 1987: 116-134). From this, one is led to conclude that Paul's Epistles try "to clarify for gentile followers of Christ their relation to the law, Jews, and Judaism and the current place of both Jews and gentiles in God's plan through Jesus Christ" (Stowers 1994: 36¹²²).

Paul's thought unfolds within the semantic juxtaposition of "Jews" and "Gentiles" (and not between "Christians" and "Jews", a separation not yet established, see Fraikin 1986: 94). Its opening passage, with its frequent allusions to the Jewish scriptures, locates the theological reflections within a Jewish tradition (see e.g. Schoeps 1959). This reveals Paul's own incapability or unwillingness to think outside of the Jewish framework, even when addressing a non-Jewish readership¹²³. Sanders notes:

"Paul's quotation of Scripture does not require that his readers themselves be adept at arguing from Scripture. They had only to realize *that* he was quoting an authoritative text, not to be able to appreciate how cleverly he argued, much less to be able to formulate counter arguments" (Sanders 1983: 182).

In his letter to the Galatians Paul addresses some of the same topics as in Romans¹²⁴. Both Epistles seem concerned with countering an uncertainty among Gentile Christian converts

¹²¹ see Rom. 1:5f., 13-15; 11:13, 15:15-21; cf. 1 Cor. 12:2, Gal. 4:8f., 5:2f.; 6:12f.; 1 Thess. 1:9, 2:14.

¹²² That a letter is addressed to Gentile Christians does *not* alone supply us with sufficient information to evaluate the "actual congregation of people hearing the speech" (Fraikin 1986: 95). The readership ultimately remains a matter of speculation whose parameters are derived from the structure of the text and a set of theoretical assumptions (e.g. is Paul a messianic Jew trying to integrate Gentile believers or is he the first Christian trying to delineate a distinct identity?). However, Paul also does not explicitly address Jews making *anti-Jewish* invective in his passages on the Law less likely (for why would Paul polemicize against a Jewish observance of the Law if there weren't any Jews among his readers?). Sanders comments: "the letters need not reflect the presence of Jews, whether natives or proselytes" (Sanders 1983: 182). Stowers warns the interpreter against a premature conflation of the discursive and the empirical reader (see Stowers 1994: 23). Some conclude that a Jewish presence is mere speculation growing from a pre-set perspective on those communities (see Gager 1983: 230; Stendahl 1976: 128-133).

¹²³ Fraikin points to the special rhetorical function "the Jews" hold in Romans 1:18-4:25. He notes the "interesting fact that Paul, in a discourse whose goal is to strengthen the Gentiles in the gospel, provides them with the arguments by which he would make his understanding of the gospel and its consequences credible to Jews. It is not simply that the theological categories used by Paul are Jewish [...], but that it is important for the Gentiles that their position be credible in the eyes of Jews. [...] The fact that the argument is meant to bring a Jew to understand their position reveals the weight of Judaism. Why would they care whether a Jew will accept them and their salvation if it is not because they are (through Paul) claiming entry into a story which belongs to the Jews from old?" (Fraikin 1986: 98).

¹²⁴ Sanders points to a difference between the letters regarding its tone. While both are addressed to Gentile Christians, Galatians "is written in a polemical setting against the views of Christian missionaries who are undermining Paul's work" (Sanders 1983: 148; cf. Davies 1977: 12f. for more assumptions on possible reasons for this change in tone). Romans appears to address a situation with a lesser sense of acuteness.

regarding the Pauline Gospel – What is the status of the Gentiles vis-à-vis Judaism? What is the status of the law¹²⁵? What is their own eschatological position? In both letters, Paul addresses this question by first underlining that his mission to the Gentiles has been ordered by God (see Rom. 1:1-5; 15:16-18; Gal. 1:12, 15f.) and authorized by the authorities (see Gal. 2:6-9). After these preliminary notes on his mission, Paul elaborates why his Gospel to the Gentiles forfeits observance to the law (see Gal. 2:16, 3:10-14; Rom 3:19f.). Sanders stresses Paul's concern with universal *participation* (see Sanders 1977: 550f.; cf. Sanders 2008: 24f.¹²⁶).

A critique of the New Perspectives, Räisänen agrees with Sanders that for Paul, Gentiles and Jews alike enter the covenant not by lawful practice but *only by faith in Christ* (see Räisänen 1988: 189-192). Likewise, Dunn notes that the law serves “to *identify* the Jewish people as the people chosen by the one God for himself, and as a *boundary* to mark them off from all (other) nations” (Dunn 1990a: 231). In Dunn's eyes, Paul is opposed to this understanding of the law “as a Jewish prerogative and national monopoly” (Dunn 1990a: 200). Hagner also sees a declaration of faith in Jesus as Paul's *conditio sine qua non* for salvation (see Hagner 2007: 110) noting on the position of the law:

“(1) the law had a temporary role to play, and that role was *not* to bring the kind of righteousness that would enable one to stand before God justified, but rather to heighten sin and the awareness of sin; (2) Jews and Gentiles alike, humans are sinful and unable to fulfil the law. Therefore, they are in the same dire situation: without hope apart from the grace of God; (3) salvation for both Jews and Gentiles is available only through faith in Christ and not works of the law, and for that reasons the gospel must be preached to both Jews and Gentiles” (Hagner 2007: 110).

¹²⁵ Gager uses the term “law” “in the broadest possible manner” (Gager 2000: ix) meaning “everything in and associated with the Pentateuch” (ibid.) such as “normative rules and regulations” (ibid.) but also “broader notions such as revelation, teaching, and wisdom” (ibid.). When the term “law” appears in the following, it refers to the keeping of Jewish ritual laws (Halakha, commandments, mitzvot).

¹²⁶ Sanders notes on the “sequence of thought, and thus the pattern of Paul's religious thought [...]”: God has sent Christ to be the saviour of all, both Jew and Gentile (and has called Paul to be the Apostle to the Gentiles); one participates in salvation by becoming one person with Christ, dying with him to sin and sharing the promise of his resurrection; the transformation, however, will not be completed until the Lord returns; meanwhile the one who is in Christ has been freed from the power of sin and the uncleanness of transgression, and his behaviour should be determined by his new situation; since Christ dies to save all, all men must have been under the dominion of sin, in the flesh' as opposed to being in the Spirit” (Sanders 1977: 549). In an essay dedicated to Sanders' idea of participation, Richard B. Hays discusses different meanings of the notion of participation he sees as complementary: (1) belonging to a family; (2) Political and Military Solidarity; (3) participation in the *Ekklesia*; (4) living within the Christ narrative (see Hays 2008: 339-347). Hays argues that the ecclesiastical and narrative participation (3 & 4) are “epistemologically primary” (Hays 2008: 347) in that they “provide the symbolic and experiential framework within which the first and second models become intelligible” (ibid.). The idea that participation is the most important element in Paul's thought goes back to Albert Schweitzer's *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (1930; see Stowers 2008 for a discussion).

Gager, a proponent of the *New Perspectives*, criticizes this interpretation as reproducing “the outmoded, unhistorical dichotomy between Jewish particularism and Christian universalism” (Gager 2000: 49). The *New Perspectives*, though generally indebted to Sander’s rediscovery of Paul’s rabbinical background (see Watson 2007: 45f.), assume that Paul’s Epistles do not imply a universal denigration of the Torah. Rather, scholars like Dunn and Gaston stress that the juxtaposition should be understood in relation to the Epistles’ addressees – the Gentiles (see Dunn 1990a: 215ff.; Gaston 1987; Watson 2007: 345). In justification for his own mission to the Gentiles, Paul argues that “the Torah as covenant with Israel [...] has no bearing on the promise to Abraham” (Gager 1983: 239). From the background of his eschatology, Paul maintains that the post-messianic time must also bring the fulfillment of the divine promise to Abraham to redeem the whole world. The inclusion of the Gentiles must thus take place *as Gentiles*, meaning *without their conversion to Judaism*, meaning that they do not have to keep the Jewish law in order to be accepted in the community of (post-messianic) believers (Gaston 1987: 21; cf. 31f.).

Paul’s focus is not on removing the law but on including the Gentiles. For the *New Perspectives*, Paul does not see Jewish observance and the inclusion of non-observant Gentiles as mutually exclusive (see Campbell 2008: 50-53¹²⁷). While observance of the law retains its validity for Jews (see Schoeps 1959: 209), Paul declares *faith* the “mode of communal practice” (Watson 2007: 346) for Gentile converts (see 1 Cor. 7:17-24). For William S. Campbell, this implies a “politics of difference” for Paul that is removed from later orthodoxies and their practice of stratification (this fits neatly into Boyarin’s conception of a Jewish continuum for the first century):

“Particularities are not an obstacle to be overcome in Christ, nor are they to be perceived as absolutely in opposition to universalism. Pauline universalism is one that can coexist with particularities. The universal dimension of the gospel acknowledges its inclusive reference to both Jews and gentiles” (Campbell 2008: 10).

Paul believed that the Messiah had arrived and expected that the end of days was close (see Rom. 8:18; 13:11f.¹²⁸). This “*a priori* Christology” (Watson 2007: 55) is crucial for an estimation of the discussion surrounding the status of Gentiles because “it had long

¹²⁷ Räisänen comments that Paul may well be “involved in the usual strategy of sectarian movements, which tend to justify novel practices and ideas by claiming that they are in full agreement with the tradition, if only the tradition is understood properly” (Räisänen 2008: 322; cf. Watson 2007).

¹²⁸ see Schoeps 1959: 85-126; critical Gager 2000: 146.

been a central belief in many streams of Judaism that in the final stage of history God would incorporate or redeem righteous Gentiles into the people of God” (Gager 2000: 62). Paul’s Gospel can thus be understood as the consequent development of Jewish eschatology promising the redemption *of the whole* world. While a specific Jewish ritual conduct remains the particularity of the Jews, Paul assumes that the righteous Gentiles are redeemed *as Gentiles* by their faith in Jesus. Their inclusion into the covenant is thus a fulfilment of a divine promise given to Abraham (see Gen. 15:1-6; 17:5; Rom. 4; Gal 3). Consider the following passage from this point of view:

“*Cometh* this blessedness then upon the circumcision *only*, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. [...] For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, *was* not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law *be* heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: [...] for where no law is, *there is* no transgression. Therefore *it is* of faith, that *it might be* by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,)” (Rom. 4:9; 13f.; 15-17).

Note the parallel construction marked by the word “also” in the section above suggesting that Paul’s argumentative aim is to justify the redemption of Gentiles *alongside* Israel (cf. Gal. 3:8, 13f.; 4:4f.; Rom. 3:29f.; 11:1-24). While the adoption of the Jewish law is acceptable for those belonging to Judaism, demanding the same from Gentiles would mean a lack of insight into the radical changes the messianic arrival brought to the dynamics of salvation (see Barth 1973: 518-522; critical Osten-Sacken 1977: 570f.).

*

For Paul, the time predating the arrival of Jesus had been marked by the cursedness and slavery *of the Gentiles* (see Gaston 1987: 30). With the Messiah, the promise to Abraham was to be redeemed as salvation of the whole world – not as a Gentile conversion to Judaism (see Gager 1983: 239). This is why Paul insists that faithful Gentiles should not convert but are saved by faith alone: “I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain” (Gal. 2:21). For Paul, Jesus has redeemed Gentiles “from the curse of the law” (Gal. 3:13). If they accept the law (i.e. convert to Judaism), they fall behind the very act that redeemed them (see Rom. 3:19f.; 4:15; Gal. 3:22f.; 5:1; cf. Gaston 1987: 27f.). Consider the following passage in Gal.,

chapter 5:

“Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace” (Gal. 5:1-4).

Campenhause comments:

“Paulus stellt die – im rabbinischen Sinne notwendige – Behauptung auf, daß jeder, der sich beschneiden ließe, dann auch verpflichtet sei, das ganze Gesetz ohne Ausnahme zu halten. Aber er drängt auf dieses Entweder-Oder eben deshalb hin, weil er die Geltung des Gesetzes für die Heiden überhaupt bestreiten und in keinem Sinn mehr in Betracht ziehen will. Wer hier das Gesetz in irgendeinem Sinne noch halten möchte, für den ist Christus vergeblich gestorben, und wer als Christ gewordener Heide das alte Heilszeichen der Beschneidung annimmt, der hat Christus verleugnet” (Campenhause 1968: 38f.).

When Paul criticizes Judaism for not drawing the consequences from Jesus’ arrival, he does not want to dispute the relevance of the Jewish law in general. Rather, his polemic aims towards a refutation of opponents who maintain an inclusion of Gentiles into the divine covenant would imply their full adherence to the Mosaic Law. Against those people, Paul argues that “[t] here is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28). This does not so much indicate the eradication of ethnic boundaries – on the opposite, those boundaries remain intact but are transformed in the messianic community (see Davies 1977: 23f.).

The Epistles to the Romans and Galatians are Paul’s contribution to a theological debate surrounding the significance of Jesus for Gentile converts – the relevance of Jewish laws and rituals and their position within the divine covenant. The “New Perspectives” on Paul set out to demonstrate that there is an alternative to the traditional interpretation of Paul as anti-Jewish. However, even without referring to conflictual assumptions it can hardly be denied that a certain kind of conflict looms in the background of those writings. It may even be correct to assume that some Christian Jews had been among the “false brethren” Paul attacks in Galatians 2:4. However, it is one thing to assume their presence, another to conclude upon their relevance to Paul’s theologizing. Paul’s own faith in the messianity of Jesus and its meaning for a Gentile group of believers provides a more convincing

framework to explain the specific position he designates to “the Jews”. One can then draw the conclusion that Paul’s focus on Jewish issues such as the adoption of Jewish rituals, the inclusion into the covenant and the distribution of election and divine provenance points to relevant *theological question* for the communities Paul addresses (see Munck 1956: 11; Gager 1983: 230f.):

“Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith. Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law” (Rom. 3:29-31).

Gaston thus concludes that an “[i]nclusion of Gentiles does not mean exclusion of Jews” (Gaston 1987: 123¹²⁹). Rather, Paul assumes that with the arrival of the Messiah in the person of Jesus, the covenant is widened to include circumcised and uncircumcised alike. The Gentiles are *accepted* as Gentiles into the old covenant. This repeats a point raised above that Paul sees his own mission not in contradiction to Judaism but as complementary to other missionary practices. As far as Paul’s Epistles convey a message of inclusion to the Gentiles and of continued appreciation of the original covenant the traditional image of Paul as anti-Judaic must be revised.

To be sure, Paul’s interpretation of the meaning of Jesus did not go undisputed. Accordingly, his intervention sometimes appears as an attempt to mediate in an ongoing conflict. Not only does he stress time and again that Gentiles are equal members of the community (e.g. Rom 10:12f.; Gal 3:28), he also warns against arrogance towards Jews and asks his audience for modesty and respect of a Jewish conduct (see Rom. 11:17-24; 14:2-5, 13, 15; 1Cor. 10:28-32¹³⁰). In a sense, Paul tells his Gentile readers “that they ought not to think that they have supplanted Jews in God’s favor or that the election of Israel, on which their own depends, has in any way been abrogated” (Gaston 1987: 150). This position is most apparent in Rom. 11:18: “Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee”.

¹²⁹ At the same time, Paul seems to believe that the unfaithful rest of the Jewish people will eventually recognize Jesus as the Messiah (see Rom. 1:16, cf. Stowers 1994: 132). This opens up a temporal space between a contemporary Jewish blindness and an ultimate redemption of the whole world. Gager notes on this tension that Paul “thinks of the two ways as a temporary, provisional stage in the story of salvation” (Gager 2000: 60). See also the following section “Israel, Jesus & the Jews”.

¹³⁰ “Paul is anxious to insist that always the priority lies with Abraham and the Jewish people. Now that they were counted among the people of God, Gentile Christians were tempted to regard themselves as superior not only to the Jews who had been lopped off, but also even to Jewish Christians, whom they already outnumbered (xi. 18). Some Gentile Christians arrogantly went so far as to claim that the Jews had been lopped off by God with the very purpose of incorporating Gentiles (xi. 19), the implication being that God had preferred them to the Jews” (Davies 1977: 29; cf. Bartsch 1967: 39).

From those mediating sections one can derive that (a) Paul preaches Christian Gentiles that they are redeemed *without* Jewish ritual observance; (b) Paul defends Jewish believers against a Gentile denigration of the Mosaic Law or the old covenant. In his discussion of the status of Gentiles, Paul replies to two questions: the relation of Gentile conversion to Jewish observance and the relation between faith, covenant and God's salvation. Both of these questions touch a central question discussed in scholarship: *is there one or two ways to salvation?* Paul's answer is consistent if one takes his Messianic conviction into account. Proclaiming the salvation of mankind, Paul does not reject Judaism and he does not entertain the idea of an ultimate abandonment of Israel. Against the majority of the Gentile followers he addresses, Paul argues that the divine promise remains the central pillar of faith "thou bearest not the root, but the root thee" (Rom 11:18). Paul thus maintains that God stays true to his promise made to Israel at Mount Sinai despite Israel's temporal "blindness" to the Messiah (see also the following chapter).

Paul fights on multiple fronts – against a tendency among Gentile believers to adopt Jewish rituals, against the arrogance of Gentiles towards Judaism, and against the rejection of a mission to the Gentiles. Paul replies to these challenges by developing a two-folded argumentative strategy: Against his Jewish and Gentile critiques, he points to the Jewish scriptures as basis for his eschatological outlook on redemption and an inclusion of the Gentiles. At the same time, he argues for the continuity of the original covenant to counter tendencies in the Gentile communities to assume their own fate as an expression of a final divine judgment against Israel.

3.2.3 Israel, Jesus & the Jews

In his Epistles, Paul is addressing Gentile Christians that, together with a portion of the people of Israel, form a part of the redeemed community that accepts Jesus as the new Messiah (see Rom. 11:1-7, Gal. 3:26-29). The previous chapter outlined how Paul envisions the position of those Gentile believers. At the same time, Paul also struggles to come to terms with the refusal of the majority of Israel to recognize Jesus as the Messiah (see Rom. 9:22f.; 30-32; 10:3; 11:7). In the 11th chapter of Romans, Paul notes that the part of Israel that has not accepted the true meaning of Jesus has been affected by a sudden hardening of hearts, blinding of the eyes and numbing of the ears:

“What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded. (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day. And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back always” (Rom. 11:7-10).

Israel has been so busy with keeping the law that it has failed to recognize “that the goal of that Torah, in which God's righteousness would be extended also to the Gentiles, was now at hand” (Gaston 1987: 141; cf. Rom. 9:24-31; 10:2-13). However, Paul's reply is ambiguous in that it implies a *temporary* falling from grace due to divine will (Gaston 1987: 148f.). The death of Jesus just as the hardening of the hearts, i.e. the rejection of Jesus serves the purpose of inviting “the world” to the covenant:

“I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?” (Rom. 11:11f.).

This passage is followed by the lengthy and well-known olive tree analogy (see Rom 11:12-26) illustrating the (historical) priority of Judaism (the cultivated olive tree) vis-à-vis Gentile believers (the wild olive tree bearing no fruits). Paul's reply to Jewish unbelief thus maintains that all of Israel remains holy and will eventually be saved (see Rom. 11:25f.; cf. Davies 1977: 29f.). While the divine election of the Jewish people remains intact after the arrival of Jesus and despite Israel's failure to recognize his divinity it now also includes the Gentiles:

“For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: Even so have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all” (Rom 11:30-32).

In this passage, Paul elaborates on an argument he already made in the 11th verse of the same chapter: God has hardened Israel's hearts in order to allow for the fulfillment of the divine promise to redeem the whole world. The rejection of Jesus by the original carriers of the covenant thus opens up a space for the Gentiles.

In his book *A Radical Jew* (1994), Boyarin notes that Paul's perspective renders "the Jews" a "concrete signifier of the fulfilled spiritual signified, the body of Christ, the Church" (Boyarin 1994: 156). The Epistles' depiction of "the Jews" as blind and hard-hearted (see Rom. 9:27-33; 10:18-20; 15:21) fits this interpretation. Furthermore, the Epistles frequently allude to specific characters in the Jewish scriptures (cf. Israel as "Esau", Rom. 9:13; Israel as "Ishmael", Rom. 9:8f.). The section of the "hardening of the heart" refers to the semantic position of the pharaoh in Egypt (see Ex. 10:27) which is then designated to the non-believing Israel (see Rom 9:17f.¹³¹). The series implied in Paul is "people of Israel" to "Egypt", from "faithful Gentiles and Jews" to the "redeemed people". This shift would soon become typical for a Christian method of self-construction via the Jewish scriptures.

As demonstrated in the passage of Rom. 11:30-32, the arrival of the Messiah situates everything that happens in the great scheme of redemption. The perspective arising from this scheme for Paul has been dubbed his "realist ontology" (Stowers 2008: 356; Nirenberg 2013: 53; cf. Sanders 1977: 522f.¹³²). This term underlines the fact that Paul does not follow the (modern) distinction between a metaphorical and literal/physical level of writing. Rather, Paul identifies the two things with each other. The faithful share one body and spirit with Christ, as they really are to be redeemed by his death, the world really is ending soon, and Christ riding on a donkey is the fulfillment of scriptural prophecy (in the Gospels). This identification of the physical and the metaphorical leans to the side of the scripture, taking precedence over historical fact (cf. chapter 4.3.2).

Paul's references to the scripture point to his "Christological hermeneutic" (Hagner 2007: 114), i.e. his search for sections in the Jewish scriptures that could be interpreted as prophecies for the coming of Jesus. This desire to find a proof for Jesus' messianity forestalls a crucial rearrangement in his theological perspective of which the semantic identification of non-believing Judaism with Egypt is a good example. Paul's/Israel's "hardening of the heart" implies that the "people of Israel"/new "Egypt" persecute the Jewish and Gentile Christians/new "chosen people" (see e.g. Romans 11:28, 1 Thessalonians 2:14-15). One should note the position of this rearrangement in Paul's

¹³¹ cf. Munck 1956: 42-46; Gaston 1987: 80.

¹³² Nirenberg calls this a "cognitive revolution" (Nirenberg 2013: 53) noting that to Paul "the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ mark a total transformation of what it is that humans can know and how it is that they can know it" (ibid.).

realist ontology. Once the unbelief of Israel has been declared an act of divine will and once this case of hardening has been identified with scriptural Egypt, persecution *must* necessarily occur. If Jesus indeed was the Messiah foretold by the scriptures the other empirical actors must behave accordingly as to prove the whole of the prophecy (see Ehrlich 1967: 44f.¹³³).

3.3 Conclusion – Supplying the Hammer

The preceding paragraphs intended to demonstrate that the interpretative assumptions of the *New Perspectives* can support a reconstruction of a Paul closer to a Jewish framework than the traditional view allows. In this view, Paul's Epistles did not originally oppose "Judaism" to "Christianity", even more so because neither of the terms had yet emerged. Throughout his epistles, Paul engaged in a fervent debate on the question of what the redemption of the world through Jesus meant. The preceding analysis has reconstructed the reply he gave on the question of the inclusion of the Gentiles and the objections he encountered among other Christian Jews. At the end, Paul's "realist ontology" and its connection to a "Christological hermeneutic" has been highlighted especially regarding the position of "the Jews"/"Israel" in his writings.

This concluding section intends to move beyond the Jewish Paul and ask for the implications of the theologizing and historical narrative he supplies¹³⁴. In his Epistles, Paul contrasts a lineage of *physical* descend of God's providence reemerging in Jesus (see Rom. 1:1-5; 6:1-11; 8:29f.) to a pre-Christian history whose representative are "the Jews" (see Goppelt 1954: 102; cf. Nirenberg 2013: 54-56). This history aims at the construction of an unredeemed situation under the subjugation of the law in which the "Jews" are identified with an ever-incomplete observance of the Torah:

"But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which vail is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord,

¹³³ Ehrlich notes: "Paulus ist sich durchaus darüber im Klaren, daß von Schuld nur die Rede sein kann, wenn man wollte, eine Tat wäre nicht verübt worden. Das aber würde den gesamten Prozeß christlichen Heilsgeschehens in Frage stellen. Wenn dieses aber nun auf Jesus von Nazareth beruht, so müssen die Werkzeuge dieses Heilsgeschehens palästinensische Juden sowie Römer gewesen sein" (Ehrlich 1967: 45).

¹³⁴ To regard the intention of the author as limit to the meaning of the text would leap back into what Wimsatt/Beardsley call the "intentional fallacy" (Wimsatt/Beardsley 1954 [o. 1946]).

the vail shall be taken away” (2 Corinthians 3:13-16).

Considering Paul’s Epistles are directed towards Christian Gentiles, those historical references serve “to contrast not Israel and Christianity but the old and the new for Gentiles” (Gager 1983: 246). Therefore, the historical narrative is a counter-image to the redemption of Jesus and a law-free mission as seen through Paul’s Christology – it is an expression of his theology. The depiction may touch the historical reality were it converges with Paul’s belief but is not seriously impaired by historical facticity. The following chapters will identify the same process for the depiction of Jesus’ life in the Gospel accounts undermining the claim that the Gospels comprise a valid historical account.

Paul does not attempt to give a historical account of those pre-Christian “Jews” but aims to build a kerygmatic background to his theologizing. In this process, “Judaism” before Jesus serves as a signifier to construct a frame of temporality for the meaning of Jesus’ suffering. A sense of a Christian history is thus conveyed through both, historical narrative and the reinterpretation of the Jewish scriptures. “The Jews” thus play a decisive role as discursive elements within the Christ-centred drama of salvation. Goppelt comments:

“Judentum ist also nun einerseits ein vorchristliches Woher und andererseits ein gegenchristliches Gegenüber zu christlicher Existenz und bleibt beides bis zum Ende dieses Weltlaufes” (Goppelt 1954: 102).

Paul maintains that “the Jews” are the exponents of pre-Christian humanity and the present enemies and persecutors of the faithful. At the same time, “the Jews” remain the privileged Chosen people for whom the covenant with God remains intact, a covenant that is also the precondition for the salvation of the Gentiles. This eschatological over-determination of “the Jews” in the Pauline depiction illustrates that they are a focal point of his theologizing.

The present chapter has demonstrated the way in which Paul reinterprets Jewish scriptures and reconstructs a pre-Christian history as a negative image to his own Christology. In this process, “the Jews” emerge as important reference point for a reconstruction of a situation predating the coming of the messiah. This exegetic strategy of putting theology before history was to become a scheme for a re-interpretation of the Christian message by the second century C.E. That Paul develops an eschatology with a certain aptitude for later appropriation echoes in Hoffmann’s assessment “if Paul had not driven a wedge

between the covenants, he had at least provided the hammer” (Hoffmann 1984: 103¹³⁵). The following analysis shows that much of the anti-Judaism traditional scholarship identified with Paul results from later authors swinging exactly that hammer. This also echoes in Nirenberg’s comment:

“To the extent that Jews refused to surrender their ancestors, their lineage, and their scripture, they could become emblematic of the particular, of stubborn adherence to the conditions of the flesh, enemies of the spirit, and of God. I say ‘could become’ because it is not clear that Paul intended to cast them as such, although many of his later readers would make precisely that move in his name” (Nirenberg 2013: 56).

¹³⁵ This hypothesis finds an early proponent in Albert Schweitzer’s *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus* (Schweitzer 1930: 324-326) and Joseph Klausner’s *Von Jesus zu Paulus* (1950; especially p. 546f.).

4. The Gospels

4.1 Historical Background

4.1.1 The Jerusalem Community

“Heute erkennt ein großer Teil der Gelehrten an, daß Jesus ein frommer Jude war, der wie auch andere Juden nach dem Gesetz des Mose lebte, wie es zu seiner Zeit praktiziert wurde, und daß er seinen Schülern seine religiöse Lebensweise anempfahl. Ferner wird meist anerkannt, daß Jesus keine neue Religion verkündete” (Flusser 1980: 216)

The four Gospels¹³⁶ of Mark, Matthew, Luke and John¹³⁷ comprise four accounts of Jesus' life that have been included in the canon of the New Testament. It is generally assumed that they were composed between the years 65 C.E. and 100 C.E. (see Sanders/Davies 1994: 5f.). Due to similarities in date, narration and material used, the first three Gospels (Mark, Matthew, Luke¹³⁸) are usually pooled together as the *Synoptic tradition* (derived from the word “synopsis” meaning “seeing together”, see Sanders/Davies 1994: 3; cf. Goodacre 2001). However, this should not serve to gloss over internal differences and tensions among the synoptic accounts¹³⁹. Among many things, the narrative sets John's account apart from the Synoptic Gospels. Therefore, scholars have supposed that it draws material from different sources (see Sanders/Davies 1994: 3-5).

The Synoptic Gospels fall into a period scholars call the sub-Apostolic age (70-140 C.E.). This means that the accounts were not eyewitness reports but composed by the second or

¹³⁶ Sanders/Davies note: “The modern English word ‘gospel’ is derived from the Old English ‘godspel’, which means ‘good message’ or ‘good news’. ‘Godspel’ was simply the direct translation of the Greek word *euangelion*, which means ‘good announcement’” (Sanders/Davies 1994: 3).

¹³⁷ Ehrman notes that these names do not actually point to the respective authors of the texts but were attributed to the texts sometime during the second century to answer the need for apostolic authorities. It is therefore not hard to understand why the books were attributed to two apostles (Matthew and John) and two of their close companions (Mark, secretary of Peter; and Luke, companion of Paul), see Ehrman 2003: 235; cf. Sanders/Davies 1994: 7-15.

¹³⁸ The temporal order of the Gospels remains contested. In his work *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (1969), E.P. Sanders has pointed out the matter may not be decidable based on the sources available (see Sanders 1969: 276-279). While the following presents a consensus in scholarship, one should keep in mind that those questions remain open to debate.

¹³⁹ see e.g. Theißen 2011; Sim 1998: 165-213; 2011; 2013. The suggestive force of the canon may well have its part in this harmonization. Consider the following comment: “Seitdem das Matthäusevangelium und die Paulusbriefe nebeneinander im Kanon vereint waren und beide gleichwertige Bestandteile des Kanons geworden waren, las der Leser diese Schriften harmonisierend. Ein grundsätzlicher Widerspruch zwischen ihnen war nicht vorstellbar, Polemik des einen Autors gegen den anderen noch weniger” (Theißen 2011: 486).

third generation of authors professing their faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Most scholars assume that the *Acts of the Apostles* (Acts) was composed around 90-100 C.E. (see e.g. Alkier 2010: 266), though there are divergent views (see e.g. Jaroš 2008: 18-22). The author of Acts is generally thought to be the same as the composer of the Gospel of Luke, though this assigned authorship rests on tradition rather than signature. The Acts of the Apostles claims to give an account about the life and death, the spiritual and physical encounters of the first Christian Apostles. Critical scholarship of the last two centuries has demonstrated the partisanship of the account as well as its embeddedness in conflicts arising during the time of its composition (see Schmithals 1982: 7f.).

While the Jewishness of Jesus is mostly undisputed, scholars continue to debate the exact type of Judaism Jesus adhered to (see e.g. Flusser 1969). Things get more difficult, though, if one moves away from Jesus and his direct followers. The early communities of Christ-believers centred around Jerusalem (see Rom 15:19; Gal 1:17f., 2:1f.; 1 Cor. 16:3). They were led by the three authorities Paul mentions in his Epistles (see Gal. 2:9) – Cephas, John and James [Jakobus], brother of Jesus and leader of the community from the mid-40s – 62 C.E. (see Gal. 1:18f.; Acts 12:17; 15:13; 21:18). As noted above, the accounts of the Jerusalem meeting in Acts and Paul testify to the central authority this Jerusalem community had for the early Christ-movement. There is widespread agreement among scholars today that this Jerusalem community remained within the bounds of Judaism in composition, self-understanding and ritual conduct¹⁴⁰. The surrounding world of the first century also appears to have accepted faith in Jesus as a variation within the limits of Judaism¹⁴¹.

From those findings, scholars have concluded that “Judaism” and faith in Jesus were not mutually exclusive categories during the first century¹⁴². However, relations with the local political and temple authorities must have been tense, as three subsequent deadly incidents illustrate: (1) The execution of Stephen by the “high priests” (see Acts 7:54-60), (2) of the apostle James (c. 42 C.E.) by King Agrippa I (“Herod” in Acts 12:1) and (3) the

¹⁴⁰ see Grayzel 1946: 79f.; Brandon 1957: 21; 74-87; Daniélou 1969: 275; Koenig 1979: 64; Hill 2007: 51; Boyarin 2012: 102; critical Frend 1965: 154; 1984: 87f. Brandon comments: “Christianity was essentially a product of Judaism, and it was primarily carried to the Gentiles by men who were by birth and upbringing Jews, generally of a very zealous type. Their whole interpretation and presentation of the new faith was essentially based upon Jewish concepts and permeated by the influence of Jewish practice and outlook” (Brandon 1957: 21). The “false brethren” (Gal 2:4) preaching circumcision to his communities can be taken as representatives of a certain Torah-observant group among the Christ-followers at odds with Paul’s interpretation of salvation.

¹⁴¹ see Flusser 1980: 227; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997; Bauckham 2007.

¹⁴² see e.g. Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 211; cf. Boyarin 2004: 1-33.

execution of another James in 62 C.E.¹⁴³. This second James, the brother of Jesus mentioned above, had risen to be the leader of the Jerusalem community. He was tried for blasphemy by the newly elected high priest Ananus II and lapidated shortly afterwards (see Bauckham 2007: 66-96). The fact that this event spurred protests among the Jews in Jerusalem provides further evidence to the high esteem that at least some Christ-believing Jews enjoyed among their contemporaries¹⁴⁴.

4.1.2 Wars of the Jews

In 66 C.E., a rebellion triggered by imminent messianic hopes among the Jewish population broke out in the province of Judea¹⁴⁵. The rebellion lingered on for four years and ended in disaster – the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem by Roman troops under the leadership of Titus in 70 C.E. It is not clear what exactly happened during those four years but the Jewish war led to the almost complete cessation of the authority exerted by the early Judean community (see Brandon 1978: 179-184¹⁴⁶). Some scholars assume that a substantial part of the Jerusalem Church left the city, possibly to establish its new centre in the Hellenistic city of Pella¹⁴⁷. However, the historicity of this move to Pella has been contested by scholars such as Smallwood who notes that “Jews, even of a schismatic sect, would hardly have been welcome in a city which had recently suffered a massacre at Jewish hands” (Smallwood 1976: 298, fn. 18¹⁴⁸). Brandon further points to the improbability of political inactivity/flight of a group as close to Judean Judaism as the Jerusalem community had been. He therefore opposes the Pella hypothesis, concluding

¹⁴³ Schmithals supposes that the persecution targeted only those Christ-believers propagating an antinomistic agenda *for Jews*, see Schmithals 1963: 17f. Other scholars have wondered whether these executions may even point towards a group within the early Jerusalem community that had more radical ideas concerning the abrogation of the Mosaic Law and the temple (see e.g. Koenig 1979: 34f.; cf. Hill 1992: 5-40 for a critical discussion).

¹⁴⁴ see Isaac 1969: 112; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292, fn. 130.

¹⁴⁵ see Josephus 1980 for the classical account; see Smallwood 1976: 293-330; Schürer 2014: 485-507 for modern accounts.

¹⁴⁶ Brandon comments: “There is a kind of tunnel in the course of the life of the Church in the second half of the first century. In the period before we see the Church strongly centralized around the mother community of Jerusalem, whose authority and prestige are unchallenged, even by the daring Paul. From this period, which is so well illumined by the writings of Paul and the narrative of Acts, we pass on in our survey to find the life of the Church disappearing into obscurity with the passing of Paul. It emerges again for us in the other new Testament writings and the documents of the sub-Apostolic age, but we see it then changed completely in its organization and outlook, for of Jerusalem and its unique authority nothing is heard, either in reference to the present or in reminiscence of the past; it is as though a curtain of complete oblivion had descended to obliterate the former order” (Brandon 1957: 183).

¹⁴⁷ see Baur 1864: 43; Schoeps 1949: 262-277; Blank 1990: 62; Bauckham claims that at least a portion of the Jerusalem community survived in exile (see Bauckham 2007: 78f.).

¹⁴⁸ for references to the recent discussion, see Bauckham 2007: 79, fn. 58.

that the majority of the Jerusalem Church stayed in the city, fought aside the other Jewish nationalists – or were killed by them – and perished with the other citizens during the Roman siege (see Brandon 1978: 179-184; cf. Smallwood 1976: 312-327¹⁴⁹).

Be it because of a lack of religious authorities, diminished numbers or an ever decreasing proportion of Judean Christians among the communities of Christ-believers, the most decisive result of the cessation of the Judean authority was that Rome rose to become the spiritual centre of the nascent faith (see Koenig 1979: 64-66; Bauckham 2007: 80). This shift marks a change in attitude so profound that some scholars have judged Christianity “in a certain sense reborn” (Brandon 1957: 249) after 70 C.E.¹⁵⁰. This is supported in a famed study by James D. G. Dunn (1991) who claims that the period between 70 and 135 C.E. must be considered the most decisive era for the separation between Christianity and Judaism (see Dunn 1991: 230-243¹⁵¹). The Gospels reflect the changes that occurred in this “tunnel period” (Brandon 1957: 11) after the removal of the Jerusalem community from authority and the consolidation of Gentile Christianity in Rome. Therefore, they testify to the diversity of Christian positions of “proximity and distance, coexistence and confrontation” (Wilson 1995: 286) composed “*within a period when the character of what we have to call ‘Judaism’ (or Judaisms) was under dispute and its boundaries in process of being redrawn*” (Dunn 1991: 160, italics original).

The religious zeal of the second Judean revolt under Bar Kokhba (132-135 C.E.) may have further alienated the remaining Jewish Christian communities (see Bauckham 2007: 80f.). The revolts also saw the intensification of an anti-Jewish climate reflected in the writings of Roman authors such as Cicero (see chapter 7.1.1). This changing climate is also mirrored in official policies such as the introduction of the *Fiscus Iudaicus* (see chapter 6.1.4) and the erection of the bas-relief of the triumphal arch of Titus in Rome “to perpetuate the subjugation of the Jews in the minds of the general public” (Koenig 1979: 65). Those cultural, intellectual and political changes in Roman attitude towards Judean Jews may have supplied further reasons for a public disassociation by the Christ-believing

¹⁴⁹ Seen from the side of the Jewish majority the year 70 C.E. marked a substantial rupture in its religious development. As the Pharisees set out to develop a form of Judaism that would survive the coming centuries in dispersion (Jabneh and the beginning of rabbinic Judaism), Jewish tolerance for deviant positions (such as Christian Jewish sects) diminished (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 215; cf. Boyarin 2004). This may have accelerated the demise of the Judean community – it is hard to believe, however, that this process of internal stratification provides a sufficient explanation the almost momentous decline of Judean influence after 70 C.E.

¹⁵⁰ The increasingly Gentile profile of the Roman community may have supported further by an expulsion of all Jews from the city under Claudius in 49 C.E. (they were allowed to return under Nero in 54 C.E. see Heemstra 2010: 91).

¹⁵¹ For a discussion of this conception, see the following chapter 4.1.3.

communities from Judaism. At the same time, early communities continued to “accept[...] the Jewish Scriptures, the Septuagint as their Bible” (Knox 1942: 158; cf. Chadwick 1967: 11f.¹⁵²). As noted above, there is no evidence for a self-sustained canon of Christian writings before the mid-second century (see chapter 2.4.1).

The interest the Gospels and Acts express in the historical Jesus and his first missionaries was a novelty. It may well give expression to a desire within a number of communities after 70 C.E. to (re)construct the history of their own faith after its witnesses had passed away. In these accounts, there is a simultaneous process of theological self-definition and a continued reliance on the framework supplied by Jewish prophecy and scriptures (see Boyarin 2012: 47). The evolution from a loose number of communities centered on Judea to a faith with a Gentile profile was accompanied by internal struggles that left their traces on early Christian writing and interpretation. As demonstrated in the following case studies, the Gospels provide evidence that a multitude of positions existed alongside this process of transformation.

4.1.3 The Parting of Ways?

In *Christianity in Ancient Rome. The First Three Centuries* (2010), Bernard Green reviews the ongoing debate among scholars about when, how and if “Christianity” and “Judaism” “parted ways”. James Parkes has been credited with “innovating, articulating, and popularizing” (Becker/Reed 2003a: 10) this notion, gaining ever more popularity with the publication of James D. G. Dunn’s *The Partings of the Ways* (1991¹⁵³). Crafted to counter a traditional supersessionist model vis-à-vis Judaism, Lieu acknowledges that the “Parting of Ways”

“represents a major shift away from an older view that saw Judaism, already in the time of Jesus, as monolithic and inherently unable to contain his message, and as subsequently

¹⁵² Christian communities in the West of the Roman Empire used Greek in liturgical communication. Campenhausen notes: “Griechisch war nicht nur die Sprache der Gebildeten, wie früher bei uns das Französische; es war zugleich die bevorzugte Sprache des Handels und Verkehrs. In jeder größeren Stadtgemeinde des Westens wurde das Griechische nicht nur verstanden, sondern wohl auch als Umgangssprache gesprochen. Für eine von vornherein von nationalen Bindungen gelöste, den Einzelnen in eine neue Gemeinschaft einfügende Religion der Stadtleute wie das Christentum war die griechische Kultus- und Kirchensprache somit das gegebene” (Campenhausen 1995: 12). By the end of the second century, Latin slowly substituted Greek as the new liturgical language (see *ibid.*).

¹⁵³ cf. Dunn 1992; for more contributions, see Lieu 1994; Taylor 1995; Horbury 1998; Boyarin 1999; 2003; 2004; Spence 2004; Heemstra 2010: 190-211; Broadhead 2010: 371-374 and Becker/Reed 2003b.

consigned to sterility by the defeat of 70 CE and by the rise of a triumphant Christianity” (Lieu 2006: 215; cf. Becker/Reed 2003: 16).

The notion of a parting of ways accounted for a growing awareness among scholars of the diversity within Judaism during the time of nascent Christianity¹⁵⁴. Despite the innovation this brought to the depiction of Judaism in Christian theology, criticism has mounted¹⁵⁵. For example, Judith Lieu argues that the idea of a parting of ways is based on a contemporary understanding of pluralism (see Lieu 2006: 215). Furthermore, she senses a Christian bias in the metaphor, implying a “Christianity” for a time when it did not yet exist:

“[T]he parting of ways is essentially a Christian model. Its concern is to maintain the Christian apologetic of continuity in the face of questions about that continuity from a historical or theological angle” (Lieu 1994: 108; cf. Lieu 2006: 215-217; Boyarin 2004: 8).

A similar critique concerns the conception of “Judaism” implied in the model of the parting of ways as developed by James D. G. Dunn. Consider the following comment by Jacob Neusner:

“So what I find in Dunn’s formulation of matters is the explicit claim that Judaism (or rabbinic Judaism) takes second place in the hierarchy of religions because it is ethnic, while Christianity overspreads the bounds of ethnic identification. That is profoundly anachronistic, on the one side, and wrong-headed in its view of Judaism, on the other” (Neusner 1995: 283).

In *The Ways That Never Parted* (2003b), Becker/Reeds propose an alternative model noting “that developments in both traditions continued to be shaped by contacts between Jews and Christians, as well as by their shared cultural contexts” (Becker/Reeds 2003a: 2). Those interactions, Becker/Reeds note, lingered on until well after the second century (see *ibid.*). Judaism and Christianity never were two separate entities in that both emerged in their “modern” form after a period of transition sometime during the fourth century (see *ibid.*: 23; cf. Boyarin 1999: 16-19; 2003: 66). Adopting a conception of Jacques Derrida, Boyarin has raised further doubts on the notion of borders between the “religions”. Those borders, Boyarin argues, “are as constructed and imposed, as artificial

¹⁵⁴ see e.g. Neusner 1995; Becker/Reed 2003: 19f.; Goodman 2007c.

¹⁵⁵ see e.g. Lieu 1994, 2006; Neusner 1995; Becker/Reed 2003a; Boyarin 2004.

and political as any of the borders on earth” (Boyarin 2004: 1). Rather, the very division between Judaism and Christianity results from “an imposed *partitioning* of what was once a territory without border lines” (ibid.). Boyarin concludes that (Rabbinic) Judaism “is not the ‘mother’ of Christianity; they are twins, joined at the hip” (ibid.: 5). He comments on the consequences for an analysis:

“Once I am no longer prepared to think in terms of preexistent different entities – religions, if you will – that came (gradually or suddenly) to enact their difference in a ‘parting of the ways,’ I need to ask who it was in antiquity who desired to make such a difference, how did they accomplish (or seek to accomplish) that making, and what was it that drove them?” (ibid.: 2).

The second edition of Dunn’s *Jews and Christians: the Partings of the Ways, 70-135 CE* (2006) included some concessions to those critiques, especially Judith Lieu. Noting that the title of his book had wrongly suggested “two embryonic religions as two homogeneous (or even monolithic) entities each pursuing a single path” (Dunn 2006: xii), Dunn conceded that the process of separation may better be described as a “crisscrossing of muddy tracks” (Lieu 1994: 119; Dunn 2006: xiii). However, he maintained that the partings of the ways continued to remain an adequate term to grasp the process of separation between Judaism and Christianity (see ibid.; 2009: 1171). In the same spirit, Stephen Spence underlines in *The Parting of the Ways* (Spence 2004) that the texts that came to be included in the Christian canon of the New Testament reflect upon “the struggles of a new religious movement to establish itself as an independent community” (Spence 2004: 1).

*

Despite all efforts to solve the discussion on the parting of ways debate has lingered on. Green and Broadhead noted in 2010 that no consensus has yet been found regarding date, content or cause of this separation (see Green 2010: 57; cf. Broadhead 2010: 363-372). As is usually the case, the perspective one employs co-determines the conclusion. A few examples: Heemstra treats the question of partition focusing on Roman official policy (2010, cf. Goodman 1989). Paying special attention to the development and character of the *Fiscus Judaicus*, a special Jewish tax levied after the crushing of the first Jewish revolt, Heemstra notes that Roman officials regarded Christians as separate from Jews by 96 C.E.

(see Heemstra 2010: 84, 176¹⁵⁶). As now Christians could “no longer officially lay claim to the label ‘Jew’” (ibid.: 187), Judaism and Christianity must have parted ways by the end of the first century. Jacob Neusner, on the other hand, focuses on the political developments, notably the Judean Revolt from 66-70 C.E., noting:

“[T]he catalytic event in the formation of the kind of Judaism we now know as normative [...] was the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E. That same event proved decisive in the formation of Christianity as an autonomous and self-conscious community of Israelite faith” (Neusner 1984: 10).

Yet another focus comes from the Israeli historian Israel Yuval who develops his analysis by enquiring after a Christian influence on Judaism (see Yuval 2007: 35f.). Daniel Boyarin, on the other hand, proposes a dynamic model focusing on the mutual ideological effects of both, proto-Catholic and Rabbinic writing (Boyarin 2004: 7¹⁵⁷). In agreement with Judith Lieu, Boyarin concludes: “The question of when Christianity separated from Judaism is a question whose answer is determined ideologically. The scholars needs always to ask: Whose Judaism; whose Christianity?” (Boyarin 2004: 6).

The present work traces the development of early Christian thought, focusing on the emergence of the proto-Catholic position as a specific perspective. A chain of events leads up to the conversion of Constantine 312 C.E., the formation of Nicaean Christianity (325 C.E.) and its recognition of Christianity as state religion by the end of the fourth century (see chapter 6). Up to the fourth century, however, “proto-Orthodox Christianity” consisted of a number of writers, theologians and bishops operating in a wide field of heterodox religious conduct. One should not be surprised, therefore, to find theological opinions in the writings of the Church fathers that would have been considered heretical in later times (see chapter 5). The idea of a unity of original teaching is the result of a later reconstruction. One must therefore agree with Paula Fredriksen:

¹⁵⁶ Heemstra is taking proto-Orthodox Christianity (and its invention of the term “heresy”) as a benchmark: “It should [...] be clear that not all groups that we often label as ‘Christians’ were seen as such by the Romans, because some of them would not be considered to be ‘illegal atheists’. This is true for, e.g., the Ebionites, who could probably still qualify as Jews, and also for members of all kinds of Docetic and Gnostic sects, who did not mind sacrificing to idols, because this was either allowed within their religious system in order to save their lives or because their religious system was not exclusively monotheist. All of these groups were seen as heretics by proto-orthodox Christians” (Heemstra 2010: 196).

¹⁵⁷ Boyarin’s conclusion is intriguing: “[T]here is a real dissymmetry between a reading of that difference from within Christianity or from within Judaism. While Christianity finally configures Judaism as a different religion, Judaism itself, I suggest, at the end of the day refuses that call, so that seen from that perspective the difference between Christianity and Judaism is not so much a difference between two religions as a difference between a religion and an entity that refuses to be one” (Boyarin 2004 :7f.).

“Before Constantine, each of the various Christian communities thought that its own views were correct and that the views of others, if different, were false. Before 312, what we have is variety. After 312, we still have variety. [...] After 312, in brief, what primarily distinguished orthodox Christians from their rivals was power. To think otherwise is simply to recapitulate in modern academic language the ancient rhetoric of the orthodox bishops” (Fredriksen 2010: XXI).

Seen from the side of the self-perception expressed in the Gospels, the separation from “Judaism” has not been completed. The process lingers on for the following centuries, illustrated by the tension unfolding between John Chrysostom and his “Judaizing” flock (see chapter 6.2.3).

This work does not intend to present an alternative solution to the question of when Christianity and Judaism separated. Adopting Boyarin’s suggestions it rejects the very idea that “Judaism” was a *religion* separate from the Christian religion supposedly beginning with Paul. The present chapter turns to the Gospels as an early expression of multiple modes of drifting away from Judaism, tracing the diversity of the theological positions imbued in the Gospels and the various positions they construct for “the Jews”. In a second part, analysis turns towards identifying tendencies among the texts and discussing the significance they may have had for later Christian interpreters.

4.2 The Texts

The accounts of Mark, Matthew, Luke and John were composed after Jesus’ death, possibly using oral accounts reaching as far back as Jesus lifetime (see Parvis 1954: 172; Käsemann 1970a: 124). Each supplying a distinct and differentiated version of the life of Jesus, the Gospels give religious guidance, consolidate the self-image of their audience and provide answers to contemporary socio-political challenges. Sanders/Davies comment on the limited value of those accounts as historical source:

“Scholars often refer to the authors of the gospels as ‘redactors’, a term which points towards ‘editing’ rather than towards ‘composition’. They gathered and arranged material, and they used what they found suitable. They did not, as far as we can tell, conduct research, cross-examine witnesses, compare accounts, and then offer only what was verified. [...] Put in another way, they were interested in the homiletical impact of their work, and their standards of ‘accuracy’ were more like those of ancient rhetoricians than

those of ancient historians. The ‘truth’ of a given event or saying would be assessed according to the impact it made. If it testified to the value of faith, or inculcated high morals, or exemplified the Christian way of life, it would be used as true” (Sanders/Davies 1994: 37f.).

The Gospels do not even intend to give an account according to modern standards of historical research. While the Gospels certainly contain historical information, George M. Smiga adds, “the literary forms which the authors of the New Testament employ have been chosen primarily to serve the function of faith proclamation” (Smiga 1992: 7). By their very function, the Gospels necessarily fail to provide the valid historical information scholars may seek (see chapter 4.3.2). Therefore, the present work does not investigate the historical accuracy of a given account but takes the texts as evidence for the respective period¹⁵⁸.

The Gospels are “testimonies written by believers, for believers” (Smiga 1992: 7), striving to provide a certain idea of Jesus (Christology). The contemporary context of the Gospels must be regarded as another factor influencing the narration. In this sense, the Gospels provide rich material on developments of theology, self-image and the socio-political context of their construction. In this process, Jewish actors serve an important function within the accounts. Whether an author invents or retells a particular event surrounding “the Jews” does not matter as much as the way he *translates* this event to a theological level.

The present work focuses on the different roles those “Jews” assume among the other characters populating the Gospel-accounts such as “Paul”, “James”, “Pontius Pilate” and “Jesus”. The present chapter gives a rough outline for each constellation, paying special attention to the development of the special character those “Jews” assume. Each of the sub-chapters starts by introducing main positions in scholarship with regard to the auctorial voice and the audience of the Gospel. As in the other parts of this work, the following section does not intend to engage in a thorough theological discussion but to focus on the development of “the Jews” in an emerging Christian theological framework.

¹⁵⁸ As pointed out above, the question of historical accuracy of a given account on “the Jews” is important in an analysis of antisemitism only if one assumes that the historical behaviour of empirical Jews is causal for the emergence and development of “the Jews” in Christian theological discourses. If one does not intend to argue this way, the question of historical accuracy implies a theoretical contradiction with problematic implications for the analytical framework.

4.2.1 The Gospel of Mark

Most contemporary scholars regard Mark as the earliest of the Gospel accounts (see Alkier 2010: 266¹⁵⁹). His position vis-à-vis Judaism remains a matter of dispute. While some scholars judge Mark's Gospel the "first reactions of a Gentile Church [...] to the destruction of Jerusalem" (Brandon 1957: 204¹⁶⁰), others declare it a "Jewish Gospel for Gentiles" (Koenig 1979: 60-81) or even "a conservative reaction against some radical innovations in the Law stemming from the Pharisees and Scribes of Jerusalem" (Boyarin 2012: 104¹⁶¹). Mark is sometimes cited as central evidence for a tradition of anti-nomistic teaching in nascent Christianity while others argue that it remains within the boundaries of conservative Judaism of that time (see Boyarin 2012: 106-135).

The same tension is present in the depiction of Jewish actors in the narrative. On the one side, Mark refers to "the Pharisees" in connection with a direct article (except Mk. 10:2), thus introducing a political situation emerging only after the time of Jesus (see Mußner 1988: 261¹⁶²). On the other side, the "Jewish people" in the Markan narrative act as one dynamic actor within a differentiated Judean society (people, high priests, scribes, Pharisees¹⁶³, Herodians¹⁶⁴). The Gospel treats the Jewish people (as opposed to the authorities) with comparable leniency (see e.g. Mk. 12:37), though Gager has pointed out that this is not consistent (see Mk. 6:3; 15:8-15; cf. Gager 1983: 146). At the same time, Jesus' addressees are marked by a consistent untowardness (see Mk. 3:31-34; 4:11f.; 6:1-5) and the Jewish authorities (Pharisees and high priests) are portrayed as vicious and ignorant (see Mk. 3:6, 22; 11:18; 12:12f.; 15:10f.; cf. Burkill 1959: 36). In almost all of the cases, however, those disputations proceed peacefully (see Koenig 1979: 68f.; except

¹⁵⁹ critical see Campenhausen 1968: 12f.; Jaroš 2008: 51-58.

¹⁶⁰ cf. Wilson 1995: 46; for a critique of the dating after 70 C.E., see Hengel 1985: 28-31; Sanders/Davies 1994: 18-21. Jesus "foretells" an event that has already happened in the presence of the reader (see Mk. 13:1f.). Such an introduction of later events to a historical account set earlier is called *vaticinium ex eventu*.

¹⁶¹ The "Pharisees" designate "the religious leadership of the mass of the Palestinian Jewish people" (Frend 1984: 23). Much of their religious ethics was adopted in early Christian communities (see *ibid.*: 25f.). "Scribes" is a term designating leading laypersons enjoying enormous prestige among the Jewish population in Palestine (see *ibid.*: 26).

¹⁶² The Pharisees emerged as the most powerful group within Judaism after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. Identifying "the Pharisees" with Jewish leadership is thus a crude projection of the reality of the later first century onto the time of Jesus (see Mußner 1988: 273). One can establish the – albeit unprecise – rule of thumb that a stronger role of "the Pharisees" points to a later composition/re-editing of the accounts (see *ibid.*: 276).

¹⁶³ There are exceptions, such as in Mark 2:16 where the author identifies "the Pharisees" with "scribes" (see Mußner 1988: 258).

¹⁶⁴ The identity of the "Herodians" continues to be disputed. In a short albeit intriguing article, Bennett points to the possibility that "the Herodians were a creation of Mark himself, employed to link the enemies of Jesus with the enemies of John" (Bennett 1975: 13f.).

Mk. 3:6). While some scholars find a lack of interest in *halakhic* questions (see Wilson 1995: 41-43), Mark's account is accompanied by a discussion of Torah (on Sabbath, see Mk. 2:23-3:6; on marriage, see Mk. 10:1-12; on food law/purity, see Mk. 7:1-23; cf. 8:11-13; 12:13-17) and frequent allusions to the Jewish scriptures (see Sanders/Davies 1989: 270f.).

While Mark is fairly well acquainted with the internal differences of the Judean society during Jesus' life, his Gospel seems to be directed at a Gentile audience (see Harrington 2004: 345; Boyarin 2012: 111). Evidence has been found in the frequent use of the term "the scribes", a Greek word commonly referring to religious teachers (see Brandon 1957: 190¹⁶⁵). The Markan focus on the Gentile world is detectable further in his discussion of *halakhic* matters (see Smiga 1992: 33f.) and emphasized in the passion narrative. Koenig notes that the series of events – Jesus dies, curtain/veil rips apart (see Mk. 15:38), centurion "sees" the truth (see Mk. 15:39) – communicates that the death of Jesus has opened up a door for the Gentiles (see Koenig 1979: 74). With the exception of the good centurion, Mark does not introduce many Gentile characters (exception in Mk. 15:39; cf. Ruether 1997: 84), however, the increasing ratio of Gentiles within Mark's community may echo in some passages of the Markan account (consider e.g. Mk. 7:14-23, see Koenig 1979: 75f.; Dunn 1990a: 47).

As pointed out, traditional exegesis concludes that Mark rejects the official Jewish policies and disputes the (Jewish) exegetic practice. By portraying "the Jews" and especially their authorities as ignorant or even malicious, Mark represents a first step towards severing Christianity from its connection to empirical Judaism (see Hare 1979: 32). This interpretation has been met with increasing resistance in recent years from scholars such as Daniel J. Harrington or Daniel Boyarin. In *The Jewish Gospel*, Boyarin

¹⁶⁵ On the rejection of Jesus by his own family in Mk. 3:31-34, Brandon notes: "Now such obvious disparagement of the Lord's kinfolk is certainly strange when it is recalled that in the primitive Christian community of Jerusalem James, the Lord's brother, came to acquire such prestige and authority that, as we have seen, there was once every likelihood that Christianity would develop a kind of caliphate based on blood relationship with Jesus. Accordingly it must be concluded that the author of the Markan Gospel was writing at a time when he found it expedient to belittle the status and reputation of those who had recently been the leaders of the Jerusalem Church: at a time, in other words, when such disparagement would not be deemed a dangerous disloyalty to a strong and accepted authority, and before the memories of the persons concerned had become invested with an unassailable halo of sanctity" (Brandon 1957: 195). Further proof for this denigration of the Jerusalem authorities can be found in the negative characterization of the Twelve Apostles as "weak, vacillating band, who generally fail to understand their Master's true nature and mission and completely lack his power. They quarrel among themselves on the matter of precedence, one of their number actually betrays Jesus to his enemies, and they all finally desert him in his hour of need and flee" (ibid.: 196). It is especially the denigration of Peter, an uncontested religious authority during the first two generations of Christ-believers, that hints to the demise of Jerusalem as spiritual centre of nascent Christianity (and the temporal space the Gospel of Mark occupies, see ibid.).

argues that Mark does not abandon Jewish ritual practice but stays well within its “religious” framework (see Boyarin 2012: 102-128¹⁶⁶). In support of this interpretation of a “Jewish” Mark, one could further point to those passages treating Jews with tolerance and respect even after they have refused to follow Jesus (see Mk. 9:38-40; 12:34). This culminates in Hare’s conclusion that the Gospel “contains remarkably little anti-Judaism of any kind” (Hare 1979: 32; critical Burkill 1959). Smiga establishes a middle-position when noting:

“Central aspects of Jewish life will have to be subordinated to Christ and the new community. Israel, however, is not abrogated. Although it may remain so only by the failure to state the opposite more clearly, within Marks gospel, Israel remains God’s chosen people” (Smiga 1992: 51).

Boyarin’s and Hare’s conclusion is put to a test in the Passion narrative where Mark has the Jewish leaders plotting to kill Jesus (see Mk. 14:1f.), a plan succeeding with the help of Judas (see Mk 14:43-46). It is the summoned *Sanhedrin* (Jewish official court) and not the Roman official that sentences Jesus to death (see Mk. 14:64). After Jesus is brought before Pilate, the “multitude” is moved by the chief priests to repeatedly demand Jesus’ crucifixion (see Mk. 15:11-14): “Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath he done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify him” (Mk. 15:14). Brandon is correct noting that this passage “greatly magnif[ies] the culpability of the Jews, both leaders and people, for the death of Jesus” (Brandon 1967: 3f.; cf. Richardson 1969: 167f.). At the same time, one must also agree with Koenig’s important amendment that Mark restricts responsibility to the specific part of the crowd incited by the priests (see Koenig 1979: 70). Furthermore, “the Jews” only make one explicit appearance in this Gospel (see Mk. 7:3). In this sense, Mark assumes a position of *relative leniency* if compared to the other accounts. It is an example for an early Christian perspective that has not yet installed “the Jews” as a negative centre to its theologizing.

¹⁶⁶ Part of the disagreement may rest in Mark’s desire to portray Jesus as a non-political figure vis-à-vis the Roman officials. Written shortly after the destruction of the temple 70 C.E., this would explain the detachment of Jesus from the Jewish authorities and the Markan emphasis on the *spiritual* meaning of Jesus’ ministry (see chapter 4.3.1). This desire to portray Christianity as a peaceful religion is underlined by the propagation of a conciliatory attitude towards the relation of Roman and divine authority: “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s” (Mk 12:17).

4.2.2 The Gospel of Matthew

The Gospel of Matthew has been described as “the most frequently quoted book of the old church” (Rohrbacher 1991: 298f.). As the second Gospel account, it appears to have been composed some time after 80 C.E. in Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine or Egypt (see Alkier 2010: 266¹⁶⁷). The account shares many aspects with the Markan Gospel, so that scholars conclude that the Markan account influenced its composition¹⁶⁸. Matthew’s interest in *halakhic* matters, his insistence on continuity (Jesus’ is the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy) and the erudition of Matthew’s Jesus has led the majority of scholars to consider Matthew a “very Jewish document” (Charlesworth 1990: 51¹⁶⁹).

Proof for this Jewish background can be detected without much difficulty. The author knows the Jewish scriptures as well as its Greek translations (Septuagint) (see Koenig 1979: 82-83). Judging by the style of writing and the allusions used, the author appears to address an audience that is fairly acquainted with Jewish terminology. Matthew’s Jesus maintains the importance of the Mosaic Law (see Mt. 5:17-20; 23:20) and claims to supply its proper interpretation in himself as the embodiment of the law’s fulfillment (see Harder 1967: 116-118). Jesus demands respect and obedience towards the Pharisees and scribes (see Mt. 23:1-3). Also, Matthew introduces a number of Pharisaic opponents to the account (see e.g. Mt. 9:11; 12:24; 21:45f.; 22:34f.), recording their doubt and critique (see Mt. 9:3; 11:18f.; 12:2, 24; 21:23) and describing how their rejection of Jesus culminates in an active conspiracy to kill him (see Mt. 12:14; 21:45f.; 22:15; 27:62-66).

In a comparative perspective, Brandon points to the difference between Matthew’s judgment introduced during the episode of the healing of the Centurion’s servant and Luke’s judgment (see Lk. 13:28f.). In Luke, “you *yourselves*” [the Jewish people] are to be cast out of the kingdom of God while in Matthew it is “the children of the kingdom” (Mt. 8:12). Matthew thus appears to maintain the chosenness of the Jewish people *even after their fall from grace* (see Brandon 1957: 228). On a second note, the Matthean account omits most of the passages where the Markan and Lukean accounts mention the “scribes” alongside the “Pharisees”. Mußner has noted that this increases the responsibility of the latter (see Mußner 1988: 261-264). As in Mark, it has been argued

¹⁶⁷ Sim assume a date of 85-95 C.E. and Antioch or Orontes as location, see Sim 1998: 31-62.

¹⁶⁸ see Frankemölle 1991: 45, 57; for a critique, see Flusser 1999: 12f.; Jaroš 2008: 67-70.

¹⁶⁹ cf. Stendahl 1954: 20-35; Brandon 1957: 217; Koenig 1979: 88; Overman 1990: 4f.; Dunn 1992: 209f.; Wilson 1995: 46-56; Sim 1998: 26; Evans 2007: 242; Jaroš 2008: 24; critical Flusser 1980: 223f.; Levine 1999: 21-24.

that this intensification of the anti-Pharisaic polemic points to a time after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. when the Pharisaic party had grown to dominance (see Koenig 1979: 86f.).

While some put the Gospel in proximity of the observant Ebionites (see Campenhausen 1968: 24), declare it a Jewish sect (see Sim 1998) or a “deviant Jewish community” (Saldarini 1991: 44), others locate the author and his community between traditional Judaism and emerging Christianity (see Gager 1983: 28f.) or even consider it “the manual of a Hellenistic-Jewish church that is conscious of its Jewish heritage” (Bekker 1990: 66¹⁷⁰). A theme common to attempts to locate Matthew in opposition to Judaism is to assume the author (and his community) is either in the process of breaking away or has already “broken away ideologically and organizationally from non-Christian Judaism” (Wilson 1995: 55¹⁷¹). Evidence for this distance can be found in Matthew’s frequent use of “your”/“their synagogues”¹⁷². If one is to conclude from this on the discontinuity between Matthew and “Judaism” one must be careful to avoid a static conception of “Judaism”. As noted above, 1st-century Judaism was not a unified phenomenon but marked by a multitude of “contested areas and centers” (Carter 2007: 157), or, as Lutz notes:

“Die Religionsgeschichte des Judentums mindestens seit der makkabäischen Zeit ist eine Geschichte gegeneinander konkurrierender Selbstdefinitionen jüdischer Sekten. [...] In dieser Vielzahl von Sekten war das Judenchristentum auch eine der Sekten, die versuchten, das wahre Israel zu repräsentieren“ (Lutz 1993: 321).

There seems to be evidence supporting the opposite conclusion, e.g. Matthew’s concern with *halakhic* questions, the insistence on soteriological continuity and the engaged and virulent polemic against other Jews. This is evidence for both, a struggle to maintain a connection to Judaism *and* that this connection has become questionable to Matthew (see Wilson 1995: 55). In addition, an implicit anti-Paulinist thrust highlights Matthew’s tendency to remain close to law-observant Judaism (see Theißen 2011: 471-484). In this sense, David Sim concludes that Matthew’s community remains a Christian *Jewish* sect in opposition to mainstream Judaism (see 1998: 162f.).

¹⁷⁰ cf. Carter 2007: 160-179 for a discussion.

¹⁷¹ cf. Hummel 1963: 28-33; 159-161; Campenhausen 1968: 22-23; Frankemölle 1991: 58; Lutz 1993: 311f.; Sim 1998: 162f.; for a critical assessment of this juxtaposition, see Saldarini 1991.

¹⁷² see Mt. 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34; similar in Mk. 1:23, 39 BUT 3:1; 6:2; 13:9; cf. Hummel 1963: 29.

Frankemölle comments that the primary function of the Gospel was a delimitation from Pharisaic Judaism and a strengthening of the identity of Matthew's Jewish Christian community (see Frankemölle 1999: 84-87¹⁷³). Overman seconds that this rejection of the Jewish leadership after 70 C.E. was a common phenomenon among Jewish sectarian movements (see Overman 1990: 19-23; for a definition of the term "sectarian", see *ibid.*: 8-16). The Matthean account thus seems to be written from the perspective of a *Jewish* outsider (see Smiga 1992: 92f.). If compared to the Markan account, Smiga comments, "Matthew seems both more Jewish and more anti-Jewish" (*ibid.*: 52).

The Jewishness of Matthew has already been pointed out. His simultaneous anti-Jewishness becomes apparent in severe attacks against the Pharisees (see Mt. 5:20; 23:13-33) and the introduction of the notion of culpability for the Jewish people as a whole (see Mt. 27:25). Furthermore, Matthew's Jesus declares that Jews who do not believe in Jesus will be "cast out into outer darkness" (Mt. 8:12). This tendency culminates in the last chapters of his Gospel where Matthew maintains that the new way will take the place of the old(er) interpretations (see Mt. 21: 33-44). Some scholars have therefore taken Matthew to imply a model of supersession ("Sukzessionsmodell") as opposed to a (Pauline) model of expansion ("Erweiterungsmodell"; see below¹⁷⁴).

This (anti-)Jewish character of Matthew should not mask "other dimensions such as its interaction with the Roman imperial world" (Carter 2007: 155; 178f.). Especially if compared to Mark, Matthews account makes important changes to the narrative: (1) the introduction of elements for the exculpation of the Roman authorities embodied by Pilate (see chapter 4.3.1). (2) the acceptance of responsibility for the crucifixion by the whole of the Jewish people (see Mt. 27:24f.). (3) The consolidation of "the Pharisees" as one solid group of opponents. (4) The development of a terminological separation between Torah/covenant and Jewish people, laying claim to the former (see Mt. 21: 33-44). And (5) the announcement of a new covenant constituting a new people of God in Jesus as Christ (see Mt. 21:43; 22:7f.; 23: 37-39).

Those shifts forestall an argumentative strategy from Pauline to the Patristic period. While

¹⁷³ Recent scholarship debates the possibility of an anti-Pauline thrust in Matthew's account. Picking up an impulse of the Tübingen School, David Sim's encompassing monography on this question inspired further discussion among scholars in Germany (e.g. Theißen 2011) and the Anglophone sphere (see Sim 1998: 165-213; 2011; 2013; critical Willitts 2009). On a critical note, Sim adopts a traditional perspective on Paul as a critique of the Jewish law and contrasts it to Matthew's position (see Sim 2013: 77f.). The New Perspective discussed in this work could thus further amend the discussion.

¹⁷⁴ see Trilling 1964: 95f., 213; Flusser 1980: 224-226; Lutz 1993: 316; cf. see chapter 4.3.3.

the Pauline perspective had aimed to expand the Jewish covenant to include Gentiles, the conception in Matthew already moves in the direction of dividing Jewish scriptures from its people (dispossession/appropriation). In the borderland between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, however, the Matthean community seems to be positioned closer to the Jewish framework. This is illustrated by the two contradictory mission statements Jesus gives to his disciples. First, he orders the disciples to proselytize only the Jews “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Mt. 15:24; cf. 10:5f.¹⁷⁵) and utters a few polemics against Gentiles (Mt. 6:6, 7:6; cf. 18:17). However, the Matthean account ends with Jesus demanding his disciples to proselytize among all the nations:

“Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen” (Mt. 28:19f.).

This tension in Matthew has troubled scholars for a long time. Lutz argues for a temporal succession of the Jewish and Gentile mission (see Lutz 1993: 312). Thus, he sees in Matthew a base for a mounting conflict between his community and the wider Judaism (see *ibid.*: 317f.). Saldarini on the other hand argues that the two mission statements express the author’s desire to stabilize the multi-cultural identity of the Matthean community (see Saldarini 1991: 59f.; Theißen 1990: 538, fn. 10). Willitts recently proposed as a third interpretation that Matthew actually demands two separate but simultaneous missions – a law-observant to the Jewish people and a law-free to the Gentiles (see Willitts 2009: 4f. for a discussion¹⁷⁶). It may be helpful for this discussion to consider Sim’s comment on the value of the Gospel as historical evidence:

“Most scholars would agree that Matthew’s depiction of the conflict between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees tells us more about the dispute between Matthew’s community and Formative Judaism than about Jesus and his scribal and Pharisaic opponents” (Sim 2013: 80).

This has led Lutz to employ a two-level approach to the Gospel focusing on both, the historical account of Jesus’ life and an account of the contemporary situation of the

¹⁷⁵ Townsend has pointed to the Jewish scriptures where the shepherd appears as an attribute of divinity, likewise, the leaders of the Israeli people are sometimes referred to as “shepherds” (see Townsend 1979: 73). The attribution of this image to Jesus implies that he “has replaced the traditional Jewish leadership” (*ibid.*) who are depicted as thieves and robbers.

¹⁷⁶ A closeness of this interpretation to the re-reading of Paul by the *New Perspectives* may be discerned.

Matthean community (see Lutz 1993: 310f.). Yet beyond those two levels the second century saw a changing interest among proto-Catholic interpreters that decentred the questions important for the Matthean readership (such as delineation from Judaism and a critique of the Jewish authorities). Proto-Catholic writers now looked for a way to maintain continuity with Jewish prophecy while delineating their own position from competing interpretations (such as Marcion). The Matthean insistence on scriptural continuity was now employed to co-opt the Jewish scriptures and prophecy from its non-believing Jewish interpreters (see Levine 1999: 21f.). Accordingly, Matthew's Jesus was interpreted as an external critique opposing not a specific stream within Judaism but Judaism in general (see Frankemölle 1999: 87; critical Dunn 1992: 209f.). A model of supersession pointed out by some scholars (see above) thus emerges from the Matthean account only after Christianity had been established as a religion external to Judaism. In a sense, a third level of interpretation could be the process of domestication of the Matthean account by proto-Catholic writers (see Lutz 1993: 326).

4.2.3 The Gospel of Luke & Acts

From an intriguing assessment of Acts, Loveday concludes that "200 years of Acts scholarship have failed to produce a consensus on the text's purpose and audience" (Loveday 1999: 24). However, there is some agreement that Luke's records, covering about a quarter of the New Testament, were composed some time close to the Gospel of Matthew around the year 80 C.E (see Alkier 2010: 266; critical Jaroš 2008: 97-99). Evidence for a dating after 70 C.E. can be deduced from the author's reference to the temple-destruction as a *fait accompli* and/or divine punishment to come¹⁷⁷. Furthermore, both of Luke's accounts describe a transformation of the temple from a place of worship to a place of political power with no theological significance thus situating them within a tradition of Hellenistic literature and historiography (see Sanders/Davies 1994: 276-278). Both aspects serve as evidence for Luke's theological position (see Tyson 1992: 183-185).

Luke's awareness of the Gentile profile of his faith (see Acts 28:17-30) lends further credibility to the assumption that the author composed/redacted his accounts at a time when Gentile Christianity had already begun to dominate the Christian communities (see

¹⁷⁷ see Lk. 19:41-44; 21:20-24; cf. Conzelmann 1964: 124-127; Koenig 1979: 98f.; consult Goodenough 1968: 57f. for a critique of this interpretation and an argument for an earlier date of creation.

Campanhausen 1968: 47-49¹⁷⁸). Judging by parallels to Josephus' *Antiquities* (published in 93 C.E.), Mason proposes a creation of the Gospel after 90 C.E. (see Mason 2003: 293; cf. Sanders/Davies 1994: 276) possibly even approaching 100 C.E. (see Schmithals 1982: 17). A third position proposes an even later dating during the time of Marcion by the mid-second century¹⁷⁹. For an elaborated discussion of this later dating, see chapter 5.2.3.

Both of Luke's accounts are addressed to the same person, a certain *Theophilus*, Greek for "lover of God" (Lk. 1:3; Acts 1:1). Drawing on works of Käsemann and Jervell, Koenig concludes that Theophilus refers to a generic (Gentile) Christian in need for religious instruction (see Koenig 1979: 97; 120; cf. Wilson 1995: 68). Despite this attempt to clarification, Theophilus' identity and its relevance for the Gospel remains a matter of dispute (see Esler 1987: 24f.¹⁸⁰) just as the identity of Luke continues to be discussed. Ruether and others assume Luke to be a Gentile Christian "anxious to show that all legitimate authority, Jewish and Roman, validated Christianity" (Ruether 1997: 76¹⁸¹). Koenig, Käsemann and Jervell on the other side conclude that Luke is a Jewish Christian highlighting the Jewish roots of his faith to his audience¹⁸². A certain distance from Judaism can be detected in the neglect of *halakhic* questions, and a decreased urgency for delineation (see Brandon 1957: 206f.). Especially if combined with Luke's obsession with "the Jews"¹⁸³, Luke's insistence reveals that the question may not be decidable along the lines of Jewish or Gentile Christianity.

Smiga notes that the two scientific perspectives are based on two radically opposed paradigms; one highlighting the continuity and the other the discontinuity of the author of Luke with Judaism (see Smiga 1992: 104-108; reminding of the difference between an apocalyptic and a salvation historical approach in scholarship on Paul, see Dunn 1994: 367-369). As outlined in the following, the present study assumes that this contradiction points to the very heart of the Lukean strategy of appropriation of Jewish scriptures and denigration of empirical Judaism. Smiga hints in a similar direction noting "Luke wants to claim that Christianity embodies true Judaism, but he also wants to claim that the

¹⁷⁸ Haenchen notes: "In Acts we are listening to the voice of a man of the subapostolic age [...] someone of a later generation trying in his own way to give an account of things that can no longer be viewed in their true perspective" (Haenchen 1982: 116).

¹⁷⁹ see e.g. Knox 1942: 78ff.; 1950: 25; Tyson 2006: 22f.; critical Campanhausen 1968: 47, fn. 60.

¹⁸⁰ Similar disagreement reigns on the question of the general addressee of the Gospel. It has been assumed a Christian community (see Esler 1987: 25), possibly made up of former Jews (see Jervell 1996: 26), Gentile converts to Judaism (see Tyson 1992: 35-39) or a Gentile/mixed audience (Käsemann 1968: 296f.; Koenig 1979: 120).

¹⁸¹ cf. Schmithals 1982: 17; Sanders 1987: 129; Tyson 1992: 75f.; Wilson 1995: 60.

¹⁸² see Käsemann 1968: 296f.; Koenig 1979: 120; Jervell 1984b: 40-43; 1996: 123-127.

¹⁸³ Reviewing contemporary scholarship on Acts Tyson notes a "tendency to neglect the seemingly obsessive concern this author had with Jews and Judaism" (Tyson 2003: 41).

Judaism of the past has been rejected and replaced” (Smiga 1992: 132). A page later, he adds: “Even though Luke-Acts asserts this rejection amidst images positive to Jews and Judaism, those images are not primary and serve another purpose, namely to demonstrate continuity with roots which have been left in the past” (Smiga 1992: 133).

*

From Paul and others sources, one can derive evidence that internal struggles accompanied the transition from the early Jerusalem community towards a more Gentile profile of the nascent faith. However, the historical record Acts supplies is marked by the almost complete silence about such an internal struggle or disagreement. This pacified image of early Christianity could point to Luke’s desire to portray the history of the Church as an unbroken chain of succession. Brandon comments that the very fact Luke’s reality

“demanded of him the presentation of an idealized picture of the origins of the Christian Church [...] must surely mean that he was writing at a time when the original issue between Jewish and Gentile Christianity had but an academic interest and when such a picture was not likely to be challenged as false by those who still retained a lively memory of those early days” (Brandon 1957: 209f.; critical see Tiede 1988: 338).

In contradiction to this interpretation, Esler notes that a pacified image can also point towards an author’s desire “to explain and justify, to ‘legitimate’ Christianity to his Christian contemporaries” (Esler 1987: 16). Behind this lies the assumption that the author and his addressee shared a need for “strong assurance that their decision to convert and to adopt a different life-style had been the correct one” (ibid.). As Luke’s theology develops a specific perspective on the faith in Jesus, his account may well react to an acute challenge they had to face. Esler assumes “Judaism” behind this challenge to Luke’s legitimacy (see ibid.: 23). Other scholars such as John Knox suggest that Luke reacted to a challenge independent from the Jewish-Gentile division (see chapter 5.2.3).

Certainly, Luke has many things to say about “Judaism” and “the Jews” and most of it is not very kind. Common to both texts are accusations that the Jewish people have always persecuted their prophets (see Lk. 6:23; 11:47-51; 13:33-35; Acts 7:51f.) and that the temple is not the dwelling place of God anymore because of Israel’s continuous disobedience and its rejection of the divine will (see Acts 7:48-50). “The Jews” are depicted as “untoward generation” (Acts 2:40), as “generation of vipers” (Lk. 3:7) or an

“evil generation” (11:29). In the Passion-account, an anonymous mass takes a greater share for Jesus' death than in Mark as it omits the provocation by the high priests (see Lk. 23:18, 21-23). Still, Jewish authorities (chief priests, scribes, elders) are made responsible for Jesus' persecution and are portrayed as enemies of the faithful Jewish people (see Lk. 19:47, 22:52, 66f.; 23:10, 35; Acts 5:12-18, 27-32). The negative portrayal of “the Jews” intensifies in Luke-Acts now lacking the internal differentiation of his Gospel as general “enemies of the Christian mission” (see Acts 9:22-24; 17:5; 18:12, 20:3; 23:12; cf. Gager 1983: 149) and the ones responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus (see Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13-15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39; 13:27f.).

At the same time, Luke regards the faith in Jesus as being well within the trajectory of Judaism as the fulfillment of God's prophecy to Israel (see Acts 26:6f.; 28:19f.; cf. Jervell 1972: 49f.; 1996: 17). Evidence for this emphasis on continuity is frequent as in Jesus' circumcision (see Lk. 2:21), his depiction as “Son of the Highest” (see Lk. 1:32), ruler of the house of Jacob (see Lk. 1:33) and anointed Messiah (see Lk. 2:11, 26). Luke's Jesus does not reject the Law and its prophets (see Lk. 16:17) and is described as the fulfillment of prophecy (see Lk. 24:27, 44). This continuity is confirmed in Acts (see e.g. Acts 3:22ff.; 7:37) while the “historical narrative approach” (Tyson 1992: 182) from Jerusalem to Rome at first seems to contradict this idea. As long as the Church is being established in Jerusalem “the Jews” are described with benevolence and the Christ-followers “shown to follow a high standard of legal observance” (Hill 2007: 49). As the story progresses, however, Luke intensifies the employment of “images of Jewish leaders and people who are hostile, vicious, and obdurate” (Tyson 1992: 182). Luke then dedicates the last part of Acts to a depiction of Paul's missionary practice culminating in his Roman speech where Paul proclaims the universal nature of the Church and the inclusion of the faithful Jews and Gentiles alike. Luke insists that this interpretation is in accordance with the Jewish scriptures (see *ibid.*). In this Luke-Acts not only explains “the inferiority of Judaism to Christianity and [...] [the] Jewish rejection of the Christian message” (Tyson 1992: 183) but also highlights the continuity of Christianity with Jewish prophecy.

*

Luke shows great interest in “Jews” who welcome Jesus' message, describing them in benevolent fashion, though ultimately a negative image dominates (see *ibid.*: 187f.). The Lukan Paul at first teaches in “synagogues”¹⁸⁴ and aims to convince Jews (see Acts 14:1;

¹⁸⁴ Stegemann/Stegemann note that the term *synagoge* only referred to Judea. The place where Diaspora

16:13; 17:1, 10, 17; 18:4, 19; 19:8). The spirit behind the Lukan accounts may thus be one of an initial hope for a Jewish conversion¹⁸⁵. On the other hand, one can find currents which increase the impression of Jewish impiousness as the conversions are frequently contrasted to a Jewish opposition and attempts to persecution (see e.g. Acts 13:46, 28:17-30; cf. Jervell 1972: 48). Furthermore, “the Jews” take a larger share of responsibility in the Lukan narrative (see e.g. Mk. 3:6 → Mt. 12:14 → Lk. 6:11). For example, Acts 9:23-25 retells Paul’s account of 2 Cor. 11:32-33 where Paul fears persecution by king Aretas in Damascus. In Acts, however, king Aretas has become “the Jews”. The same ambivalence can be found in Luke’s portrayal of “the Pharisees” (positive in Lk. 7:36; 11:37; 13:31; 19:39; Acts 5:34; negative in Lk. 11:39-44; 16:14f., 18:9-14¹⁸⁶).

This ambivalence has been explained with reference to the empirical Jews, it has also been taken as a reference to “Luke’s own ecclesiastical situation” (Sanders 1987: 314) which made it “necessary to define Christianity over against Judaism while holding on to the reality of the promises made to Israel” (ibid.; cf. Smiga 1992: 132f.). As noted above, the present study leans to the latter side. Luke seems to be aware of the fact that the profile of his faith has become increasingly Gentile and that the Jewish mission is about to fail. Both aspects destabilize a self-perception of the nascent faith as the fulfillment of the promises made to the Jewish people. Perhaps in response to this challenge, Luke develops a two-track strategy. On the one hand, he records the continued success of a Jewish conversion and stresses the divinity of the Gentile mission, on the other he portrays the Jewish majority as Godless people incapable of seeing the truth. This fits neatly to the eagerness with which Luke’s Jesus struggles to provide a theological explanation for this Jewish “blindness” (see Lk. 8:10; 10:21-23; 19:43f.) while stressing the continuity of his faith with Judaism, including elements that lift weight off “the Jews”¹⁸⁷. This element of “exoneration” could be a way to keep the doors open for a Jewish conversion but most importantly to maintain a positive relation to Jewish eschatology thus underlining the “Jewishness” of Luke’s own faith.

The problematic dimension of this ambivalence has found the support of different scholars, though it is not fully recognized in Gaston’s famous assessment “that Luke-Acts

Jews would pray was known as the *proseuche*. They are called *synagoge* only in the New Testament (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 225).

¹⁸⁵ see e.g. Lk. 12:10; 15:17ff.; Acts 2:41; 4:4; 5:14; 6:6f.; 9:42; 12:24; 13:43; 14:1; 17:10ff.; 21:20; cf. Jervell 1972: 44-49; Koenig 1997: 110.

¹⁸⁶ cf. Koenig 1979: 115-119; Sanders 1987: 85-131; Tiede 1988: 238; Mußner 1988: 265f.

¹⁸⁷ such as remorse, see Lk. 23:27, 48; ignorance, see Lk. 23:34; Acts 3:17, preordination, see Lk. 24:25f., 44-46; Acts 3:18; 4:27f.

is one of the most pro-Jewish and one of the most anti-Jewish writings in the New Testament” (Gaston 1986a: 153; cf. Tyson 1992). Räisänen is closer to the assumption underlying this work:

“Luke’s language suggests a very positive attitude to Judaism. In reality, however, his attitude is quiet ambiguous. In his ‘exaggerated continuity’ he is anti-Jewish in driving a wedge between the Old Testament religion and contemporary Jews” (Räisänen 1991: 110, quoting Gaston 1986a: 152).

For Räisänen, a focus on continuity (that is, continuity of “Christianity” with “Judaism”) is not a sign for a pro-Jewish attitude but for a specific strategy of *legitimation* (cf. Räisänen 1991: 108). Smiga seconds

“that Luke-Acts presents a disjunctive picture of salvation history wherein the Jews have been rejected at the same time as the Christian church claims Jewish roots. [...] Even though Luke-Acts asserts this rejection amidst images positive to Jews and Judaism, those images are not primary and serve another purpose, namely to demonstrate continuity with roots which have been left in the past” (Smiga 1992: 133).

This conceptual attempt to solve the twin-issue of Jewish rejection and Gentile responsiveness culminates in an appropriation of the Jewish divine election by Luke and, especially, his proto-Catholic followers. The “Jewishness” of the Jews becomes a question of faith in Jesus as Christ – and thus, a matter of conversion to Christianity. Conzelmann notes concisely: “Die Juden sind gerufen, sich nunmehr als ‘Israel’ zu realisieren. Tun sie das nicht, so werden sie – ,die Juden’” (Conzelmann 1964: 135¹⁸⁸). The notion of continuity may have also been useful to support a claim for the privileged status Judaism enjoyed in Roman official policy as *religio licita* (see Knox 1950: 25). In Lukan eyes, Christianity is “*the authentic understanding and practice of Pharisaic Judaism*” (Koenig 1979: 119, italics original) and the fulfillment of the messianic hope

¹⁸⁸ Leaving aside Conzelmann’s laudable employment of the term “‘the Jews’”, Tiede criticizes the scholar for intensifying “the traditional view of Luke on the Jews with its historical schematization, and the notion of gentile triumph at Jewish expense” (Tiede 1988: 327, Fn 4). One must agree that Conzelmann provides an adequate description not of Luke’s position but of his *interpretation* among proto-Catholic writers. The opposition Israel/Jews fails to capture the theological attitude of Luke, as Jervell notes: “In Luke’s writings ‘Israel’ always refers to the Jewish people. At no time does it serve to characterize the church, i.e., it is never used as a technical term for the Christian gathering of Jews and Gentiles. The early Catholic understanding of the church as a *tertium genus* in relation to Jews and Gentiles and ultimately as the *new* Israel that is made up of Gentiles and Jews is not present in Acts” (Jervell 1972: 49; criticized in Sanders 1987: 314). Koenig maintains that the term “Israel” in Luke “denotes the Jewish nation as a whole, without regard to whether it believes or rejects the gospel. [...] Israel always means something historically and ethnically Jewish” (Koenig 1979: 106).

imbued in the Jewish scriptures. It is crucial to note that this denigration of non-Christian Judaism is both, a side-effect of the Lukan intention to describe the Gentile conversion as being in accordance with divine providence and a direct result from underlining the continuity of the nascent faith with Jewish prophecy.

This interpretation has not gone without objections and some scholars maintain that the intention behind Luke's emphasis on Jewish prophecy is to appreciate the Jewish elements in his community (see Esler 1987: 128f.). This counter-tendency in scholarship culminates in Helmut Merkel's conclusion: "Weil Lukas so projüdisch war, mußte er in manchem antijüdisch werden" (Merkel 1994: 398¹⁸⁹). Even if one is to reject the notion of appropriation for the Lukan account, however, the Patristic writing of the second century uncovers the anti-Jewish potential lurking behind those descriptions that should be acknowledged in an analysis of anti-Judaism/antisemitism in early Christianity. Without a doubt, the subsequent employment of the Lukan account in second-century debates allows an insight into the attitudes and contexts of its (proto-Catholic) interpreters (see Tyson 1992: 187f.). Whether or not it is also an expression of Luke's original intent will probably have to remain a matter of dispute¹⁹⁰.

4.2.4 The Gospel of John

Ernst Käsemann's remarks markedly that the Gospel of John has never had a secure place in terrestrial history (see Käsemann 1971: 10f.). As one of the few undisputed aspects it is generally assumed that the Gospel of John draws from sources other than the Synoptics. A popular perspective situates the Gospel between 80 and 100 C.E.¹⁹¹ within an exclusively Jewish context (see Heestra 2010: 176f.¹⁹²). Supporting this idea of a Jewish

¹⁸⁹ Cf. the collected volumes Tyson 1988 and Farmer 1999 for an extended discussion.

¹⁹⁰ see Reese 1991; Tyson 1992: 181-189; Merkel 1994: 371-382; Blum 1999: 117f. For a discussion of the question whether Luke was written or revised to counter Marcion during the second century, see chapter 5.2.3.

¹⁹¹ see Koenig 1979: 124; Townsend 1979: 82ff., Flusser 1999: 9-13. Bultmann's *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (1964 [1st edition 1941]) inspired the method and focus of most modern scholarship on John. German theologian Peter von der Osten-Sacken sheds a critical light on the embeddedness of Bultmann's commentary in contemporary discussions (see Osten-Sacken 1976; cf. Leistner 1974: 17-67).

¹⁹² see Pancaro 1975: 396; Martyn 1979: 64-66; Wengst 1990 [o. 1981]: 183f.; Fredriksen 2000: 5; Dunn 2001: 59; Hirschberg 2007: 217; 231-235. John's Gospel pertains a certain closeness with Judaism. The Gospel highlights Jesus' Jewish background, describing him as a Jew from Nazareth (see Jn. 4:9; cf. 1:11; 4:22) and the son of Joseph (see Jn. 1:45). Jesus is addressed as rabbi (see Jn. 1:38, 49; 3:2; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8; 20:16) and his disciples are described as Jews (see Jn. 18:15). Some of the Jewish people are recorded to believe in Jesus as a result of the miracles he performs or the speeches he gives (see Jn. 2:23; 7:40; 8:30f.; 10:42; 11:45-48; 12:9-11, 19). It is Jesus' popularity among "the Jews" that leads to his persecution by the authorities (see Jn. 11:45-48) and some Jewish leaders secretly believe in him (see Jn

John, Paula Fredriksen notes that the Dead Sea Scrolls (discovered between 1947 and 1956) show “that early first-century Judean Jews spoke and thought in similar ways” (Fredriksen 2000: 5¹⁹³). Other scholars highlight the discontinuity of John with Judaism, situating his Gospel outside its religious frame¹⁹⁴. In the same spirit, the editors of the collection *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (2001a) ask:

“Is the gospel of John not a witness to the already irreversibly separation between those who believed in Jesus and those who did not? And is the breach between those who did and those who did not believe in Jesus not deeper and more radical than the breach between any other conflicting parties in Jewish literature?” (Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Vandecasteele-

12:42; cf. 3:1ff.; 7:50f.). Scholars such as Martyn find evidence for John’s Jewish position in references to the excommunication of believers from the synagogues (see Jn. 9:22; 12:42; 16:2). Since only Jews could be afraid of being thrown out of the synagogue, he argues, the Johannine community must have been counted among the Jews (see Martyn 1979: 50). To Marty, those sections in John point to the threat of expulsion the Johannine community faced with the introduction of the prayer *birkat ha-minim* to Jewish liturgy (*amidah*) around the year 90 C.E. (see *ibid.*: 56; 66); cf. Heemstra 2010: 161-174; 177f.). Reinhartz has called this the “expulsion theory” (Reinhartz 2001: 352). It assumes that empirical Jews caused the anti-Jewish polemics in John that are in turn regarded “as understandable, perhaps even ethically or theologically acceptable” (Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Vandecasteele-Vanneuville 2001b: 12). Recently, researchers have argued against this idea that John’s community was object to a Jewish aggression which can in turn be made responsible for the parting of ways (see *ibid.*; Kimelman 1981: 234f.; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 209f.; Reinhartz 2001; Boyarin 2004: 65-67; Goodman 2007b: 170-172; Hakola 2007). To begin with, the prayer *birkat ha-minim* does not mention “Christians” *expressis verbis* but uses the terms “minim” and “nozrim”. The text of the prayer is as follows: “1. For the apostates let there be no hope/2. And let the arrogant government be speedily uprooted in our days/3. Let the *nosrim* and the *minim* be destroyed in a moment./4. And let them be blotted out of the Book of Life and not be inscribed together with the righteous./5. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant” (translation taken from Kimelman 1981: 226). While Stegemann/Stegemann suppose that the word “nozrim” is probably the result of a later insertion between 135 and 150 C.E. (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 206f.) Flusser argues that the *birkat* itself is older than Christianity (see Flusser 1980: 230). Kimelman argues that in order to prove the applicability of the *birkat* to Christianity, the meaning of both terms (*minim*, *nozrim*) would have to be specifically directed towards Christians – as a general denouncement of “heretics” the prayer would lose its function (as Jewish Christians would not have considered themselves either *minim* or *nozrim*, see Kimelman 1981: 227). Kimelman concludes in accordance with other scholars that if anything, “minim” was directed against Christian *Jews* (see Kimelman 1981: 232; cf. Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 207; Heemstra 2010: 172). On the other side, Boyarin has highlighted the analogy of “minut” and “min” with the simultaneous emergence of the use of “heresy” and “heretic” in Justin (see Boyarin 2004: 66). Noting that he is “not entirely sure that these terms refer [...] to anyone” (*ibid.*: 55) Boyarin still maintains that the Hebrew neologism “minut” and “min” should rather be understood as a rabbinic “appropriation of a Christian notion” (*ibid.*: 29) by engaging “in the construction of the borders of orthodoxy via the production of others who are outside them” (*ibid.*: 66; cf. 54-65). Boyarin concludes that the “minim” were a “rhetorical construct for the production of a Jewish religion or church, functioning in this sense much as [...] *Ioudaioi* does for [...] Christian writers” (*ibid.*: 30). One can thus skim two options for the interpretation of the passages in John referring to an expulsion from the synagogue. (1) John refers to a real exclusion from the synagogues. This traditional perspective implies that his Gospel is directed towards *Christian Jews*. (2) John refers to a general conception of “Judaism” and its rejection of a Christian vision highlighting the mutual exclusivity of faith in Jesus and Judaism. The latter implies a distance of John from Judaism and the equally remote Jewish or Gentile Christian character of his audience. Considering John’s remoteness from Jewish ritual, his indiscriminate description of “the Jews” and his condemnation of Jews and Jewish Christians alike (see below) the assumption of a relative distance is regarded as the more probable.

¹⁹³ Fredriksen points to the documents found in Qumran. Haenchen comments that this congruence does not expand to the content and aim of critique (see Haenchen 1977: 281).

¹⁹⁴ see Käsemann 1971: 130; Townsend 1979: 81; Brumlik 1990: 15-19; Smiga 1992: 147f.; Hakola 2007. Boyarin proposes a temporal perspective on the question assuming John to be a Jewish precursor for what will only later become orthodox Christianity (see Boyarin 2004: 96-105).

The undifferentiated portrayal of the Jewish society in John certainly points to a time when the historical reality of a (Jewish) Jesus encountering (Jewish) people and (Jewish) authorities was no longer feasible to the author¹⁹⁵. This temporal distance finds an expression in an interchangeable use of “the Jews” and “the Pharisees” to designate the enemies of Jesu¹⁹⁶. Furthermore, John makes no distinction between Jewish authorities and “the Jews” when it comes to the Passion story (see Mußner 1988: 290f.). The indiscriminate use of “Pharisees” (about 19 times, see Culpepper 1987: 130f.) as collective semantic category for Jewish authorities (“the scribes” are completely absent from the account) points to a historical situation after the demise of the temple caste following 70 C.E. (Leistner 1974: 142). This has led Martyn to detect “a concern for tradition and effective involvement in contemporary issues” (Martyn 1979: 19). Martyn concludes “when we read the Fourth Gospel, we are listening both to tradition and to a new and unique interpretation of that tradition” (ibid.). This is compatible with David Rensberger taking a middle-position in the ongoing debate on John’s background:

“John comes from a unique, transitional period that belongs neither to the purely intra-Jewish sectarianism of Christianity’s earliest days, when it might have seemed that the new group would either remain within or come to dominate Judaism, nor yet to the fully separate religion that Christianity became. Instead, John shares aspects of both” (Rensberger 1999: 142).

One may find another clue for the transitional position of the author and audience of the Fourth Gospel by scrutinizing the relationship of Jesus to Judaism. Although “the most Judaeo-centric of the gospels” (Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Vandecasteele-Vanneuville 2001b: 18), John’s Jesus shows no concern for a detailed discussion of halakhic matters and stresses that the Law necessarily points to Jesus (see Jn. 1:17f.; 6:31-36; 10:9; 14:6f.; cf. Smiga 1992: 141-145). This distance to a ritual framework finds further expression in John’s reference to the Mosaic Law as “their law” (Jn. 15:25), it is also detectable in in Jesus’ teachings (see Jn. 8:17; 10:34), actions (see Jn. 5:1ff.) and a specific conception of Jewish election and the Jerusalem Temple (see Jn. 7:45-52; 8:39-59; 10:22-42; 12:36-43).

¹⁹⁵ see Gräßer 1964: 87; 1967: 160; Schramm 1974: 209; Mußner 1988: 269; 290.

¹⁹⁶ Compare “Pharisees” in Jn. 1:24; 7:32, 35, 47; 8:13; 9:13, 12, 15f., 40 to “Jews” in Jn. 1:19; 5:16-18; 7:13; 8:22; 9:18, 22; cf. Mußner 1988: 269f.; Reinhartz 2001: 348. While negative references to “the Pharisees” clearly dominate the Gospel, the example of Nicodemus differentiates the picture, see Jn. 3:1ff.; 7:50f.; 19:39f.; cf. 9:16 for internal disagreement among the Pharisees). However, Wengst has pointed out how Nicodemus remains within the limits of the carnal that John usually designates to “the Pharisees” (see Wengst 1990: 138-140).

Further evidence can be deduced from John's distance to Jewish customs and festivals calling them festivals "of the Jews" (see Jn. 2:6, 13; 5:1f.; 6:4; 7:2; 11:55; 19:40, 42; 18:39, cf. Culpepper 1987: 224f.). Those aspects strengthen the assumption that the author writes for community farther removed from Judaism than, say, Matthew (critical Rensberger 1999: 126f.).

Pointing to Jn. 8:31-59, Hakola has highlighted that John's Jesus condemns *both*, "the Jews" that do not believe and "the Jews" that do believe in his divinity but maintain their ritual practice (see Hakola 2007: 192-197). The scholar concludes: "The Johannine writer sees the believing Jews as an example that shows that it is impossible to continue to practice traditional Judaism and to be a believer in Jesus at the same time" (Hakola 2007: 196; cf. Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 210). John's Jesus thus departs from the Jerusalem consensus of Peter and Paul that had accepted the Mosaic Law alongside a lawless Gospel to the Gentiles (see above) and adopts a generally dismissive attitude towards the Mosaic Law instead (see e.g. 15:24f.). The conflict-potential of this position becomes apparent as the story progresses. Jesus' rejection of the Mosaic Law is rendered the main reason for his condemnation (see Jn. 19:7) and an indiscriminate mass of "the Jews" demands Jesus' crucifixion before Pilate and subsequently carries out the death sentence (see Jn. 19:14-16¹⁹⁷).

Gräßer has noted that the Johannine narration develops as a great trial, seen by the frequent use of witnesses and testimony throughout the account (see Grässer 1964: 83). This typological treatment of the different actors has led some scholars to conclude that John does not intend to reconstruct a historical event but a symbolic drama¹⁹⁸. To some, the symbolic interpretation reveals a situation detached from a Judaeo-Christian encounter (see Grässer 1964: 83; De Jonge 2001: 242¹⁹⁹). Following this interpretation, the Gospel of John should not (only) be understood as an attempt to describe a real historical event but – probably more so – as the culmination of a theological tendency to shift blame from Jewish leadership to "the Jews" as a whole (see Townsend 1979: 74, Koenig 1979: 129; critical Leistner 1974: 142ff.). The Johannine treatment of "the Jews"

¹⁹⁷ compare to Mk. 15:11; Mt. 27:20; Lk. 23:10; critical Leistner 1974: 145-150.

¹⁹⁸ see Koenig 1979: 134; Mußner 1988: 288-291; Kelber 1996: 136ff.; De Jonge 2001: 242, 258. Others propose to read John on two levels – the level of Jesus' life and the level of the contemporary situation of John and his community (see Smiga 1992: 136f.).

¹⁹⁹ Gräßer notes: "die 'Juden' sind von unserm Vf. überhaupt nicht als empirisches Volk genommen, sondern als 'stilisierte Typen', als 'ideelle Vertreter des Judentums, das auf Grund des Gesetzes Jesus ablehnt'" (Grässer 1964: 83). De Jonge seconds "that John's polemic does not reflect a dispute with traditional Jews; it only reflects a controversy with other Christians who maintain a different christological understanding than John's own group" (De Jonge 2001: 242).

has been at the centre of a revived contemporary debate of anti-Judaism/antisemitism in John (see Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Vandecasteele-Vanneuville 2001b: 9-23).

*

The Gospel of John mentions the term *Ioudaios/Ioudaioi* seventy-one times (as compared to 7 in Mk. and 5 in Mt. and Lk., see Kierspel 2006: 10, fn. 31) a number “matched only by the eighty occurrences in Acts” (Wilson 1995: 74; cf. Grässer 1964: 76; Leistner 1974: 11; Reese 1991: 61, fn. 2²⁰⁰). Its use constructs a clear antagonism in 33 cases, in other cases the term is employed in a neutral sense as people, public or crowd, to describe contemporary Jews and their ritual practices and as oppositional term to “the Pagans” (see Grässer 1964: 76; cf. Leistner 1974: 143). The fact that this attribution does not show a uniform negativity taken aside, Culpepper highlights that “the Gospel does not attempt to distinguish and separate these groups” (Culpepper 1987: 126). Many scholars have thereof described John's account as the climax of anti-Jewish writing among the Gospels²⁰¹. Others continue to exonerate the Gospel of this charge to a varying degree²⁰².

Despite the investment of many intellectual resources in researching anti-Judaism in John in the last decades²⁰³, the discussion lingers on. Crucial to any analysis are the thirty-seven uses of *hoi Ioudaioi* that generally refer to the enemies of Jesus and his followers (see Wilson 1995: 74-76; Leistner 1974: 11²⁰⁴). In the semantic organization of John's

²⁰⁰ for more literature on the Johannine position towards Israel and “the Jews“, see Scholtissek 1999: 156, fn. 23.

²⁰¹ see e.g. Brumlik 1990; Ruether 1997: 111-116; Reinhartz 2001: 342; for more sources see Kierspel 2006: 11, fn. 33. Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Candecasteele-Vanneuville distinguish three levels on which scholars argue that anti-Judaism entered the Gospel of John: “(1) the level of the interpreter(s) (*intention lectoris*), (2) the level of the text (*sensus textus*) and (3) the level of the author (*intention auctoris*)” (Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Candecasteele-Vanneuville 2001b: 5).

²⁰² Leistner 1974: 150; Theißen 1990: 540-542; Wengst 1990a: 128-152; Scholtissek 1999: 177-181; De Jonge 2001: 239; Kierspel 2006: 217, for more sources, see Scholtissek 1999: 157, fn. 26. While rejecting Leistner's conclusion on the absence of a Johannine anti-Judaism his observation raises an important aspect for the discussion. Leistner notes: “Angesichts der sich vollziehenden (oder bereits vollzogenen) Ablösung der christlichen Gemeinde von der Synagoge schärft der Evangelist seinen Lesern ein, den inneren Zusammenhang mit Israel zu bewahren, der durch den Heilstod Jesu für Juden und Heiden unauflösbar ist” (see Leistner 1974: 150). As already argued in the previous section on Luke, stressing the point of continuity does by itself *not* proof the friendliness of the author towards empirical Judaism or the absence of anti-Judaism. Rather, it highlights an elemental part in the proto-Catholicism strategy to fend off competing interpretations in the second century onwards (such as Marcionism). The emerging formation of proto-Catholic antisemitism is marked by this double-process of appropriation (of Jewish prophecy) and rejection (of the empirical Judaism).

²⁰³ See the essays in Neuhaus 1990, Farmer 1999 and Bieringer/Pollefeyt/Vandecasteele-Vanneuville 2001a; cf. Kierspel 2006: 9, fn. 30.

²⁰⁴ Leistner notes that the term *hoi Ioudaioi* appears only once in Mt. (28:15), once in Mk (7:3); twice in Lk (7:3; 23:51) and roughly seventy times in John (see Leistner 1974: 11). The diverging numbers in Wilson, Mußner et al. appear to be due to a different classification. This classification also leads Leistner to conclude that the mix of positive and negative remarks to “the Jews” proves that John's account is not consistently anti-Judaic but directs its polemic against the Jewish authorities (Leistner 1974: 144f.). In

Gospel, the disciples (and note Jesus) are the oppositional term to *Ioudaios* (see Schramm 1974: 207f.). While these “Jews” are frequently depicted as fervent critics of Jesus, accusing him of demonic possession and blasphemy, John also allows for a differentiated picture sometimes pointing to a division between the faithful and unfaithful “Jews” (see Jn. 4:22; 6:52; 7:31; 8:31; 10:19-21, 42; 11:45; 12:42f.; 19:38). However, as pointed out above, John's “Jews” also conspire against Jesus, cause his arrest and ultimately have a share in his death. “The Jews” in this depiction may well be identical with the Pharisees or the high priests – they also serve as symbols for “all [...] the negative categories and images in the gospel: the world, sin, the devil, darkness, blindness, and death” (Culpepper 1987: 129). Consider in this identification, the crucial question must not be what empirical reality lies behind John's depiction but *why* he employs “the Jews” as the central negative reference (see Broer 1992: 13f.).

John's Gospel develops around an “overriding christology” (Smiga 1992: 137) maintaining that whoever does not believe in Jesus will be condemned (see Jn. 3:18) – everything that has come before Jesus is now without value (see Jn. 10:8). The refusal to believe in Jesus as the son of God thus equals the rejection of God himself (see Jn 5:18-47; 14:6f.). For John, this rejection does not arise from a spontaneous Jewish failure to recognize Jesus as the Messiah – it is the culmination of a history of moral degeneration. “The Jews” never believed, knew or worshipped God (see Jn. 5:37, 42, 47). In fact, they are the children of the devil (see Jn. 8:44). The argument of supersession is underlined further by the fact that the term “Israel” and “Israelite” occurs five times carrying a positive connotation (see Jn. 1:31, 47, 49; 3:10; 12:13²⁰⁵). In what must be described a crucial discursive operation regarding the genealogy of a Christian episteme of antisemitism, “the Jews” are identified “with the negative side of the contrast, with unbelief, darkness, and the world” (Wilson 1995: 79; see below) while Israel is appropriated for the believers in Jesus. The Gospel of John thus escalates a tendency already contained in the Synoptics as expressed in Matthew: “He that is not with me is

direct opposition to this conclusion, the present study maintains that *the employment of the same term for the enemies of Christ and “the Jewish people” forms the core of the problematic development in John.*

²⁰⁵ Severino Pancaro has pointed this out in a small article from 1975. However, the present study does not agree with Pancaro's conclusion that these positive remarks make John a disgruntled Christian Jew struggling with the stratification caused by Jamnia (Pancaro's conclusion is shared by Koenig 1979: 124). Instead, it is argued that an appropriation of “Israel” and rejection of “the Jews” with its underlying emphasis on continuity (“The Church is the New Israel”, Pancaro 1975: 405) gives expression to a certain Christian self-construction that does not necessarily point to the Jewishness of the author. Rather, this peculiar (proto-Catholic) self-construction is characterized by the simultaneous emphasis on continuity (reference to the Torah to defend Jesus' legitimacy) and an intensifying depreciative attitude towards Judaism (see Campenhausen 1968: 67-72). It rose to dominance with the Patristic writings following the second century but finds a precedent in the Gospel of John (see the respective chapters in this work).

against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad” (Mt. 12:30²⁰⁶).

In conformity with this interpretation, John frequently points to “the Jew’s” intention to kill Jesus, his disciples or his followers (see Jn. 5:16, 18; 7: 1, 11-13, 19; 8:37-59; 9:22, 34f.; 10:31-39; 16:1-3; 19:7; 20:19). Arguing that “the Jews” have never been chosen in a positive sense, John declares this unbelief a part of their ontological constitution (see Brumlik 1990: 9). Rejecting Jesus as the son of God, “the Jews” affirm their historical status as a people of the devil opposed to God (and the status of the Christians as true heirs to the prophecy). In this sense, Lambrecht’s comment on John’s Revelation 2:9b and 3:9a is also true for the Gospel of John: “The fact that John so strongly denies that the Jews are genuine Jews implicitly proves that in his opinion the Christians are the true Jews” (Lambrecht 2001: 526). To John, faith in the Jewish God must lead to faith in Jesus concluding that a failure to believe in Jesus indicates sin against God²⁰⁷. Likewise, the theme of Jewish anti-Christian persecution (see Jn. 9:22; 12:42; 16:2) supports the Johannine claim that Jesus is the Messiah²⁰⁸. Culpepper concludes that John “strips Judaism of the validity of its faith and practice” (Culpepper 2001: 78) and Lambrecht seconds that the “seizure of the Jewish identity” (ibid.) is a crucial aspect in John’s Christology. This seizure is among the most important novelties when comparing John to the Synoptics (see chapter 4.3.3).

If one accepts this seizure of Jewish identity as central thrust of John’s Gospel, two aspects can be integrated that usually on opposite sides in scholarship – John’s positive references to Israel, Jewish prophecy and scriptures and his fervent polemics against “the Jews” (see Grässer 1964: 88; Culpepper 2001: 82f.). John’s insistence on the Jewishness of Jesus, his identification with the temple and his insistence that “salvation is of the Jews” (Jn. 4:22) now seems only consequent. Rather than proving a positive attitude towards Judaism it highlights John’s desire to claim the Jewish framework for Jesus. A self-ascription as “Jew” is necessary for John *in order to prove* that the Jewish scriptures have always foretold Jesus coming and testify to his divinity. It is in order to stabilize this claim that John highlights the religious ignorance of “the Jews” and the conformity of Jesus with Jewish

²⁰⁶ cf. Lk. 11:23; Jn. 8:23f., 39-47; 5:37-45; 15:23-25. This development from the synoptics to John should not be taken as proportional development among the relationship of Christian writings towards Judaism. As Sanders has shown, no such law can be identified (see Sanders 1969: 272-275).

²⁰⁷ see Jn. 5:19-23, 37-39; 7:28f.; 8:47, 54f.; 10:25-30; 12:44; 15:21; 16:3, 25ff.; 17:1ff.

²⁰⁸ Ruther notes that the theme of “ejection of Christian preachers from the synagogues [becomes] a central symbol of this principle of hostility to ‘the Jews’ against the prophets of Christ. This is the ongoing expression of their ‘hatred’ of Christ and, through Christ, their hatred of God. The Jews are represented in the Gospel as constantly attempting to throw those who believe in Christ ‘out of the synagogues’” (Rueher 1997: 115).

prophecy. Thus, John introduces the split between empirical Jews and Christian appropriation of Judaism as in Jn. 5:39: “Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me”. Seen from this perspective, even the puzzling passage in Jn. 4:22 makes perfect sense: “[...] we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews”.

4.3 Overwriting the Empirical – Jews, Romans and Theology

4.3.1 Fading out of Focus – The Romans in the Passion

Narrative

“It is useless to be drawn here into an argument concerning the execution of Jesus; to excuse, commend or regret it. The story as the New Testament tells it, and there is no other source, is too confused and shows too many signs of having been told to suit a later generation” (Grayzel 1946: 81)

“Sowohl Judenfeinde der verschiedensten Überzeugungen als auch Befürworter einer Ökumene aus Juden und Christen stimmen in einem entschiedenen Punkt überein: darin nämlich, daß an der Wurzel des ‘theologischen’ Judenhasses die Jahrtausende alte Anklage des ‘Christusmordes’ wuchert” (Lapide 1979: 239)

Modern research has repeatedly demonstrated that Jesus' crucifixion is best understood in the framework of a political persecution by the hand of the Roman authorities. In the historical proceedings, the Jewish authorities/Jewish people that figure so prominently in the Gospel-narratives in all likelihood played only a minor role²⁰⁹. Paul Winter points to the historical truism that the ruling Roman power was the only one legally entitled during that time to condemn Jesus (see Winter 1974: 10). This is confirmed by his detainment subsequent crucifixion – one of the Roman capital punishments (see Lapide 1979: 244). Historical evidence for the political nature of the persecution of Jesus is found in Flavius Josephus' account *Wars of the Jews* (Josephus 1980). Albeit a mere two references to Jesus as a “Wonder-worker”, the Jewish historian “recognized Christianity primarily as a [Jewish] revolutionary movement against Rome” (Brandon 1957: 119; cf. 116-118²¹⁰). Paul Winter comments in his seminal *On the Trial of Jesus* (1974) that the political nature of this persecution does not necessarily prove Jesus to be a political revolutionary himself (see Winter 1974: 206). While some scholars highlight the importance non-violent

²⁰⁹ see Baron 1952: 70; Zeitlin 1964: 171f.; Winter 1967; 1974: 190-207; Isaac 1968: 458; Lapide 1979; Stegemann 1998: 8-21; Kurth 1998: 52-55.

²¹⁰ consult *ibid.*: 122f. for an English translation of the relevant passages from the *Slavonic Josephus*.

symbolic politics have had for Jesus (“gewaltfreie Symbolpolitik”, see Theißen 2004: 29; 269-277) others have associated him with a Jewish nationalistic revolutionary movement tied to or even identical with the radical Jewish nationalistic Zealot party (see Brandon 1967: 260-264²¹¹).

Evidence for a “political Jesus” can be found in Paul (see 1 Cor 2:8) and John, whose negative treatment of the Romans in the Passion narrative remains unparalleled by the synoptic accounts (see e.g. Jn. 19:2f., 24; cf. Wengst 1990b: 24-26). This is most apparent in his depiction of the arrest of and trial against Jesus where an escort of armed Roman soldiers accompanies Judas, the chief priests and elders (see Jn. 18:3, 12²¹²). In Jn. 11:45-53, the high priests and Pharisees debate actions on Jesus and conclude: “If we let him thus alone, all men will believe on him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation” (Jn. 11:48; cf. the reaction of the crowd in Jn. 19:12-16). In John’s account of the trial, the chief priest declares in a decisive moment “[w]e have no king but Caesar” (Jn. 19:15, see Townsend 1979: 78). Different from the synoptic tradition, therefore, the concern of the high priests and Pharisees in John is with the *political relations* towards Rome (see Brandon 1957: 124-125; 1967: 17; Leistner 1974: 134²¹³). Apparently, they consider Jesus a potential political threat to their political relations towards Rome (see Winter 1974: 203; critical Fredriksen 2000: 9). This lends a political dimension to the description of Jesus as “king of the Jews” (see Jn. 18: 33; 19:19²¹⁴).

At first sight, an increased responsibility of the Roman officials in John appears to decrease the Jewish responsibility and thus culpability for Jesus’ crucifixion (Leistner 1974: 134). Indeed, aspects working to highlight the culpability of the Jewish side in the Synoptics are absent in John (e.g. the Synhedrin plotting to kill Jesus or the crowd

²¹¹ see Winter 1974: 202 for a more careful assessment. Winter notes: “The evidence, fragmentary though it is, affords no solid basis for the view that he [Jesus] was engaged in any political activities of a subversive character” (Winter 1974: 206).

²¹² cf. Brandon 1957: 125; Winter 1967: 97f.; Leistner 1974: 92. Leistner notes against Brandon: “Der vierte Evangelist läßt freilich keinen Zweifel daran, daß Jesus nicht der Anführer einer der üblichen zelotischen Aufstandsbewegungen war” (Leistner 1974: 93).

²¹³ Dodds raises the question as to whether John’s depiction draws material from a tradition older and less influenced by political considerations than the synoptic accounts. This hypothesis can claim some probability as the political aspect would certainly have been a disturbing feature that later Christian writers would have wished to diminish (see Dodds 1963: 113-115).

²¹⁴ Insofar as the ascription “king of the Jews” is not only restricted to the religious kingdom, the synoptics may be read against the grain to supply evidence that the Roman procurator Pontius Pilate had Jesus crucified as a political rebel (see Mk. 15:1f., 15-20, 26, 32; Mt. 27:11-13, 26, 29-31, 37; Lk. 23:1-5). Accordingly, the Roman characters in those accounts show the disrespect a political adversary of the Roman Empire deserves. Herodes ridicules Jesus (see Lk. 23: 7-12), the soldiers dress Jesus in purple, crown him with thorns and call him the king of the Jews (see Mk. 15: 15-19; Mt. 27: 27-30). When Jesus is hanging on the cross, the soldiers mock him and gamble for his clothes (see Mk. 15:24, Mt. 27: 35, Lk. 23: 36-38, Jn. 19: 23f.). The historical figure of Jesus thus emerges as a political adversary (see Leistner 1974: 92; Theißen 2004: 243-305).

demanding Jesus' crucifixion, see Wengst 1990b: 25f.). Likewise, the aristocracy is only an intermediary between Jesus' detention and his trial before Roman officials (Jn. 18:12-28; cf. Wengst 1990a: 144f.). Opposed to this alleviating tendency, the previous section on John's Gospel has shown that he is far from exculpating "the Jews". Jesus clarifies the question of culpability when brought before Pilate: "he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin" (Jn. 19:11). Furthermore, the alliance between high priests and Roman authorities works to undermine the moral stance of the former. John shows the priest's ineptitude, immorality and dependency on Rome – and ultimately their inability to speak for the Judean people. This sits well with Paula Fredriksen's comment that John adopts a rhetoric similar to the one found in the Dead Sea Scrolls whose main thrust is with a critique of power (see Fredriksen 2000: 5). Although explicit on the political nature of the persecution, John's rhetoric ultimately partakes in the redistribution of guilt from the Roman to the Jewish side (see Wengst 1990a: 144f.).

*

Opposite to John, the synoptic Gospels work to exonerate Jesus from any charge of political rebellion (see e.g. Mk. 12:13-17; Mt. 22:15-22; Lk. 20:20-26; for a similar tendency in Acts, see Knox 1950: 28). This endeavor has two consequences – as the Gospels progress, the Roman responsibility for the persecution fades to the background while the responsibility of the Jewish side is highlighted (see Winter 1967: 102²¹⁵). This can be illustrated by tracing the portrayal of the Roman procurator in Jerusalem, Pontius Pilate: Mark depicts Pilate as a weak opportunistic political character yielding to the pressure of the malignant Jewish community (see Mk. 15:15, cf. Brandon 1967: 4). Yet, Mark's account remains comparably removed from the direct exculpatory statements present throughout Matthew's Gospel. It is in Matthew that one can first find the image of the washing of the hands (see Mt. 27:24) and Pilate's wife warning against a condemnation of Jesus (see Mt. 27:19). In Luke's Gospel, this exonerating tendency is developed further. Pilate declares Jesus innocent three times, telling the Jewish crowd that he has "found no cause of death in him" (Lk. 23:22) and even intends to free Jesus (see Lk. 23: 14-16, 20, 22). Even in John's account, Pilate refuses to take any responsibility

²¹⁵ "Alle Evangelisten bemühen sich zu verschweigen, daß die Todesstrafe über Jesus vom kaiserlichen Statthalter verhängt worden ist. In ihrer Verlegenheit, klipp und klar auszusprechen, daß das Todesurteil in der Form eines Rechtsspruchs des Landpflegers gehalten war, spiegelt sich die verfängliche Situation der jungen Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur staatlichen Obrigkeit [...]. Denn daran kann kein Zweifel sein, daß es Pilatus war, der das Urteil gefällt hat. Hätte er dies nicht getan, so hätte Jesus allenfalls durch Steinigung, die jüdische Vollstreckungsform der Todesstrafe hingerichtet werden können; er wäre jedoch nie gekreuzigt worden" (Winter 1967: 102; cf. Lapide 1979: 243; Kierspel 2006: 7, fn. 21 for more sources).

(see Jn. 18: 38), engages in lengthy negotiations (see Jn. 18:29 to 19:16) and ultimately testifies to Jesus' true identity as savior (see Jn. 19:6-22). This supports Ruether's observation that the synoptic Gospels shift responsibility increasingly from political (Roman) to Jewish (religious) authority (see Ruether 1997: 88f.²¹⁶). The contradiction of those accounts to the historical facts poses the question why the Gospels strove to exonerate the Romans and highlight the responsibility of the Jewish side. Recent scholarship has proposed a multi-factored explanation combining theological, social and political aspects:

- (1) Theological: all the information the New Testament supplies on the early stages of the faith demonstrates that it understood itself as a fulfillment of Jewish prophecy. In order to prove Jesus' divinity, his crucifixion had to be explained as an act of divine will (without crucifixion, no resurrection). By decentering the Roman responsibility, the narrative shifted to the Jewish framework and thus, to the question of prophecy. If Jesus could be shown to be executed by his own people and if those people had always persecuted their prophets, this would prove Jesus' status as Messiah (see Kampling 1990: 127). As will be demonstrated later, an internal Christian debate fuelled the tendency among proto-Orthodox/Catholic writers.
- (2) Social: With the increasing Gentile influx into emerging Christianity, the religion moved closer to the Roman world (see Rohrbacher 1991: 299; see chapter 6.1). While Jesus was born a Jew and preached to Jews, the position of the authors of the Gospels had changed. The introduction of certain characters into the story, e.g. the faithful Roman centurion as opposed to the unfaithful Jews (see e.g. Mk. 15:39; Lk. 23:47), may well be an attempt to ease tension between the historical Jesus and an increasingly Gentile profile of the faith (see e.g. Mk. 15:39; Lk. 7:2-9; 23:47; Mt. 8:5-13; cf. Lapide 1979: 243).
- (3) Political: Some of the authors of the Gospel accounts faced a political situation

²¹⁶ In order to clarify the trajectory of this development, it is all the more helpful to consult the first of the non-canonical gospels, the Gospel of Peter. In this account, the anti-Judaism of the Passion narrative is escalated even further to a point where acts formally associated with Roman soldiers (the crown of thorns, the ridiculing, the spitting and the gambling) are now entirely attributed to "the Jews" (see Peter 6-12). Jules Isaac adds that the dogmatic writing of the second century and later occasionally declared Pilate an unbaptized, subconscious Christian (see Isaac 1968: 367; cf. e.g. Tertullian, *Apol.* 21). This tendency continues to Christian art and writing during the Middle Ages. It was not uncommon to depict Romans partaking in the Crucifixion with Jewish features. Rohrbacher notes: "From the time of the Church Fathers the guilt of the Jews was increasingly accentuated, whereas little or no significance was attributed to the part which, according to the gospels, had been played by the Romans. [...] In medieval literary and pictorial descriptions of the Passion the Jews are often depicted as the prime movers, with the Romans acting at their instigation only; and sometimes even the Roman soldiers are converted into (medieval) Jews" (Rohrbacher 1991: 298).

where their belief was increasingly criminalized by the Roman authorities and its followers condemned as anti-Roman (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 274; see chapter 6.1.1). In this regard, the description of Jesus as a religious enemy may well be an apology to counter the Roman accusation of disloyalty (see Lapiere 1979: 243; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 280f.). The Gospel's struggle to demonstrate that their Roman critics had misconceived the message of Jesus and that the mission was in line with the official political position of the Roman Empire and had no intention of disturbing its internal peace.

A multiplicity of reasons made it desirable for the authors of the synoptic Gospels to diminish the role of the Romans in the crucifixion of Jesus. At the same time, the shift of blame to the Jewish side remains an open question. The first and most obvious argument is that *somebody* had to be guilty. Since Jewish characters are the only other big player left in the account of Jesus' life, responsibility must be placed at their door. However, the previous analysis has pointed to internal differences among the accounts – while the Gospel of Mark blames the Jewish authorities, Matthew points to a Jewish multitude up to John's conflation of "Jews" and "Pharisees" blaming them indiscriminately for the persecution and murder of Jesus.

*

Why are "the Jews" being increasingly made responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus?

The previous analysis has already pointed out that Christian authors writing after 70 C.E. depicted Pharisaic Judaism as *pars-pro-toto* for the Jewish elite or even all of the Jewish people that refused to believe in Jesus. In this, a few things appear to happen at once. As the guilt of the Jewish side is underlined, the soteriological meaning of the crucifixion is highlighted. Along the process, "the Jews" gain a specific semantic position vis-à-vis the "Christian" and the "Roman" side. An explanation for this development follows the same course as the tendency to exculpate the Romans – social (Gentile composition of the communities), political (deterioration of the Judaeo-Roman relationship) and theological.

As pointed out before, an early Christian strategy to claim legitimacy for their belief consisted in underlining its closeness to Judaism in order to partake in its status as *religio licita*. During the latter half of the first century, however, the Jewish-Roman relationship was disrupted by two subsequent Jewish revolts that broke out in Judea and ended with

the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. (see chapter 4.1). These revolts were accompanied by a rapid deterioration of the reputation of “the Jews” among Gentiles (Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 281; see chapter 7.1.3).

The deteriorating image of Judaism in the Roman Empire gave Christian writers, missionaries and preachers a reason to distance themselves from Judaism. Supported by an increasingly Gentile make-up, some Christians set out to draw the theological consequences of this reversal by the end of the first century (Marcion). Believers opposing this idea of discontinuity set out to counter those inner-Christian claims that there was no connection of Jewish prophecy and faith in Jesus. Those writers now had to come up with a new model for the continuity of their faith to Jewish prophecy without resuming the connection with empirical Judaism (see chapter 5.2).

While Christianity moved closer to the Roman world and while the image of “the Jews” deteriorated in the wake of the Judean wars during the second half of the first century, Jewish tradition kept on influencing the nascent faith. One can find traces of this closeness in the Gospel accounts: For example, the “washing of the hands” of Pilate is used to testify to the Roman procurator's innocence. The antique author Origenes already noted that this gesture was not Roman but engrained in Jewish tradition, resembling it all the way down to its wording (see Deut. 21:1-9; 2 Sam 3:28; Psalms 26:6; 73:13; cf. Schelkle 1967: 153f.). Schelkle comments ironically: “Der römische Prokurator wird sich nicht mit den Worten des Alten Testamentes ausgedrückt haben” (ibid.: 154).

Kampling has pointed to the tension unfolding between a demarcation from empirical Judaism and the desire to maintain Christianity's continuity with Jewish prophecies. In order to keep on claiming Jewish prophecy for themselves, a split was introduced separating prophecy from empirical Judaism (see Kampling 1990: 127). This accelerated a process in which “the Jews” were increasingly juxtaposed with the Christian faith. The denigration of the Jewish authorities and people as corrupt, disloyal and unlawful now started to serve the clarification of the theological position of the author of the Gospels. In accordance with Jewish prophecy and in opposition to the Jewish authorities/Jewish people (proto-Orthodox) Christianity started to constructed itself as the heir to Jewish prophecy. This perspective grew to maturity only during the second century. However, the very fact that the Gospels were accepted into the canon underline their compatibility with this process.

4.3.2 Overwriting the Empirical – History and Intertextuality

“The entire Jewish Bible was to be sacrificed to the validation of the historicity of the gospels; yet its whole authority was needed to establish that historicity” (Kermode 1980: 107)

The Gospels are designed as a historical account of Jesus’ life and death. By the beginning of the twentieth century, the tradition of *Form Criticism* called into question whether the authors of the Gospels had even wanted to give such an account of the life and death of Jesus. Dibelius and Bultmann, two of its foremost proponents, argued that the Gospels had not intended to record historical facts about Jesus’ life but to describe “Jesus” as a symbolical figure. Dibelius comments:

“In der Tat wird durch alle Beobachtungen und Rückschlüsse, die wir anstellen können, bestätigt, daß die urchristlichen Missionare nicht das Leben Jesu erzählten, sondern das in Jesus Christus erschienen Heil verkündeten. Was sie erzählten, war dieser Verkündigung untergeordnet, mußte sie bestätigen und begründen” (Dibelius 1967: 14; cf. Bultmann 1931: 396²¹⁷).

For the Gospels, the “Jewish textual and intertextual world [was] the echo chamber of a Jewish soundscape for the first century” (Boyarín 2012: 160). One can find a similar proposition in Richard B. Hays’ *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (1989). In a meticulous study, Hays underlines the engagement of the Pauline Epistles with the Jewish scriptures. Stowers comments that Paul “privilege[s] scripture by explicitly drawing attention to the connections between the discourse of the letter and earlier authoritative texts” (Stowers 1994: 9). Apparently, Paul and the Gospels hold their own claims to Jewish standards. Sanders and Davies further point to the frequent allusions to the Jewish scriptures in Mark:

“John the Baptizer is dressed like Elij ([...] Mark 1.6; II Kings 1.8), the Son of man coming on the clouds in Mark 13.26 alludes to Daniel 7.13, and there are allusions to Psalms 22 and 69 in the description of Jesus’ crucifixion: Mark 15.24 and Psalm 22.18, Mark 15.29 and Psalm 22.7, Mark 15.36 and Psalm 69.21” (Sanders/Davies 1994: 271).

²¹⁷ Consult also Krister Stendahl’s critical appraisal of Dibelius et. al. on the Gospel’s origin and function (see Stendahl 1954).

In the Gospel of Matthew and Mark, the story of Jesus “resembles the stories of prophets in Exodus, Numbers, I and II Kings, with their episodic narratives punctuated by dialogue and miracle” (Sanders/Davies 1994: 274). Matthew supplies a genealogy declaring Jesus the son of Abraham and a narrative of his birth and upbringing proving Jesus’ indisputable connection to the Jewish prophecy and prophets (see Sanders/Davies 1994: 259f.). Furthermore, the Matthean narrative portrays Jesus living in the Gentile regions of Zebulun and Naphtali in order “to fulfill the saying of Isaiah that in 'Galilee of the Gentiles – the people who dwell in darkness have seen a great light' (Matt. 4:12-16)” (Ruether 1997: 86).

Matthew’s narrative is ridden with references to the Jewish scriptures – from the time predating Jesus’ ministry to entering the city riding a donkey to the last supper on Passover. The latter example alludes to Moses and the Exodus of the people of Israel. Matthew’s account of the cleansing of the temple (see Mk. 11:17; Mt. 21:13) is a further reference to Isaiah and Jeremiah (see Is. 56:7; Jer. 7:11). Matthew apparently wants to underline the soteriological significance for his narrative, e.g. by having Jesus mutter his last words in reference to Psalm 22:1 “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”. Also later, the Psalm echoes the narrative of crucifixion familiar from the Gospels (see Kermode 1980: 106):

“For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture” (Psalms 22:16-18).

To be sure, there are elements surpassing those scriptural references. They can be found in Matthew’s eschatological outlook and an enduring dichotomy between God and Satan (see Sanders/Davies 1994: 260-264). Also in Luke’s writing, one can find frequent allusions to the Jewish scriptures as “parts of Luke-Acts seem to be conscious imitations of the style of the Septuagint” (Sanders/Davies 1994: 290). For example, Simon’s prediction at Jesus’ circumcision fits the frame of Jewish expectations for the coming David/Messiah (see e.g. Lk. 2:4, 11, 26, 32; 3:31; Acts 13:22). Jesus’ first sermon is modeled after a passage in Isaiah (see Lk. 4: 16-30). Just as in Matthew, Luke traces Jesus’ ancestry back to David (see Lk. 3:23-38) and the cleansing of the temple is a reference to Isaiah and Jeremiah (see Lk. 19:46; cf. Sanders/Davies 1994: 291-294; Jervell 1996: 61-75). Further allusions can be found in John’s depiction of Jesus as “bread from heaven”, the “good shepherd” and the “true vine”. References are also detectable in Jesus’ actions (e.g. the change of water to wine, the healing of the son, the lame and the blind, the

feeding of the multitude, the walking on water and the raising of the dead).

Those allusions have led scholars to conclude that the Jewish scriptures form a basic point of reference for the passion narrative in the Gospels (see e.g. Dibelius 1967: 205, Isaacs 1968: 439ff.). This finds further expression in the use of *formula quotations*²¹⁸, mostly in Matthew (see Mt. 1:22; 2:5, 15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35; 21:4f.; 27:9f.) but also in Mark 14:49: “but the scripture must be fulfilled” (cf. Jn. 19:36). Testifying to a desire among the authors of the Gospels not to describe the historical fact “but [...] to convey a religious message” (Winter 1974: 2) the Gospels reflect a spiritual need of their authors and, probably, their communities (see *ibid.*). Their religious perspective, however, appears to have been highly contested within early Christianity. An emphasis on specific aspect within the Jewish scriptures (just as the emphasis on Jewish scriptures by itself) must thus be understood as an expression of a *particular theological perspective*. The integration of those accounts into the Catholic canon testifies to an enduring, albeit different, suitability for the subsequent editors.

*

While the Gospels are connected by a common strategy of likening Jesus' actions to the Jewish expectations for the Messiah, there are also substantial differences. Examples may be found in a different eschatological outlook based on differences in Christology (see chapter 4.3.3) but the differences also concern details. For example, all of the accounts seem to use the image of vinegar (see Mk 15:36; Mt 27:48; Lk 23:36; Jn 19:29) pointing to the Psalm 59: “They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink”. However, a closer look conveys how the composition of the drink given to Jesus before his crucifixion changes among the accounts – Mark, the earliest of the Gospels, mentions wine mixed with myrrh (Mark 15: 23), Matthew speaks of vinegar mixed with gall (Matthew 27: 34). Matthew seems to leave the *Jewish* tradition of giving wine mixed with myrrh to a person that is sentenced to death (see Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, Folio 43a) in order to highlight the brutality of Jesus' persecution.

Further intertextual allusions to the Jewish scriptures shape the crucifixion accounts (consult Kermode 1980 110f. for an incomplete list). Here, the authors of the Gospels

²¹⁸ Editorial comments that “interpret an event in the life of Jesus by means of prophecies found in the Jewish Scriptures” (Koenig 1979: 82). Harnack comments: “In dieser Formel erscheint das Verhältnis von Weissagung und Erfüllung recht eigentlich umgekehrt. Die Weissagung ist hier nicht mehr ‚der Schatten des Zukünftigen‘, sondern, das Zukünftige‘ besitzt seinen Werth darin, dass es geweissagt worden ist. [...] Christus hat den Kreuzestod erlitten damit die Schrift erfüllet würde“ (Harnack 1883: 58).

increasingly overwrite the (likely) behavior of the Roman persecutors and connect this instead to a section in the Jewish scriptures (cf. Ibid.: 112) pointing to a mounting desire among the authors to prove Jesus' divinity. Tying Jesus life and death to divine will (see e.g. the allusion to Is. 6:9f. in Mk. 4:11f.) the Gospels "prove" the continuity of Jesus' actions with the Jewish scriptures and thus, Jesus' status as the foretold Messiah (see Culpepper 2001: 79f.). Sanders and Davies note:

"The tradition about Jesus had another source of 'information' than the remembered words and deeds of Jesus. It also had the Scripture, which he was believed to have fulfilled, and which therefore could be called on to give significance to the account of his life" (Sanders/Davies 1994: 297).

One is led to ponder the interrelation between the intertextual fabric the Gospels offer as an account of Jesus' life and the actual transmission of the remembered word and deeds of the historical Jesus. For, as Kermode notes, "the narrative must continue to *seem* factual [...] despite the competing demands of the figural plot, and the necessities of ideology" (Kermode 1980: 112f.). It is probable to assume that the authors were not free to invent their own account but had to reconstruct a narrative integrating certain coordinates people knew to be true. This produces a surplus meaning surpassing the portrayal of Jesus as the anointed one (a special kind of "reality effect", cf. *ibid.*). At the same time, Sanders and Davies note that Jesus himself may have at a certain point behaved according to prophecy:

"Scriptural motifs could appear in Matthew because Jesus himself modelled his ministry, at least in some respects, on the biblical prophets. [...] Matthew, for example, may have written that Jesus went up on a mountain because he actually did so; yet once he was on the mountain he became, in Matthew, a kind of second Moses" (Sanders/Davies 1994: 258).

One may be led to wonder whether the people featuring in Christian accounts actually behaved according to Jewish prophecy, e.g. the stories of Christian martyrs told in Acts of the Apostles, or the Martyrdom of Ignatius or Polycarp. This renders it all the more difficult to decide upon the question whether an account was written to fit the Jewish scriptures or whether the individual behaved according to its example (see Ehrman 2003: 137-139²¹⁹). Consider also the death of Cyprian during the Valerian persecutions. Green

²¹⁹ Ehrman notes on martyrdom in early Christianity: (1) it was taken as a proof of faith by proto-Catholic authors such as Tertullian (see Ehrman 2003: 139f.); (2) it had a close connection to a specific theological position specific to proto-Catholic Orthodoxy. "The emphasis on Jesus' real flesh-and-blood existence and, as a consequence, his real suffering is tied to the claim that willingness to suffer physical martyrdom

describes it as such:

“Cyprian's execution on 14 September 258 was almost liturgical as he seemed wholly in control of the choreography of his death, flanked by his deacons, attended by a chanting crowd of the faithful, with handkerchiefs and towels placed in front of him to soak up the blood as relics for his people” (Green 2010: 166).

This short excursion demonstrates how Christians may have picked up the formal structure of the Gospels and emulated their narrative (see Simon 1986: 119). In a way, those biographies and textual accounts develop a second-level intertextuality by following a sequence of events similar to the Passion narrative that in turn is an emulation of the Jewish scriptures. All of these aspects render it almost impossible to determine the actual empirical behavior lying behind those accounts, as they may point to an actual behavior but may also express a theological desire (see chapter 4.3.3). In any way, it becomes extremely difficult to determine whether there were any empirical Jews behind “the Jews” of those accounts. However, given that the empirical Jews did not have any desire to fulfill the prophecy according to Christian interpretation (such as that the Jews have always persecuted their prophets), it is rather unlikely that those accounts can claim any empirical truth when it comes to Jewish behaviour if it is not supported by non-Christian sources²²⁰. This leads to the assumption that “the Jews” in early Christian texts primarily point to the theological framework of the respective author.

*

While all Evangelists agree on – albeit different degrees – of a Jewish guilt for the persecution of Jesus, there are a number of remarkable dissimilarities (see Isaac 1968: 384-390). For example, the scream “His blood be on us, and on our children” appears

is somehow a proof of one's theological views” (ibid.: 152).

²²⁰ Taylor takes an extreme position when arguing: “To the extent that the Judaism portrayed by the church fathers is recognized as a figurative entity which emerges out of Christian theorizing about Christianity, it cannot simultaneously be interpreted as referring to a living Judaism from which useful information can be gleaned about Jewish-Christian interaction” (Taylor 1995: 141). While the present study agrees that there is a need for theoretical reflection and a better conceptualization of the connection between the intertextual and the empirical it does not necessarily follow that an intertextual reference renders a connection to the empirical reality impossible. There are at least three possible connections: (1) empirical reality can correspond with the intertextual, e.g. because the subject already behaved correspondingly (as in the case of martyrs, see Green 2010: 166); (2) empirical reality can appear in the absence of intertextual reference, in an inconsistency of the pattern; (3) empirical reality appears through the intertextual as a specific way of “putting things” in a time when the bible was taken as highest authority (see Simon 1986: 214f.; Lieu 1996). The present study calls in question, however, that there is a causal connection between empirical reality and formation of an episteme of antisemitism in proto-Catholic writing.

only once in the Gospel of Matthew (Mt. 27:25). Luke does not mention the custom of freeing a prisoner so essential for the Barnabas-scene (depending on the sources Barnabas was a rebel, a robber or a murderer who was released instead of Jesus²²¹). While Mark explains the ignorance of the Judean people by the secrecy of Jesus' epiphany as Messiah, John turns to "the Jews" as the ones responsible for their own obduracy (see Dibelius 1967: 297f.). Then again, he omits the presence of Jewish crowds during Jesus' conviction (see John 19:6). On the Lukean version of the Passion narrative, Sanders notes:

"Luke's altering the received tradition of the passion narrative in the direction of greater Jewish culpability in the death of Jesus represents more a theological tendency than a historical tradition. Furthermore, the fact that the same Jewish religious leaders appear so routinely in Acts rather woodenly working the same mischief on the church that they worked on Jesus casts a thick shadow of doubt on the historicity of those accounts. It seems likely that Luke's portrayal of the Jewish religious leaders throughout Acts is based at least as much on his theological notion of symmetry between Jesus and the church as it is on any sources or historical tradition" (Sanders 1987: 18f.).

Matthew's "his blood be on us and on our children" stands out as one of the most frequent justifications for a Christian rejection of "the Jews" on religious grounds. However, the traditional interpretation that this passage describes a Jewish acceptance of their own guilt may be misleading by itself. Isaac and Schelkle point out that the phrase "blood be on us" is an allusion to the Jewish scriptures (see 2 Samuel 1:16; cf. Isaac 1968: 395; Schelkle 1967: 148f.). In the cases of Lev. 20:9; Jos. 2:19; 1 Kings 2:32f., the person uttering this phrase takes responsibility for a *specific act* and accepts death as a punishment (see *ibid.*: 148). Matthew may thus intend to put a juristic emphasis on the accusation brought forward by the gathered crowd ("we and our children believe this man to be guilty", see *ibid.* 1967: 149).

In addition to those biblical references, the Gospel of Matthew usually refers to Jesus' blood as a promise for forgiveness, atonement and salvation (e.g. Mt. 26:28). Possibly, then, Matthew did not intend to describe an intergenerational Jewish acceptance of responsibility for the condemnation of Jesus. Matthew's intention may have been to supply an explanation for the historical events – the destruction of the temple – and portray it as a divine punishment. This goes well with Levine's argument that "all the people" (Mt. 27:25) refers to "all the people of Jerusalem" (see Levine 1999: 34).

²²¹ However, the Matthean passage echoes in Acts 5:28; 18:6 and 20:26.

Schelkle affirms this when noting that the phrase “and on our children” could be taken as direct reference to the suffering of the Judean Jewish communities after the first Judaeo-Roman war (see Schelkle 1967: 152; cf. Hare 1979: 38). Matthew may not have intended to construct “the Jews” as arch-enemies to Christianity but to interpret recent history with regard to his own soteriology (see Frankemölle 1999: 97-102).

*

Douglas Hare notes on the establishment of a proto-Orthodox tradition of interpreting the Gospels:

“from the time of Justin, if not from the time of Acts, the proposition that Jewish hostility was primarily responsible for the church's sufferings was a *theological convention* requiring little or no evidence in its support” (Hare 1967a: 456; cf. Kampling 1984).

Accordingly, authors such as Tertullian interpreted Matthew 27:25 according to this conviction as evidence that “the Jews” had accepted responsibility (“his blood be on us”) for the crucifixion of Jesus for themselves and the generations to come (“and on our children”) (see Tert. Adv. Marc. 2.15, cf. Schelkle 1967: 155). Facing this lock-in of (anti-Jewish) interpretation, Boyarin asks for the effect theological conventions had on interpretation in the crucifixion-narrative of the Gospels:

“Perhaps his [Jesus] followers saw him arisen, but surely this must be because they had a narrative that led them to expect such appearances, and not that the appearances gave rise to the narrative” (Boyarin 2012: 159).

As pointed out in the previous section, the Passion narrative fulfils a variety of functions. It is rendered as a fulfillment of the Jewish prophecy for proving Jesus’ divinity. It allows for a distance to empirical Judaism and decenters Roman responsibility to soothe internal and external socio-political tensions and possibly to attract new converts (see Winter 1967: 97; 103). By distinguishing “Jesus” from the common type of prophet-rebel of his day and by making him the victim of an internal spiritual affair, Christ-believers are exonerated from charges of political conspiracy. Thus, the Passion narrative may well be at the centre of a Christian strategy to meet those contemporary demands. They (1) construct an affirmative position towards Jewish prophecy and scriptures (antiquity/continuity); (2) clarify the superiority of Jesus’ interpretation of the Jewish scriptures (supersession) and (3) improve the relationship with Rome, its authorities and

people (mission and defense against criminalization).

More than Paul, the Gospels employ “the Jews” as a tool to solve problems independent from the things that had or had not happened to Jesus and his followers during his lifetime. A prototype for this development can be found in the shifting personnel addressed. While earlier narratives tend to describe the life of Jesus within a differentiated society, these groups gradually give way for “the Jews” as a solid mass which ultimately becomes a symbol for the (evil) world (illustrated by a shifting portrayal of the Jewish mass in the synoptic Gospels, see Mk. 15:9-14 to Mt. 27:18-25 to Lk 23:4-23²²²). This is most apparent in writings that make an excessive use of “the Jews” – the Gospel of John and Luke-Acts (see the next section). Its most decisive proponent, John, does not just designate to all living Jews the status of principal antagonists, it also marks the whole body of the faithful as (potential) victims.

The present section demonstrated among other things that it is improbable to assume that the empirical Jews are causal for the role “the Jews” assume in the Gospel texts. Rather, “the Jews” appear as a separate discursive entity situated in a separate causal framework. Their multiple functional dimensions make it hard to offer a conclusive answer to the question of the historical events as the concern of the Gospels to prove Jesus’ divinity overwrites historical reality. The fact that those accounts continued to serve the needs of proto-Catholic Christianity may provide further evidence of their spiritual functionality to later interpreters (see chapter 5.2).

4.3.3 Interpreting Scripture/Scripting History

“in the misfortunes of the Jewish people, in the dissolution of the state and in subsequent Jewish defeats, the Christians found definite confirmation of their belief that God was displeased with the Jews and no longer wanted the continuance of the people” (Grayzel 1946: 84)

The following section turns to the relationship between exegesis and empirical reality in

²²² Paul Winter notes in the spirit of Dibelius/Bultmann: “What the Gospels tell us of the life, and in particular of the trial, of Jesus is not a historical account of what actually took place, but is a representation of the manner in which the Passion of the Lord was interpreted in certain early Christian circles. Not written with any historical aim but with a religious one, the Gospels may affect the outward form of a biography, but they are much rather theological treatises based on collective traditions and incorporating communal preaching about Jesus as it had developed over a period of several decades” (Winter 1974: 3).

the Gospels. The primacy of the prophetic interpretation is characteristic for an early exegetic strategy among Christ-believers (such as Paul or the Gospels). This interpretation entails a tautological loop between prophecy – Jerusalem will be destroyed because of the culpability of the Jews – and the event – because Jerusalem was destroyed, the Jews must be guilty²²³. The destruction of the temple ties a proof of Jesus' messianity to the loss of divine favor for the Jewish people (and its transference to the Christian side; see Mt. 22:2-14; 23:38f.; 24:1-3; Mk. 13:1f.; Lk. 14:16-24; 19:41-44; 21:6, 20-24²²⁴). The destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem is thus understood as divine punishment for Jewish ignorance with its destruction proving yet again the spiritual culpability of "the Jews" (see Kampling 1990: 128f.²²⁵). Likewise, the primacy of the prophetic may imply a total inversion of the relationship between the historical and the prophetic. Since Jesus had been the Jewish Messiah and since the Jewish scriptures says the Jewish people always persecuted their prophets, "the Jews" had to have the major share in Jesus' crucifixion as well (see e.g. Mt. 23: 29-32, 37; Acts 7:52²²⁶). Ruether points to a "dogmatic necessity for the fact that the Prophet-King-Son of man is not only to be unheard by an unbelieving people, but that *it was predicted that he should be killed by them*" (Ruether 1997: 90²²⁷).

The desire to make sense of Jesus' crucifixion inspired a historiography that rendered the historical events within the framework of Jewish prophecy from a Christian point of view. The Pauline construction of a pre-Christian history and the allegorical re-interpretation of some central stories from the Jewish scriptures can serve as an example. Paul constructs a conception of time in which "the Jews" hold a central position. *Because* the Law of "the Jews" had not been sufficient to provide salvation, the Messiah had to come in the person

²²³ "der Satz 'Jerusalem wurde zerstört wegen der Schuld der Juden' geht mit dem Satz ursächlich einher: 'da Jerusalem zerstört wurde, sind die Juden schuldig'" (Kampling 1984: 51, Anm. 174)

²²⁴ cf. Hare 1979: 39. The topos of a transfer of divine election is elaborated in the parable of the vineyard (see Mk 12:1-12; Mt 21:28-46; Lk 20:9-19; cf. Jn. 15). It reappears in subsequent proto-Catholic writings, see e.g. Tert. Adv. Jud. 10.19; 13.28; Adv. Marc. 3.23f.

²²⁵ Two alternative interpretations of the destruction of the temple from a non-believing Jewish side: (1) orthodox Judaism argued the other way around that God had punished Judaism for the toleration of heretic sects and (2) crucifixion was taken by most of the Jewish contemporary as a divine verdict over the person crucified. The way Jesus was murdered thus proved his non-divine status (see Blank 1990: 52f.)

²²⁶ cf. Just. Adv. Jud. 9. The accusation of prophet killing derives either from Jeremiah (2:30), "your own sword hath devoured your prophets, like a destroying lion", or Elijah (1. Kings 19:10, 14), "the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away". While a common accusation in the Jewish prophetic tradition, the killing of prophets seems to have been a rare historical event in Jewish history. Secharja (Zechariah) ben Johada is the only prophet recorded to have died in Jerusalem and present in the canonized Jewish scriptures (2 Chron. 24:17-22; see Schoeps 1943: 17-20). Secharja is also the only prophet Matthew's Jesus mentions by name (Mt. 23:35).

²²⁷ For early interpreters, the rejection of Jesus by the majority of the Jewish people is explained as either a theological necessity for the salvation of the Gentiles (Paul) or the result of an enduring historical ignorance of the Jewish people (see Jn. 5:18-47; Acts 13:27-29). Paul's last words to the Roman Jews recorded in Luke-Acts underline the theological necessity of this unbelief to justify a Gentile mission (see Acts 27:27f.; echoing Isaiah 6:9f.).

of Jesus. *Because* “the Jews” had failed to recognize Jesus as the Messiah, the destruction of their temple and the following dispersion from Judea had followed. Divine favor had now shifted to the Christians as apparent by the success of their mission (see Chapman 1967: 71²²⁸). This prophetic interpretation is very productive in arranging events from the empirical sphere. It has been argued above that it also effects the structure of the historical narration (e.g. characters that behave according to prophetic expectation). Furthermore, this framework points towards the subsequent interpretation of the Christian texts themselves (e.g. the interpretation of Mt. 27:25 by later proto-Catholic authors²²⁹). This tendency to explain historical events through the lens of prophecy will be called an “eschatologizing of history”.

To be sure, understanding history as a sign of God's favor was an interpretative strategy prominent in Roman times, e.g. among writers such as Cicero or Apion (see Rokeah 1982: 168f.). The Gospels share this interpretation of historical events according to allegorical exegesis. While the works of the Jewish philosopher Philo may have served as concrete blueprint for this allegorical interpretation, the technique of allegorical interpretation was part of the regular interpretation in antiquity (see Frankemölle 1994: 68f.). Yet Philo maintained that the literal and the allegorical interpretation would have to be kept in balance (see Leighton 1994: 34f., cf. Rokeah 1982: 95-97, 125). In Christian theologizing, however, the allegorical reading was to gain an immense priority over the literal reading. Frankemölle mentions two other techniques relevant for an early interpretation of the Jewish scriptures among Christ-believers – the *typological reading/pesher*, i.e. the interpretation of events in certain characters in the Jewish scriptures as prefiguration of contemporary events (e.g. the story of Jacob and Esau as prefiguration of the relationship between Church and synagogue) and the haggadic midrash as the creation of a narrative from Bible verses and references (e.g. the story of Jesus entering Jerusalem on a donkey, thereby fulfilling Jewish prophecy in Mt. 21.4f; see Frankemölle 1994: 69-73).

*

²²⁸ However, Christian authors continued to praise Jewish forefathers as the “progenitors of the sciences” (Rokeah 1982: 215). With this, they defended the antiquity of Christianity against the Pagan claim to culture, science and civilization (see *ibid.*). The latter aspect points to the main addressee of Christian writings – Pagan converts and the Pagan world. In this process, the Jewish tradition increasingly became a semantic position for a proto-Catholic conception of the faith vis-à-vis a Pagan public.

²²⁹ As the Christian interpretation became increasingly dominant, it started to extend its interpretation of history to the production of historical facts. A direct result from Christian policies, medieval theologians assumed that the misery of Jewish communities (a product of Christian policies) testified to their fallenness from divine grace. This underlines the way Christianity increasingly tilted the balance between theology and world in favor of the former

The authors of the Gospels react to multiple problem areas – the violent death of Jesus and the continued oppression by the Roman officials, the lack of success of the Jewish mission and the question of theological self-sufficiency. With the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., Christian communities plunged into an ever deeper theological crisis (see Brandon 1957: 203). Had Jesus not taught that the fall of the temple and the return of Christ (*Parousia*) would coincide (Mk. 13:3-5)? Why did he now fail to return after his prophecy had so marvelously come true? The Gospels give different answers to this problem. Mark continues to express faith in the *Parousia* during the lifetime of his own generation (Mk. 13:30) but sounds a note of caution on the time of its realization (e.g. Mk. 13:10, 32). Matthew 22:7 also adopts a cautious position on the seriality of events – destruction of the temple and *Parousia*, noting that the latter would be following by an interval of undeterminable length (see Mt. 23:38f.; 24:1ff.). Luke elaborates on this by downplaying the historical closeness of the end of days (see Lk. 17:20f.; 19:11ff.; Acts 1:6f.) and diluting “the passages in Mark which his readers might take as predictions of a *imminent Parousia*” (Koenig 1979: 99; see e.g. Mk. 13:30-32 → Mt. 24:34-36). Consider the following passage in Acts:

“It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth” (Acts 1:7f.; cf. Lk 17:22-24; Mk. 13:32; Mt. 24:36).

Once *Parousia* and the destruction of the temple have been pulled apart, the event of final redemption gains the quality of a future-event. Thus prolonging the time of redemption to an indefinite length, the Gospels manage to integrate unredeemed man, the messianic era and final salvation in one historical perspective (see Ruether 1997: 247). A flip-side to the eschatologizing of history, this “historicizing of eschatology” is central to the development of the proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism. In this conception, “the Jews” do not only constitute the beginning and end-point of history (as ignorant, carnal, prophet-persecuting people and as the witnesses to Jesus’ return) but the conception of the intermediate period also relies on “the Jews” negativity. This “becomes Judaism’s ongoing historical identity to the end of time” (Ruether 1997: 240). With the growing primacy of the discursive vis-à-vis the empirical surrounding, the empirical Jews were identified with their image in Christian theology (see e.g. Acts 7:51f.).

One of the characteristic aspects of the proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism is the causal primacy of the discursive Jews over the empirical Jewish reality. The “Jews” in

Christian discourse are marked by an almost complete inversion of a Jewish self-understanding. While, in Jewish tradition, the critique of the prophets functions as a corrective, it now becomes a proof for the historical wickedness of the Jewish people (prophet-killing); while in Judaism, circumcision is a sign of divine chosenness, it now becomes a sign for Jewish disbelief. This schismatic conception fuses the messianic sectarian dualism which had opposed unredeemed history to the messianic era with Greek dualisms opposing body and spirit (of which one can find its most mature development in the Gospel of John).

4.3.4 “The Jews” in the New Testament

While the term “the Jews” (*Ioudaios*, pl., *Ioudioi*) appears 71 times in John and more than 80 times in Acts, it appears less than 30 times across the other Gospel accounts. In particular in John’s Passion narrative, these “Jews” are acting collectively as the enemy of Jesus, the son of God. It is crucial to note, however, that the term does not always carry a negative connotation²³⁰. Also, it is not evenly distributed throughout Luke/Acts as it clusters around later passages (see Townsend 1979: 80). Townsend takes the traditional view that this concentration reflects the change of setting of the Christian mission from a Judean to a predominantly Greek context. In this perspective, then, the juxtaposition of “Jews” and “Gentiles” is understood as an illustration of the change in Christianity’s shape and composition. John Gager offers an alternative interpretation when arguing that the semantic changes in Acts mirror an increasing distance the author of Luke sees between Judaism and faith in Jesus. Acts reconstructs this distance symbolically as it is “structured around the movement from Jewish Jerusalem to gentile Rome” (Gager 1983: 150). Paul’s last words in Acts echo this development:

“[...] Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people [the Jews], and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive: For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it” (Acts 25-28).

²³⁰ see Townsend 1979: 79; Smith 1990: 80, Ruether 1997: 89f.; critical Koenig 1979: 114, fn. 15.

As pointed out above, the establishment of “the Jews” as first addressees of the gospel and their ultimate rejection is a necessary and important precondition for Luke to justify the change of the missionary focus to the Gentiles. At the same time, Luke seems to regard Christianity as a religion already remote from Judaism as he avoids the adjective “Jewish” when “talking about Christianity qua Christianity” (Ruether 1997: 90). The term “Jews” appears in a hostile setting in 45 cases (see *ibid.*: 89²³¹). The reoccurring theme of persecution by Jewish adversaries can be regarded as another application of the theme of Jewish depravity. Likewise, the Jerusalem Temple is depicted as a monument to Israel's disobedience, underlining the illegitimacy of non-Christian Judaism (see Acts 7:42ff.; 17:24ff.). The character embodying this conception in Acts is Stephen. In his speech, Stephen raises the theme of Jewish obduracy and attacks the Jewish high priests for their temple worship (see Acts 7:1-53). Instead of the temple, Stephen argues, “the Jews” should worship Jesus as Christ (see Acts 47-50). Even in the sketchy and biased account Luke gives of the circumstances, the controversial nature of Stephen's position among other Christians emerges clearly from the text (see Brandon 1957: 127-129).

Acts is a reconstruction of the history of the early Church as Luke has come to see it. In this sense, the story of Stephen “bridge[s] the gap between the two distinct cycles of tradition from which Luke constructs his account of Christian Origins” (Brandon 1957: 129). This is illustrated with force in the concluding section of Stephen's speech, ending with a slur similar to parts of the Johannine Gospel:

“Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers *did*, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers: Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept *it*” (Acts: 51-53).

The inclusion of Acts into the canon of the New Testament demonstrates the increasing claim of Gentile Christians to a Jewish position. With this, the Pauline juxtaposition of “Jews” and “Greeks” is shifted to the opposition of “Jews” and “Christians”. In a way, the Gospel of John moves further down this road.

*

²³¹ for a discussion of anti-Judaism in Luke, see Reese 1991.

The Johannine account is constructed around the word-pairs carnal and spiritual, old and new, finite and eternal, dark and bright (see Ruether 1997: 111). The carnal world on the one hand is depicted as the world of old, of darkness and finitude that has come to an end with the advent of the Messiah. It follows the wrong principles and knows nothing of the redeemed world that is bright, eternal and spiritual. For John, Jesus has fulfilled the Mosaic Law (see Jn. 1:17) just as Jesus' body has replaced the Temple in Jerusalem (see *ibid.* 2:18-22). The Mosaic Law and the Temple both belonged to the carnal world. From the point of Jesus' coming, the only way to redemption is through faith in Jesus:

“He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the porter openeth; [...] Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep. All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them. I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture” (Jn. 10: 1-3; 7-9, cf. Jn. 4:6-15; 5:19-47; 6:27-35, 48-58; 8:24-27).

Light and darkness, life and death, God and the devil, believing and non-believing, accepting and not accepting, doing good and doing evil, loving and hating... The soteriology of John consistently identifies the negative side of this list of dichotomous constructions with “the Jews”. In this dualistic argument Jesus testifies to the divine truth by three aspects: He is without sin (see Jn. 8:46; cf. 18:29-38; 19:4,6), he is sent by God (see Jn. 8:42; cf. 3:17, 34; 5:23, 24, 30; 7:16, 33; 8:16; 11:42, etc.) and his coming has been foretold in the Jewish scriptures (see Jn. 8:38, 40, 42). Since Jesus' words and deeds are by definition equal to the truth and since “the Jews” do not believe in Jesus (see Jn. 8:42), their words and deeds cannot possibly derive from God or Abraham. In John's dualistic scheme, therefore, the only possible father for these actions can be the devil (see Jn. 8:34-47²³²):

“Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not” (John 8:44f.; cf. Matthew 3:9f).

²³² “Die Kennzeichnung der Juden als Teufelssöhne ist eine der theologischen Reflexion des vierten Evangelisten entsprungene historische Konkretion seines Dualismus, mit dessen Hilfe er die Krisis-Funktion des Logos als des Offenbarers herausarbeitet. Durch diese Krisis wird die Welt gespalten in Licht und Finsternis, Leben und Tod, Glaube und Unglaube, Gott und Teufel. Das Phänomen des jüdischen Unglaubens aber wird auf dieser hohen Ebene theologischer Reflexion zum Demonstrationsobjekt für eben diese Krisis” (Gräßer 1967: 166).

John's Jesus denies "the Jews" the right to call themselves children of Abraham. Because they do not believe in Jesus' divinity and strive to kill him, they are *not* Abraham's sons but of the devil (see Gräßer 1967: 163-165). "The Jews" thus become the signifier for both, the carnal man and the old man, the incarnation of the wrong and apostate principals of the fallen world itself (see Ruether 1997: 111, 240). Rosemary Ruether comments that "the Jews" in John "become[...] a hostile symbol for all that resists and rejects the gospel" (ibid.: 89).

While the Synoptic Gospels maintain a difference between faithful past and a contemporary fall from grace John adopts a conception where "the Jews" *never* knew God (see Jn. 5:37-47; 8:19, 24-27, 47; 14:7; 15:21-23; 16:3²³³). Mark employs the topos of Jewish ignorance (see Mk. 3:31-34; 4:11f.; 6:1-5) to explain the difference between faith in Jesus and Judaism. John, on the other hand, integrates Jewish non-recognition of Christ into the greater dualistic scheme of his theological argument (the following in Gräßer 1967: 165f.). Arguing that "the Jews" have never known God, "the Jews" are disconnected from salvation except through faith in him (see e.g. Jn. 8:34-47; 10:7-9; 14:6). This opens a discursive field for John's Jesus to occupy the very space that had previously been reserved to the Jewish people. Thus, Jesus assumes the position of the new Temple (Jn. 2:19-21) and the true fulfillment of the divine commandments (Jn. 1:17; 7:37f.; 14:6f.). The dispossession is based on a denigration of "the Jews" and is accompanied by a series of positive references to the term "Israel" (see Jn 1:31, 47, 49; 3:10; 12:13²³⁴).

The Johannine depiction of "the Jews" thus also provides a proof to Jesus' divinity. The fact that "the Jews" do not see the truth of God manifest in Christ and, ultimately, kill him even *testifies* to Jesus' truth (see Jn. 15:19-23; 16:2f.; cf. Lk. 6:26).

"And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape. And ye have not his word abiding in you: for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not. Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life" (Jn. 5:37-40).

²³³ This prepares for the charge of "deicide" where "the Jews" in killing Jesus, commit the religious crime of rejection and murder, not merely of God's prophet, but of God's revealed self-expression" (Ruether 1997: 114; cf. Baron 1952: 72; also Isaac 1968: 373; Simon 1986: 118).

²³⁴ Chapter 5 will examine how this double-strategy of appreciation and appropriation reappears in the proto-Catholic reaction to Marion.

Throughout John's account, "the Jews" are rendered as a threat to Jesus and his followers (see e.g. Jn. 5:16ff.; 6:41, 52; 8:52-59; 10:31-39; 18:36; 20:19), for example when Jesus remains in Galilee avoiding Judea because "the Jews" are said to be looking for a chance to kill him (see Jn. 7:1; cf. 7:12; 12:42). Likewise, following the crucifixion, John's disciples are again hiding behind locked doors "for fear of the Jews" (Jn. 20:19). The depiction of Jewish wickedness is developed further in the narrative of the Passion where all "the Jews" demand Jesus' death (see Jn. 18:31, 40; 19:7, 12, 15). John's invective against "the Jews" as children of the devil testifies to the divinity of Jesus *because* as children of the devil they must reject all that is divine just as their rejection marks the divine. And since "the Jews" in John come to embody the principle of darkness they *continue* to persecute the divine Christians²³⁵. The German scholar Micha Brumlik comments: "Es gehört in dieser Perspektive zum satanischen Wesen der Juden, *Jesus nicht erkennen zu können und somit verfolgen zu müssen*" (Brumlik 1990: 9, italics original).

*

In John's account, world and Jews form one demonic complex (see Jn. 1:10; 7:7; 15:18f.; 17:25). In the tradition of Bultman, Kierspel points to this amalgamation as an argument *against* an anti-Jewish reading of the Johannine Gospel (Kierspel 2006: 12). As "the Jews" designate "humanity in general, including Gentiles" (ibid.) it is "an illustration of the world's opposition against the church" (ibid.: 182) situating the historical account "in a post-Easter context of universal hate and persecution" (ibid.: 213). Since John aims at the world and not only the empirical Jews, it is not the Gospel that carries antisemitism but its subsequent interpreters (see ibid.: 12; cf. De Jonge 2001; Grässer 1964). Kierspel's conception rests on the notion that anti-Judaism is a discourse directed against Jews. If the empirical Jews are not attacked, it is not antisemitism!²³⁶ Osten-Sacken criticized the

²³⁵ In a sense, this is an inversion of the argument made by Rosemary Ruether who argues that John asserts the Jews have never known God because "by rejecting christological exegesis of the Scriptures, [they] are completely incapable of knowing their true meaning or of finding in the true knowledge of God" (Ruether 1997: 112). By inverting cause and effect in Ruether's argument the *functional dimension* of John's position is highlighted. It is not the Jews who refuse to accept Christian exegesis but Christian exegesis trying to connect Jesus' death to the Jewish scriptures leading to a construction of empirical Judaism as ignorant and blind to God's truth. Interpreted in such a way, this position is not a radicalization but an alternative interpretation to the Pauline argument for an *Ekklesia* made up of Gentiles and Jews alike. While Paul appears to write in a context of Jewish and Gentile encounter the theology of John neglects real Jews or is written in a situation, when the author considers Jews lost to his faith.

²³⁶ De Jonge's conclusions rests on the same logic – by proving the detachment from empirical Judaism one also disproves its supposed anti-Jewish character. While De Jonge's hypothesis that John aimed his polemics at competing Christians is inspiring, the present study does not agree with his conclusion that "the Fourth Gospel *appears* to be anti-Jewish, but [...] is *in fact* directed against non-Johannine

course of this argument in an essay from 1976, noting:

“Die Stilisierung der Juden zu Typen ist zu allen Zeiten Kennzeichen von Antijudaismus gewesen. Gerade die Typisierung trifft die empirisch Existierenden am härtesten: Notfalls, in actu, wird eine Ausnahme konzidiert, aber grundsätzlich ist der Typus festgelegt (Osten-Sacken 1976: 168²³⁷).

The fact that the use the Johannine Gospel makes of “the Jews” is one more of “rhetoric than of calculated prejudice” (Dunn 1992: 201) in no way relieves John of the charge that he perceives the world through “the Jews”. When John puts “the Jews” as a *pars pro toto* for the world he supplies a *locus classicus* for antisemitism as it is defined in this work. The accompanying detachment of “the Jews” from their empirical referent can be regarded one central effect of antisemitism. Once the empirical referent has been taken out of the equation, “the Jews” can move freely as signifiers in a Christian theological framework. This detachment is crucial for the following chapters of this work.

While Paul had argued for the acceptance of Gentiles as Gentiles into the covenant of Jewish Israel, Luke's Gospel had shifted the frame of the argument by introducing the idea of a temporary dispossession of “the Jews”. However, Luke still allows for the idea of ultimate return to salvation. With John, the empirical Jews disappear behind “the Jews” as symbol for the faithless world. In the Johannine drama, Jesus subsequently assumes the vacant position of covenant, Torah and temple. One is led to conclude that the Gospels mirror a movement away from Judaism while continuing to claim Jewish tradition and prophecy. This is the context for the formation of “the Jews” in the New Testament. It is surely correct that John intended to amplify “the identity and salvific role of Jesus” (Reinhartz 2001: 354). Also in this sense, then, anti-Judaism appears as a “by-product” (ibid.) to theological considerations. However, this “by-product” demonstrated a curious tendency to stick to proto-Catholic thought and, ultimately, a Christian identity.

Christians” (De Jonge 2001: 241). David Rensberger presents another attempt at exonerating John. Rensberger argues that John's position at the fringes of the Jewish community renders any charge of anti-Judaism meaningless (see Rensberger 1999: 152f.). Connecting the term to the question of power, Rensberger concludes that John's language “was not an instrument of oppression, since its speakers and hearers lacked the power to oppress anyone” (ibid.: 152). A discussion would thus have to focus on both – the relation of power to anti-Judaism/antisemitism and the position of the Johannine community vis-à-vis Judaism. The notion of power as a qualifying instance for antisemitism moves close to what Peter Schäfer calls the “highly problematic criterion” (Schäfer 1998: 200) of “the degree of quantity and intensity” (ibid.). The latter point remains a matter of dispute though it seems important to note that an insistence on continuity with the eschatological “Israel” makes for a weak argument, as it is adopted seamlessly by the following proto-Catholic writers.

²³⁷ cf. Theißen 1990: 548 and Bartsch's reaction to Gräßer recorded in Stöhr 1967: 210f.

4.4 Conclusion - Is the New Testament anti-Judaic?

The preceding paragraphs have demonstrated how Paul's Epistles, the Gospels and Acts focus their accounts on proving that Jesus's life and death was a fulfillment of Jewish prophecy. In those writings, intertextuality thus takes precedence over the historical events. The detachment of the empirical from the discursive Jews is therefore another central operation. Also, a new exegesis is put in place. While the biblical passages of prophetic or divine condemnation had originally served as a tool for self-critique, they were now employed as proof of the depravity of the Jewish people, their viciousness towards their own prophets and their ignorance of God's will. The "Christological hermeneutic" of the New Testament texts thus increasingly designates all positive prophecy to Christianity and all negative remarks to Jewish characters. The recipients of contempt shift from "the authorities" (high priests, elders, Romans) to the anonymous Jewish masses, culminating in "the Jews" as semantic position marking an antagonistic principle to the Christian position (epistemic stage). This increasing culpability of the Jewish side coincides with a reduction of the Roman responsibility for the crucifixion, pointing to socio-political and theological background motivating the specific arrangement of characters among the accounts. Paul, Acts and the Gospels thus reflect upon the contemporary situation of their composition (as opposed to the historicity suggested by the Gospel accounts). In this context, the discursive Jews emerge as central signifiers for a construction of a Christian self that was under increasing pressure through internal and external political, theological and social challenges (cf. chapter 6.1).

As demonstrated in the following chapters, Christian authors of the second century bundled up the diverse theological tendencies present in the New Testament texts²³⁸. A negative perception of "the Jews" subsequently moved to the center of proto-Catholic self-perception. If one were to assemble a list of those writings in the New Testament that ended up being used for anti-Jewish polemics, it would have to include almost every text (see Kampling 1990: 123). This observation leads the German theologian Rainer Kampling to the question as to whether anti-Judaism was already imbued in the Gospel's intention (see Kampling 1999c: 11). As noted above, giving an answer to this question is

²³⁸ In this sense, Boyarin is right in claiming "that Christianity hijacked not only the Old Testament but the New Testament as well by turning that thoroughly Jewish text away from its cultural origins among the Jewish communities of Palestine in the first century and making it an attack on the traditions of the Jews" (Boyarin 2012: 157). If one is not willing to judge all problematic sections in the New Testament as later interpolations, one arrives at the double conclusion: not only was the New Testament appropriated by later Christian writers but its texts already supply a specific interpretation and reworking of Jewish traditions.

made complicated by the fact that the victory of Catholicism shaped not only the way the New Testament has been interpreted but also the textual substance itself (cf. chapter 2.4.1) For Kampling, this demands a focus on genealogy:

“Angesichts dieses Rezeptionsverhaltens, das vom unmittelbaren Verwertungsinteresse der jeweiligen Autoren und ihres Umfeldes geprägt war, lautet bei unserem Thema die Leitfrage nicht: Welche Texte des Neuen Testaments enthalten Polemik gegen Juden? Sondern: Welche Texte wurden in den Dienst antijudaistische Argumentation gestellt? Und als Zusatzfrage: Lassen sich in der Rezeption die Bevorzugung gewisser theologischer Denkmodelle und Texte erkennen? Gibt es neutestamentliche Texte, die aufgrund bestimmter Elemente eher für eine antijudaistische Aneignung geeignet waren als andere?” (Kampling 1990: 123).

Kampling and others have concluded that an anti-Judaic reading of the New Testament results from interpretation, i.e. the theological perspective and heuristic of subsequent interpreters²³⁹. Indeed, there is no convincing proof for an initial Judeo-Christian antagonism as the two entities had not yet been created. Grayzel concludes somewhat romantically “[n]ot in hatred but love for Judaism was Christianity born” (Grayzel 1946: 80). The present work has demonstrated this aspect by a re-interpretation of Paul’s Epistles in its Jewish framework²⁴⁰. Against Kampling’s focus on interpretation there are also scholars like Lutz or Levine putting responsibility back on the texts themselves. Lutz’ comments:

“Es genügt bei weitem nicht, das Neue Testament von seinen späteren antijüdischen *Wirkungen* zu befreien, denn es gibt – zentral – Antijudaismen im Neuen Testament selbst“ (Lutz 1993: 327).

Levine seconds on the question of an anti-Judaism inherent to Matthew’s Gospel:

²³⁹ cf. Grayzel 1946: 79f.; Isaac 1968: 53; 288-305; 460-463; Schreckenberg 1982: 84; Sänger 1988: 228; Broer 1992: 18. Schreckenberg comments: “Bis tief in die zweite Hälfte des 1. Jh. ist das Christentum eine innerjüdische Entwicklung und die vermeintlich antijüdische Apologetik und Polemik des neuen Testaments ist vor allem Ausdruck eines Ringens innerjüdischer Gruppierungen um die Messiasfrage und das Reich Gottes” (Schreckenberg 1982: 84). Sänger seconds: “Wir haben es historisch betrachtet im Neuen Testament durchweg mit einem *innerjüdischen* Konflikt zu tun, zu dessen Charakterisierung die Invektive *Antijudaismus* und *antijüdisch* untauglich und zudem falsch sind“ (Sänger 1988: 222).

²⁴⁰ This is echoed in Lapidé’s comment: “Jesu Kreuzigung war [...] weder ein Unglück noch eine Überraschung, sondern vielmehr das Herzstück der göttlichen Vorsehung. Wäre er nicht verraten, verurteilt und gekreuzigt worden, so wäre der Heilsplan Gottes vereitelt worden. [...] Hierzu gesellt sich ein *zweiter* Faktor: Gott allein, und nur Er, ist der im Kreuzesgeschehen Handelnde [...]. Wer da noch als Christ Sündenböcke zu suchen gewillt ist, stellt Gottes Heilsvorhaben in einer Weise in Frage, die im Grunde lästerlich ist“ (Lapidé 1979: 253).

“Wherever it has been read, anti-Judaism erupts – not from all readers, to be sure, but from a significant number in a significant variety of cultural contexts and geographical locations. This excrescence is not, I believe, simply the result of the texts being read through Gentile eyes unfamiliar with Jews or Judaism; I believe even in Matthew’s own community, the Gospel would have stirred up hostility toward any Jew who favored the synagogue over the church, the teachings of the Pharisees over those of Jesus, the sacrifices of the Temple or deeds of loving kindness over baptism and eucharist” (Levine 1999: 35²⁴¹).

This work has dedicated substantial attention to the Gospel of John where “the Jews” emerge as symbolical figures passing the threshold of the epistemic. Those “Jews” have no connection to the historical situation in which Jesus was encountering Jewish scholars, struggling with the temple authorities, sparking hopes among the Jewish people and ultimately being crucified by the Roman authorities. Rather, it is probable to assume John’s Jews serve the purpose of identity-construction, theological clarification and confirmation. During John’s time, this theological conception surrounding “the Jews” effected not more than a few Christian communities struggling for a balance between their Jewish background and an ever-growing Gentile profile. John’s conception is still far from employing political instruments to shape reality, and has not yet sparked policies such as the burning of synagogues or the physical persecution of Jews²⁴². Considering the previous analysis, one cannot but agree with Lutz that seeds of a later Christian antisemitism are engrained in the New Testament itself.

To be sure, the perspectives of Kampling and Lutz can be used to illuminate each other. Certainly, later readers allude to the texts of the Gospels to justify their own perspective. At the same time, this later appropriation is a layer of the New Testament that cannot merely be dismissed as later addition to the “original” texts. Since theology does not know of any original texts it follows that the genealogical perspective must also be applied to questions such as antisemitism in the New Testament? One may find a middle-position in

²⁴¹ This could find a theoretical framework in Umberto Eco’s idea of the restrictedness of an open interpretation, as noted by Frankenmölle: “Denn ich bin immer mehr zu der Überzeugung gekommen, daß es ‘die’ ‘richtige’ Auslegung nicht gibt, sondern durchaus mehr oder weniger zahlreiche angemessene – gemäß dem Grundsatz von *Umberto Eco*: ‘Auch ein ,offener‘ Text ist doch immer ein Text, und ein Text kann zwar unendlich viele Interpretationen anregen, erlaubt aber nicht jede beliebige Interpretation. [citing Eco 1992: 144] Ich halte auch das Matthäusevangelium für einen solchen ,offenen‘ Text, so daß es unter dieser Perspektive auf die Beantwortung der Frage ankommt: ‘Wie sehen die Strukturen aus, die die Verarbeitung der Texte im Rezipienten lenken?’ [citing Iser 1990; IV] (Frankenmölle 1999: 77; cf. Frankenmölle 1991: 71ff.).

²⁴² As Nicaean Christianity rose to dominance in the Roman Empire it was not long before an anti-Jewish perspective also became a basis for Roman imperial policy. This had a crucial impact on the way empirical Jews were treated. I will turn to describe this process in detail below (see chapter 6).

Warren Carter's comment that

“since the identities, locations, and assumptions of readers greatly impact readings, anti-Judaism exists not in the text but may arise in the *interaction* between text and readers” (Warren 1999: 57²⁴³, italics added).

The question does not have to be decided by an either or but by reference to both. If belief in Christ would have remained within the fold of Judaism, it may never have evolved into the antisemitism dispositive structuring a Christian Western perception of self and world. As argued below, the same may be true if Christianity would have left the framework of Judaism completely. Nirenberg comments:

“On the subject of Judaism (as on every other) early Christianity had many possible futures, and there is real relief in knowing that there was nothing inevitable about the paths it eventually trod. But this book does not seek such relief. It is written, as it were, with an eye on the rearview mirror: a history of roads heavily traveled, not of might-have-beens” (Nirenberg 2013: 91).

With things being as they are, Paul's Epistles, the Gospels and Acts serve as an important source for later antisemitic interpretations. There is no straight line connecting those two points. Rather, a variety of internal and external shifts accompany the perpetual text-production (see Lieu 2006: 218). Judith Lieu notes:

“[E]ach of these writings is working within a Jewish matrix; each is also at least moving towards an exclusive claim to interpret that tradition, and so to de-legitimate other claims – at the discourse level. In social contexts where other claimants could not be avoided, a variety of consequences would have been possible, although we cannot know whether outside observers would mark differentiation more than similarity” (ibid.: 217).

The interaction between text and readers affects the original context of the New Testament texts as well as its later interpretation. The following analysis reconstructs a process of some of those subsequent interpretations of the New Testament texts. It focuses on the “the Jews” in the Patristic writers Justin Martyr, Tertullian, John Chrysostom and the works of the “heretical” Christian Marcion.

²⁴³ Ben-Chorin speaks of the duality of “Vorverständnis” and “Wirkungsgeschichte” as decisive for the perpetuation of a Christian tradition of anti-Judaic interpretation (see Ben-Chorin 1980: 213).

5. The Patristic Period – Marcion & the proto-Catholic Reaction

“We may at first wonder why the attempt to prove the reality of the Divinity of Christ made it necessary to falsify the whole of Jewish history, as the Gentile Church undoubtedly did, but if we study their approach to the problem we see that they were led on inescapably by the method of their own argumentation” (Parkes 1934: 96)

“Die altkirchliche Verschärfung und Generalisierung neutestamentlicher Aussagen über das jüdische Volk ist vielleicht der eigentliche Ausgangspunkt des sogenannten christlichen Antijudaismus” (Schrekenberg 1999: 38)

The following two chapters focus on the Patristic period regarding the Christian formation of antisemitism from the second to the fourth century. This period was marked by two developments: the internal competition among interpretations of the faith (chapter five) and the institutional and political consolidation of the proto-Catholic interpretation (chapter six). This development culminated in the rise of Christianity under Constantine and led to an intensive internal stratification that ended the centuries of heterodox conduct. While the Judean communities of the first century had regarded themselves – and had been regarded – as an integral part of the Jewish community, the character of this religion changed substantially during the following centuries. This had a decisive impact on the shape and discursive position of “the Jews” in Christian theologizing. The chapter starts by turning to the most important heresiologist of the early Church: Marcion. The success of his teachings spurred reactions among proto-Catholic Christian apologists that are a decisive focal point of the development of a proto-Catholic self-understanding.

Before turning to Marcion, however, a note on the notion of the “Fathers of the Church” and the complementary adjective “Patristic” is needed. If one was to search the writings of these authors for a common creed or theological position this search will be frustrated. Just as the writers put under the label “proto-Catholic” in this study the single patristic writers demonstrate a great diversity not only among each other, but also regarding the later Catholic dogma. For example, Justin Martyr, the earliest Patristic author considered in this work, accepted adherence to Jewish rituals if they did not include apostasy. The same practice was already regarded “Judaizing” and condemned fervently one-and-a-half centuries later by bishop John Chrysostom. Tertullian, living shortly after Justin Martyr, left the Roman Church during the second half of his life and became the leader of the Northern branch of Montanism, a sect deemed heretical by the Roman Church. However, this conversion did not prevent Tertullian from becoming one of the most important Latin

Fathers of the Church. If I decide to use the term Patristic to mark a certain group of writers the reader should be aware that there is a multiplicity dwelling under the label that cannot be explained by geography or chronology alone²⁴⁴.

Almost 150 years ago, Franz Overbeck noted that Catholic writers introduced the notion of Church Fathers trying to situate a diverse group of authors from different locations and times in one line of succession to the Apostolic period. Analogous to the development of the New Testament canon, this served a contemporary need to construct the continuity of tradition by introducing the Patristics as arch-fathers of post-apostolic Christian theology and dogma (“Traditionsbeweis”, see Overbeck 1882: 418). The need for this construction had probably grown out of intensifying theological discussions. Campenhausen comments:

“Es galt, die Zeugen der 'echten', orthodoxen Überlieferung zu sammeln, um gültige oder umstrittene Lehren dadurch zu stützen und zu begründen. In dieser Absicht bemühte man sich schon im vierten Jahrhundert um die Meinung der früheren, anerkannten Theologen und bezeichnete sie mit Nachdruck als 'Väter' der Kirche. Ihre Autorität wurde auch für die Gegenwart maßgebend und trat damit neben die ältere und eindeutigere Autorität des biblischen Kanons, der Heiligen Schrift” (Campenhausen 1993: 9).

Insofar as the term is an expression of a retrospective alignment, the “Patristics” can be regarded the “customs inspectors at the frontiers of this Christianity and Judaism” (Boyarin 2004: 2). If one is to identify a common ground for those “Fathers of the Church” it is their acceptance of the Jewish scriptures as Christian heritage and the Gospels as true uncorrupted accounts of Jesus’ life (see Campenhausen 1993: 165f., a notion going back to Eusebius, see Markus 1980: 3f.). In their simultaneous insistence on the continuity of their own faith with Jewish prophecy and their delineation from empirical Judaism, they act as both – the producers of difference and as “the agents of illicit interchange” (ibid.) between Judaism and formative Christianity (cf. Droge 2006: 244). However, one is not born a customs inspector. The first chapter traces how the focus of those authors on continuity with the Jewish scriptures developed in delineation from an early “heretic”, Marcion²⁴⁵.

²⁴⁴ As for example in Rengstorf 1968: 50-64.

²⁴⁵ In his study on *Border Lines. The Partition of Judaeo-Christian Christianity*, Boyarin includes rabbinic Judaism as customs inspectors from the Jewish side (Boyarin partially revised this hypothesis of a reactive development of Jewish orthodoxy in an article from 2009). However, the concern of the present study is not the emergence of an “episteme of religion” (Boyarin 2004: 27) but an episteme of Christian antisemitism. It may very well be that this episteme initially needs “experiential real categories” (Boyarin 2004: 26). However, the discourse is soon detached and develops independent from this encounter.

Campenhausen divides the Patristic writers according to their Greek and Latin background (see Campenhausen 1993, 1995). This does not necessarily imply a biographical rootedness²⁴⁶ but marks the language the respective author uses. The Patristic literature emerges within the Eastern part of the Roman Empire by the second century where its center remains until the fourth century. Although theological differences accompanied the emergence of the Latin Patristic tradition, the Greek Church Fathers remain heirs to the Latin authors (see Campenhausen 1995: 9). Boyarin proposes a different arrangement when calling those writers “heresiologists”, i.e. “the anatomizers of heresy and heresies” (Boayrin 2004: 2). Thereby, he highlights that the group formed during the second century in the context of competing interpretations of the Christian message.

The following analysis starts with a depiction of the Marcionite claims, paying special attention to this interpretation of Paul, his treatment of “the Jews” and his relevance for the development of a Christian canon of sacred writings. Along with Justin Martyr, analysis points to the intensification of a Christian anti-Jewish invective the Marcionite challenge inspired. A second part in this analysis of Patristic reactions to Marcion considers the work of the Carthagenean writer Tertullian developing some of Justin’s central impulses further. The section ends with the conclusion that (epistemic) antisemitism intensifies within the framework of a *proto-Catholic polemic* against competing claims to the Christian truth (cf. Wirth 1991: 54). The following chapter six then returns to Justin and Tertullian as proto-Catholic writers and representatives of the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature including also the sermons of the Antioch preacher John Chrysostom as the most forceful representative of a Christian polemic against “the Jews”.

The proto-Catholic writers and the selection of their works analyzed are but samples for those that participated in developing a theology in which “the Jews” take a central

²⁴⁶ Setzer comments in *Jewish Responses to Early Christians* (1994) that a “division and classification of materials based on geography is not useful or even possible. Frequently, the provenance of a work is unknown, or even if known it conveys little. An author may grow up in one place, study in another, and write in a third. He or his teachers may be travelers, garnering traditions from various places. Further, materials from the two most frequently identified locales – Syria-Palestine and Asia Minor – show the whole range of reactions, from tolerance to persecution” (Setzer 1994: 165). On chronology, Setzer continues: “Chronology alone does not explain things any more than geography does, because the simple passage of time is only one factor in the way people and societies work. [...] Jewish attitudes toward Christians (and vice versa) did not follow an inexorable, irreversible process” (ibid.: 182).

position. In this sense, the following chapters do not claim to exhaust the richness of the Patristic literature but to reconstruct a line of development for a proto-Catholic Christian antisemitism and the productive role “the Jews” came to play for this group to develop a sense of identity²⁴⁷. It is crucial to note that those early proto-Catholic writers did not write for a consolidated community of Orthodox Christians but contrasted their views in competing and vivid interpretations of the faith, possibly even within their own communities (e.g. the sermons of John Chrysostom, cf. Mason 2007: 476).

5.1 Marcion (85-160 C.E.)

Marcion (c. 85 – 160 C.E.) was born in Sinope (Pontus, today's Turkey) at the Black Sea coast. He earned a fortune as ship owner and merchant and relocated to Rome in the late 130's. Until 144 C.E., Marcion appears to have been a respected member of the Roman Christian community (see Metzger 1987: 90). However, by the time of July 144 C.E., Marcion confronted the religious authorities with his own interpretation of the faith in Jesus. He may have already developed his Christology while still based in Pontus (see Harnack 1924: 23-26²⁴⁸) and his refusal to revoke his views publicly led to his excommunication (see Metzger 1987: 90f.). Marcion subsequently focused on his own missionary practice, quickly spreading throughout the Roman Empire. His teaching appears to have been so successful that, by the end of the second century, the Marcionite church had grown to be a serious threat for the emerging proto-Orthodox institutions (see Harnack 1924: 154f.; Metzger 1987: 91²⁴⁹). Knox comments:

“It is of greatest importance to recognize that Marcion was not in the situation of

²⁴⁷ A reader familiar with the usual course of discussion for early Christian antisemitism will notice the absence of Barnabas in the present work. This text has been omitted. For one, because it did not seem to convey any crucial innovation for the development of the proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism. Second, because its relevance for the proto-Catholic strain that interests me here remains disputed. For a discussion, especially regarding the notion of old and new covenant in Christian literature of the first and second century, see Ferguson 1980; cf. Paget 1994.

²⁴⁸ cf. Knox 1942: 8-12. This hypothesis finds recent support in Hoffmann 1984 but is rejected by Aland 1992: 90 and Räisänen 2001: 192, fn 2. Schmithals notes that Marcion may have been adopting and developing thoughts already present in Asia Minor during the turn of the century. In this case, the term “Marcionism” would be partially misleading (see Schmithals 1982: 12f.).

²⁴⁹ Justin Martyr remarks that by 150 C.E., it had spread to every nation, supporting Knox' perspective of a Marcionite missionary activity before his exclusion (see Martyr, 1. Apol. 26; cf. 58; cf. Knox 1942: 8f.). Harnack supposes that by the end of the second century, more than half of the churches rejected the Jewish scriptures as their base and had thus adopted one central tenet of the Marcionite teaching (see Harnack 1924b: 206, fn. 1; cf. Bauer 1964: 195-197; Wilson 1986: 45). The Marcionite teaching proved persistent. Traces of it were still to be found as late as the 8th century C.E. (see Tyson 2005: 198). For a history of the Marcionite Church, see Harnack 1924b: 143ff.

challenging what had become a systematically formulated and generally established theological position; on the contrary, he faced a divided field and was only one of many competing teachers. He never thought of himself other than as a member of the true and universal church of Christ, and his contemporaries would have had appreciably more difficulty proving he was wrong than later churchmen had in outlawing his doctrine as held among the Marcionite churches even a generation afterward” (Knox 1942: 5f.; cf. Harnack 1924: 13).

As one of the few systematic records of early “heretic” Christianity, only fragments of Marcion’s *Antitheses* survive²⁵⁰. Those fragments can be found in the polemics written by proto-Catholic writers, testifying to the fierce reactions Marcion spurred among his theological counterparts (see Gamble 2006: 195). Scholars have tried to reconstruct the systematic character of Marcion’s teachings from those mostly negative references and quoted fragments²⁵¹. Harnack’s 1921-book *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Texte und Untersuchungen* (see Harnack 1924) “opened the modern era in Marcion-studies” (Hoffmann 1984: xv; cf. Kinzig 2004: 41²⁵²) and it “remains unrivalled as a compendium of the relevant texts for the study of Marcion’s theology” (Hoffmann 1984: xv). Despite growing criticism²⁵³, Harnack’s reconstruction of Marcion as a radical Paulinist and Christian reformer thus continues to exert strong influence on present scholarship²⁵⁴.

²⁵⁰ “A significant exception to this rule is the existence of the so-called ‘Marcionite’ Prologues to the Epistles of Paul, which date from as early as the end of the second century” (Hoffmann 1984: 25f.; cf. Knox 1942: 169-171). For an attempt of reconstructing the central arguments of the *Antithesis*, see Harnack 1924b: 74-92).

²⁵¹ Hoffmann lists Justin Martyr (Rome, c. 150 C.E.), Theophilus of Antioch (160), Dionysius and Modestus (Greece, c. 170), Irenaeus (Lyons, 176), Rhodon (Rome, c. 180), Clement of Alexandria (c. 200), Tertullian (Carthage, 200 and later); Bardesanes (Armenia, c. 200), Commodianus (Gaul, c. 300), ‘Adamantius’ (Greece, 320), Ephraem (Syria, 370), Philastrius (Brescia, 385), Eznik de Kolb (Bargevand, 445) (see Hoffmann 1983: 33). While some of these authors only attack Marcion in passing, others elaborate on their criticism. Most of the material used to reconstruct Marcion’s position has been preserved in Tertullian (see Schmid 1995: 309; cf. Hoffmann 1983: 33-74; 185-208). On the possibility of reconstructing Marcion’s position from these polemics, Hoffmann notes: “Taken together, the evidence speaks more clearly of the seriousness of Marcion’s heresy in the eyes of the church fathers than of its substance, and church historians have attempted with only variable success to reconstruct his teaching on the basis of the polemic against it” (Hoffmann 1984: xi).

²⁵² See Kinzig 2004: 73-85 for a summary; for an overview on the contemporary reception of Harnack’s *Marcion* in neoorthodox, *kulturprotestantische* and, among these, antisemitic voices, see *ibid.*: 108-144.

²⁵³ Check Barnikol 1933 for an early critique. For more recent critical reassessments, see Aland 1973, Blackman 1978 [o. 1948]; Balas 1980; Hoffmann 1984; Wilson 1986; May 1987 and the essays of Aland, Bienert and Löhr in May/Greschat 2001. For the genesis of Harnack’s own perspective on Marcion, from a prize essay Harnack wrote in 1870 as a 19-year-old down to the publication of *Marcion*, the latest and most radical of his works on Marcion published in 1921, see Kinzig 2004: 43-108. Shaye D. Cohen notes: “Harnack, like Schürer, Wellhausen, Bousset, and virtually every other German liberal Protestant academic of his era, had no doubt that Judaism was much inferior to Christianity. Theodor Mommsen thought that the *Judenfrage* should be solved by the conversion of the Jews to Christianity, and I suspect that Harnack would have agreed. This is not anti-Semitism; this is Christianity” (Cohen 2010a: 315, f. 26; for further sources, see Cohen 2010a: 309, fn. 4).

²⁵⁴ Works considered for the present section include Aland (1973), Blackman (1978 [o. 1948]); Balas (1980), R. J. Hoffmann (1984), May (1987), Schmid (1995) and the essays in May/Greschat (2001). Cf. May 1987 for an overview.

Before proceeding, one should consider Harry Gamble's note of caution that "[i]t has not yet become entirely clear either what Marcion taught or why he taught it" (Gamble 2006: 195). The following sections will therefore not focus on a reconstruction of Marcion's teaching²⁵⁵. When turning to Marcion, the present study rather seeks to demonstrate two things – the presence of alternative approaches to the faith in Christ (against the argument of a natural hatred against Jews/birth trauma growing out of theological kinship) and the centrality "the Jews" take in this refutation by proto-Catholic writers. It is concluded that an intensified rejection of Judaism resulted also from a proto-Catholic struggle with competing interpretations.

Analysis focuses on three aspects: (1) In *Marcion and the Renaissance of Paul* it is demonstrated how Marcionism picked up a specific line of the Pauline interpretation adopting this "Paul" to the perspective of a second-century Gentile. (2) *"The Jews" and the Question of Antisemitism* discusses the relationship between Marcion and Judaism/"the Jews". The study then proceeds asking to what extent one can speak of a specific Marcionite anti-Judaism as opposed to other interpretations within Christianity. (3) In *Marcion and the Canon of the New Testament*, Marcion's influence on the development of the canon of the New Testament becomes the central point of interest. This section concludes that a defense of Marcion by proto-Orthodox authors marks a crucial step in the development of an early Christian formation of antisemitism.

5.1.1 Marcion and the Renaissance of Paul

"In einem Tischgespräche, das wir bei mir einmal führten, fiel meinerseits der Witz von Paulus als dem Leidensgenossen Hegels: *Er habe nur einen Schüler gehabt, der ihn verstanden habe, Marcion – und dieser habe ihn mißverstanden!*" (Overbeck 1919: 218f.)

By the beginning of the second century, Paul had been pushed to the margins of mainstream Christian theologizing (see Hoffmann 1984: 99; possibly to be substituted by Johannine material, see *ibid.* 239²⁵⁶). With the changing structure of the Christian communities and the challenges they faced (see chapter 6.1) the framework in which Paul

²⁵⁵ For works attempting such a reconstruction, see see Aland 1973; Blackman 1978; Clabeaux 1989; Schmid 1995; Roth 2005. See *ibid.* 2015 for the most recent attempt to reconstruct Marcion's Gospel. In it, one can also find an extensive overview over the history of research on Marcion.

²⁵⁶ Hoffmann notes that communities existed that continued to read the Pauline Epistles, especially in Asia Minor. They may have constituted a background for Marcion's teachings (see Hoffmann 1984: 237).

had formulated his arguments was slowly forgotten (see Campenhausen 1968: 46). Marcion developed his thought in the context of a “Pauline renaissance” (Hoffmann 1984: 99) which really meant a reinvention of Paul as a Marcionite. Rejecting the perspective on law, covenant and prophecy of other Christian communities, Marcion maintained that the Twelve Apostles had falsely believed Jesus to be the Messiah of the old God, and deliberately modified the words of Jesus in order to establish this perspective (see Metzger 1987: 92; cf. Norelli 2001: 119). Claiming a corruption of the Epistles, Marcion appears to have went on changing the Epistles “back” to their “original” meaning (see Aland 1973: 437, fn. 83; 442f.).

Marcion apparently claimed that Paul was the only true interpreter of Christ’s message, judging the ten Epistles sent by Paul (nine to the seven churches and one to Philemon) as “the source, the guarantee, and the norm of true doctrine” (Metzger 1987: 92). Marcion moved Galatians to the beginning of his Pauline corpus as a general introductory note (see Knox 1942: 60f.; on the origin of Marcion’s ten-letter-corpus, see Gamble 2006: 208-210) possibly because he deemed it the most important of the Epistles (entailing a scriptural proof for the one true Gospel, Gal. 1:7-10). Marcion thus regarded Paul as the arch-apostle for his faith, though he probably also accepted the Gospel of Luke as a truthful albeit corrupted account (see Campenhausen 1968: 187f.²⁵⁷).

Marcion saw salvation as the result of a decision between the law of death (old law) and the law of freedom (Christ) (see Harnack 1924: 30). This difference echoes in the conception of the two gods – an inferior God of justice, creator of the world, and legislator of the Old Testament law, just but violent, jealous and spiteful (see Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.19; 4.6; 5.13; cf. Harnack 1924: 85, 99f.²⁵⁸). The old creator God was the protector of the

²⁵⁷ For contemporary discussion on the sources Marcion had access to, the question of why Marcion focused on the Gospel of Luke and what version of it he might have used, see Schmid 1995, 2002; Tyson 2006. Gamble comments: “Multiple gospels came to be known first in the larger urban centers of Christianity, the natural points for the production, confluence and dissemination of Christian literature, but in provincial areas it was probably typical that at an early time only one gospel was known and used. Against this background, and lacking any evidence for his knowledge or repudiation of other gospels, Marcion’s use of only one gospel can be understood as a normal and widespread practice” (Gamble 2006: 208).

²⁵⁸ Harnack supposes that the opposition between the two Gods were at the centre of Marcion’s *Antithesis* (see Harnack 1924: 75). However, Aland has noted conceptual similarities between the two Gods and argues that for Marcion, the two Gods represented two sides to one divine unity. The separation may well have resulted from the anti-Marcionite polemic in proto-Catholic authors (Harnack quotes Tertullian to prove his point). Aland concludes: “Tertullian konstruiert zwar seine gesamte Widerlegung so, daß sie von den zwei Göttern, 'gleichsam zwei symplegadischen Felsen, an denen er [Marcion] Schiffbruch erleidet', ausgeht, aber damit wird nur angezeigt, wie Tertullian die Lehre Marcions verstehen und lesen will, nicht, daß er damit die Absicht Marcions vollständig trafe” (Aland 2001: 154; cf. Harnack 1924: 20f.; 116). This disagreement points to a principal problem when dealing with Marcion – almost all that is known about this character and his teaching has survived (and been distorted) in anti-Marcionite writings.

Jews (see Wilson 1986: 48). Marcion opposed this creator God with a superior and previously unknown deity of goodness. This deity had been revealed in Jesus, whose unconditional love Marcion expected to redeem the spirit and soul of all humanity (see Harnack 1924b: 118-120). In applying this strict binary differentiation between creation (law) and gospel, Marcion argued that the latter had not left any traces in the creation and cannot be “seen” through human perception nor influenced through human deeds (see Harnack 1924b: 3f.; Hoffmann 1984: 209). For Marcion, man did not know the roots of evil before the appearance of the God incarnate in the person of Jesus (see Aland 2001: 149) and salvation is by revelation alone (see Harnack 1924b: 4; cf. Norelli 2001: 119). Transcendence can therefore not be achieved by the individual's natural ability (φύσις), exercise (ασκησις) and instruction (διδασκαλία) but only through the faith in and the teaching of the God incarnate (Jesus) (see *ibid.*: 125²⁵⁹).

Marcion's position developed from a specific line of interpretation of the Pauline Epistles²⁶⁰. By shifting the Pauline reflections to a – possibly Gnostic – framework, Marcion takes this tradition to a new level (see Aland 1973: 434-436). In this framework, redemption means redemption not only from the world but also from its creator God. By assigning human logic, sentiments, emotions and morality to this creator, the “old” God moves closer to “the world” while the unknown “new” god manifested in Jesus reveals itself as a proponent of a higher sphere. Referring to passages in Paul distinguishing between the physical and spiritual body (e.g. 1 Cor. 15:44-50), Marcion argued that Jesus

²⁵⁹ Knox connects the rejection of the “old God” to a branch within early Christian communities (most probably of Gentile origin) “where the Jewish Scriptures were little, if any, used, and where belief in the God of the Jews was held only formally, if at all” (Knox 1942: 15) and where prayer was directed towards Jesus as God (see *ibid.*: 16). If Marcion indeed originated in one of these (Pauline) communities it is easier to understand the origin of his teaching of the two Gods and his rejection of the Jewish scriptures. Knox concludes in accordance with Harnack: “Marcion was not primarily a Gnostic but a Paulinist” (*ibid.*: 14; Harnack 1924b: 196ff.). Hans Jonas, on the other hand, regards Marcion as a Christian Gnostic of a special character (see Jonas 1999: 171). May seconds that “Marcion was more strongly influenced by philosophy than Harnack would admit it” (May 1987: 144). Accordingly, contemporary scholars have found traces of Gnostic and monistic positions in Marcion's writing (see Aland 1973, 2001; Norelli 2001: 121ff.; for a discussion of the differences between Marcion and Gnosticism, cf. Harnack 1924b: 3ff., 196, fn. 1; Aland 1973: 430-435, 444f.; 2001: 157; Hoffmann 1984: 155-184; May 1987: 145f.; Norelli 2001: 127, Bieneret 2001: 202f.). Other scholars have challenged the opposition between Gnosticism and Paulinism. Wilson points to “the intense interest in Paul among gnostic groups” (Wilson 1986: 51) and opts for a perspective that allows for an oscillation between the two positions: “The likelihood, therefore, is that Marcion began as a Paulinist, but with a brand of Paulinism already open to gnostic influence and profoundly affected by his own eccentric reading of Paul” (Wilson 1986: 52). This tendency to integrate both sides may have become more obvious in the writing of Marcion's pupil, Apelles (see Harnack 1924b: 139, fn. 1; May 1987: 146). Furthermore, Norelli demonstrates how the Marcionite intervention opposed not only a certain line in Christian theology and Gnosticism but also the Stoic conception of Logos (see Norelli 2001: 119). The individual, Marcion maintained, is not in harmony with God and they do not share one Logos to be detected in this world. Rather, salvation is an act of transcendence of human nature from sin to the state of unconditional love (Aland 2001: 149).

²⁶⁰ For the implication of Jesus for redemption, see 1 Cor 8:4; 15:21f.; 2 Cor 4:4; Gal 3:19, 4:8f., 6:15; for the opposition of law and faith, see Rom 6:14; cf. Gal 5:16-24; for the sinfulness of man, see Rom. 3:23, 5: 12-19.

could not have taken the form of the flesh because he was the representative of the spiritual deity (see Aland 1973: 438). Accordingly, the promise of resurrection does not refer to the physical world but points to an act of spiritual salvation (see Hoffmann 1984: 217f.). For Paul, meanwhile, the advent of Jesus opened up the possibility for the Gentiles to be saved as Gentiles. In a way, Marcion's conception radicalized Paul's messianic expectations maintaining a complete separation between Jesus and anything that had been there before.

As should be apparent by now, Marcion was not only an heir to a Paulinist theology but also one of its significant early re-interpreters and re-inventors (see also Overbeck's statement at the beginning of this section). Paul's original Epistles support neither Marcion's juxtaposition of law and salvation nor his perspective on man as creation of the old God. This has led W. D. Davies to note that Paul had "challenged Marcion before Marcion" (Davies 1999: 730). Campenhausen seconds: "ein Paulus, der das Alte Testament verwirft und weder die Schöpfung noch das Gericht kennt, war [...] ein Phantom, das niemals gelebt hat" (Campenhausen 1968: 193; cf. Harnack 1923: 18). Developing his interpretation two generations after Paul it has been noted that Marcion was "dealing with the literary remains of controversies that had been resolved (often in ways contrary to Paul's hopes)" (Hoffmann 1984: 75f.). Marcion's Christology thus gives expression to a situation in which "the ability of the churches to understand the rudiments of his theology" (Hoffmann 1984: 99) had been seriously impaired²⁶¹.

Considering these contemporary demands, Harnack's argument that Marcion constructed his position in opposition to Judaism seems rather one-sided (see Harnack 1924b: 22, 33). To be sure, Marcion adopted Paul's condemnation of "false Apostleship" (see Gal 1:6-9; 2:4; 2 Cor. 11:13f.). In good Pauline tradition, he directed his attacks against the *pseudoapostoloi et Judaici evangelizators*. The whole of the church tradition, Marcion maintained, had been the corrupted by a conspiracy he called "judaistic" (see Harnack 1924b: 35-37). To conclude from this term that Marcion targeted an actual Jewish influence on Christian communities means to declare a Pauline terminology to be an expression of Marcion's reality. This implies the – unlikely – assumption that the context of the Pauline Epistles could still be regarded as valid for the early second century. As an alternative, one could take the terminological continuity of as an expression of Marcion's

²⁶¹ cf. Schweitzer 1930: 39f.; Schoeps 1959: 281; Bornkamm 1987: 13. Haacker comments: "Für die Wirkungsgeschichte dieser [Paulinischen] Texte war es verhängnisvoll, daß der geschichtliche Anlaß dieser Polemik in Vergessenheit geriet bzw. unter der Überschrift 'Gesetzlichkeit' ins Allgemeinmenschliche 'übersetzt' und dabei der Willkür neuer Aktualisierungen preisgegeben wurde" (Haacker 1988: 417).

Paulinism. Could it be that Marcion used the Pauline words to accuse his opponents as “Judaici evangelizators”? If this is accepted, it is not necessary to suppose Jews or Judaizers as an empirical group behind the accusations.

So whom exactly did Marcion oppose and what group did he target? With the onset of his theological struggle, Marcion had confronted the conservative and Gentile clergy of Rome. Since the time of Paul, Rome had developed to the center of an interpretation of Christianity remote from the Jewish framework of the Judean Church (see Bauer 1964: 231²⁶²). The Christians whose conduct Marcion rejected in Rome were not more Jewish than the accuser himself. In Marcion, the Pauline differentiation between Gospel and *pseudoapostoloi/falsi apostoli* (see Harnack 1924b: 37ff.; Hoffmann 1984: 105f.; 135-145) points to the specific, i.e. Marcionite conception of religious truth and its corruption. Thus, it is highly unlikely to assume Marcion meant the same thing Paul had when using the term “Judaici evangelizators”. Continuity of terminology does not necessarily imply continuity of the object that is referred to. Marcion, employs the Pauline charges against “Judaizers” as a “key term of epistemological and ontological critique” (Nirenberg 2013: 60) in an inner-Christian debate²⁶³ just as the Gospel of John employs “the Jews” as a reference to the world in general.

From the sections above one can conclude that Marcion's treatment of the Epistles assumes a “Pauline” position without paying tribute to its original context or intention (see Hoffmann 1984: 152). This ignorance becomes especially harmful regarding the accusation of “false Apostleship”. For Paul, the accusation of “false Apostleship” had been aimed against proponents of the Judean communities preaching observance of the Mosaic Law to Gentile believers. As detailed in chapter three, the preacher to the Gentiles tried to defend his mission *against* the influence of those “false missionaries”. The

²⁶² Bauer notes: “Rechtgläubigkeit [...] stellte die Form des Christentums dar, die von den Mehrheit in Rom getragen wird, die freilich noch das ganze Jahrhundert hindurch und darüber hinaus schwer mit den Ketzern zu kämpfen hat [...]. Die römische Kirche hatte schon um 100 ihren Einfluß auf Korinth ausgedehnt. Und mit ihr stimmen im Laufe der folgenden Jahrzehnte in einigen Kirchen Kleinasien die Mehrheiten, in anderen [...] Minderheiten überein. Jedoch östlich des phrygischen Hierapolis vermochten wir kaum mehr Spuren der Rechtgläubigkeit wahrzunehmen. Dort waren Christentum und Ketzerei wesentlich gleichbedeutend” (Bauer 1964: 231). Barnikol has argued that the consolidation of the Roman community as Church took place only after Marcion and in reaction to his teaching (see Barnikol 1933: 25f.; see chapter 5.1.3 for a further discussion of the relation between proto-Catholicism and Marcion).

²⁶³ Nirenberg comments that while Paul wanted to eradicate all difference between Jews and Gentiles, his “logic identified with Jews and Judaism a cardinal category of error for the believer in Jesus – that of giving excessive attention to the ‘flesh’ of the text and of the person. Over time, the effect of this identification would be the opposite of the one that Paul perhaps intended, for far from making ‘Jewishness’ an irrelevant particularity (‘there is neither Jew nor Greek’) in the new creation, Paul’s letter to the Galatians would help to turn it into a key term of epistemological and ontological critique” (Nirenberg 2013: 60).

question relevant for Paul's discussion was "Who is to be included into the Jewish covenant in what way"? This question had lost its relevance for most of the Christian communities by the time Marcion emerged. Instead, formative Christianity was in the process of breaking away from the Jewish framework. Marcion used the term "false Apostleship" to confront a religious establishment that did not resemble the Judean church of Paul's time at all. The anti-nomistic argument Paul installed for Gentile converts and against the influence of a powerful Judean church now became a rejection of Jewish scriptures and prophecy *as appropriated by a Gentile church*. Marcion thus came to argue the opposite of what Paul had wanted – the coexistence of Jews and Gentiles as equal partners within a new covenant based on Jesus and as the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy.

5.1.2 "The Jews" and the Question of Antisemitism

"Keiner hat klarer die Grundverderbnis in die das Christentum durch seine Vermählung mit dem Judentum unfehlbar verfallen mußte, eingesehen als Marcion und er machte es sich zur Lebensaufgabe, die Christenheit vom Alten Testament zu befreien" (Chamberlain 1939: VII)

Marcion's conception demonstrates how an affirmative reference to Paul can serve to cover up a substantial shift in theological conception. In a sense, Marcion's Paul (which is not the Jewish Paul of the Epistles), gives expression to a second century confrontation in a situation when most of the Christian communities moved away from the Jewish framework with increasing speed. The adoption of Pauline terminology thus maintains a continuity on the textual level that is unparalleled by the empirical referents. The appropriation of "Paul" by Marcion – and later proto-Catholic writers – demonstrates the possible detachment of a signifier (e.g. "false Apostles") from its referent (Christian Jews demanding full adherence to the Mosaic Laws from Gentile converts). Instead, the ascription shifts to a new group (e.g. the clergy of Rome). Regarding his own Gentile background, Marcion was only consistent rejecting the Jewish scriptures as guarantor and backdrop of his faith. However, the semantic juxtaposition Marcion adopts from Paul is misleading once this difference between original setting and contemporary polemic passes unmentioned.

This should be kept in mind when turning towards the question of Marcionite anti-Judaism. What is the exact implication of the rejection of the soteriological frame of the

Jewish scriptures in the juxtaposition of the two gods? Schrekenberg comments:

“Mit ihm [Marcion] beginnt eine antijüdische, besser antibiblische Linie der Kirchengeschichte, deren Ausläufer bis in die Gegenwart reichen“ (Schrekenberg 1999: 180).

An interpretation of Marcion as anti-Judaic has been prominent in scholarship. For example, Harnack had no doubts concerning Marcion's anti-Judaism as his work culminated in a plea for the removal of the Jewish scriptures from the Christian canon (see *ibid.*: 215-235²⁶⁴). This demand met a contemporary desire to rid the German society of a spiritual, theological and philosophical influence deemed non-German (“Jewish”). Writers such as Friedrich Delitzsch (1850-1922), the previously quoted Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927) together with exponents of the German Christians (“Deutschchristen”, e.g. Alfred Falb, Friedrich Andersen) started to claim Marcion as a prototypical antisemite (see Kinzig 2004: 121-127). During the late years of the Weimar Republic, the question of what was to be considered truly Christian and what not was, of course, inextricably connected with the question of what was to be considered “German” – and what “Jewish”. Accordingly, the radical wing of the “Deutschchristen” developed its reform agenda in mutual inspiration with the NSDAP (see e.g. Rosenberg 1934: 75) demanding the removal of all un-German (“undeutsche”) elements from liturgy and creed (see *ibid.*: 603f., 614). In this context, Harnack's call for the removal of the Jewish scriptures from the Christian canon could easily be integrated in an agenda that wanted to appropriate Jesus as an Arian, Christianity as a non-Jewish religion and render “the Jews” a despicable and, ultimately, disposable people. In this sense, Harnack's “Marcion” backed up the aims of National Socialist Christians.

In a substantial sense, these examples point to the context-dependency of scholarship itself. As in the case of Paul, one must be careful not to confuse the reconstruction of “Marcion” by Harnack, the appropriation of Marcion as a proto-typical antisemite and its functionalization by the “Deutschchristen” with the “Marcion” vis-à-vis his contemporary adversaries during the second century. However, most modern scholars seem to agree on the existence of a profound anti-Judaism in Marcion's writing²⁶⁵. Wilson comments:

“Marcion's teaching in general contains a profound denigration of Judaism and the symbols

²⁶⁴ cf. Harnack 1924b: 22, 33, 106-118.

²⁶⁵ see Chadwick 1967: 40; Efreymson 1979; Wilson 1986: 52; Mußner 1995: 241; Aland 2001.

precious to its life and faith. Whether it is in his view of their god, their scriptures, their law, or in his account of Jesus, Paul, or the Jewish-Christian conspiracy, in each case Judaism appears as an inferior religion” (Wilson 1986: 52).

Indeed, a reconstruction of Marcion's main conceptual tenets evolve around binary constructions in which “the Jews” are always on the negative side (see *ibid.*) – “The Jews” and the creator God are the necessary opposing terms for underlining the complete newness of the Christian revelation. Efreymson comments:

“The [...] point is that Marcion’s challenge or threat placed all the anti-Judaic themes in a new apologetic context, appending them to ideas of God and Christ in ways that came perilously close to permanence” (Efreymson 1979: 105).

Juxtaposing creator and redeemer, law and gospel, creation and salvation, “the Jews” serve as markers for the old order. Their customs are outdated, their faith has been proven insufficient for salvation and their hope for the Messiah is pitifully particularistic. This finds further support in Aland who adds that Marcion's conception of sin rests on a negative conception of “the Jews”. Their ascribed focus on the law, their ignorance and mistrust towards the God incarnate forms the eschatological basis for Christianity:

“Es ist dieses ungläubige Mißtrauen gegenüber dem göttlichen Heilsangebot und die dementsprechende Begier, für die geleistete Gesetzesobservanz den gebührenden Lohn zu erhalten, was präzise den Inbegriff der Sünde kennzeichnet. Der darin verfangene Mensch vermag das Heilsangebot nicht mehr als rettende Möglichkeit wahrzunehmen. Der Sünder Marcions ist der zwanghaft auf sich selbst konzentrierte und bornierte Anhänger des Schöpfergottes und seines Gesetzes” (Aland 2001: 152²⁶⁶).

To be a sinner means for Marcion to be ungrateful towards God’s offer who sends his

²⁶⁶ For a discussion of Marcion's understanding of human nature, compare Harnack 1924: 105, Hoffmann 1984 and Aland 2001: “Der Mensch ist ganz und gar verantwortlich für seine Sünde, sowohl als einzelne Tat als auch für sein sündiges Sein, seine Ablehnung der angebotenen Liebe Christi, aus dem die einzelne Tat als schlechte Frucht hervorgeht. Die Verblendung des Sünders zeigt sich insbesondere daran, daß er den Charakter der neuen Gebote Christi als Wegweiser für die neue Existenz gar nicht erkennen kann, daß er also völlig in seinem Zwang zum sündigen Haben- und Erwerben wollen verfangen ist. Aus diesem zwanghaften Verblendungszusammenhang kann nur eine Erlösung *extra nos* befreien. Diese Erlösung muß und kann allerdings – nur glaubend - empfangen werden” (Aland 2001: 151). Hoffmann comments that for Marcion, man “is not only under the law, but he mistakes the law for the highest good. He is therefore as much a stranger to the alien God as he is a creature under the 'law of sin and death' administered by the Creator. Being so constituted, he is 'guilty' only under the second condition [mistaking the law for the highest good]; under the first, he is merely renegade from an unknown good” (Hoffmann 1984: 214). Man is thus responsible only with regard to his refusal to receive Christ. He is not, however, responsible for his sinfulness, which is due to the law itself and thus, not to man but to the weakness of the creator God (see *ibid.*: 213; cf. Harnack 1924: 105f.).

own son to redeem humanity. “The Jews” who remain observant to the Mosaic Law even after the advent of Christ embody this ungratefulness. To Marcion, the Jewish conception of God degrades the divine to be the recipient of human deeds (see Aland 2001: 152). Since “the Jews” are the followers of the creator God, they turn against faithful Christians whom they persecute in alliance with Pagans, false Christians and worldly authorities (see Harnack 1924b: 137). With this, Marcion probably reiterates a specific interpretative line of the Pauline Epistles. “The Jews” who refuse to accept Jesus as Christ (e.g. Rom 10:2f., 19; 11:7f., 23) are ignorant, mistrustful and malicious while the Gentiles “being removed from the law, have a natural advantage over the Jews” (Hoffmann 1984: 228).

*

All of this may well be an appropriate description of Marcion’s cosmology. At the same time, there is a substantial difference between Marcion’s rejection of Judaism as a base for his faith and a proto-Catholic perspective on Judaism reconstructed below. Marcion continued to regard the law of the creator God as holy and its commandments as righteous (see Tert., Adv. Marc. 5.13). Furthermore, he accepted the creator God as real and the Jews as his chosen people. This is why some scholars such as Goppelt, Hoffmann, Bienert and Wilson refuse to call Marcion antisemitic. To Goppelt, Marcion’s polemic was directed solely against the creator God and not against Jews (see Goppelt 1954: 273; cf. Bienert 1990: 143f.). Hoffmann seconds that the literal (rabbinical) mode of scriptural exegesis provides further proof for Marcion’s non-Catholic and even pro-Jewish orientation (see Hoffmann 1984: 227). And indeed, Marcion’s interpretation of the Jewish scriptures led to serious assaults by authors such as Tertullian who accuse him of siding with the Jews (see Tert., Adv. Marc. 3.6). The reason for this assault appears to have been that, once Marcion had found no hint for the coming of his Jesus in Jewish writings, he concluded that the Jewish Messiah was still to come. In accordance with his own argumentative interest, he therefore concluded on the existence of two saviors – one Christian (Jesus) and one Jewish (cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 3.24²⁶⁷).

The story of the two Messiahs is a double-edged sword. It proves the irrelevance of the Jewish scriptures for Christianity and grants a space to Jewish prophecy unacceptable to proto-Catholic writers. To Marcion, “the Jews” had indeed remained blind and ignorant to the universal Messiah sent by an alien God. Their “historical relationship with the

²⁶⁷ This Jewish Messiah was supposed to be a warrior known as Emmanuel and sent by the creator God whose purpose was, and here Marcion followed a line in Jewish prophecy, to gather and deliver the children of Israel.

Creator” (Hoffmann 1984: 233) had “clouded their understanding, and caused them to be naturally suspicious of the revelation of unconditional grace” (ibid.). Thus, Marcion may not have blamed “the Jews” directly for killing Jesus but noted that their ignorance was due to the creator God causing them to remain blind to the truth (see Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.6, 14; cf. Räisänen 2001: 198; Hoffmann 1984: 206-208). The Jewish ignorance of Jesus' true nature was understandable to Marcion because Jesus did not resemble the Messiah foretold in their scriptures. Instead of condemning “the Jews” for their observance, Marcion may thus have pitied them to have “suffered most under the Creator's regime” (ibid.: 227). Hoffmann comments accordingly that Marcion’s perspective did not demand the exclusion of all Jews from salvation but “quite the reverse: that God's mercy is magnified in the attempt to save the children of wrath” (ibid.). Prematurely and mistakenly identifying Christ with the fulfillment of the Jewish prophecy, the apostles had been mistaken themselves (see ibid.: 229). To Hoffmann, the Marcionite stressing of the error of the Apostles proves that rather than focusing on a denigration of “the Jews” he aimed at supporting his charge against an early Christian tradition as “false Apostleship” (see ibid.²⁶⁸).

The whole of Marcion's theological edifice is based on two books – one book he rejects (Jewish scriptures) and one book he compiles/reconstructs (Luke’s Gospel & Paul’s Epistles). Marcion rejects the Jewish scriptures and prophecy *in its relevance for Christianity* (see Harnack 1924b: 94; Metzger 1987: 91). Righteous Jews could not receive salvation and “would be immune to [the] appeal” (Wilson 1986: 52) of the “universal messiah” (Jesus). In the tradition of Harnack, Bienert discusses whether one should regard this very distinction as intrinsically antisemitic (see Bienert 2001: 198; a question Harnack decided to the positive without much discussion). Bienert concludes:

“Was bei Paulus noch mit der konkreten Frage verbunden gewesen war, nämlich ob ein Heide, der Christ werden wolle, sich beschneiden lassen und die Gebote des alten Bundes übernehmen müsse, um in Christus die neue Gemeinschaft von Christen leben und feiern zu können, entwickelt sich bei Marcion zu einem fundamentalen Gegensatz in dem Sinn, daß christliche Identität grundsätzlich die Ablehnung alles Jüdischen einschließt” (Bienert 2001: 199).

Be it by virtue of his “antithetical turn of mind” (Wilson 1986: 53²⁶⁹) or the result of his

²⁶⁸ Further proof for this perspective is supplied by the fact that Marcion’s canon does not seem to include the anti-Jewish sentiments recorded in the infamous Romans, chapter 9 (see Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.14; cf. Hoffmann 1984: 229-233).

²⁶⁹ Harnack notes: “M. hat das Gesetz, d.h. gewisse Teile desselben (das Moralgesetz), für *heilig, gut* und

polemic against other Christians, this judgment remains a problematic aspect of Marcion's exclusionary anti-Jewish teaching. As the liberator of the human race, Marcion considered Jesus superior to the Jewish Messiah and a faith in Jesus as superior to Judaism in its entirety (see Hoffmann 1984: 228; cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.6).

Marcion establishes a conception of a Christianity independent of Judaism, its scriptures and prophecy. He rejects all Jewish heritage and constructs a religion solely based on the revelation of Jesus as God incarnate. In this theological and normative juxtaposition of unconditional love on the one, the Jewish law on the other side, one cannot only find evidence for the developing self-conception of Gentile Christianity. A few discursive elements ("the Jews" as ignorant, mistrustful and malicious) also reappear in later of the proto-Catholic writings. As noted above, this anti-Jewish element in Marcion is not directed against the authority of the Jewish scriptures and prophecy *per se* but against its morality as "something that fell beneath the teachings of Jesus and Paul" (Tyson 2005: 202). Marcion's perspective unfolds from the radical emphasis on the soteriological newness of Christ and its complete disconnectedness from anything that had existed before. The denigration of "the Jews" follows from their identification with this pre-Christian past and serves as contrasting foil for Marcionite Christianity. Regarding the negative and epistemic position of "the Jews" and according to the definition the present work adopts, Marcion's position can thus be judged antisemitic. However, Marcion's antisemitism is placed in a different frame than the proto-Catholic Christian response (see below). Consider Wilson's comment:

"The Marcionite position left Judaism intact, decidedly inferior though it was considered to be. There was a point, as Marcion seems to have noted, in Jews continuing to be Jews, keeping their law, and awaiting their Messiah. And it is of some interest, though perhaps no more than a coincidence, that there is no record of the persecution of Jews by the Marcionite churches" (Wilson 1986: 58).

Marcion certainly regarded Christianity to be the superior religion and wanted to eradicate all traces of the "Jewish scriptures" from his corpus. However, he did not question the legitimacy and divinity of Judaism as a religion of its own. Neither did he argue that "the

sogar für *geistlich* erklärt und damit für eine unverbrüchliche Norm; aber er hat es trotzdem nicht vom guten Gott abgeleitet, weil es zum Sündenstande gehört und die Sünde mehrt. *Dann aber ist die Annahme unvermeidlich, daß er zwischen 'gut' und gut, 'heilig' und heilig, 'geistlich' und geistlich unterschieden hat.* Die 'Güte', 'Heiligkeit' und 'Geistlichkeit' des Gesetzes folgt lediglich aus seinem Kontraste gegenüber dem Bösen und der Sünde; in Hinsicht aber auf die Güte, die sich in der Barmherzigkeit und Erlösung ausspricht, ist es weder gut noch heilig noch geistlich" (Harnack 1924: 109).

Jews” had persecuted and killed Jesus. Marcion's sharp separation of Christianity and Judaism thus presents an alternative to the emerging Catholic orthodox position which based its teaching on two fundamentals that drifted apart with increasing speed – the insistence on continuity with Jewish prophecy and an increasingly thorough adoption of a Gentile framework (cf. Tyson 2005: 202-208). Marcion’s position may have ultimately helped to relieve tensions arising from an increasing disconnection from a Jewish origin (see Wilson 1986: 58). In his book *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Ehrman 2003), Bart D. Ehrman formulates a similar thought. What, he wonders, would have happened if Marcionite Christianity had prevailed?

“This may have opened the doors to heightened hostilities, since Marcion seems to have hated Jews and everything Jewish; or possibly even more likely, it may have led simply to benign neglect as Jews and their religion would have been considered to be of no relevance and certainly no competition for Christians. The entire history of anti-Semitism might have been avoided, ironically, by an anti-Jewish religion” (Ehrman 2003: 111).

5.1.3 Marcion and the Canon of the New Testament

“There can be little doubt that events of the second half of the second century created a demand for a proto-orthodox canon of Scripture” (Ehrman 2003: 238)

As pointed out above, Marcion saw the Jewish Scriptures and Jesus' Gospel as irreconcilable. Maintaining that Jewish prophecy had not foretold the arrival of Jesus as Christ (see Tyson 2005: 202²⁷⁰), Marcion held the whole of the Christian faith he encountered in Rome to be fundamentally distorted. As a reaction, Marcion claimed that the Gospels and the church authorities had misapprehended and corrupted Jesus' message

²⁷⁰ Harnack suggests that Marcion's familiarity with the Jewish exegetic practice points to a closeness to Judaism, possibly even a previous conversion (see Harnack 1923: 15, 1924b: 22). While this hypothesis has remained marginal in scholarship, it has been argued that the exegetical method may testify to an encounter with Jewish circles in Sinope (Pontus), Marcion's place of birth (see Hoffmann 1984: 5-8). Hoffmann comments: “the existence of teachers such as Aquila points to the beginnings of a rigorist strain in Pontic Judaism [sic!] and a 'sharpening of the Torah' as a response to the destruction of the Temple. This being so, anti-Jewish sentiment can hardly have been less intense in Pontus than elsewhere between the years 70 and 140 CE. What is perhaps of more significance is that it is precisely such a 'reactionary strain' of biblical exegesis that seems to stand behind Marcion's interpretation of the law and the prophets as literal (i.e., purely historical) accounts of God's covenant with the Jews. Like Aquila – though obviously for a very different reason – Marcion opposed the spiritual and allegorical exegesis of the OT, which Christian interpreters themselves derived from the Hellenistic rabbis. Marcion's attitude toward the law thus seems to have been informed both by the (anti-Hellenist) literalism with which some Jews in Pontus were construing the Torah, and by the anti-Jewish sentiment which caused Judaism to turn in upon itself in the first place” (ibid.: 8).

to fit their scheme of continuity. Since, to Marcion, the text was “the inferior vehicle for the transmission of the truth, not, as among the orthodox, the primary vehicle” (Hoffmann 1984: 110), it was only consequential that he set out to restore the “original” meaning of those “corrupted” texts²⁷¹. This revision included a selection of specific texts and the editing sections according to his perspective, i.e. especially those parts implying a continuity of Christianity and Israel, old and new covenant and the Jewish law²⁷². Marcion apparently decided to include in his corpus only the ten Pauline Epistles and the Gospel according to Luke (see Alkier 2010: 19f.).

Scholars have claimed the Marcionite collection to be the first canon of *Christian* writing²⁷³. Its specific character as Paulinist and anti-scriptural collection (see Harnack 1924b: 84, 210f.; Knox 1942: 24-26), its early occurrence by the middle of the second century and its particular structure of Evangel and Apostolikon (see Campenhausen 1968: 180f.) has led some to wonder about the role Marcion played in the development of the Catholic canon. The first to argue for a pivotal position was J.G. Eichhorn. In his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1820), Eichhorn noted that the canon was established in reaction to Marcion who had supplied “the stimulus to collect New Testament writings” (Metzger 1987: 18). Adolf von Harnack prominently supported this perspective in a series of works including *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung* (1914), *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (1921/1924b) and *Neue Studien zu Marcion* (1923). In the seminal *Marcion*, Harnack ventured to show that neither Marcion nor any earlier author portrays knowledge of more than one *litera scripta* of Christianity (“Offenbarungsurkunde”, Harnack 1924b: 84, 210f.). Harnack thus arrived at his famous conclusion that the New Testament canon developed *in reaction to*

²⁷¹ Campenhausen points out that the alteration of texts was frequent practice among the early Gospel authors (consider only the differences between Matthew, Luke and Mark!). The scandal of Marcion's canon is thus arising only in post-canonical times when people were used to regarding certain texts as holy and untouchable, i.e. after their canonization (see Campenhausen 1968: 188f.).

²⁷² see Harnack 1924b: 39ff; Metzger 1987: 93f.; Gager 1983: 160f.; critical Knox 1942: 19ff.; Hoffmann 1984: 135ff., 308; Schmid 1995. It is difficult to determine the changes Marcion made to the Gospel. In order to trace them with certainty two things are necessary—proving that there existed a version of Luke older than the text altered by Marcion and then showing that this older version is closer to the first Lukan Gospels known today. For a list of the changes in Luke's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles usually designated to Marcion, consult Harnack 1924b: 45-65; Knox 1942: 83ff.; Evans 1972b: 643-646; Hoffmann 1984: 116ff. Scholars have also wondered whether there was a further revision by proto-Catholic editors *in reaction to Marcion* (see e.g. Eichhorn 1820: 101-104). Knox comments on the first two chapters of the Catholic Luke: “[H]ow wonderfully adapted it is to show the nature of Christianity as the true Judaism and thus to answer one of the major contentions of the Marcionites” (Knox 1942: 87; cf. 78ff., 111; cf. the chapter 5.2.3). Furthermore, the charge of alteration/corruption of the original teaching was frequent among Patristic writers as it expanded from Marcion to the charge that the Jews had altered the Jewish scriptures in order to prevent a Christian interpretation (see Ruether 1997: 122).

²⁷³ see Harnack 1924b: 72; Knox 1942: 55; Blackman 1978: 23f.; critical Balás 1980: 103-105; McDonald 2007: 333.

Marcion's writing (see Harnack 1923: 26-28; 1924b: 212-215²⁷⁴).

In contemporary scholarship, Marcion's influence on the New Testament canon remains a disputed matter. Scholars disagree on the question of whether Marcion inspired²⁷⁵, accelerated²⁷⁶ or had no decisive influence²⁷⁷ on the development, structure and content of the proto-Catholic canon. It seems the answers a scholar gives is connected to whether or not he/she understands the development of the Catholic canon as a deliberate decision or an anonymous process (see chapter 2.4.1). Scholars leaning to the side of deliberate decision tend to credit the Marcionite collection with influencing the Catholic canon to a varying degree²⁷⁸. However, arguments for deliberation and anonymous development do not exclude each other necessarily. The development of the Catholic canon may well have crystallized around individuals such as Marcion or other "heretics" that triggered a counter-reaction. This counter-reaction in turn shaped a process of identifying the sacred scriptures (canonizations) becoming increasingly hegemonic within proto-Catholic Orthodoxy (see Barnikol 1933: 26f.; Blackman 1978: 32f.). The inclusion of certain writings (e.g. Acts, Gospels), the appropriation of specific authors (Paul's original ten-letter corpus and three other Epistles) and the introduction of interpretative literature (the Pastorals) carry the traces of such struggles²⁷⁹. However, assuming the canon of the New Testament reflects contemporary conflicts among early Christians does not necessarily falsify the argument that the collection developed gradually and over a certain period.

With the installment of his own canon, Marcion effectively eliminated the (proto-Catholic) "issue of whether Christianity or Judaism stood as rightful heir to the promises of Israel" (Gager 1983: 160). Albeit enduring criticism, the hypothesis of a Marcionite influence is supported by the very structure of the canon (see chapter 2.4.1). Thus it is probable to assume that the Marcionite canon put pressure on those Christian communities that adhered to an idea of continuity between Jewish prophecy and Christian message. They now had to defend their own interpretation against two sides – an enduring but waning

²⁷⁴ A hypothesis supported further by Ernst Barnikol in *Die Entstehung der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions* (1933: 27).

²⁷⁵ see Harnack 1914: 39-42; 1924b: 212-215; Knox 1942: 140-157, 161; Campenhausen 1968: 174; Gager 1975: 85.

²⁷⁶ see Hoffmann 1984: 107; Metzger 1987: 99; McDonald 2007: 332f.

²⁷⁷ see Zahn 1975a: 638; Turner 1978: 253-256; Barton 2002; Oeming 2003; Klinghardt 2003; Gamble 2006: 205.

²⁷⁸ Knox notes that saying that a collection of the New Testament did not exist by 150 C.E. and existed by 175 C.E. is by "itself almost equivalent to saying that it was consciously brought into existence" (Knox 1942: 32; cf. Barnikol 1933: 7-9; Knox 1942: 140-157; Campenhausen 1968: 184, fn. 39).

²⁷⁹ see Barnikol 1933: 28; Bauer 1964: 225-229; Campenhausen 1968: 211-213; Gager 1983: 190; cf. Knox 1942: 77. Some scholars also find traces of the influence of the Marcionite canon in its dual structure of Evangel and Apostlikon (see Knox 1942: 31; cf. Campenhausen 1968: 181, fn. 22; refuted by Hoffmann 1984: 112).

influence of Jewish Christianity and the influence of voices demanding a complete separation. This defense was mirrored in the development of a set of proto-Catholic measures against “heretic” opinions²⁸⁰. This led to a shift in proto-Catholic strategy to “[t]he wording and the context of the New Testament on the one hand, and on the other hand the agreement between it and the older scripture” (see May 1987: 139).

Yet Marcion’s influence on the canon does not seem to have been as linear as some may have it as the development of proto-Catholic theology was influenced by multiple factors (see Campenhausen 1968: 193²⁸¹). Hoffmann concludes “that ‘the structural principle of Marcion’s canon’ (Knox) is not as such the ‘organizing idea of the Catholic NT’, but rather the very idea which the expansion and subsequent closure of the canon by the orthodox sought to bring under control” (Hoffmann 1984: 112; referring critically to Knox 1942: 31). Ultimately, the Catholic Church included in her canon those documents that “the church found most useful to [its] purposes” (Allert 2002: 19). The *antithetical relevance of the Marcionite canon for the New Testament* does not mean, however, that the proto-Catholic canon was successful in separating Church and “heresy”²⁸². This meets half way those scholars that argue that Marcion takes a pivotal position in the construction of the Catholic canon. One may detect traces of Marcionite editions in versions of the Epistles of Paul and Luke in early versions of the Catholic canon (see Metzger 1987: 97²⁸³). Most

²⁸⁰ One of those measure was the establishment of a canon of sacred writings, the other two being bishopric and the creed/rule of faith, see Chadwick 1967: 41-45. The *New Testament* distributed a blueprint for anyone who wanted to distinguish the righteous Church from its “heretic” counterparts.

²⁸¹ It is difficult to reconstruct the influence of other Christian sects deemed “heretic” by proto-Catholic Orthodoxy as few traces survive. Besides Gnosticism, the Montanists comprised a group within Christianity that appeared a little later than Marcion around the middle of the second century in the East of the Roman Empire. Marked by an intense apocalyptic outlook and a rigid penitential discipline, the new belief spread through the Empire quickly and was declared “heretic” by the Church (as *Cataphrygians*) during the first decades of the third century. Of the supposedly abundant literary production of this sect, nothing but a few quotations survive in the writings of their early Catholic opponents. An influence on early Catholic authors might be detected in a general mistrust towards apocalyptic and prophetic writing of a newer date developed in early Catholic Christianity. Metzger assumes the Montanist intervention inspired an affirmation of the New Testament canon (see Metzger 1987: 99-106). On Marcion and the Montanists, Metzger comments “the influence of the Montanist movement on the conception of the canon was the opposite of that exerted by Marcion. Whereas the latter had spurred the Church to recognize the breadth of the written corpus of authoritative writings, the insistence of the former on the continuous gift of inspiration and prophecy influenced the Church to emphasize the final authority of apostolic writings as the rule of faith. By rejecting the extravagances of Montanism, the Church took the first step toward the adoption of a closed canon of Scripture” (Metzger 1987: 106; cf. Chadwick 1967: 53; Campenhausen 1968: 257ff.).

²⁸² As noted before, the juxtaposition of “dogma” and “heresy” is not even sustainable for the church fathers themselves. Justin Martyr portrays a tolerance towards Jewish conduct hardly acceptable to his later Catholic interpreters. Tertullian turned to the “heretic” Montanism out of frustration for the laxity of the Roman Church, where he rose to leading ranks (see below; cf. Bauer 1964: 196).

²⁸³ One of these examples for the Marcionite influence is to found in the *Canon Muratori*, named after its discoverer L.A. Muratori (1672-1750). It is “one of the most important documents for the early history of the canon of the New Testament” (Metzger 1987: 191) and “the primary source for the state of the New Testament in the Western churches at the end of the second century” (Knox 1942: 54). The Latin fragment (the beginning and probably also the end of the document is missing) is supposed to have been derived from a Greek original and appears to have been written in the vicinity of the Western Church around the

importantly, one can credit Marcion with the reintroduction of Paul, who “was in clear danger of being forsaken altogether” (Hoffmann 1984: 101; cf. Barnikol 1933: 27; Knox 1942: 117). While Marcion subsumes everything under the tenets of the Pauline teaching, proto-Catholic writers reacted by first rejecting the Pauline Epistles before appropriating him for their own camp (Hoffmann 1984: 236f.). In a way, Hoffmann concludes, “Paul’s canonical status was secured by the need to defend his letters against marcionite and other heretical claimants” (Hoffmann 1984: 237²⁸⁴).

5.2 The Proto-Orthodox Reaction – Against Marcion, Against the Jews

“Putting it simply, it is as if the Marcionite said to the Jew: ‘Keep your God, your Scriptures, your Messiah, and your law; we consider them to be inferior, superseded in every way by the gospel.’ The Catholic said: ‘We’ll take your God, your Messiah, your Scriptures, and some of your law; as for you, you are disinherited, cast into a limbo, and your survival serves only as a warning of the consequences of obdurate wickedness.’” (Wilson 1986: 58)

Proto-Catholic writers considered the Marcionite teaching a serious threat by the latter half of the second century (see Aland 1973: 446). While those authors set out to object Marcion’s interpretation of Paul (see Hoffmann 1984: 236) and his proposed canon of

close of the second century (see Metzger 1987: 191). It compiles a list of texts accepted and rejected by the Catholic Church. This rejection and acceptance follows a set of criteria common “to a broad spectrum of proto-orthodox authors of the second and third centuries” (Ehrman 2003: 242): antiquity, apostolicity, catholicity and orthodoxy (see *ibid.*: 242f.). In this desire to include and exclude certain books, Campenhausen sees a reflection of both, the Marcionite introduction of the concept of canon and the presence of other “heretic” texts such as Montanism or Gnosticism (see Campenhausen 1968: 288f.). The author of the *Canon Muratori* accepts four Gospels (though only Luke and John are mentioned by name), the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistle of Jude, the Apocalypse and two Epistles of John and 13 of the Pauline Epistles. While the (unknown) author fails to mention 1 and 2 Peter, James and the Epistle to the Hebrews (see Metzger 1987: 199f.), he explicitly excludes two of the Pauline Epistles as forgery (Laodiceans/Ephesians and Alexandrians) arguing that they “promote the heresy of Marcion” (Metzger 1987: 197). Since Marcion had published his list some 50 years before the supposed publishing date of the *Canon Muratori*, it must be regarded as “the earliest collection of Pauline Epistles of which we have definite and indubitable documentary knowledge” (Knox 1942: 55).

²⁸⁴ Knox notes that the preponderance of Pauline writing within the New Testament canon cannot be explained by his relevance for conservative Christian communities alone. It rather points to a strategy of wresting Paul from its Marcionite interpreters: “We are so accustomed to the fact that thirteen of the twenty-seven writings in the New Testament are ascribed to Paul and that a fourteenth (Acts) deals in large part with his career that the real strangeness of the fact does not at first strike us. It is undeniable that Paul bulks larger in the New Testament than he bulked in the life of the early second-century church” (Knox 1942: 36; cf. 115ff.). While there surely were voices within proto-Catholic Orthodoxy that favored the marginalization of Paul (see Hoffmann 1984: 106), it is crucial to note why the group supporting a domestication of Paul prevailed. Knox claims that this decision testifies to the wide circulation of the Epistles of Paul. Declaring them “heretic” “would have been tantamount to regarding more than half of Christendom as heretical” (*ibid.*: 116; cf. Campenhausen 1968: 211-213).

sacred writings, what appears to have provoked them most was the detachment of the Christian message from the Jewish scriptures and prophecy. His critiques may have feared that this effectively deprived “Christianity of its apologetic proof, namely the proof of antiquity” (Hoffmann 1984: 233f.; Ehrman 2003: 112, 144f.; cf. Feldman 1993: 177f.). While former apologists had focused on Christianity as the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, those arguments became ineffective in face of the Marcionite challenge (see Campenhausen 1968: 105f.). Hoffmann comments:

“The character of Marcion's threat required the orthodox to wage a defense on two fronts: on the one, it was necessary to define the limits of Paul's apostolate; and on the other, to demonstrate the unity and integrity of the original apostolic witness as a basis for the (ongoing) rule of faith and the authority of bishops” (Hoffmann 1984: 127).

Between Justin and Tertullian one can observe a shift in strategy regarding Paul. While the former had chosen to ignore his writings, the latter switched strategy to appropriation and domestication of the Pauline Epistles²⁸⁵ This shift may well hint to a process of dissemination throughout the Roman East. Hoffmann supposes accordingly that the Epistles had gained so wide a currency by the year 200 C.E. that it could no longer be ignored (see *ibid.*: 103f.; 126f.). The canon was one of the central places where this appropriation of Paul's Epistles took shape.

In the following, two anti-Marcionite reactions are analyzed – Justin Martyr and Tertullian – and the *Acts of the Apostles* are re-interpreted in the light of the Marcionite challenge. As pointed out above, those critiques also serve as the only source for a reconstruction of the Marcionite teaching. The degree of misrepresentation and exaggeration one can expect to find in such a polemic leads Hoffmann to recommend “a healthy skepticism toward the patristic evidence about Marcion's heresy” (*ibid.*: 240). Yet the reason why this work dedicates a whole sub-section to those defenses against Marcion is that anti-Jewish elements frequently appear in the writings of both sides (see also the section above). What evokes special attention is the fact that those polemics are not even rhetorically directed against Jews as “Jews” (as in the *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition). Rather, the devaluation of “the Jews” develops out of a desire for a mutual refutation. It will be argued that this derailment of rhetoric marks a new quality in the development of a Christian formation of antisemitism.

²⁸⁵ A similar process appears to have been taken place regarding the Gospel of John who was claimed by Gnosticism and then reclaimed by Irenaeus for the Catholic Church (see Bauer 1964: 210-214; Leistner 1974: 9f.).

Before turning to those accounts, one curious example: In *Adversus Marcionem*, Tertullian claims to agree with Marcion on the anti-Judaic tendency of Galatians. While being the most important letter for the Marcionites because it “most clearly represented the Apostle's own claims for the singularity of his Gospel” (see *ibid.*: 75) it is far from clear if the Marcionites took it as anti-Jewish (see *ibid.*). By claiming an agreement, Tertullian may well attempt to incorporate the Marcionite position into his own anti-Judaic interpretation of Paul. In a way, Tertullian charges the figure of “Paul” with a *specific* anti-Jewish meaning that he in turn projects onto the Marcionites. This does not mean that a specific branch of Marcionite antisemitism did not exist; it illustrates, however, in what way proto-Catholic writers claimed a Marcionite “Paul” as an authority for an outright rejection of observant Judaism and, increasingly, Jewish Christianity.

Facing the Marcionite challenge, the proto-Catholic side now had to fight for their own interpretation on two fronts – an enduring but waning influence of Jewish Christianity and the influence of voices demanding a complete separation. The proto-Catholic thus had to “defend the god of the Hebrew Bible, as well as the Jews against their Gnostic denouncers and, at the same time, to refute the interpretation of prophecies and of the most important Biblical texts that was common to the Gnostics and the Jews” (Rokeah 1982: 91). The critique against Marcion therefore tried to safeguard central conceptions of God, Christ and scripture while maintaining the faith’s continuity with Jewish prophecy. To maintain its claim to Jewish *prophecy*, it had to disown not only empirical Judaism but also those believers who insisted on their own Jewish roots. Confronting Marcion’s claim, it had to demonstrate also that Jesus was the fulfillment of the *Jewish* prophecy and the promised Messiah.

The following analysis will conclude that this double task was solved by appropriating Jewish prophecy and denigrating the Jews as original carriers of God’s covenant. In the process of fending off the Marcionite teachings, proto-Catholicism developed a central conceptual tenet of its theological framework based on a denigration of “the Jews”. Efroymson notes accordingly “after Marcion and the defense against him, Christianity was thinking of its God, its Christ, its Bible, and itself, in anti-Jewish ways” (Efroymson 1979: 108). Gager seconds:

“Marcion’s anti-Judaism [...] focuses almost exclusively on the god and the scriptures of Judaism and says little of Jews as such. Indeed [...] it was rather among the Christian *opponents* of Marcion that the focus shifted from the god of the Jews to the Jews

themselves” (Gager 1983: 172).

Together with the Marcionite invective against “false apostles”, “the Jews” started to assume the role of a negative empty signifier for inner-Christian discourses by the middle of the second century – an attribution of any given opposition to the side of the interpreter.

5.2.1 Justin Martyr – *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*

“Judaism is, for Justin, not a given entity to which he is opposed and which he describes accurately or not, or to which he addresses an apologetic, but an entity that he is engaged in constructing in the textual process” (Boyarin 2004: 28)

The first post-apostolic writer considered in this work, Justin Martyr, was born at the beginning of the second century either at Schechem in Samaria (see Metzger 1987: 144) or in Neapolis (today's Nablus, see Campenhausen 1993: 15-23; Minns/Parvis 2009: 32; Green 2010: 84 for the following). A child to Pagan, middle-class parents, he came from a Gentile background. At the beginning of his spiritual career a follower of Plato's philosophy²⁸⁶, Justin converted to Christianity around the year 130 C.E. Following his conversion, Justin moved to Rome where all his books were published and where he was ultimately to be decapitated sometime during the 260s (thus the addition “Martyr”). Justin has been regarded to “mark a major step forward in the history of Christian apologetic literature” (Rajak 1999: 60²⁸⁷). His work outlines a conception of a “Christian”, “Pagan” and “Jewish” history not so much reflecting upon a current situation than “laying the groundwork for the very categories” (Droge 2006: 243). On the impact this “discursive practice” (ibid.: 244) had on Christian self-perception, A. J. Droge remarks:

“It was Justin more than anyone else who would set the terms in which Christianity would be represented to the wider world of antiquity, and a whole host of Christian writers would

²⁸⁶ Green notes that Justin “was probably the first Christian theologian to have had a solid education in philosophy” (see Green 2010: 84), something Campenhausen considers the central condition for the emergence of theology and the central difference between Apostolic and Patristic period (see Campenhausen 1993: 14).

²⁸⁷ In the introduction to the collection *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, the editors Edwards/Goodman/Price/Rowlands define “Apology” as “the defence of a cause or party supposed to be of paramount importance to the speaker. It may include *apologia* in the sense of Plato’s *Apology*, the defence of a single person, but is distinguished from polemic (which need not assume any previous attack by the opponent) and from merely epideictic or occasional orations” (Edwards/Goodman/Price/Rowlands 1999: 1). Sara Parvis argues for a narrower definition as “a phenomenon invented in its classic form by Justin Martyr in very specific circumstances, developed by the next generation, and perfected and retired by Tertullian” (Parvis 2007b: 115f.).

follow in his path, elaborating and expanding upon his project of self-definition” (ibid.: 230).

It is equally important to note yet again that this advancement is not identical with a Catholic understanding of Christianity but a step in its path. After his conversion, Justin continued to identify himself with Greek philosophy, believing that he had “attained the ultimate reality in God, the true philosophy” (Allert 2002: 184). Platonism inspired his definition of faith maintaining that Jesus was the personified logos common to all men²⁸⁸. Some scholars detect a further Platonic echo in Justin’s conviction that “Christianity could be expressed in terms that made sense to any rational person” (Green 2010: 84²⁸⁹). While not much of Justin’s writing survives, the *first* (c. 153, Just. A1) and *second Apology* (Just. A2)²⁹⁰ and the *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (c. 160 C.E., Just. Dial.) are among the most important documents in early Christian theological writing (see Campenhausen 1993: 15²⁹¹). Interest in Justin’s works has recently surged among scholars of Patristics and the New Testament (see Parvis/Foster 2007: 1f.²⁹²).

The main concern behind the *Apologies*²⁹³ is a defense of Christianity against Pagan prejudice and assaults (a massive problem during the second century, see Chadwick 1965: 278f.). Addressed to Antonius Pius and the ruling elite, Justin Martyr maintained that those assaults resulted from “prejudice and misinformation” (Chadwick 1966: 19²⁹⁴). This is why Justin chose to *explain* the main tenets of Christianity to his Gentile addressee (see Metzger 1987: 144). In a kind of “bid for intellectual respectability in the Greco-Roman eyes” (Efroymson 1979: 109) the *First Apology* is concerned with proving that

²⁸⁸ see Just. A1 36.1-2; 46.2-5; Dial. 61; see Barnard 1966: 85-100; Allert 2002: 185, Minns/Parvis 2009: 61.

²⁸⁹ Chilton comments: “[B]ecause Christianity was committed to the *Logos* as its systemic center, and Judaism to the Torah as its systemic center, the two could not understand one another” (Chilton 2007: 86f.). This likening of logos and faith in Jesus inspired the medieval scholars to conclude that “the Jews” who did not believe in Jesus as Christ had no insight in the logos. This connection of the logos as the trait of a human (“zoon politikon”) to faith in Jesus implies the conclusion that the (unbelieving) “Jews” cannot be humans but animals.

²⁹⁰ The division into two apologies continues to be disputed (see Parvis 2007a; Minns/Parvis 2009: 21-31). The present analysis will be restricted to the first Apology. Consult Paul Parvis for a discussion of this issue (see Parvis 2007a).

²⁹¹ cf. Horner 2001 on the composition of the *Dialogue*.

²⁹² For a short account on the history of research on Justin, see Slusser 2007. For the past fifty years, Slusser identifies two phases focusing on one of the two surviving texts: the “Justin of the *Apologies*” and the “Justin of the *Dialogue*” (see Slusser 2007: 15). Slusser also dedicates a section of his overview to the cooperation of Jewish and Christian scholars (see Slusser 2007: 18f.).

²⁹³ For the translation of the Apologies, see Minns/Parvis 2009.

²⁹⁴ On Justin’s argumentative strategy, Simon notes: “The main theme of Justin’s defence of Christianity is that Rome’s burgeoning hostility to the Church is due to a misunderstanding. The Romans lack accurate information about the new religion, and know of it only from the biased reports of those hostile to it. [...] The real responsibility for the wrong rests on other shoulders. Where else, if not on those of Israel” (Simon 1986: 118).

Justin's community of the faithful is in fact the fulfillment and true carrier of the Jewish scriptures (see Just. A1 30-53). Thus claiming (Jewish) antiquity for Christianity, Justin portrays Gentile philosophy as a derivative of Christianity, carrying part of its truth (see Campenhausen 1993: 17, Lieu 1996: 181). To Martyr, "the gospel and the best elements in Plato and the Stoics are almost identical ways of apprehending the same truth" (Chadwick 1966: 10f.). This assumption marks Justin as "the most optimistic" (ibid.: 10) of early Christian theologians regarding "the harmony of Christianity and Greek philosophy" (ibid.).

To strengthen his claim to Jewish prophecy, Justin adopts the topos of misapprehension already familiar from the Gospels. "The Jews" are described as ignorant as they "do not understand what has been said, and consider us to be enemies and adversaries, and, like you, they destroy and punish us whenever they are able" (Just. A1 31, cf. 36.3, 63.1-17). The Jewish prophets themselves foretold the downfall of the Jewish people (see ibid.: 37.1-2) and also, most importantly, the coming of Christ (see ibid. 31.7-42.2; cf. Chilton 2007). Likewise, the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple has been foretold (see ibid. 47.1-6). After this downfall, the divine election shifted to the Gentiles (see ibid. 49.1-7). In Justin's first *Apology* it is therefore possible to identify an assembly of arguments typical for an early Christian formation of antisemitism in the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature (see Efroymson 1979: 108f.; cf. chapter 6.2): Not only do "the Jews" not understand their own scriptures (ignorance), they are also a threat to Christ/Christianity/the truth (maliciousness). While arguing that Christianity is rooted "in a culture and religion antecedent to paganism" (Remus 1986: 60), the juxtaposition of Christianity and Judaism shifts sympathy to the Pagan side. The much shorter second apology amends a few questions that seem to have arisen in the face of the first work (see Cosgrove 1982: 4). Its authenticity is disputed (see Parvis 2007a). In the *Dialogue*, Martyr's latest writing, things get more complex as the context changes with the growing impact of the Marcionite teachings.

In Justin Martyr's writings, one finds the earliest evidence for a proto-Catholic reaction to the Marcionite teaching (see Just. A1 26.5; 58.1; Dial. 82). At the same time, he is the "very first witness of Marcion's activity and also the only contemporary witness we have" (Moll 2007: 145). Marcion's teaching threatened the very foundation of the Christian defense against its Roman critics and persecutors. On one defense-line, apologists had claimed the Jewish tradition for Christianity, which was accepted as *religio licita* in the Roman Empire (see chapter 6.1.1). Before Marcion, this claim had to be defended only

against a Jewish interpretation and a Gentile assault. Marcion's separation of Judaism and faith in Jesus as Christ opened up a new line of confrontation within the group of Christ-believers. The advent of Marcion put Justin in a difficult situation; while the established arguments had aimed at defending Jesus' legitimacy as fulfillment of the Jewish prophecy, Justin suddenly had to defend the relevance of the Jewish scriptures and prophecy itself (see Campenhausen 1968: 116²⁹⁵). Campenhausen comments:

“Justin steht in einem Dreifrontenkrieg. Dieselben Argumente, die einst gegen die Juden entwickelt und dann auch der Heidenmission dienstbar geworden waren, müssen sich jetzt gegen die gnostischen und markionistischen Kritiker wenden lassen, gegen die sie nicht ausreichen. Man muß sie umprägen und ergänzen; aber man kann sie nicht abstoßen, da sie an den älteren Fronten noch immer benötigt werden. So erscheinen sie je nach dem Blickpunkt, unter dem sie gesehen werden, und nach dem Gegner, den sie treffen sollen, in recht verschiedener Beleuchtung und Funktion” (ibid.: 115).

*

The *Dialogue*²⁹⁶ is told as an encounter between a Christian and a Jewish character. It shows some similarities to the Platonic dialogues but adds elements of Justin's own ingenuity (see Allert 2002: 184). The *Dialogue* consists of 142 chapters (though parts are missing, see Chadwick 1965: 278). Among the first contributors to the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature it is also “the longest book thus far produced by an orthodox Christian writer” (Metzger 1987: 144; cf. Stroumsa 1996: 8²⁹⁷). The text refers to early versions of all four of the Gospel sources (called “Memoirs of the Apostles”) though Justin makes far more

²⁹⁵ There is no necessary contradiction to Justin's supposed closeness to a “Judaean-Christian milieu in close contact with Jewish Messianic exegesis of the OT” (Skarsaune 1987: 287; Cf. 371-373). The Marcionite pressure and other external developments explicated below caused a deepening of the difference between faith in Christ and the Jewish framework Justin and his contemporaries relied on for their interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. The “two distinct voices” (ibid.: 371) in Justin of Jewish Christianity and of triumphant Gentile Christianity are but an expression of this deepening condition of theological schizophrenia.

²⁹⁶ For citation, see the revised edition of Thomas B. Falls' translation (see Martyr 2003).

²⁹⁷ According to Richardson, the characteristics of the *Dialogue* are: “(1) a sharp, though not absolute, discontinuity between the old people of God and Jews after the cross; (2) a similarly sharp discontinuity between Gentiles and Jews as possible recipients of the grace of God in Jesus Christ; (3) a close relationship between the righteous in the old times and the new people of God, the Christians; (4) yet, in spite of all this, the Church and Jews can still talk reasonably together” (Richardson 1969: 13). Considering those aspects, Justin's *Dialogue* is a classic example for the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature (see Harnack 1883: 74-78).

use of the Synoptics²⁹⁸ – and no *explicit* use of Paul (see Metzger 1987: 145-148²⁹⁹). The *Dialogue* unfolds between the Hellenistic Jew Trypho and Justin, a Gentile convert to Christianity. Traditional scholarship assumes that a real Jewish-Christian encounter lies behind the *Dialogue*³⁰⁰. Critics judge the encounter to be artificial, pointing to the weak argumentation of Trypho and the essentially Christian focus of the supposed record³⁰¹. Cosgrove concludes pointedly “the dialogue with the outsider may represent no more than internal monologue” (Cosgrove 1982: 219; cf. Horner 2001: 15-32 for a review).

As in the question of the motivation for the *Dialogue* (to which this work returns towards the end of this section), the addressee has remained a crucial concern of the scholarly debate until the present day. Scholars have argued for a Pagan readership³⁰², a Christian readership³⁰³, Christian and Pagan³⁰⁴, Christian and Jew³⁰⁵ or only Jew³⁰⁶. Recently, scholars seem to favor a perspective that includes all of the aforementioned groups³⁰⁷. Wilson notes that the whole of the *Dialogue* is “essentially exegetical” (Wilson 1995: 270) in that both parties refer to the Jewish scriptures as main source for their arguments. Different explanations have been brought forward to explain this mutual focus. Scholars assuming a Jewish readership tend to argue that the Jewish scriptures are the common ground on which the two parties meet or conclude that Justin does not yet seem to possess “a book called ‘The New Testament’” (Chadwick 1965: 283). On the contrary, scholars such as Harnack, Campenhausen, Cosgrove and Efroymson argue that the *Dialogue* is a defense against a Jewish critic only on its surface. Behind it lurks a defense against the “heretic”/Marcionite attack³⁰⁸. Scholars assuming that the *Dialogue* aims primarily at a

²⁹⁸ Allert notes: “while it may be accurate to say that Justin used the Synoptic Gospels in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, it must be clarified that he used a source that was based on the synoptics and not actually the separate synoptics” (Allert 2002: 219). There is disagreement on the question of John, though present scholarship appears to lean towards assuming that Justin knew and used it as well (see Bellinzoni 1967: 139-142 but Skarsaune 2007b: 67f. and Hill 2007).

²⁹⁹ Justin knew of Marcion and relied heavily on Paul’s Epistles, especially Romans and Galatians (see Skarsaune 1987: 92-100; 2007b: 74f.). Skarsaune has pointed out that Justin even borrows quotations and expositions from him (see Skarsaune 2007b: 74, fn. 92). However, Justin avoids any explicit reference to Paul. Goodspeed and subsequent authors interpret this absence as an early strategy among proto-Catholic writers to refute Marcion (see Goodspeed 1927: 55-57; Cosgrove 1982: 225; Campenhausen 1968: 117f.). In an intriguing essay, Cosgrove further discusses the question of canon-formation with regard to Justin (see Cosgrove 1982).

³⁰⁰ see Zahn 1886: 60; Williams 1935: 31; Barnard 1964: 398; Lieu 1996: 104; cf. MacLennan 1990: 49, fn. 2.

³⁰¹ see Harnack 1883: 77f.; Tränkle 1964: lxxif.; Chadwick 1965: 281f.; Bokser 1973: 98; Cosgrove 1982: 218f.; 1994: 129; MacLennan 1990: 53f.; Mach 1996: 34-37; Schreckenberg 1999: 184f.).

³⁰² see Harnack 1883: 78; Goodeneough 1923: 96-100; Hyldahl 1966: 17-20; Schreckenberg 1999: 182f..

³⁰³ Cosgrove 1982: 215-219; Rajak 1999: 79.

³⁰⁴ see Chadwick 1966: 10; Mach 1996: 47; Green 2010: 83f..

³⁰⁵ see Stylianopoulos 1975: 165f.; Allert 2002: 61.

³⁰⁶ Wilde 1949: 107; Rokéah 2002: 128.

³⁰⁷ see MacLennan 1990: 87; Campenhausen 1993: 20; Setzer 1994: 129; Lieu 1996: 105; cf. Rokéah 2002: 6-19 for an overview.

³⁰⁸ Harnack and Goodeneough assume that the *Dialogue* is best understood as a polemic against rival

Pagan or a Christian audience reject the Jewish mission as context for the debate. Rather, they tend to agree that a Christian self-assurance is its final objective³⁰⁹. While this may point towards the pressure exerted by Roman official policy (see chapter 6.1.1), the position developed in the *Dialogue* has also been taken as contribution to a theological debate (see Boyarin 2004: 38f.). Following the latter two assumptions of internal conflict and theological self-reflection, the *Dialogue* can be understood as an outline of Justin's theological position vis-à-vis the Marcionite challenge. It starts by discussing the Mosaic Law and its relevance (chapters 9-31), the main part is then dedicated to a discussion of Christology (chapters 32-110) before ending with the claim to the true Israel (chapters 111-142). Boyarin notes that Justin's emphasis on logos-theology fulfils two purposes:

“First, it articulates Christian identity as theological. Christians are those people who believe in the Logos; Jews cannot, then, believe in the Logos. Second, Christians are those people who believe in the Logos; those who do not are not Christians but heretics” (Boyarin 2004: 39).

The “logos”-theory supplies one central pillar to a strategy of countering Jewish claims to prophecy but also countering the “heretic” rejection of prophecy. The term “heretics” points to this anti-Marcionite thrust in Justin's *Dialogue* though most references remain implicit. For example, the 11th chapter stresses that “there will be no other God [...] nor was there from eternity any other existing”. In the 23rd chapter, Justin rejects any notion dividing God as “foolish opinions”, repeatedly stressing that God has remained consistent in the passing of the election from Judaism to Christianity throughout the *Dialogue* (see Just. Dial. 23; 30; 92; cf. Efroymson 1979: 105). In the 35th chapter, Justin then condemns the Marcians explicitly and calls them “false prophets” (cf. Just. Dial. 82; a reference to the Pauline polemics also employed by Marcion). In the 80th chapter, Justin uses the word “godless, impious heretics” to designate those that “teach doctrines that are in every way blasphemous, atheistical, and foolish”. Furthermore, allusions to the Jewish scriptures and prophecy are a structural part of Justin's argumentation for the legitimacy of Christianity. This stress on continuity may be taken as further evidence that the *Dialogue* refutes the Marcionite detachment of Christian and the Jewish God, scriptures and prophecy (see Cosgrove 1982: 221-225; Setzer 1994: 136).

Christians (see Harnack 1883: 78; Goodenough 1923: 95-100). Likewise, Campenhausen notes that Justin's argument appears to be influenced by inner-Christian adversaries (see Campenhausen 1968: 106) and Efroymson concludes about a decade later the *Dialogue* “shows significant traces of the defense against Marcion” (Efroymson 1979: 105; cf. Cosgrove 1982: 220; Fredriksen 1997: 44; for a discussion see Wilson 1995: 261-265; Rajak 1999: 75-80).

³⁰⁹ see e.g. Cosgrove 1982: 218f.; MacLennan 1990: 152; Lieu 1996: 105; Boyarin 2004: 39.

The other side of Justin's attempt to legitimize Christianity is a tendency to separate empirical Judaism from Jewish scriptures/prophecy. For example, he introduces the idea that the physical Israel (Judaism) has been superseded by the spiritual Israel (see Richardson 1969: 1; 11f.; Wilson 1995: 269f.³¹⁰). This may be taken as proof for the increasing strength of the teachings of the heresiarchs with Marcion as their central figure (see e.g. Just. Dial. 35). By intensifying a denigration of "the Jews" and their capacity for staying true to the covenant, Justin is able to open up a space for an appropriation of the divine covenant for his own interpretation of the faith (the "true Israel"³¹¹). This "proof" of divine provenance also supplies a counter-argument to Marcion's claim that the Jewish God has no business with Jesus or his followers. It also marks an important step in the development of a notion of supersession vis-à-vis a Jewish Christian insistence on continuity of ritual. Closer analysis of the refutation of Marcion reveals that the rejection of "the Jews" is the cost by which Justin tries to "save" the Jewish prophecy for Christianity.

Boyarin has noted that the *Dialogue* is "part of Justin's overall project of inventing orthodoxy as the form and structure of Christianity" (Boyarin 2004: 28). This development is accompanied by a crucial shift in the construction of a proto-Catholic position as appropriation of a Jewish-Christian tradition by Gentile Christianity. Accordingly, Justin has been understood to develop his theological position in

³¹⁰ In his seminal *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (1969), Richardson notes that "[n]owhere from the close of the NT canon to Justin is the Church explicitly said to be Israel" (Richardson 1969: 16). Rather, the Christian authors only hesitantly "move towards the statement that Christianity is the 'true Israel', a conclusion reached [...] in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*" (ibid.: 31). For Richardson, this is "a symptom of the developing take-over by Christians of the prerogatives and privileges of the Jews" (ibid.: 1). Ben-Zion Bokser pointedly sums up the trajectory personified in Justin when noting: "Justin Martyr stands midway between the New Testament and the rabid anti-Jewishness which eventually became part of Christian culture" (Bokser 1974: 204). The claim to a fulfillment of divine prophecy did not start with Christianity but in Jewish sects (see Heemstra 2010: 167f.). However, the characteristic features of this takeover only unfold once the Christian author regards himself as proponent of a religion that is external to Judaism. It therefore needs the transition out of a Jewish framework. In Justin, one can find this transition of a "measure of continuity" (Richardson 1969: 1) to a position of discontinuity with empirical Judaism. Accordingly, Richardson finds "a growing, though not uniform, tendency to emphasize discontinuity and to forgo continuity" (ibid.: 31) as "[t]he one constant factor" (ibid.) in early Christian writing, a tendency to depict Judaism as a "temporary phenomenon" (ibid.) superseded by Christianity. He concludes, "[g]enerally, the farther one moves into the second century the more separated are Judaism and the Church" (ibid.: 32).

³¹¹ Consider the following sections: "For the true spiritual Israel, and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham [...] are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ" (Just. Dial. 11); "you ought to understand that [the gifts] formerly among your nation have been transferred to us" (ibid. 82); "we from Christ, who begat us unto God, like Jacob, and Israel, and Judah, and Joseph, and David, are called and are the true sons of God, and keep the commandments of Christ" (ibid. 123); "those who were selected out of every nation have obeyed His will through Christ [...] must be Jacob and Israel" (Just. Dial. 130); "Jacob was called Israel; and Israel has been demonstrated to be the Christ, who is, and is called, Jesus" (Just. Dial. 134); "Christ is the Israel and the Jacob, even so we, who have been quarried out from the bowels of Christ, are the true Israelitic race" (ibid. 135).

demarcation to both, the Jewish interpretation of prophecy and the “heretic” rejection of Judaism³¹². Skarsaune notes:

“It is striking to observe that while this Gentile Christian adaption of the tradition virtually disinherits the Judaeo-Christian predecessors, it keeps in close contact with Jewish exegesis” (Skarsaune 1987: 429).

To Justin Martyr, faith in Jesus is the true and rightful heir to Jewish prophecy from which “the Jews” are to be excluded. Efroymson notes accordingly that Justin is “the first to have 'saved' the God who enacted the law, and the book which contained it, at the expense of the Jews” (Efroymson 1979: 105). In Justin’s writing, the argument for continuity to Jewish prophecy turns into a conception of supersession, moving the construction of a negative image of Judaism to the center of his self-understanding as a Christian. This is underlined by the treatment of the Jewish scriptures itself. Metzger points out that the scriptural passages Justin refers to give “preference to [...] the rejection of Israel and the election of the gentiles” (Metzger 1987: 145). Bokser amends that Justin’s depiction of the crucifixion paints “the Jews” as sole crucifiers motivated by “their depraved, satanic nature” (Bokser 1974: 205).

In accordance with Marcel Simon, Skarsaune explains this development by “missionary competition” (Skarsaune 1987: 429; 433³¹³). In much the same vein, Bokser assumes that the “resistance of the Jews to the claims of Christianity” (Bokser 1974: 205) was the central motivation this intensification of anti-Jewish invective in Justin. Against this, Lieu underlines the speculative quality of such a conflictual assumption (see Lieu 1996: 107) and Mach points to the anachronism of some of Tertullian’s claims even during his own time (see Mach 1996: 32f.) concluding:

“If Justin’s knowledge of contemporary Jewish history is limited, and his attacks on Jewish involvement in the persecution of Christians depend on New Testament sources, then the actual historical situation, whatever it was, cannot be accounted the basic motive for his writing the *Dial*” (Mach 1996: 33).

Even if the Jewish mission is an important reference point for the textual treatment of “the Jews” it is not sufficient to explain the contemporary challenges Justin’s *Dialogue* is devised to encounter. By Justin’s time, the failure of the Jewish mission was an

³¹² see Cosgrove 1982: 221; Wilson 1995: 269; Boyarin 2004: 39.

³¹³ cf. Setzer 1994: 146; Rokéah 2002: 128.

established fact (the *Dialogue* would have probably ended with the conversion of Trypho, if this would have been the author's objective, see Setzer 1994: 136). Jewish-Christian competition should therefore not be taken as a blueprint for "the Jews" in the *Dialogue*. The success of the Marcionite mission demonstrates further that a claim to Jewish prophecy was not a *necessary* condition for successfully attracting converts. Rather, Justin's *Dialogue* gives expression to a beleaguered position *within* early Christianity.

It has been demonstrated above how the Marcionite pressure provided for an *intensification* of the claim to Jewish prophecy combined with a denigration of "the Jews". This does not mean that Justin did not integrate earlier aspects of a Christian self-understanding into his rearrangement. In fact, anti-Jewish accusations familiar from the Gospels merge with the Justinian defense against Marcion. In this sense, the *Dialogue* should be taken as an update of basic Christian arguments according to contemporary needs. Efroymson's hypothesis can thus be confirmed:

"Marcion's challenge or threat placed all the anti-Judaic themes in a new apologetic context, appending them to ideas of God and Christ in ways that came perilously close to permanence" (Efroymson 1979: 105).

In an attempt to counter Marcion, Justin wanted to stress the necessary connection of Jewish prophecy and the Christian message. His exegetic strategy followed the Gospel tradition in claiming Christianity to be the fulfillment of the Jewish prophecy to counter the Marcionite rejection of the Jewish scriptures. Justin took a Gospel tradition of appropriation further in emphasizing the split between Jewish prophecy and empirical Judaism. By this, Justin managed to channel the Marcionite rejection of the creator God away from Jewish prophecy towards the empirical "Jews". This double-strategy of denigration of "the Jews" and appropriation of scriptures opened a way to maintain Christianity's continuity with Jewish prophecy (culminating in the claim to be the true Israel – "Verus Israel"). Accordingly, Boyarin sees in Justin a decisive shift within the internal structure of (proto) Catholic Christianity that affects the very relation of the two entities "Judaism" and "Christianity":

"After the time of Justin and his promulgation of *Verus Israel*, becoming a Christian (or follower of Christ) meant something different – it no longer entailed becoming a Jew –, and once becoming a Christian became identified with 'entering [the true] Israel', the whole semantic/social field shifted. The boundary between Greek and Jew, the definition of Jewishness as national or ethnic identity, was breached or gravely threatened by the self-

definition of Gentile Christianity as ‘Israel,’ leading to a reconfiguration of the cultural features that signal the boundary, indeed a reconfiguration of the understanding of the substance of the boundary itself from the genealogical to the religious” (Boyarin 2004: 73).

Claiming the Jewish prophecy and scriptures *against Marcion*, Justin introduced a notion that remained present in subsequent proto-Catholic writers such as Clement, Origen and Tertullian (see Chadwick 1966: 9f.). Defending the legitimacy of their own interpretation of the faith in Christ vis-à-vis competing interpretations, those writers followed analogous argumentative patterns – highlighting the notion of continuity to the Jewish scriptures and prophecy and denigrating a Jewish conduct in order to justify a particular claim to their heritage³¹⁴. However, there were also differences. One of these differences concerns the treatment of Paul.

5.2.2 Tertullian – *Adversus Marcionem*

“Tertullian acts as if the Jews no longer exist, and as if he stood in their stead, or, even more precisely, as if he were continuing their work according to the same principles. That is why, when necessary, Tertullian might use Jewish themes and tools to display closeness to Judaism or on other occasions might rather remain distant from the Jews if it enables him to influence and lead the Christians effectively” (Binder 2012: 198)

Septimius Tertullianus was born in Carthage to Pagan parents around the middle of the second century. His native tongue was Latin. Educated in literature, law and rhetoric, he also became adept in Greek. The first half of his adult life he appears to have spent in Rome as a lawyer, which did not remain without influence on his later work as a (Christian) writer, polemic and apologist. After his conversion in 195 C.E., Tertullian returned to Carthage to proselytize. Following a series of disappointments with the religious conduct

³¹⁴ Harnack comments: “Nur bei flüchtiger Beobachtung erscheint es als eine Paradoxie, dass die eifrigsten und entschlossensten Gegner des Judenthums dasselbe innerhalb der Kirche zu Gehör gebracht haben. Sie erkannten die Ansprüche und die Eigenart desselben an, um es eben dadurch aufs nachdrücklichste von sich zu stossen” (Harnack 1883 69).

of the Roman church, he joined the Montanists³¹⁵, becoming their African leader³¹⁶. In contrast to Justin Martyr, Tertullian shows no comparable appreciation of Greek and Roman philosophy. He does acknowledge an occasional closeness to Christian truth but argues that these sections were stolen from the Jewish scriptures (see Campenhausen 1995: 22). As “a great opponent of heresy” (Rives 2001: 276) he opposed any combination of Greek philosophy with Christian theology (see Dunn 2004: 31-34 for a discussion³¹⁷). When Tertullian died around the year 220 C.E. he had become “the most prolific of the Latin Fathers in pre-Nicene times” (Metzger 1987: 158³¹⁸).

Tertullian stands at a point in time when Latin began to replace Greek as the dominant liturgical language in the Western Roman Empire. About thirty of his works survive. The earliest is the *Apologeticum* dating from around 197/198 C.E.³¹⁹. It was followed by a time of fervent writing until 212 C.E., when the *Address to Scapula* was published as his latest known work (see Rives 2001: 273; Dunn 2004: 7-10³²⁰). The form of these writings ranges from pamphlets to elaborate studies and they discuss virtually all aspects Christian communities of his time had to deal with. Ilona Opelt notes that most of Tertullian’s writings was polemic and directed against what he regarded enemies to Christianity or Gentile critics (see Opelt 1980: 28; Campenhausen 1995: 15f.). With none of his Greek writing surviving, he became famous for his Latin works. Tertullian, schooled in classical rhetoric, introduced many neologisms adopted by later writers and thus shaped the vocabulary of Western Latin Christendom Tertullian has been called the beginning of Latin Patristic writing (see Campenhausen 1995: 12³²¹).

³¹⁵ Going back to Barnes, scholarship divides Tertullian’s writing in a pre-Montanist and a Montanist phase starting in 206 C.E. (see Barnes 1985: 55). Important Christian communities (Rome, Carthage) declared Monatanism heretical only after Tertullian’s death. To Tertullian and his contemporaries, however, the proto-Catholic interpretation was but one stream in the sea of Christian multiplicity. In this sense, Rankin comments that Tertullian’s turn to Montanism does not imply that he left the church (see Rives 2001: 275; cf. Dunn 2004: 6f.). Just as in the case of Justin’s laxity regarding the Mosaic Law, this case supplies a further example for how a Catholic interpretation invented a tradition of religious authorities that partially fall out of their own dogmatic line. According to the Catholic dogma, Tertullian would have been excommunicated a heretic. Remarkably, though, his diversion did not dampen Tertullian’s popularity among later Catholic writers (see Chadwick 1967: 92; Campenhausen 1995: 35).

³¹⁶ see Metzger 1987: 158; Campenhausen 1995: 31-34; cf. Barnes 1985: Rives 2001: 273-276; Dunn 2004: 3f.; Wilhite 2007: 1f. for biographical details.

³¹⁷ This rejection has been explained by two factors – (1) the lower status of philosophy in the Latin occident and (2) the theological opponents Tertullian tries to encounter. As in the case of Marcion, these opponents appear as educated Gentiles developing their “heresy” by means of philosophical method (see Campenhausen 1995: 24f.). To be sure, Tertullian does resort to Stoic conceptions when it serves him in his rejection of Marcion (see below).

³¹⁸ For an intriguing reassessment of the established view from the venturing point of postcolonial thought, see Wilhite 2007.

³¹⁹ see Campenhausen 1995: 17-24; consult Sider 2001: 1-70 for a commentary and translation.

³²⁰ For a translation of the texts of *Adversus Iudaeos* (Against the Jews) and *Scorpiace* (Antidote for the scorpion’s sting), see Dunn 2004. For a translation of the *Adversus Marcionem* (Against Marcion), see Evans 1972a,b.

³²¹ see Metzger 1987: 158, fn. 24; Campenhausen 1995: 14f.; Schreckenberg 1999: 216; For example,

Historians have traditionally explained anti-Jewish slurs in the Patristic literature as a reaction to Jews partaking in the persecution of Christians. An interpreter adhering to this traditional scheme may be surprised to find that the Carthage of Tertullian's time was marked by a closeness between Judaism and a community of Christians (an echo of which can be detected in the latter's religious conduct, see Blumenkranz 1968: 88; Dunn 2004: 13-15; Binder 2012: 200). Tertullian's own account on "the Jews" is two-folded. Sometimes he expresses hatred of "the Jews" (see e.g. Tert. Apol. 21; Scorpiace 10.10), at others he underlines the continuity of emerging Christianity with Judaism (see Tert. Apol. 16.3; 19.2; 21.1; Adv. Marc. 4. 8). Efreymson notes on this peculiar position:

"With Tertullian, there were added some extra touches: a version of Israelite history which made their loss of place (to Christians) more intelligible; a God who warned Jews, and replaced them with gentile Christians 'capable of a fuller discipline': and 'ecclesiology': a Church, now comprised of these same 'more capable' gentiles, but with historical roots (and a claimed respectability in the Roman world) that went back to the beginning of time" (Efreymson 1979: 110).

In contrast to this, Tertullian's theology appears to have been influenced by Jewish scholarship and employs elements "in full consciousness of their Jewish origins" (Binder 2012: 217). Stéphanie E. Binder comments that this must be considered "representative of the wider Church of his time" (ibid. ³²²). To be sure, an adoption of Jewish thought does not necessarily point to its acceptance on a social or religious level – and the relationship may have been marked by a policy of delineation in which the Carthaganean representatives of both religions engaged (see Tertullian, Apol. 21:2; cf. Binder 2012: 217). Binder notes on this ambiguity:

"Tertullian's apparent hatred of the Jews is just one more tool for him. He likes them when it serves his interests, as when he endeavours to demonstrate to the Gentiles the legitimacy of Christianity through its links with ancient Judaism [...]. On the other hand, however, [...] he denigrates the Jews in order to demonstrate to a Jewish audience that their faith and

Tertullian uses two Latin words derived from his profession as lawyer to designate authoritative Christian writings – *Instrumentum*, referring to a written contract or agreement and *Testamentum*, meaning last will or testament (see Metzger 1987: 159). Ilona Opelt notes Tertullian's significance for Patristic polemics: "Tertullians Leistung ist die Entwicklung der gruppenspezifischen Attacke. Sie wurde später stereotyp. Wo sie aufgegeben wird, Vorwürfe unspezifisch gebraucht werden, verliert der Angriff seine Prägnanz" (see Opelt 1980: 209). As demonstrated below, the latter assessment is not entirely correct. Anti-Jewish images reappear in attacks on other opponents as they become interchangeable with the position of "the heretic".

³²² Compare Stéphanie E. Binder (2012) for an insightful discussion of the influence of rabbinic Judaism on Tertullian.

practices are outdated, praising the novelty of the Christian faith and trying to convince potential converts that Christianity is superior to Judaism. When addressing these potential pagan converts to Christianity, however, he avoids mentioning that Christianity is the heir to Judaism, since pagan culture tends to scorn the Jewish faith” (Binder 2012: 201).

This observation is of special interest to the present study because it points to the strategic nature a reference to “Judaism” and “the Jews” have in Tertullian’s writing. The following section is going to examine more closely his treatise *Adversus Marcionem* (c. 203-211³²³) that incorporates parts of his earlier treatise against Jews, *Adversus Iudaeos* (c. 197, discussed below). Both books employ anti-Judaic themes in their argument. In both cases, the study agrees with Efroymson’s assumption that empirical Judaism does not *motivate* the depiction, but that its employment lies rooted within the theological tradition to which Tertullian refers.

In the first book of his *Adversus Marcionem* (there are five), Tertullian refutes Marcion’s position³²⁴ from the standpoint of a Stoic conception of God as good, rational and eternal (see Norelli 2001: 113ff.). This serves him as venturing point to uncover logical contradictions in Marcion’s conception of divinity: two God’s cannot exist because they contradict God’s quality as eternal, the *demiurg* of the Jewish Scriptures cannot exist because he contradicts God’s goodness, and an *absolute goodness* of God cannot exist because this would render him irrational (see Tert. Adv. Marc. 1.22f.; cf. Norelli 2001: 114f.; 125³²⁵).

The second book is concerned with defending the unity of God by demonstrating the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and the newer teachings of Jesus. It is here that

³²³ On the development of scholarship about this treatise, see Lukas 2008: 19-35. See *ibid.*: 36ff. for a thorough interpretation.

³²⁴ Harnack notes the difficulty involved when trying to separate Marcion and Marcionites as addressees of Tertullian’s attacks (see Harnack 1924: 83f.). This blurriness of terminology, Harnack concludes, only allows for a reconstruction of the general tenets of the Marcionite teaching, not for a clear reconstruction of specific positions within the Marcionite church (see *ibid.*).

³²⁵ Norelli notes: “Was Tertullian gegen ihn [Marcion] vorbrachte, mußte er schon voraussetzen: die Güte des höchsten Gottes sei alogisch, irrational, ganz widersinnig und mit den üblichen Maßstäben dieser Welt und deren Philosophie unverträglich. Die Liebe, die Jesus durch sein Beispiel gezeigt hat, kann mit dem Logos aus diesem einen Grund nicht versöhnt werden” (Norelli 2001: 120). On the other side, Campenhausen maintains that Tertullian’s attitude towards philosophy does not follow the juxtaposition of faith and reason. Rather, both terms denote “einen vor allem inhaltlich unterschiedenen Besitz prinzipiell gleichartiger Erkenntnis, die auf verschiedenen Wegen gesucht und angeeignet wird. Der Glaube hält sich an das, was Gott offenbart hat, während der Philosoph in der Einbildung lebt, auch solche Fragen, die über den menschlichen Horizont hinausreichen, von sich aus ergründen zu können. [...] Der Glaubende denkt nicht weniger logisch, vernünftig und ‘wissenschaftlich’ wie ein Philosoph; nur daß er das Ziel auf seinem Wege auch tatsächlich erreicht. Insofern kann man das Christentum auch als die wahre oder ‘bessere Philosophie’ bezeichnen” (Campenhausen 1995: 23). What Tertullian opposes in his first chapter of his treatise against Marcion thus rejects an idea of God as illogical from a third position of Christian truth.

an anti-Jewish topos appears for the first time. In his attempt to reclaim the scriptures against Marcion's argument of discontinuity, Tertullian argues like Justin Martyr that the strictness of God in the Jewish scriptures is not due to the evil nature of the divine (Marcion's claim) but to the disobedience of the Jewish people ("Israel's hardness", see Tert. Adv. Marc. 2.15), a responsibility recognized by the Jewish people themselves (referring to Mt. 27:25, see *ibid.*). God gave the law in order to control "that stiff-necked people, devoid of faith in God" (see *ibid.* 2.18; cf. 2.19, 22). Not accidentally, therefore, a topos present in the Gospel of John and developed in Justin Martyr reappears at this point. As in the other cases, the denigration of "the Jews" is a mere side-effect to Tertullian's argument for continuity against the Marcionite detachment.

The third book of Tertullian's treatise is concerned with a discussion of Christology/Christian theology. Tertullian maintains that the advent of Jesus as the Christ and Israel's refusal to accept him should not be explained with reference to two different Gods (Marcion) but as a fulfillment of divine prophecy recorded in the Jewish scriptures (see *ibid.* 3.2, 5f., 8, 23). Tertullian then accuses Marcion to follow the "Jewish error" (*ibid.* 3.6; cf. 3.16) or "poison" (*ibid.* 3.8) in his rejection of Jesus' status as the Jewish Messiah. The critique culminates in the remark: "from the Jew the heretic has accepted guidance in this discussion, the blind borrowing from the blind, and has fallen into the same ditch" (*ibid.* 3.7³²⁶). The notion of blindness reappears in Tertullian's *Adversus Iudaeos* (see chapter 6.2.2). Tertullian's attack of Marcion as a "Jew" precludes a process in which the accusation starts to *gain a relative independence from its empirical referents* – "the Jews" being but a semantic position to denigrate a practice deviating from the respective position of the author

The fourth and fifth Book is dedicated to a detailed discussion of Marcion's writings. Tertullian sets out to demonstrate that Jesus was concerned with criticizing and attacking "the Jews" for their unbelief and pride, concluding that he was the son to the same God who had punished the Jews by giving them the law. The latter argument is central for Tertullian's claim to continuity accompanying him throughout the fourth chapter. The antagonistic relation between Jesus and "the Jews", Tertullian maintains, was not only foretold (see Tert. Adv. Marc. 4.14f., 42), it also mirrors the relationship between God

³²⁶ As pointed out above, Marcion had believed that the Jewish Messiah was yet to arrive and refused to understand the destruction of the temple as divine punishment (see Hoffmann 1984: 233). Lieu comments: "By [...] affirming the integrity of Jewish rejection of Jesus, and by adopting a 'Jewish' reading of the scriptures against the convoluted allegorisation or typology of Christian attempts to claim them, Marcion made possible Tertullian's picture of him as an ally of the Jews" (Lieu 1996: 264; cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 3.16, 22, 23).

and the Jewish people (see *ibid.* 4.12; 15; 27). The antagonistic relation between Jesus and the Jews thus serves to prove the divine nature of Jesus: “And who is this? The one who follows the Creator's pattern. How shall I prove it? Because of the hatred prophesied against him: as by Isaiah, addressing the Jews, the instigators of hatred” (*ibid.* 4.14; cf. 3.18, 23; 4.15, 39; 5.15).

In the fifth book, Tertullian focuses on Marcion's canon and his interpretation of Paul. He accuses Marcion of a subjective and unreasonable act of interpolation of the original texts (see *Tert. Adv. Marc.* 5.2ff.; 4.2) and ultimately concludes that all of the four Gospels and the apostolic Epistles possess an authority equal to that of Jewish scriptures and prophecy (see Metzger 1987: 160). At the beginning of the 5th chapter, however, Tertullian doubts the centrality Marcion grants to the Pauline Epistles. He comments scornfully:

“I find some lack of foresight in the fact that Christ did not know beforehand that he would have need of him [Paul], but after setting in order the office of apostleship and sending them out upon their duties, considered it necessary, on an impulse and not by deliberation, to add another, by compulsion so to speak and not by design” (*Tert. Adv. Marc.* 5.1).

In what follows, Tertullian claims Paul for his own interpretation (see *ibid.*). He agrees with Marcion on Galatians as “the primary Epistle against Judaism” (*ibid.* 5.2³²⁷). He then accepts the contrast between new and old, letter and spirit, law and gospel as consistent with his own perspective on Christ (see *ibid.* 5.2f.). Tertullian's departs from Marcion on a crucial point arguing that Paul had directed Romans 2:24 not against (the old) God but “his attack was as clearly against the Jews” (*ibid.* 5.13; cf. 5.20). This diversion allows Tertullian to maintain that “the Jews” were rejected by divine will and scriptural prophecy (see *ibid.* 5.2, 8, 13). Thus, a denigration of “the Jews” (cf. *ibid.* 3.6, 13) serves Tertullian as a strategy to maintain his claim for continuity and divine integrity.

What can be seen in this discussion of the Marcionite interpretation of Paul is the emergence of a new figure, the proto-Catholic “Paul”³²⁸. Martin Rist notes accordingly

³²⁷ As noted above, it is unclear whether Marcion interpreted Galatians as primarily anti-Judaic. Tertullian's appraisal could be an attempt of pulling the Marcionite Paul on his side or a projection of Tertullian's own interpretative perspective. Either way, Tertullian's interpretation of Galatians as anti-Judaic is instrumental to his refutation of Marcion and the appropriation of Jewish prophecy.

³²⁸ Campenhausen comments: “[D]en anti-Judaistischen Paulus, den Paulus der das Gesetz durchbricht und die ‘Gerechtigkeit des Glaubens’ aufrichtet, hat erst die abendländische Theologie des vierten Jahrhunderts entdeckt und dann nicht mehr fahren lassen” (Campenhausen 1995: 152). On the ongoing history of re-interpretation and appropriation of the Pauline thought, Ehrman has pointed to yet another twist in Tertullian's argument, notably a misogynistic tendency for which he refers to Paul “to show that

that Tertullian “attempted to reclaim Paul for orthodoxy by citing teachings attributed to him against those very heretics who claimed the apostle for their own” (Rist 1942: 43). Against Marcion, Tertullian maintains that Paul had “received his teaching from those who had preceded him in the faith” (ibid.). Thereby, Tertullian stresses the idea of an unbroken chain of apostolic succession (see ibid.: 42) – a claim also central to Acts’ depiction of Paul (see below). From there, one can understand Tertullian’s allegation that “[e]ven Genesis long ago promised Paul to me” (Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.1) and later notes his intention to “enforce my claim that he [Paul] is mine” (ibid.).

The proto-Catholic Paul serves the threefold purpose of maintaining that the coming of Christ is the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy, underlining the superiority of Christianity vis-à-vis Judaism and justifying the Christian claim to the Jewish scriptures and covenant (supersession). As supposed above, this marks a change of strategy from silence to appropriation. It may have grown from an insight into the wide currency Paul’s Epistles had gained among the Christian communities by the time Tertullian wrote his works. To realize this new strategy, Tertullian draws a Paul in accordance with and subordinated to the authority of the twelve Apostles (see Adv. Marc. V., 3.1). Furthermore, Paul was shown to be against the Jewish people (a claim that would have probably sounded very strange to the actual Paul). Tertullian’s appropriation of the Marcionite Paul culminates in a reorganization of the historical setting in whose process God, Christ and Paul himself retroactively become anti-Jewish (see Taylor 1995: 172³²⁹).

Rather than being contradictory, then, the double-finding of an increasing rejection of “the Jews” and an emphasis on continuity with the Jewish scriptures/Jewish prophecy (“Verus Israel”) has become the very basis of the proto-Catholic response to Marcion. In this regard, it seems especially important that some parts of the text against Marcion are a direct repetition of sections from the (earlier) treatise against the Jews (see Lieu 1996: 264f.). Such an identification of Marcion as “Judaizer” serves Tertullian to disarm his opponent and subdue his demands (see Binder 2012: 201, fn. 27). In a sense, then, Justin

women were to be silent in church and exercise no authority over man” (Ehrman 2003: 37; cf. Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.8). Ehrman notes that of the two passages supporting misogynistic ideas (1. Cor. 14:34f. and 1. Tim. 2:12-15) are regarded pseudonymous by modern scholarship (see Ehrman 2003: 38). The rejection of these two passages is supported further by the fact that women appear to have been allowed to hold positions of authority in churches connected to the Pauline teaching (see ibid.: 38f.). Also, there are female missionaries and church authorities in Paul’s account (Rom. 16:1, 3, 6, 7, 12) testifying to the great(er) number of women in the early Church (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 224). If these passages indeed are to be rejected, attention shifts to those parts that highlight equality (e.g. Gal. 3:28).

³²⁹ “Against Efroymson’s suggestion that the church began to think of God and Christ in anti-Jewish ways in the response to Marcion, I would maintain, rather, that Marcion’s challenge to the church’s theological vision compelled the fathers to ‘reaffirm’ their own notion of an anti-Jewish God and of an anti-Jewish Christ” (Taylor 1995: 172).

and Tertullian continue a process in which “Judaism” increasingly takes the shape of a negative point of reference for what it means to be Christian.

5.2.3 Luke's Acts – A Reaction to Marcionism?

“Hier ist des vornehmsten christlichen Missionars der ältesten Zeit, des Apostels Paulus, zu gedenken. Seine Stellung ist deshalb eine so einzigartige, weil er sowohl ein Vater der katholischen Kirche als auch der 'Häresie' gewesen ist” (Harnack 1924b: 11)

The following section focuses on Luke-Acts as it has been included in the Western Text of the New Testament (the most probable scriptural source for Marcion and many of the Patristic writers, see Metzger/Ehrmann 2005: 276f.). On the development of this Western Text, the seminal work of Eldon Jay Epp *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (1966³³⁰) can still be studied with benefit today. Epp describes how an anti-Jewish tendency was significantly heightened in later editions of the *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*, an early evidence for the existence of the Catholic canon, while a more lenient position slowly moved to the background (see Epp 1966: 165-171). Discussing the question of anti-Judaism in Luke, scholars have recently returned to the question of the dating of Acts. Said discussion had grown in prominence within the 19th century Tübingen School and Franz Overbeck (1872) and reaffirmed with John Knox (1942)³³¹.

As noted above, Paul had almost disappeared from the attention of most Christian communities by the end of the first century (see Bornkamm 1987: 24f.). The fact that Acts still designates seventeen chapters to the persona Paul has baffled scholars for a long time (Acts 9 and 13-28, see Hvalvik 2007: 121). Haenchen notes that Acts appears to have “proved immediately useful” (Haenchen 1982: 9) because it could be used to “demonstrate the unity of the apostolic message” (ibid.). Many scholars agree with Haenechen that Acts and the Pastorals were incorporated into the canon to domesticate the Marcionite Paul, refuting the conception of the two Gods and the detachment from the Jewish scriptures and prophecy³³². For John Knox, Acts’ strategy of “exalting and

³³⁰ The Codex is a bilingual manuscript composed around the late fifth-century. It contains the four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Modern textual criticism has regarded it as “the leading Greek representative of the 'Western' textual tradition” (Epp 1966: 7). Beyond space, the focus on Acts is explained by Epp because “the characteristic features of the 'Western' text and Codex Bezae are the most prominent and abundant in Acts” (ibid.: 26).

³³¹ cf. Haenchen 1982; Reese 1991; Tyson 2006: 1-23.

³³² see Knox 1942: 73ff.; cf. Rist 1942; Bauer 1964: 225-229; Campenhausen 1968: 211-213; Haenchen

idealizing Paul and at the same time definitely subordinating him to the leaders at Jerusalem” (Knox 1942: 120) even testifies to the immediate context of its composition.

Hoffmann supports the hypothesis of a later dating of Acts when noting that there is “virtually no evidence for the existence of the Lucan corpus prior to Justin Martyr’s first Apology” (Hoffmann 1984: 132³³³). If combined with the assumption that Acts wants to reclaim “both a Gospel [Luke] and Paul from the Marcionites” (Knox 1942: 139), its position in the canon as a link between Paul and the Gospels (see Harnack 1888: 312, fn. 12) raises suspicion on the purpose and time of its composition³³⁴. This suspicion led John Knox to propose that Acts was created or profoundly revised in reaction to Marcionism by the early middle of the second century (see Knox 1942: 139; 1968: 285). Since then, this idea has been updated by scholars like Gager (1983: 184-186), Hoffmann (1984: 130) and Tyson (2006).

If one cannot accept a later dating of Acts during the mid-second century, one may still decide to settle with Schmithals’ claim that Luke-Acts conveys a reaction to a (pre-)Marcionite tendency (see Schmithals 1980: 14f.; 1982: 13). There are good reasons to argue for such a reactive quality of Acts. As pointed out above, the account of the Jerusalem meeting in Acts differs from that of Paul in presenting both sides in complete agreement with one another. At the same time, Paul stays under their authority (see Knox 1942: 119; Hoffmann 1984: 129; cf. chapter 3.2.1). While the Apostolic fathers are rendered the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy Acts still relieves them of any suspicion of a deliberate “Judaizing” (see Campenhausen 1968: 54) when they accept the Pauline mission to the Gentiles (see Acts 13:38f., cf. 10:43, 15:10f., 20:24). Schmithals comments:

“Lukas [bindet] das Christentum auf das engste an seinen alttestamentlich-jüdischen Mutterboden; gleichzeitig muß er es aus Gründen der politischen Apologetik ebenso deutlich von dem (aufrührerischem) Judentum seiner Zeit distanzieren” (Schmithals 1980: 15).

By showing that Paul accepts Jewish laws and Jewish traditions (see Lüdemann 1987:

1982: 9; Bornkamm 1987: 24f.; critical Hoffmann 1984: 124ff.

³³³ cf. Haenchen 1982: 9; critical May 1987: 131ff.

³³⁴ To be sure, Acts is not the only text in the New Testament concerned with Paul’s theology. For example, David Sim recently presented an updated version of the arguments for an anti-Paulinist reading of Matthew (see Sim 2013) and one may further discern an engagement with Paul in 2 Pet. 3:15f. However, Acts may well be the place where an anti-Marcionite invective overlaps with a reassessment of Pauline soteriology.

22³³⁵), the author of Acts highlights the continuity of those early communities with the (Gentile) Christian claim for continuity with the Jewish prophecy Luke represents. From this, Stendahl concludes that Acts is written “from the perspective of those who required a continuity with the Torah” (Stendahl 1976: 68). This fits the apologetic scheme of proto-Catholic writers reacting to the Marcionite challenge (see Haenchen 1971: 9) with their twofold strategy of appropriation of Jewish prophecy and denigration of the empirical Jews. Luke focuses his efforts on a domestication of the figure of “Paul”. Hoffmann notes:

“if it is assumed that Luke's apologetic intention consisted in both, the wish to vindicate the original apostolic witness, as well as to ‘reclaim Paul from the Marcionites’ (Knox), it then seems reasonable to conclude that Luke's ‘paulinism’, which is ordinarily explained in terms of his unfamiliarity with the pauline correspondence, is rather to be explained by this intention. That is to say, whatever his acquaintance with the Paul of the epistles, he knew this to be Paulus Marcionis; and any response to Marcionism, as being an exaggeration of the pauline apostolate, would necessarily have resulted in a modification of Paul's claims as well” (Hoffmann 1984: 127).

While Goodspeed and Bornkamm take the silence on the Pauline Epistles to be evidence that the Pauline letters had not yet been published (see Goodspeed 1927: 20; Bornkamm 1987: 18), Knox assumes a deliberate omission:

“If Luke not only knew of Paul’s letters (as he must have) but also actually made some use of them, it becomes harder to account for his omission of any mention of this aspect of Paul’s career – unless he *wished* to be silent about it” (Knox 1968: 285).

The author of Acts stresses that Paul and the Judean authorities act harmoniously while omitting the Epistles. As such, Acts stabilizes the canon of the New Testament as it stands between the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels subordinating the former to the latter as original Apostolic accounts (see *ibid.*; Tyson 2006: 76).

Luke’s argument for continuity also resembles the proto-Catholic argument on the level of its treatment of “the Jews” whom he paints as malicious and aggressive enemies to the true message. And Acts indeed represents a radicalization of an anti-Jewish tendency that

³³⁵ According to Acts, Paul remained within the boundaries of the early Judean Church. This desire is apparent in various details: His missionizing activities in Athens, where he at first entered a synagogue before turning to the Gentiles (see Acts 17:17). Paul is described to circumcise his co-worker Timothy (see Acts 16:3) and to cut his own hair in accordance with an ancient Nazirite vow (see Acts 18:18, 21:23-26). He then travels to Jerusalem to attend religious festivals (Acts 20:16) and when put on trial stresses that he is a Pharisee (Acts 23:6; 26:5).

has already been identified in the synoptic Gospels. It is “the Jews” that “stir up trouble for Christians and accuse them before political authorities” (Wilson 1995: 69) to ignore the Jewish laws and to defy the Roman authorities (see e.g. Acts 17:6f.; 18:13; 24:5f.). The Christian characters defend themselves by pointing to the Jewishness of their faith (see e.g. Acts 23:6; 24:10-21; 26:19-23), thereby assuming a position in which the Christians lay rightful claim to Jewish prophecy. Tyson comments:

“Contrary to the Marcionite claims, the author of Acts makes it clear that the Hebrew prophets were not only proclaiming truth but that what they proclaimed pertained to Jesus. The forceful and engaging narrative of Acts and its use in anti-Marcionite controversies late in the second century assured that for proto-orthodox Christians the Hebrew prophets would forever be bound up tightly with Christian proclamation” (Tyson 2005: 204).

The socio-political situation of Christian communities by the end of the first century was marked by a growing attraction of converts *and* a rapid deterioration of Christianity’s legal position in the Roman Empire. By the end of the first century, Roman authorities had come to the conclusion that the young faith was no longer to be considered a part of Judaism. People who professed faith in Christ were now exempted from the protection of Judaism’s legal status as *religio licita* and as a new sect of non-Jewish believers vulnerable to an accusation of apostasy (see chapter 6.1.1). Some parts in Acts have been taken to betray this socio-historical position of its author and his community (see Wilson 1995: 59; Tyson 2005: 203f.). Gregory Sterling notes:

“The expansion of Christianity was a *fait accompli* by the end of the first century. The intellectual undergirding of that expansion had not yet, however, been grasped in historical terms. This is what our author [of Acts] saw and why he wrote. It was an attempt to move Christianity into the larger world intellectually and socially as well as physically” (Sterling 1992: 388).

Another concern of Acts may lie with a political apology towards the Roman authorities (the Roman characters in the story tend to accept the Christian claim and confirm the innocence of the characters under attack, see e.g. Acts 16). Highlighting conformity with Roman Law and underlining the connection with Judaism as a *religio licita*, Luke provides the young faith with a license-plate (see Wilson 1995: 68f.; Cadbury 1927: 308-316³³⁶). With intriguing precision, then, the dedication of positions to “the Jews”, Jewish

³³⁶ For a critique of understanding Acts as an apology, see Loveday 1999. Referring to Gregory Sterling’s *Historiography and Self-Definition* (1992), Loveday comments: “Luke’s work must first of all be taken seriously as a narrative; but it is not in any primary sense an antiquarian account of Judaeo-Christian

prophecy and Jesus in Acts' discursive framework manages to reject Marcion, claim Jewish prophecy and defend the young faith against Roman official discrimination (this process is discussed in detail below).

Marcion's rejection of the Jewish roots demanded a rearrangement of the older Christian claim to be the true Judaism. As demonstrated in the chapters on Justin and Tertullian, proto-Catholic writers reacted to Marcion by separating the Jewish scriptures from "the Jews" and Christians from empirical Judaism. The argument for a later dating is based on three aspects: the domestication of "Paul", the position of "the Jews" and the apologetic tendency towards the Roman Empire. The juxtaposition of "Christians" and "Jews" allows for both – the rejection of Marcion's Paulinism and a rejection of the Jewish background for "Paul". While the Paul of the Epistles developed his thoughts within a Jewish framework, trying to secure the status of the Gentile mission, this new "Paul" had become an early Gentile Christian. Acts indeed suits a second-century development by stressing Jewish guilt for Jesus' persecution, depicting Jews as hostile and rejecting Jewish practices and customs, while claiming Christianity's continuity with Judaism. Acts also serves to falsify Marcion by underlining Christianity's independence from empirical Judaism, claiming Paul and maintaining a claim to the Jewish prophecy (see Tyson 2005: 203). From these points, however, one can only conclude on the *possibility* that Acts was composed or substantially altered to serve the proto-Catholic struggle against the Marcionite church and its defense against official Roman policy. The layers of semantic and historical sediments in Acts do not allow any certain conclusions.

5.3 Conclusion – Dissemination and Intensification

"This struggle over the authority of the Old Testament and over the nature of the continuity between Judaism and Christianity was the earliest form of the quest for a tradition that has, in other forms, recurred throughout Christian history" (Pelikan 1971: 14)

"Christianity's continued dependence on Judaism, particularly for the understanding of the scriptures they now claimed for their own, was none the less real but could never be admitted" (Lieu 1996: 109)

historical traditions. It is a relatively short description of recent historical events, set in the real world of the eastern Empire in the middle of the first century CE. This narrative construct is much too substantial to be called merely a framework" (Loveday 1999: 27). One may agree with Loveday that a part of the fascination with Acts lies in its suggestive historicity. In order to uncover its apologetic aspects, however, one has to scrutinize this fascination itself by comparing it to other accounts (e.g. Paul's Epistles) and by exploring the characters and their possible connection to (later) historical contexts.

The present section has demonstrated how the proto-Catholic demarcation from Marcion intensified a two-sided process of denigration of the empirical Jews and appropriation of the Jewish scriptures and prophecy. The proto-Catholic strategy of *denigration and appropriation* identified in Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Acts solves three problems at once – the Marcionite claim against a Christian appropriation of Jewish prophecy, the challenge posed to proto-Catholic Christianity by the continued existence of empirical Judaism and the precarious position of Christians in Roman official policy (cf. Wirth 1991: 53).

However, why did proto-Catholic writers decide to maintain the connection to Jewish prophecy? I want to discuss three answers that have been proposed. Dunn points to the fact that Jesus simply “fulfilled too many [Jewish] prophecies” (Dunn 1990: 101). For Dunn, the Jewish scriptures were thus “too valuable a means of evaluating Jesus and of presenting him to fellow Jews” (ibid.). At the same time, the scholar notes that those claims need faith in Christ as the Jewish Messiah as prerequisite guiding interpretation (see ibid.). Jesus did not simply “fulfill too many prophecies” but was made to be the fulfillment of these prophecies, as the authors of the Gospels believed Jesus to be the Jewish Messiah. This is, therefore, not a very convincing answer.

A second answer would highlight political aspects, claiming that the antiquity of Judaism was vital to support Christianity’s socio-political position within the Roman Empire. To Tertullian and Justin, it seemed necessary to defend the Jewish scriptures and prophecy as integral part of their faith in order to improve its status. Furthermore, a claim to Judaism had proven to be an effective tool for the mission among Gentiles as Christianity appears to have owed part of its initial success to the appropriation of Jewish antiquity. This argument is connected to the sociological answer.

Answering the question from a sociological perspective would mean to highlight that Paul had been successful in attracting Gentile converts sympathetic to Judaism (see Gager 1983: 166; Ehrman 2003: 179). A lowering entrance barriers by rejecting circumcision and Jewish ritual practice gave Christianity an advantage among interested Gentile converts. This advantage could be maintained effectively *as long as Christianity counted as a kind of Judaism*. Since the group of Christians Tertullian and Justin represented had given up on Jewish rituals, a soteriological connection to the Jewish scriptures and divine prophecy was tantamount for maintaining a plausible connection to Judaism.

With Marcion the study identified a Christian desire to detach Christianity from Judaism. Possibly, Marcion was only picking up a stream of pre-Paulinist Gentile communities prevalent in Asia Minor at that time (see Hoffmann 1984: 237) as the Marcionite Church appears to have spread through the Roman Empire quickly. This success also reveals the defectiveness of an argument of necessity – continuity with Jewish scriptures was not imperative to the attraction of converts as it was not imperative to spread in the Roman Empire or to justify faith in Jesus. Tertullian's and Justin's insistence on continuity can therefore not claim any more necessity than Marcion's interpretation did³³⁷.

For Norelli, Marcion and Tertullian represent two possible paths Christianity could have taken (see Norelli 2001: 126). While Tertullian's conception remained reconcilable with the Stoic insistence on human reason, Marcion represented a radical break away from this worldliness in the process of salvation. For Marcion, God's working and intention cannot be understood through human perception and philosophizing. The only true possibility for salvation thus rested not in this world but in an act of divine grace. Tertullian opposed this perspective and argued that Christianity could be understood only in continuity with Jewish prophecy. In reconciling world, God, Gospel and Logos, Tertullian thus developed a prototype for a proto-Catholic theology.

Neither Marcion nor his proto-Catholic opponents were concerned with Paul's discussion of the status of Gentile converts after the arrival of the Jewish Messiah. Rather, Marcion asked "If, as 'everyone' agrees, the law is to be abandoned – especially since it is so clearly 'inferior' to what Christians do – how can one take seriously the *God* who enacted this inferior law in the first place?" (Efroymson 1979: 101). Tertullian and Justin Martyr replied to Marcion's question not by restating the Pauline argument for a law-free mission as fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise. The discussion between the two sides unfolds in a Gentile Christian framework that has already made the denigration of the Jewish people the basis of its self-understanding (see *ibid.*).

³³⁷ Until today scholars argue "die lebendige Weiterexistenz des Judentums nach Golgatha bedeutete für viele Christen eine ständige Provokation des Christentums. Das bloße Weiterleben eines Volkes, das am Alten Testament genug hatte und kein Neues benötigte, schien die Kirche Christi als Ganzes in Frage zu stellen; denn wenn Israel zu Recht weiter auf seinen Messias wartete, war der Heilsanspruch des Christentums null und nichtig" (Schrekenberg 1999: 33). However, the case of Marcion illustrates that the intolerance towards an active Judaism is an expression of proto-Catholicism as a *specific stream* within early Christianity, not of Christianity in general. This is matched by Schrekenberg's observation that anti-Judaism did not reach its peak until after the consolidation of the proto-Catholic position after the conversion of Constantine in 312 C.E. (see *ibid.*: 38). The rejection of Judaism by Christian authors is not the result of a natural/psychological development. It is a historical development that saw the rise of the proto-Catholic position to dominance (see chapter 7.1).

In the wake of the Marcionite alternative, proto-Catholic writers had to fight on three fronts. They had to defend their claim of belonging to the divine prophecy and thus, the people of Israel against Marcion. They had to defend Christianity's insecure political position against the onslaught of Roman policy and they had to defend a Christian interpretation of the Jewish scriptures and prophecy against the continued existence of empirical Judaism. By separating the empirical Jews from their scriptures, the proto-Catholic writers refreshed their claim to Israel's heritage. Their defense of the Jewish scriptures and prophecy was accompanied by an equally strong denigration of "the Jews". This double-strategy of denigration and appropriation helped the Patristic writers to defend, confirm and develop their own position vis-à-vis competing claims to the Christian truth (see Nirenberg 2013: 94³³⁸). Tertullian notes: "But it is necessary for me to claim for the support of my point of view those scriptures of which even the Jews attempt to deprive us" (Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.9).

During the second century, a general denigration of the Jewish Other increasingly supported the formation of a Christian self-image. While Marcion adopted "the Jews" with his employment of Pauline terminology, proto-Catholic writers relied more on the Gospels. With the Patristic period, an anti-Jewish self-image had established itself well within the minds and pens of the Christian authors. Once "the Jews" had gained a central position within a theological reflection, they could be employed for various polemical purposes. Criticizing the corruption of the scriptures, Marcion attacked the "Judaizers" in Rome. Defending the continuity of Christianity with Jewish prophecy against the Marcionite attack, Tertullian and Justin still argued against the "Jewish" Marcion, denigrating "the Jews" in passing. This employment demonstrates the growing versatility of the discursive "Jews", supporting the hypothesis of a growing disconnectedness of a Christian discourse on "the Jews" from an empirical group of Jews.

It is likely to assume that inner-Christian conflicts played an important part in the formation of the canon of the New Testament as both anti-Marcionite and anti-Jewish. Turning to Luke-Acts, analysis tried to demonstrate in what way the appropriation of "Paul" could possibly reflect the presence of Marcion (disregarding the question for a moment if Acts was actually composed or merely employed for this struggle). It has

³³⁸ Nirenberg comments: "'Judaizing' became a basic negative charge because it proved tremendously useful for Christians debating profound questions about the nature of God and God's actions in the world. [...] In the centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem, Christian portrayals of Judaism were largely driven not by confrontation with Jews and Judaism, but by Christian engagement with non-Jews" (Nirenberg 2013: 94).

further been demonstrated in what way this appropriation was accompanied by a specific turn to the double strategy of appropriation of the scriptures and denigration of empirical Judaism. The struggle between the author of Acts and Marcion unfolds at a time when the Jewish “Paul” could not be retrieved. Previously composed in the context of Christian Judaism to defend the rights of Gentile converts, the Marcionite “Paul” was now aimed at detaching Christianity from the Jewish scriptures. Proto-Catholic authors reject this interpretation not to return to the Jewish “Paul” but appropriating him as evidence for their argument of continuity with Jewish prophecy.

In the writings that comprise the New Testament, anti-Jewish invective had mostly been employed to stabilize a proto-Catholic identity regarding Jewish scriptures and “Israel” as its predominant referent. In the conflict with Marcion and others, the Patristic writers intensify anti-Jewish sentiments already detectable in the Gospel accounts (see Campenhausen 1968: 86). In this sense, then, proto-Catholic writers continue to move within an anti-Jewish framework. However, their reactions to Marcion also marks a shift from an argument of continuity with Judaism (widening of the covenant/inclusion of the Gentiles) to its appropriation (Christianity as true Israel/exclusion of the Jewish people). Gerd Theißen is, therefore, both correct in claiming that anti-Judaism is the other side of a Christian insistence on continuity with Judaism (see Theißen 1990: 549) and also wrong, because this insistence took its specific form during the second century when proto-Catholicism was leaving the Jewish fold. The shape a proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism ultimately took was all but a necessary result from a Christ-belief per-se as alternative relationships towards Judaism such as Marcion’s complete detachment or a Jewish Christian insistence of continuity were on the table.

In an interview regarding his book *Lost Christianities*, the renowned scholar Bart D. Ehrman is asked what would had happened to Christianity if proto-Catholic Christianity had failed to gain supremacy. Ehrman responds: “What drove anti-Semitism was the competition between the Jewish understanding of scripture and the Christian understanding of scripture” (Ehrman 2004). In the light of the present analysis, Ehrman’s answer is unsatisfactory as “the Jews” are employed by different Christian sides to criticize the respective opponent. Neither Marcion nor proto-Catholic writers were empirical Jews nor did they relate substantially to any Jewish practice. The empirical Jews do not lurk behind the semantic scenery of the second century which was consequently *not* fueled by the difference of a Jewish or Christian understanding of the scripture! Rather, this work has set out to explain the centrality of “the Jews” with reference to a

genealogical framework. This echoes Bourdieu's conception of *doxa* as paraphrased in Karen King:

“In practice this means that the limits of any critique of *doxa* are established precisely by the fact that, in the struggle over the boundaries of orthodoxy, all parties to the struggle necessarily unconsciously or subconsciously accept a great deal of the *doxa* of their shared society – not only the rules of the game, that is, what kinds of arguments or evidence are considered to be valid or persuasive, but even more the underlying structuring structures that make claims to knowledge of the truth possible at all” (King 2003: 243).

The previous chapters unearthed evidence that the development of a Christian episteme of antisemitism resulted from an inner-Christian development and was enhanced by an inner-Christian struggle. A central reason for the aggravation and, ultimately, centrality of the formation of antisemitism in Christian communities lies in the competition with other branches of Christianity, causing a crucial shift that moved the early proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism into the centre of Christology. This hypothesis can also explain Efroymson observation that in Tertullian, “the largest block of anti-Jewish material [...] is to be found not in his early treatise, *Against the Jews*, but in the later *Against Marcion*” (Efroymson 1979: 100). Anti-Jewish invective is connected to the development Catholic Christian doctrine (rather than to an empirical conflict between Christians and Jews). Anti-Jewish polemics are employed by authors such as Tertullian or Justin Martyr not to refute Jews or Judaizers but the to recover “the God, the scriptures, and the ancient pedigree of Israel from Marcion's damaging attack” (Gager 1983: 163)?

A preliminary conclusion from these observations could be that the incremental development of the early Christian formation of antisemitism was (a) due to external historical developments such as the destruction of the Temple and influx of Gentiles and (b) resulted from internal Christian struggles largely independent from the competition with empirical Judaism. The exiting of those Christian authors from the Jewish framework must be regarded as decisive prerequisite for the emergence of a proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism. This meant a shift in context – from a self-construction as a group within the fold of Judaism (itself a diverse phenomenon) towards the self-construction of an emerging religion vis-à-vis the Roman world.

6. The Rise of Christianity – From Persecution to State Religion

6.1 *Entering Politics – the 2nd to the 4th century C.E.*

“Christianity survived and prospered because the ruling class upheld it, not because it ministered to the poor, plagued, and downtrodden masses” (Lundskow 2006: 240)

The following chapter starts by reconstructing the events surrounding the Constantine conversion and the Council of Nicaea. The focus is on the effects of this conversion on the internal structure of the nascent faith. After an excursion on the effect this had on the political and juridical sphere, analysis returns to a discussion of the *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition among selected Patristic writers. Focusing on the development of “the Jews” as discursive elements in this developing formation of proto-Catholic antisemitism, chapter 6.2 traces the way Nicea triggered a process of internal stratification, slowly replacing a century-old tradition of religious diversity (Christ-believing communities) and tolerance (Rome) with the religious intolerance of post-Nicene Christianity.

6.1.1 On the “Persecution” of Christians

“There is no evidence outside Luke-Acts that Jews persecuted Diaspora Christians, perhaps even Gentile Christians, by denouncing them to the Roman authorities” (Sanders 1987: 313)

During the first century of its existence, the social and legal status of Christians took a path analogous to the attitude Hellenism adopted towards Judaism (Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 279-281³³⁹; cf. Acts 16:20; 17:7; 19:13ff.). While Christians were considered Jews, the Roman authorities appear to have recognized them by an early date as a specific group *within* Judaism (see e.g. Acts 11:26; 16:20). Their faith in Jesus qualified them in a negative way – as propagators of a superstitious and harmful faith (see e.g. Acts 16:21; 19:27f.) and as followers of Jesus, a condemned anti-

³³⁹ “Allerdings verstehen wir die Analogien der antichristlichen Vorwürfe nicht als seine *pauschale Übertragung* von antijüdischen Vorurteilen und Verbrechensvorwürfen auf die Christustugläubigen. Wir sehen darin also nicht eine Art Nebenfolge der paganen Judenfeindschaft. Vielmehr sind antijüdische Stereotypen im spezifischen Vorurteil der Mehrheitsgesellschaft gegenüber Christustugläubigen als Anhänger eines Aberglaubens und eines hingerichteten Aufrührers konkretisiert worden” (Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 279).

Roman rebel (see e.g. Acts 17:5-7; 21:38; 24:5, Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 280). Since Christ-believers were at first considered a part of Judaism, the official accusations focused on secondary felonies (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 278). A legal acquittal of them as Christians was not established until Trajan's reign 98 C.E. – 117 C.E. (see Barnes 1984: 48). The New Testament contains some traces of a Jewish participation in the “persecutions”³⁴⁰ of Christians – e.g. Paul's Epistles³⁴¹ and Acts³⁴², though none of the incidents described end with the death of the accused.

A first wave of official Roman aggression against Christians has been identified in the year 64 C.E. under Nero (see Moureau 1971: 33). Following a devastating fire that destroyed large parts of the capital, Nero blamed the Christians for the arson (see McLaren 2013: 39-42). This had deadly consequences for several individuals. Heemstra comments that the choice of (Gentile) Christians as a target-group was not random:

“Especially those Christians who were not Jewish and could not claim the right to the Jewish privilege of monotheism could immediately be seen [...] as people who had turned their backs on Roman society by distancing themselves from the Roman gods. Their behaviour could disturb the *pax deorum*, jeopardizing the well-being of the Roman state and its citizens” (Heemstra 2010: 92f.).

Dibelius remarks the leniency with which Christian authors treat the anti-Christian aggression under Nero in 64 C.E. (e.g. *First Epistle of Clement*, written about 96 C.E.; see Dibelius 1971: 64ff.). The scholar gives three reasons for this leniency: (1) the Pauline demand for loyalty to the worldly powers, (2) protection of the communities from further persecution, (3) the conviction that any power is given by God (see Dibelius 1971: 72). The decreasing Roman responsibility for the persecution in the Gospels is in accordance with this apologetic attitude (see the chapter 4.3.1).

At least a part of the Christian community seems to have been a distinguishable group by the time of Nero. However, the distinction between “Jews” and “Christians” arose in Roman official policy only by the end of the first century under Emperor Neval (see Heemstra 2010: 84; McLaren 2013: 42-45; cf. chapter 6.1.4). That “Christians could no longer officially lay claim to the label ‘Jew’” (Heemstra 2010: 187) was, as Heemstra notes, “the first and necessary step to a setting in which Jewish Christians could be

³⁴⁰ For a discussion of the term and the question of Jewish participation, see below.

³⁴¹ see 2 Kor 1:8; 4:8; 11:23-25; Gal 6:12; 1 Thess 2:14; 3:3f.

³⁴² see Acts 13:50; 14:4f.; 16:22f.; 17:5f.; 23:30f.; 24:5.

executed for their beliefs” (ibid.).

Once the situation had calmed down again after Nero, official aggression was restricted to individual cases. Those professing faith in Christ (a *superstitio illicita* after 96 C.E.) were now charged of “atheism”. This remained so until the middle of the third century when Christianity was officially declared a capital offence (see Barnes 1984: 48; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 272-284). In the meantime, incidents appear to have continued occurring on the local level testifying to ongoing social animosities between Christians and their surrounding Pagan society (see Green 2010: 132-138³⁴³). Chadwick highlights the ambivalent effect these early incidents had: “Because the early persecutions were limited they did not seriously slow down the expansion of Christianity, but on the contrary tended to give the church the maximum of publicity” (Chadwick 1967: 29). A few pages later he adds:

“The sporadic nature of persecution, which often depended on local attitudes, and the fact that before the third century the government did not take Christianity seriously, gave the Church breathing space to expand and to deal with critical internal problems” (Chadwick 1967: 31; cf. 54ff.).

*

Reviewing political measures, testimonies and accusations against Christians in the first three centuries, Stegemann/Stegemann conclude that they cannot properly be labeled persecutions (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292f.). Lacking the systematic quality the term implies, the scholars prefer the terms “discrimination” for the social sphere and “criminalization” for the official sphere (see ibid.: 272; 292f.). Both note that traditional scholarship has adopted the topos of “persecution” from the New Testament³⁴⁴ and later Patristic sources³⁴⁵ as *terminus technicus* for scientific analysis (see ibid. 1997: 292). In this case, the term “persecution” designates all hostile acts against Christian communities until the conversion of Constantine 312 C.E.³⁴⁶. A problem of this biblical reference lies

³⁴³ There is a list of records of this anti-Christian mood in the New Testament put as prophecy (see Mk. 13:13; Mt. 10:22; Lk. 6:22f.; 21:16f; Jn. 15:18f; 17:14) and through the narrative account (Acts 13:50; 14:4f; 16:19ff; 17:6-8, 13; 19:23ff; 21:27ff); cf. Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 284f.

³⁴⁴ see e.g. Mt. 5:10; Lk. 11:49; 21:12; Jn. 15:20; 2Kor 4:9; 1 Thess 2:14-16. Luke-Acts supplies the traditional account for such a narrative of Jewish responsibility for the persecution of Christians (see e.g. Acts 8:1; 9:23-25, 17:5f; 18:12; cf. Parkes 1934: 128-132 for a critical assessment).

³⁴⁵ see Just. Dial. 16f.; Tert. Scorp. 10.10.

³⁴⁶ see e.g. Sherwin-White 1952; de Ste. Croix 1963; Moureau 1971. Heemstra also uses the term “persecution” for the measures taken by Domitian in applying the *Fiscus Iudaicus* to Christians between 85 and 96 C.E. (see Heemstra 2010: 98f.) using it for any form of legal criminalization. He notes: “At first these [persecutions] were sporadic and not systematic, but between 250 and 313 there were periods

in the responsibility it designates to “the Jews”. Together with the term “persecution” many scholars also adopt the assumption of an active Jewish role³⁴⁷. Others have been more careful in estimating the extent of Jewish hostility³⁴⁸. At the other end of the spectrum, James Parkes argued in 1934 that the Jewish communities did not participate in persecutions at all (see Parkes 1934: 145-147), commenting: “The statement of Jewish hostility in general terms is based on theological exegesis and not on historical memory” (ibid.: 148).

In his study *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St Matthew* Douglas R. A. Hare concludes much in the same spirit: “The charge that Jews were largely responsible for the Gentile persecution of Christians was found to be without foundation” (Hare 1967b: 79). In a small article from the same year, he elaborates regarding Justin Martyr that “Justin’s statements manifest a theology of the role of the Jews which requires that the Jews be held primarily responsible for the sufferings of the church” (ibid.: 456). This goes well with the observation of an inversion of the relationship between theology and empirical reality in the Gospel-accounts – if “the Jews” are the eternal adversaries of Jesus they *must* also be responsible for the persecution of Christians! (cf. chapter 4.3.2). An indirect reference to the factual lack of a Jewish involvement may have even found its way into a passage from Justin’s Dialogue:

“For you curse in your synagogues all those who are called from Him Christians; and other nations effectively carry out the curse, putting to death those who simply confess themselves to be Christians” (Just. Dial. 95).

If even a writer who wants to charge the Jews of persecution cannot point to an actual involvement, the Jews may not even be involved at all. Scepticism is supported further by a legal argument recently reiterated by Bauckham. In the Roman Empire, Bauckham notes, Jews could only punish those converts that still fell under Jewish jurisdiction such as the Christian Jews in Jerusalem (see Bauckham 2007: 75-77). Indictments would have been accompanied by an accusation of blasphemy and punished by stoning (see ibid.). However, Jewish authorities did not possess the legal rights to expand legislation to Gentile Christians. It is hardly surprising, then, that the only known case of a systematic

of more intense and centrally organized persecutions under, for example the emperors Decius and Diocletian” (Heemstra 2010: 203; cf. 102). Most of the scholars arguing for an early persecution of Christians adopt this wider definition.

³⁴⁷ see Harnack 1924a: 65ff.; Frend 1965: 145; Speigl 1970: 250f.; Simon 1984: 144ff.; 164; McLaren 2013: 46-48.

³⁴⁸ see Riddle 1934: 277ff.; Hare 1967b: 19ff.; Sanders 1987: 306-313; cf. Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292, fn. 133, 134.

persecution of Christians took place during the Judean revolt under Bar Kokhba from 132-135 C.E. (see Brumlik 1990: 13). It may well be the only one ³⁴⁹. Stegemann/Stegemann thus conclude that the accusation of a Jewish persecution employs the topos of a persecution repeats a biblical motive (the persecution of the prophets) to render the respective situation as divine and righteous and expressing a desire for self-affirmation (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292).

By 200 C.E., Christianity had grown to be a serious religious movement within Roman society. This consolidation was accompanied by a tendency on the Roman side to neutralize its destabilizing potential by integrating it into the political establishment (see Dodds 1968: 105-108). This policy of absorption was accompanied by a sense of threat for a Pagan cultural dominance. This anxiety found its occasional expression in events of official aggression that mostly remained restricted to a local level. Likewise, anti-Christian writings were composed throughout the first centuries (see *ibid.*: 110; cf. Wilken 1984). Those critiques accused Christianity of sacrilege to the gods, proselytizing, immoral practice such as cannibalism or incest, disloyalty or hostility to the Empire, arson and responsibility for catastrophes such as natural disasters or diseases (see Green 2010: 123ff.; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 278). Dodds gives a number of reasons fueling this dislike:

“Like the Jews, they [the Christians] appeared to be ‘godless’ people who paid no proper respect to images and temples. But whereas the Jews were an ancient nation, and as such legally entitled to follow their ancestral custom in matters of religion, the Christians as an upstart sect of mixed nationality could claim no such privilege. They appeared moreover, to constitute a secret society, whose members recognized each other by private signs [...] and were bound together by some mysterious intimacy” (Dodds 1968: 111).

Official policy took a turn for the worse in 249 C.E. when the Empire was suffering a series of military defeats. The city of Rome had just pompously celebrate its millennial existence in 248 C.E. Possibly inspired by this huge affirmation of divine protection and due to a widened conception of citizenship and responsibility, the Roman emperor Decius (249-251 C.E.) called on all the people in the Roman Empire to sacrifice to the gods (see Green 2010: 142f.). The edict of Decius demanded everyone to present a certificate (*libellus*) in order to prove that he had followed the directive. This brought Christians in a difficult situation. While some complied, others refused to follow Decius' call on

³⁴⁹ The case may be different regarding Jewish believers in Jesus, though there is no record of their systematic punishment in non-Christian sources.

religious grounds. The effect was a persecution across the Empire that targeted Christians and led to imprisonment and death (though some Christians seem to have escaped persecution by bribing officials, see Green 2010: 142-150).

After the death of Decius in 251 C.E. and a following two-year power struggle that stalled persecution, Valerian emerged as the new emperor by 253 C.E. Against the backdrop of serious problems in the military, economic and political sphere, Valerian sparked the “first direct attack on Christians initiated by imperial authority in Roman history since Nero” (Green 2010: 162). Like Decius before him, the Caesar demanded the conformity of Christianity with Roman rites, ordered his officials to ban high-ranking representatives, disowned Christians among the upper class and forbade Christian assemblies and burials by the threat of death (see Haas 1983: 136³⁵⁰). Enforced with a varying degree of strictness, the orders of Valerian caused the death of many church leaders and pious Christians all through the Empire (see Green 2010: 162-167). The persecutions ended only with Valerian’s death of around 260 C.E. and the take-over of his son, Gallienus, who rescinded the official orders.

The following forty years were one “of great growth and consolidation” (Green 2010: 167) for the Christian communities. However, this half-century of peaceful coexistence was deceiving as the persecutions of Christians only rose to its most severe level in the years that followed (for the following, see Chadwick 1991: 4f., Green 2010: 207f.). In the course of fighting Persia in the East, Diocletian had been crowned by the Roman army to be the new Caesar. He appears to have arrived at the conclusion that the Empire was too big to be ruled by one person alone. Thus, Diocletian successfully introduced a system of division for the reorganization of the administration (Tetrarchy). By 285 C.E., Maximian, a fellow senior officer from his Persian campaign, was nominated Caesar and promoted to the rank of an Augustus the following year. While Diocletian took military and administrative responsibility as the Augustus of the Empire East of the Adriatic from 284-305 C.E., Maximian ruled the West, leading the northern campaign on the Rhine frontier. In 293 C.E., each of the two Augusti nominated a Caesar for their respective territory – Galerius for the Eastern and Constantius (father of Constantine) for the Western Empire. Soon, the pious Pagan Diocletian issued a series of edicts against Christians (see Chadwick 1967: 121; Green 2010: 210-212).

³⁵⁰ For a discussion of different perspectives (political, economic, religious) on the causes of this persecution, see Haas 1983: 138-141.

The first edict released the 23rd/24th of February 303 C.E. set off persecutions by ordering all churches to be destroyed, all Christian Bibles and liturgical books to be surrendered to the authorities, the destruction of houses which had kept the scriptures, sacred vessels to be turned in and all Christian worship to be forbidden. A few months later, a second edict ordered the arrest of all Christian clergy. Prisons were soon overcrowded which led to a third edict granting freedom to all clergy that would offer sacrifice. This meant a test of loyalty that resembled the edict of Decius. It was extended in 304 C.E. to include all citizens of the Empire on the threat of death. The adoption of these edicts varied. In the West, Constantius, who was responsible for Britain, Gaul and Spain, followed the first edict by destroying church buildings but refrained from killing people. Maximian took a stricter line in Italy and especially North Africa, where he encountered strong resistance among the conservative majority of African Christians (Donatists³⁵¹). The Eastern provinces under the rule of Diocletian (after 305 C.E. Maximinus Daia) and Galerius suffered the full force of the measures (see Chadwick 1967: 122; Green 2010: 212).

Those events don't only describe the most severe persecutions of Christians in antiquity – they also set the frame for the rise of Constantine to become the ruler of the whole Roman Empire (see Green 2010: 214f. for the following). In 306 C.E. Constantius, who had just been made Augustus in succession to Maximian, died in Britain. The troops stationed in York proclaimed Constantine, his son, new Augustus. Constantine remained cautious, laying claim only to the title of Caesar. In his place the newly promoted Eastern Augustus Galerius acknowledged the Western Caesar Severus as the new Augustus. Rome soon rose against Severus over Galerius' plans to tax the city, leading Galerius to decide to make Maxentius, son of Maximian, the city's new ruler. With the military support of Maximian, who returned from his retirement, the two family-members defeated the Augustus Severus and rejected an attempt by Galerius to restore the order of the Tetrarchy. Constantine, who had remained Caesar and commander of the Northern provinces, re-emerged on the scene when Maximian decided to support Constantine's plan to become Augustus of the Western part of the empire. A summit was held on the

³⁵¹ Green notes, regarding the effect of the persecutions on the Church: "[T]his opened up yet another dispute about what was and was not acceptable behavior for Christians in their relations with the pagan world. The African view was not necessarily shared by others, who did not regard the demand to hand over the sacred books and vessels as something to be defied to the point of death. It also opened the old question about what should be done to those who had handed them over, the *traditores*: how serious was their sin? This effectively caused a major schism within North African Christianity, separating the hard-line majority of African Christians, labelled Donatists by their opponents, from the rest of the Christian world"(Green 2010: 212f.). 85 years later, Augustine of Hippo encountered a later echo of this division in the conflict between Donatist and Catholic Christians (see Campenhausen 1995: 185-192). Despite consecutive efforts of worldly and spiritual Roman authorities to suppress and prohibit the movement and despite the invasion of Arian vandals in 429 C.E., it survived Justinian's reconquest in the sixth century, continuing to cause distress to Pope Gregory the Great in 590 C.E. (see Chadwick 1967: 222-225).

political situation in Danube in 308 C.E. It ended with an agreement declaring Constantine the new Western Caesar and appointed Licinius as replacement Augustus for the dead Severus. While the meeting was taking place, Galerius declared Maximinus Daia (Caesar of the East) and Constantine the new Augusti, thus increasing political instability. While these events were taking place, Maxentius had gained popularity among the people of Rome and had expanded his power to the provinces in North Africa. Even though he was still unrecognized by the other rulers of the Empire, his position in Rome and North Africa looked unassailable.

6.1.2 The Conversion of Constantine

“The empire's transition from paganism to Christianity looks so like a major watershed in the history of the Mediterranean world that it is also necessary to remind oneself that in its main fabric and structure ancient society did not change when Constantine was converted” (Chadwick 1991: 2)

The fourth century has been widely regarded as decisive turning point for European history, marking “the transition from the pagan and classical age to the Christian and medieval one” (Neusner 1987: 15³⁵²). This shift was initiated by the conversion of the Western emperor Constantine in 312 C.E. Two separate accounts of this conversion have survived. The earlier account was written around 315 C.E. by Lactantius, a Christian rhetorician and later tutor to Constantine’s oldest son. The second account is contained in *The Life of Constantine* (337 C.E.) written by Bishop Eusebius shortly after Constantine’s death (see Drake 2006: 113). Recently, the epigrammatist Palladas has been added as a contemporary source (for a short overview, see Barnes 2011: 6-16). Those sources state that Constantine had a dream or a vision in 310 C.E. when he was in Gaul with his army (possibly, they observed a solar halo, see Barnes 2011: 74-80). Initially, Constantine interpreted this vision as evidence for the support of Apollo and had it put on the shields of his soldiers. It took the Emperor until 312 C.E. to interpret the celestial sign he had seen as a representation of the Christian God (see Barnes 2011: 80). It is possible that Constantine then took a vow to convert to Christianity if he would emerge victorious in his struggle against Maxentius (see Fox 1986: 612-619, critical Barnes 2011: 80). The decisive battle took place at Milvian Bridge in 312 C.E. where Constantine’s troops triumphed as Maxentius drowned with its collapse. Constantine proceeded to swiftly enter

³⁵² cf. Rebenich 2009; critical Mayer 2013: 15, fn. 62.

Rome as liberator of the city (see Green 2010: 223; Barnes 2011: 82f.).

By the end of the year 312 C.E., Constantine started granting “privileges and subsidies to the Christian Church and Christian clergy” (Barnes 2011: 84³⁵³). The time following Constantine's victory over Maxentius was marked by an alliance with Licinius. In early 313 C.E. the two emperors met in Milan on the occasion of the marriage of Licinius and Constantine's half-sister Constantia (see Barnes 2011: 91). This event, which cemented the alliance between Licinius and Constantine, also saw the emergence of a mutual agreement. This agreement was concerned with administrative issues, though religious policy towards the Christian who continued to be persecuted in the Eastern part of the Empire also played an important role (see Barnes 2011: 90-94). The Christians in the Western Empire had enjoyed religious freedoms since 306 C.E. (see Barnes 2011: 94) and the emperors now “agreed to extend to the rest of the Roman Empire the freedom of worship and the restoration of property confiscated in 303” (Barnes 2011: 93). These decisions are sometimes referred to as *Edict of Milan*, “even though in the form we have it, it was not an edict and was not issued in Milan” (Drake 2006: 121; cf. Barnes 2011: 93-97). Nevertheless, Green notes the diplomatic relevance of those decisions. As persecutions continued under Maximinus Daia in the East (Galerius died in 311 C.E.), “the main distinction between the western and Eastern halves of the empire lay in their treatment of Christianity” (Green 2010: 223).

Pressured by developments in the West, Daia swiftly introduced an edict of toleration in his own territories. However, he was defeated by Licinius in the summer of 313 C.E. This made Licinius the ruler of the larger part of the Roman Empire, which included the Balkans, the Middle East, Egypt and everything East of these territories. While Constantine continued his policy of tolerance, Licinius resorted to some of the old Tetrarchy's policies of excluding Christians from public service, prohibiting synods of bishops and closing churches (see Green 2010: 224). Constantine, with Licinius his only remaining contestant for sole dominance of the Empire, decided to make the persecutions of Christians a political issue. In what turned out to be a decisive diplomatic move, Constantine allied with the kingdom of Armenia, which had recently converted to Christianity. When Licinius ransacked Christians near the Armenian boarder, this gave Constantine a *casus belli* (see Barnes 2011: 105f.). Without much hesitation, Constantine engaged in a war from which he had emerged victorious by September 324 C.E. This made him the sole ruler of the Roman Empire and its entire Christian people, a position

³⁵³ Constantine himself was not baptized until he lay dying in 337 C.E.. See Chadwick 1967: 125-127.

he held until his death on 22nd May 337 C.E. Christian reactions to the Constantine triumph in the Eastern and Western provinces differed substantially – while the East, stricken by fierce persecutions until Constantine's victory, welcomed this turn of fate³⁵⁴, Western Christians were more reserved (see Chadwick 1967: 125).

*

Constantine's position as Christian is ambivalent. On the one hand, he presented himself as a strong proponent of pro-Christian policies; on the other, he was hesitant to convert himself and tended to fuse his new found faith with older Pagan traditions (e.g. the faith in the Unconquered Sun, a type of Pagan solar monotheism, see Green 2010: 226f.). Any scholarly attempt to clarify this ambivalence suffers by a lack of evidence about the last third of Constantine's reign (324 C.E. to 337 C.E.). Barnes' comments that this lack makes it "simply impossible to construct any sort of detailed military or political narrative" (Barnes 2011: 1). Nevertheless, different hypotheses have been put forward to solve this ambiguity. Some assume that Constantine decided to hide his full personal embrace of Christianity for the sake of internal peace in the Empire (see Baynes 1929: 18f.; consult Barnes 2011: 16 for more sources). Others highlight Constantine's commitment to Christianity by pointing to the many policies he installed before and after his victory at Milvian Bridge (see Barnes 1981: 44-53; 2011: 16). A third perspective argues that Constantine did not really convert to Christianity, but rather embraced the faith for his own political purposes, e.g. to justify monarchy (see Burckhardt 2013: 287; Drake 2000: 297f.).

Considering the multiplicity of early Christianity, some scholars have started to wonder about the specific stream of Christianity Constantine adhered to (see Drake 2006: 112). Drake, for example, notes that Constantine followed a Christianity different from the solidified, "coercive and intolerant Christianity" (Drake 2000: 350) known to later ages but maintained by only some of Constantine's contemporaries³⁵⁵. A Christianity "both noncoercive and inclusive" (Drake 2000: 285; apart from heresy, see *ibid.*: 347) allowed

³⁵⁴ For the East, Constantine's victory meant the installment of pro-Christian policies more encompassing than the ones already effective in the Western part of the Empire (see Barnes 2011: 107f.).

³⁵⁵ Drake comments: "the Christianity of Constantine's day, while more organized than any ancient religion had ever been, was still by later standards simply a loose assemblage of local congregations, held together by regular meetings of their bishops, but still differing significantly in character and even in fine points of belief. Constantine thus had a variety of Christianity with whom he could choose to work – some certainly determined to war to the death against the old gods, but others prepared to live in harmony with their pagan neighbors" (Drake 2006: 112).

for an integration into the Roman tradition of religious tolerance³⁵⁶. Drake notes:

“[T]he conversion story leads to the conclusion either that the church became immediately submissive to his [Constantine’s] will or that he himself was so awed by the experience that he slavishly delivered the empire to the church. Both alternatives ignore the great diversity in the number and condition of Christian communities that prevailed in the early fourth century, some of which did not define themselves in a way that precluded being both ‘Christians’ and ‘Romans’” (Drake 2006: 116).

MacMullen and others warn scholars not to overestimate the effect of Constantine’s embrace of Christianity and the decisions taken in Milan. Neither implied a substantial change in state policy, a conversion of a majority of the Roman army or the Roman state apparatus, or a decisive change among Constantine’s subjects (see MacMullen 1984: 43-48; Lundskow 2006: 236; Barnes 2011: 84). H. A. Drake notes in seeming contradiction that “during the thirty years of his [Constantine’s] reign, more change took place in the status, structure, and beliefs of the Christian Church than during any previous period of its history” (Drake 2006: 111). While the time directly preceding Constantine’s reign had been marked by “a concerted effort to remove all traces of Christian presence from the empire” (ibid.), the restitutions of 306 C.E. and the decisions in Milan represent the shifted official attitude now willing to acknowledge and embrace Christianity. Barnes is right that this change in official legislation meant a landmark victory for the position of Christianity in the Roman Empire (see Barnes 2011: 107-111). Both sides are reconcilable if one assumes that Constantine favored Christianity but within the traditional Roman policy of religious tolerance.

The Constantine measures and the subsequent rise in the Church’s status inspired changes that affected the *internal* development of (Orthodox) Christianity. Those changes turned out to be more ambivalent than the Eastern communities may have expected in their first frenzy of triumph. Constantine surely mustered official support for Christianity by financing the construction of churches (e.g. basilicas in Rome, Bethlehem and the Holy Sepulcher), issuing new copies of the Bible and dedicating a part of income from the Empire’s provinces to Church charity. Furthermore, he granted jurisdiction to the bishops and demonstrated his willingness to change Roman law and customs in accordance with Christian ethics³⁵⁷. At the same time, however, the integration of Christianity into the legal framework of the Empire as a body public made it an issue of *public law*. This

³⁵⁶ see Chadwick 1967: 126; MacMullen 1984: 47f.; critical Barnes 1981: 210ff.

³⁵⁷ see Chadwick 1967: 128, Fox 1986: 667-668, Green 2010: 227.

process greatly magnified the influence the Roman state had on the Church and its dealings (see Ullmann 1976: 11³⁵⁸). Furthermore, Constantine seems to have regarded himself as a ruler whose duty it was to preserve the *status rei Romanae* and therefore sustain the unity of the Church as an act of *Renovatio Romae* (see Baynes 1929: 29; Ullmann 1976: 9, 14). As shown in the following chapter, this had a grave effect on the process of internal stratification and the ultimate success of an orthodox religious framework within Christianity.

Regarding Christianity, the Constantine policies mirror a movement in two directions at once – the transformation of the Roman Empire towards Christianity *and* the rejection of internal religious multiplicity. While Constantine accepted the continued existence of Paganism (grudgingly or not), his policies left almost no room for diversity within the young Christian faith (see Drake 2006: 132). Soon after his rise to the ruler of the whole Roman Empire, it became apparent that Constantine was able and willing to use his power to eradicate the internal conflicts in the Church by silencing disagreement and producing a unified Church.

6.1.3 The Nicaean Council

“The conversion of Constantine marks a turning-point in the history of the Church and of Europe. It meant much more than the end of persecution. The sovereign autocrat was inevitably and immediately involved in the development of the church, and conversely the Church became more and more implicated in high political decisions” (Chadwick 1967: 125)

“[I]t is also essential to note that from the christianization of the Roman Empire under Constantine (325 C.E.) onward, the monumental intrusion of the state into what had heretofore been a largely meta-political struggle between two essentially powerless minorities transformed the nature of the confrontation completely” (Katz 1991: 52)

After his victory over Licinius in 324 C.E., Constantine was distressed to discover that the Greek episcopate had been divided over a dispute on the unity of Christ and God (*Arianism*). Richard Hanson notes that what “began as a theological debate, quite soon turned into a struggle for power by various groups, each of whom tried to obtain the emperor’s ear” (Hanson 1989: 147³⁵⁹). In his position as *pontifex maximus* Constantine

³⁵⁸ “The public law enabled Constantine to integrate the Christian body into the empire and to allocate to it a decisive role in the task of the empire's revival” (Ullmann 1976: 5).

³⁵⁹ Hanson discusses and ultimately rejects the hypothesis that the Arian controversy disguised an internal

saw himself as the guarantor of public order, a role he extended to the Church as body public. This is illustrated in a letter sent to two central figures in this confrontation – Arius and his bishop, Alexander:

“On the subject of divine Providence therefore let there be one faith among you, one understanding, one agreement about the Supreme; the precise details about these minimal disputes among yourselves, even if you cannot bring yourselves to a single point of view, ought to remain in the mind, guarded in the hidden recess of thought” (Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 2.71.7, quoted after Drake 2006: 124).

The letter demonstrates that Constantine’s first objective lay in unity (see Drake 2006: 129). When his attempt to negotiate the issue proved unsuccessful, the Emperor called for a synod to re-establish the unity of the Church³⁶⁰. Scheduled at first for Ancyra (Ankara), the meeting was ultimately to take place in Nicaea in 325 C.E.³⁶¹ Two hundred twenty bishops of which only seven or eight had arrived from the Latin West attended the Council. The unprecedented size of this synod led to its recognition as “the first 'ecumenical' or world council” (Chadwick 1967: 130; cf. Barnes 1981: 214f.³⁶²). Of the bishops attending the meeting, 218 signed an agreement prescribed by Constantine that settled the dispute that had served as reason for the council. In its final creed, the bishops recognized the son (Jesus) and the father (God) to be “of one substance”, an ambiguous statement that left room for interpretation but unified the Church under the auspice of the Roman emperor (see Chadwick 1991: 11f.). This gave the Christian emperors a tool to maintaining the unity of the church (e.g. by Theodosius at Constantinople in 381 C.E., see Lyman 2007: 301).

Being mostly the result of a Constantine intervention, the Nicaean settlement created an unprecedented unity between the Syrian, Egyptian and Roman church with regard to a common code of canon law. It regulated the election of bishops, introduced a general codex with regard to their conduct and increasingly concentrated authority in the hands of metropolitans (see Chadwick 1967: 131). Considering these changes, Lyman comments that the “Nicene controversy” triggered a “fundamental restructuring of

power-struggle. Rather, he concludes “that this theological dispute, if it had any serious meaning, was a competition between rival Greek philosophical theories with very little reference to the doctrines and assumptions of either the Old or the New Testament” (Hanson 1989: 147).

³⁶⁰ “[T]he synod was a properly convened assembly that was to decide in a collective or corporate capacity controversial issues of fact or of doctrine. Down to the late fourth century the synod was the supreme, inappellable organ that, because inspired by the Holy Ghost, finally laid controversies to rest” (Ullmann 1976: 9).

³⁶¹ For the factors that motivated this change of location, see Drake 2006: 125.

³⁶² consult Barnes 2011: 120-126 for an account of the meeting.

Christian theology and ecclesiastical authority through creeds and councils” (Lyman 2007: 299³⁶³). On the nature of this change, Ullmann notes that the structure “of ecclesiastical organisation [...] was in essential points an adaptation of the imperial administrative system” (Ullmann 1967: 14³⁶⁴). This convergence points to the way in which Constantine successfully claimed a “leadership position in an organization that had developed completely independent of imperial control” (Drake 2006: 127).

Constantine also achieved this recognition by connecting himself with the notion of orthodoxy: “The prospect of using the coercive powers of the state to suppress heresy greatly enhanced the attraction of the empire in the eyes of the bishops and provided the incentive for them to cooperate” (Drake 2006: 132). Drake therefore concludes that the Arian controversy “produced a creedal statement that ultimately became the touchstone of Christian orthodoxy” (ibid.: 124). The synod of Nicaea thus serves as an example for how Constantine used his position as *pontifex maximus* to exert pressure on the Church with regard to its innermost dealings. One can therefore say that the rise of Christianity to political power was traded in for its internal autonomy. While the Roman Emperors “treated heresy as a political crime [and] enforced decrees of Church councils through the state courts and administration” (Neusner 1987: 15) Christianity experienced an accelerated process of internal stratification and public functionalization. This officially sanctioned process ended the period of early Christian heterodoxy as the proto-Catholic position and its call for religious orthodoxy grew to ultimate dominance (see McDonald 2007: 318).

*

As noted above, Constantine’s reign had a profound and unprecedented impact on “the status, structure, and beliefs of the Christian Church” (Drake 2006: 111). Besides the introduction of a different calendar, the changes influenced post-Nicene Christianity “to re-assess itself in relation to its own past” (Markus 1990: 137). It also sparked a fierce opposition to competing “heresies”. Fredriksen notes “[b]y banning the texts of ‘deviant’ Christians, burning their books, or simply ceasing to allow them to be copied, the bishops

³⁶³ “To many living in that time [...] Nicaea represented a dangerous innovation. By introducing non-biblical terminology into the creed, and by making the Son equal to God the Father, the council seemed to compromise the primitive Christian belief that God the father is one, the sole source and origin of all that exists” (Wilken 1983: 11).

³⁶⁴ Ullmann comments: “[T]he specific significance of this measure of Constantine was that the eventual decision was formally to be taken by the ecclesiastics and, therefore, be synodal, although it was Constantine's will alone which brought the synod into existence and sustained it” (Ullmann 1976: 10). For a discussion of the authority by which Constantine convened and influenced the synod, consult ibid.

got to remake the past in their own image. The only documents to survive were the ones that they approved” (Fredriksen 2006: 588). This stratification was so thorough, the triumph of the Catholic call for an orthodox religious framework so encompassing that it distorted everything that is known today about the heterodox past of the faith. It is certain, however, that “[c]ountless gospels, apocryphical acts, sermons, letters, commentaries, and theological treatises simply disappeared” (ibid.).

It should come as no surprise that a negative reference to Judaism played a central part in this process of internal stratification. Accordingly, the Nicaean synod confronted “heresies” by introducing measures that aimed towards a separation of “Christianity” from “Judaism”. For example, it decided to change the date of Easter away from the Jewish celebration of Passover (fourteenth of Nissan), the original date of Jesus' crucifixion (see Marcus 1999: 117, Ruether 1997: 172). Furthermore, it apparently also introduced the custom of Lent to the Eastern part of the Empire (see Barnes 2011: 125³⁶⁵). By the beginning of the fourth century, the date of Christmas (Jesus' birth) was changed to the 25th of December, day of the winter solstice and the birthday of the Pagan god of the sun³⁶⁶. Those examples illustrate the way a deliberate elimination of the Jewish cultural and religious background was accompanied by an increasing identification with the Roman state and its political interests (see Markus 1990: 27ff.). Its alliance with power was no coincidence.

During the second century, proto-Catholic Christian writers such as Tertullian, Eusebius of Caesarea or Cyprian of Carthage had started to preach adherence to the Roman state and later authors justified Constantine's monarchy as expression of the divine will (see Chadwick 1967: 6; cf. Dibelius 1971: 58; Ullmann 1976: 4ff.). This implies that proto-Catholic Orthodoxy and the Roman state approached each other expecting their mutual benefit. For the post-Nicene Church, this transformation to a religion of the state posed new challenges, as a concern arose among the conservative elements to distinguish their faith from the wider Roman culture, e.g. separating the older Pagan celebrations from the

³⁶⁵ The passage in the Nicaean resolution is explicit about this separation: “[I]t appeared an unworthy thing that in the celebration of this most holy fest [Eastern] we should follow the practice of the Jews, who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin, and are, therefore, deservedly afflicted with blindness of soul. [...] Let us then have nothing in common with the detestable Jewish crowd; for we have received from our Savior a different way” (Marcus 1999: 117). Barnes comments: “Constantine (and therefore the Council of Nicaea) assumed that all Jews were forever polluted by the crime of deicide committed by the Jews in Jerusalem on the day when Jesus was condemned to death and crucified” (Barnes 2011: 125).

³⁶⁶ see Chadwick 1967: 126; Markus 1990: 103; Barnes 2011: 85. Some scholars assume that Constantine directly influenced this Nicaean resolution on the date of Eastern (see Barnes 1981: 217; 2011: 122-126). Others add that Constantine's position on dogmatic questions was itself shaped by proto-Catholic theology developing over the previous two centuries (see Markus 1990: 102; Barnes 2011: 125).

newer Christian faith (see Markus 1990: 100-106³⁶⁷). This is anticipated by Tertullian's well-known question *quid Athenae Hierosolymis?* ("what has Athens to do with Jerusalem?", see Markus 1990: 27; 101ff.). Within the Roman population, Paganism only slowly receded, remaining the "religion of the majority until well into the second half of the fourth century" (see Chadwick 1967: 152). As a result, a struggle unfolded on a societal level between Christianity and the century-old Pagan state religion (see Chadwick 1967: 152-159). Scholars such as Markus and Boyarin comment on the influence this late fourth-century Christian struggle had on the juxtaposition of Paganism and Christianity. Markus notes:

"Unlike Christianity, with its growing world-wide cohesiveness, 'paganism' was a varied group of cults and observances. [...] It existed only in the minds, and, increasingly *the speech habits* of Christians. Insofar as a particular section of Roman paganism acquired some sort of homogeneous identity [...] it was a response to the growing self-confidence and assertiveness of a Christian establishment" (Markus 1990: 28; cf. Boyarin 2004).

Together with the old elite, conscious Pagans saw Christianity as a challenge to their tradition and a threat to the bonds of custom and morality (see Markus 1990: 28³⁶⁸). Only as the fourth century ended had Christianity ousted Paganism from its place as first religion in the Empire. Under Theodosius I. "the Great" (379-394 C.E.), Nicene Christianity was made the official state religion. In 380 C.E. (*Cunctos populos*) all public worship of Pagan deities was declared illegal. With the *Theodosian Code* of 387 C.E. Christianity had reached a "position of political and cultural dominance that it would enjoy until the twentieth century" (Neusner 1987: ix). In 391 C.E., this new cultural dominance of Christianity as the sole religion of the Empire was reflected in a decree ordering the suppression of all Pagan cults (see Skarsaune 2007c: 772f.).

³⁶⁷ Consult Origen's *De principiis* as an example for the Christian embrace of Paganism. His teachings were declared heresy only in 543 C.E, after centuries of struggle. (see Dodds 1968: 127-132).

³⁶⁸ An interesting example for the changing tide of Roman attitude vis-à-vis Constantine's support of Christianity is supplied by Julian, nephew of Constantine and ruler from 361-363 C.E. (for the following, see Chadwick 1967: 154-159). Raised by moderate Christian tutors, who had also taught him the Greek classics, Julian was baptised and fairly acquainted with Christian theology. Julian showed increasing interest in his Pagan background and secretly abandoned Christianity by 351 C.E. After Constantius died ten years later, Julian was proclaimed sole ruler and adopted a policy that aimed to reverse the Constantine pro-Christian measures. To subdue the Christian influence Julian forbid Christians to become teachers, excluded them from promotion to high office and proclaimed his plan to rebuild the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. When he died while campaigning in Persia, this last official revival of Paganism came to an abrupt end (though its spirit continued to circulate). What followed was a Christian "counterrevolution, with the Christian state now suppressing the institutions of paganism, and Christian men in the streets of the towns and villages acting on their own against those institutions" (Neusner 1987:16).

The decisions made at the Council of Nicaea remained highly disputed within and among the growing community of believers as internal heterodoxy lingered on for the following centuries (see Bauer 1964: 233). The adaption of the Pagan calendar, for example, did not prevent Christians to keep the Sabbath (traces of this obduracy can be found in John Chrysostom's sermons discussed below). It was forbidden only at the council of Laedicea in Phrygia, Asia Minor that took place sometime between 343 C.E. to 381 C.E. (see Markus 1999: 118). A special religious service appears to have been tolerated for the day of Sabbath long afterwards and was banned only in 789 C.E. (see Marcus 1999: 116).

6.1.4 Excuse: Jews in Roman Law – The Impact of Christianity

“Die zunächst rein theologisch gemeinte Enterbung Israels zog mit der Zeit eine politisch-soziale Deklassierung nach sich, die sich bis zur mittelalterlichen Kammerknechtschaft und darüber hinaus erstreckte“ (Schreckenberg 1999: 222)

The time following the Constantine conversion 312 C.E. was marked by an increasing substitution of a Roman Pagan tradition of religious tolerance with a Christian claim to sole representation. This process was accompanied by “a rising campaign to contain and isolate the Jewish community” (Meeks/Wilken 1978: 34). For some time following the adoption of Christianity by Constantine, however, Judaism remained the only religion besides Christianity able to retain the status of *religio licita* (see Heemstra 2010: 206³⁶⁹). It is important to note that there had barely been any change in the legal status of Jews during the time from Josephus to Constantine. As Christianity rose to power, the legal position of Judaism deteriorated by increments. As early as 315 C.E. the *Laws of Constantine the Great* had put an attack on Christian converts by Jewish subjects under the penalty of death (see Markus 1999: 4). In 339 C.E. the *Law of Constantius* prohibited Jews to own Christian slaves and to marry a Christian women (see *ibid.*). More juridical

³⁶⁹ Chadwick notes that Constantine maintained “the continued validity of the entire tradition of Roman law inherited from the past” (Chadwick 1991: 2; cf. Wilken 1967: 324f.; Gager 1983: 98. Referring to Jeremy Cohen's *Roman Imperial Policy Toward the Jews from Constantine Until the End of the Palestinian Patriarchate (ca. 429)* (1976), Gager comments: “Cohen finds no evidence to support either a rapid decline in the status of Jews and Judaism under the Christian emperors of the fourth century or the traditional view that such limitations as did arise can be explained on religious grounds. The emperors appear to have been motivated above all else by traditional political factors and by a desire to protect the freedom of Jews to practice their religion, a freedom first guaranteed by Julius Caesar. Rather than serving as willing instruments of ecclesiastical anti-Judaism, they appear more frequently as resisting efforts by church authorities to dissolve the status of Judaism as a protected religion. This does not make the emperors friends or sympathizers of Judaism any more than Tiberius in the first century was a 'friend of Jews.' But it does suggest that church and state followed separate courses in dealing with Judaism at least until the early part of the fifth century” (Gager 1983: 98).

measures are recorded in the *Codex Theodosianus* (438 C.E.) and the *Code of Justinian* (534 C.E.) containing almost fifty edicts concerning the official dealing with the Jews grafted since Constantine the Great (see Wilken 1967: 324; Marcus 1999: 3-7). It is therefore probable to assume that the events following the conversion of Constantine, notably the growing influence of post-Nicene Christianity on official policy, exerted a growing influence on Roman state legislation (see Wilken 1967: 324³⁷⁰).

The groundwork for the official Roman policy towards Judaism was laid down right after first contact had been made between the kingdom of Judea and the Roman Empire by the mid second century B.C.E.³⁷¹. After Judea had become a Roman province, this framework was in effect until the beginning of the fifth century C.E. Henceforth, Judaism was recognized as a *religio licita*. This status granted the right to live according to ancestral customs and the privilege to donate annually to the Temple in Jerusalem (see Wilken 1967: 317). Furthermore, Jewish communities retained partial jurisdiction on most disputes and were exempted from civic obligations on the Sabbath (see Gager 1983: 41). While Jews did not earn full citizenship, the scholar S. W. Baron concludes that Jews enjoyed a favorable legal position in the Roman Empire (see Baron 1962: 238-246). Only during the time of Hadrian do the source evidence restrictions of circumcision and access to Jerusalem (right after a Jewish revolt had been subdued). During the reign of Septimius Severus Jews were prohibited to proselytize among non-Jews (see Wilken 1967: 318).

The introduction of a special annual levy for the Jewish inhabitants of Alexandria (Egypt) (*fiscus Judaicus*) appears to have been a local precursor for the *Fiscus Judaicus*

³⁷⁰ Wilken notes that the Christian “theological tradition concerning Judaism was to have enormous influence” (Wilken 1967: 322) on Roman legislation. This influence slowly deteriorated Judaism’s former social and legal position in the Roman Empire (see Ruether 1997: 186). At the same time, however, the integration of Christianity into the Roman Empire left a deep imprint on Christianity. Marcus comments: “The real significance of Roman law for the Jew and his history is that it exerted a profound influence on subsequent Christian and even Moslem legislation. The second-class status of citizenship of the Jew, as crystallized in the Justinian code, was thus entrenched in the medieval world, and under the influence of the Church the disabilities imposed upon him received religious sanction and relegated him even to lower levels” (Marcus 1999: 3).

³⁷¹ “Schon die Makkabäerfürsten bemühten sich um Anlehnung an Rom und fanden bereitwillig Gehör; [see 1. Makk. 8:1-32; 13: 16-24] die Verbindung mit den östlichen Kleinstaaten ermöglichte die Unterwerfung des Ostens. Im Jahre 63 v.Chr. machte Pompeius, im Bruderkwitz der Makkabäer von den Juden selbst herbeigerufen, ihr Land zu einem Teil des Imperiums. Die zahlreichen jüdischen Kriegsgefangenen, die Pompeius nach Rom brachte, bildeten den Grundstock einer jüdischen Gemeinde in Rom, zu der bis dahin nur unbedeutende Anfänge vorhanden waren. [...] Im Kampf zwischen Pompeius und Cäsar traten die Juden auf die Seite des letzteren. Nicht nur aus Dankbarkeit, sondern aus weitblickenden politischen Erwägungen gewährte Cäsar den Juden im ganzen Reich Rechtsschutz ihrer Religionsübung. Die Edikte Cäsars, die nach seinem Tod vom Senat bestätigt wurden, waren die Magna Carta des Judentums im Römischen Reich, die bis zum Sieg des Christentums im Wesentlichen aufrechterhalten wurde [bestätigt durch Augustus und Claudius; nach 70 fielen die Sonderrechte für das pal. Judentum weg]” (Goppelt 1954: 221f.). For a discussion of the legal status of Judaism in Josephus’ writings, see Zeev 1998.

introduced by Vespasian around 70 C.E. (see Sevenster 1975: 197). A reaction to the Judean revolts, his son Domitian (81-96 C.E.) gradually expanded its scope (see Smallwood 1956: 3f.). According to the record of Josephus and Cassius Dio, the tax replaced the former Jewish Temple tax following the Temple's destruction, though it appears the group of tax payers was expanded from male Jews between the age of 20 and 50 to all Jewish inhabitants of the Empire (see Heemstra 2010: 9-13). Under Domitian, the tax appears to have affected not only observant Jews but also those people that lived according to Jewish conduct without seeing themselves as Jews, or also those people who had concealed their Jewish origin in order to avoid the new tax. Even more importantly, it was now accompanied by the double accusation of Jewish lifestyle and the crime of *asebeia* (*atheism*), possibly aiming at the limitation of Pagan proselytizing (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 282f.) or the avoidance of displeasure of the Pagan Gods (Heemstra 2010: 27-34). However, the extent to which this law affected Christ-believers has been debated (for this discussion, see Heemstra 2010: 32-66). Anyway, Nerva clarified the situation by expressively exempting Christians from the *Fiscus Iudaicus*. This has inspired Heemstra to assume that “the process of separation between Judaism and Christianity [...] reached its climax in the form of the *fiscus Iudaicus*” (Heemstra 2010: 1; 190-211; cf. Speigl 1970: 84f.³⁷²).

The legal status of Judaism as *religio licita* remained unchanged until Christianity's official recognition as state religion by 380 C.E. The traditional Roman principle of toleration remained in place alongside the deterioration of the legal, social and economic status of Jews. A “progressive deterioration of Jewish rights” (Marcus 1999: 3) was thus accompanied by a “steady string of laws [...] which guaranteed Jewish privileges” (Wilken 1967: 324). Since the succession of restrictive laws for Jews was also accompanied by pro-Christian laws, scholars assume an increasing influence of Christianity on Roman legislation (for the following, see Wilken 1967: 322-324; Marcus 1999: 3-7; Barnes 2011: 131-140): In 313 C.E. official subsidies were paid to the Church and Christian clerics exempted from public duties. In 320 C.E., Christian clerics were exempted from taxation. In 321 C.E., Sunday was recognized a holiday and the inheritance-law changed so that a dying man can bequeath to the church as much as he wishes. In 330 C.E., clerics are exempted from senatorial service. In 331 C.E., a Christian marriage law was adopted, restricting women's right to divorce their husbands. In 368 C.E., a political amnesty was granted to prisoners at Eastertide. In 380 C.E., legal

³⁷² Heemstra adds that this acknowledgment of Christianity as a separate entity also meant its vulnerability to charges of superstition (see Heemstra 2010: 84).

proceedings were suspended during Lent.

Accompanying those laws were the following anti-Jewish laws: In 315 C.E. Jews were forbidden to accept proselytes, thus restricting its social impact on society. In 339 C.E. male Jews were forbidden to marry Christian women and to own Christian slaves, dealing a severe blow to their economic position. In 352 C.E. the property of converts from Christianity to Judaism was confiscated. In 388 C.E. all intermarriage between Jews and Christians was forbidden. In 404 C.E., Jews were exempted from imperial service (reaffirmed in 418 C.E.). In 380 C.E., Christianity was officially recognized as state-religion under Theodosius I. (the Great), the last Emperor to rule over a united Roman Empire. The proclamation required that “all peoples of the empire should confess the ‘sole deity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit’” (Wilken 1967: 322). In 398 C.E., jurisdiction of Jewish courts was curtailed “so that they were entitled to do no more than arbitrate on matters of purely Jewish concern” (Simon 1986: 128). This implied a significant weakening of the legal position of Jewish citizens, in that they were now “compelled to conduct virtually all their affairs through the civil courts, and at just about the same time Jews were prohibited from acting as judges” (ibid.). In 423 C.E., Jews in the Roman Empire were prohibited from building new Synagogues except those destroyed by Christians and from repairing and expanding existing Synagogues without special permission³⁷³. The *Codex Theodosianus* (“Theodosian Code”, published in 438 C.E.) forbade Jews to hold honorary offices, be part of the city administration, a warden of the jail or a cities “defender” and “overseer” (see Marcus 1999: 5f.). The same Law forbade active conversion and the construction of new synagogues, declaring it “sinful that the enemies of the heavenly majesty and of the Roman laws should become the executors of our laws [...] and that they [...] should have the power to judge or decide as they wish against Christians” (Marcus 1999: 5). The publication of the Theodosian Code signaled the end of centuries of Roman tolerance towards Judaism. Simon comments:

“The effect of these measures was progressively to reduce the opportunities for Jews to

³⁷³ This decision echoes a controversy between bishop Ambrosius and Theodosius I. (379-395 C.E.). In 388 C.E., Ambrose wrote a letter to the Roman emperor. It came as a reaction to the destruction of a synagogue in the town of Callinicum, Mesopotamia that had been encouraged by the local bishop. Seeing the event as an unacceptable disruption of public order, Theodosius I. had ordered the synagogue to be rebuilt at the expense of the local bishop. Ambrose’s response to this order was ferocious. In his letter, Ambrose demanded the exculpation of those responsible arguing that the reconstruction of the synagogue would grant success to the Jews. The letter at first remained without effect, yet Ambrose’s wish was granted after appealing to the ruler in person and refusing him the Holy Communion (see Markus 1999: 120-123). Theodosius I. retreated from his demand for compensation but only five years later he issued an order “to punish any Christian who attacked and destroyed synagogues” (Marcus 1999: 120).

influence Gentiles (either pagans or, more particularly, Christians) and at the same time to restrict them to the area they then occupied, on the fringes of society. On the other hand, since no hope remained of any massive or spontaneous conversion of Israel to Christianity, these laws aimed at further accentuating the peculiar position of the Jews, but in such a way that it no longer appeared as a privilege. Instead, the Jews' position was made to seem more and more like a burden placed on them; like a divine punishment falling on a class of people who are under condemnation” (Simon 1986: 127).

The increasing influence of Christian customs and Christians norms put to one side, the Constantine legislation is a curious example for the intermediate and ambivalent situation of the Roman emperors between Pagan traditions and the nascent religion. For example, in 321 C.E., Constantine declared Sunday a legal holiday for all Roman citizens (see Marcus 1999: 118). The week was expanded from six to seven days and the list of prohibitions for the Sunday included the cessation of law courts “except for the pious purpose of freeing slaves” (Chadwick 1967: 128). While this law looks like a major concession to Christian beliefs and customs, these alterations were officially justified with reference to the Pagan respect for the Sun (see *ibid.*). It is here again that one can observe the merging of Christianity and older Pagan beliefs in Constantine’s adoption of the new faith.

When it comes to actual persecutions against the Jewish inhabitants and a proactive demolition of their synagogues, the policy of the Roman state at first continued its tradition of religious tolerance (expressed in laws passed in 393, 397, 412 and 418 C.E.). This official peace was disrupted by occasional pogroms incited by Christian bishops and monks on the local level (see Simon 1986: 224-226). The official mood changed rapidly during the second half of the fourth century, marked by the publication of the collection of imperial laws (“Theodosian Code”) in 438 C.E. No longer did officials insist on restitution or a reconstruction of those edifices destroyed by ravaging Christians (see Simon 1986: 228f.). Measures against the Jewish community now became state policy. Those laws, resulting from political development, not “self-defense” (*ibid.*: 130), supplied a trigger for violence against Jewish communities and individuals. Officially sanctioned by Roman law, Church authorities tolerated, approved and at times instigated those pogroms. Proto-Catholic antisemitism developed over the previous two centuries had finally succeeded in expanding its surface of application to the field of official Roman policy (see *ibid.*: 227). The following section returns to the development of this tradition in the genre of *Adversus Iudaeos*.

6.2 *Adversus Iudaeos Revisited*

“Virtually every major Christian writer of the first five centuries either composed a treatise in opposition to Judaism or made this issue a dominant theme in a treatise devoted to some other subject” (Pelikan 1971: 15)

MacLennan notes that the term “*Adversus Iudaeos*” is “an informal designation given by scholars such as J. Parkes, A. L. Williams, R. Wilde, H. Schreckenberg, J. Gager, and R. Ruether to those writings of early Christians against Jews and Judaism in the first five centuries of the common era” (MacLennan 1990: xvii). Stroumsa identifies two ways scholars have explained the emergence of those writings, one looking at social interaction between Jews and Christians, the other focusing on the process of Christian self-definition as a process *intra muros* (see Stroumsa 1996: 3). The latter perspective was proposed forcefully by Adolf von Harnack’s *Die Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani* (1883). To Harnack, the aim of the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature was not to record encounters with empirical Jews but to establish the truth of the theological position of the author for a public of Christians and potential converts. Since the Christian authors had lost touch with Judaism and since the *Adversus Iudaeos* was apparently concerned with their own theological position, Harnack declared the Jewish opponents in Christian writing mere “straw men”:

“Der Gegner ist hier in der That nur ein gedachter, er besitzt keinen anderen Horizont als sein Widerpart; eben darum ist er nicht der Jude, wie er wirklich war, sondern der Jude, wie ihn der Christ fürchtete“ (Harnack 1883: 63; cf. Hulen 1932: 63f.).

An early objection to Harnack’s assumptions came from Lukyn Williams who argued that the *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition had been designed to support Christianity in its struggle with Judaism for converts, “both as a protection to Christians, and as a means of winning Jews” (Williams 1935: 43). To Williams, the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature was a reaction to a real threat from empirical Jews (see *ibid.*: xvi). In *Verus Israel*, published in 1948, the aforementioned Marcel Simon updated this view of Judaism as an aggressively proselytizing religion threatening the success of the Christian mission. This has remained the dominant perspective in scholarship on the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature (see e.g. Dunn 2008; Binder 2012: 196f.), albeit accompanied by a constant stream of critique (see e.g. Tränkle 1964: lxxii-lxxiv; MacLennan 1990: xvf.).

In her book *Faith and Fratricide* (1974), Rosemary Ruether returned to Harnack's hypothesis when noting that the portrayal of the Jewish opponent in the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature appeared to be reduced to a "few observances of the sort that any Gentile might be expected to know" (Ruether 1997: 156). This led her to the conclusion that "[t]he Christians' opponents are the Jews of Christian imagination" (Ruether 1997: 120³⁷⁴). For Ruether just as for Harnack, the image of "the Jew" of Christian writing is detached from his empirical referent and serves the purpose of theological clarification. The *Adversus Iudaeos* literature must therefore be understood as the "earliest form of Christian theologizing" (ibid.: 117), forming the "hermeneutical basis of the New Testament" (ibid.) and the "overall method of Christian exegesis of the Old Testament" (ibid.: 121³⁷⁵). While the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature grew in popularity and impact all through the Patristic period, its purpose remains relatively stable: developing Christology and demonstrating the legitimacy of Christianity as the true heir to Jewish prophecy. In both cases, "the Jews" assume the role of the negative Other (see ibid.: 117). Although Ruether has been criticized for adopting a model that does not account for the immense dynamics and diversity of early Christian writing (see Stroumsa 1996: 16), her work has sparked intense interest among North American, mostly Roman Catholic theologians (see ibid.: 13).

In his 1982 book *Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict*, Rokeah seeks to expand Ruether's and Harnack's argument (see Rokeah 1982: 45ff.³⁷⁶). While the tradition of *Adversus Iudaeos* in fact *appears* to supply evidence for a continued encounter between Judaism and Christ-believers, Rokeah argues that the polemics themselves not only aimed towards internal adversaries but also Pagan polemics (see ibid.: 68f., 211). In his

³⁷⁴ cf. Baron 1964: 8; Rokeah 1982: 209; Kampling 1990: 137; Taylor 1995: 4; Schreckenberg 1999: 16f. Kampling comments: "In der Auseinandersetzung ist nicht der wirklich Jude gemeint, sondern der Jude, wie sich ihn die Christen dachten. Und dieser ist ohne Heil, ungläubig, halsstarrig, blind verrückt, hochmütig, verworfen, treulos etc." (Kampling 1990: 137).

³⁷⁵ "Any sermons, commentaries, or teachings based on scriptural exegesis of the Old Testament, and even of the New Testament texts where Jews are mentioned, will reflect this tradition of anti-Judaic midrash. It was virtually impossible for the Christian preacher or exegete to teach scripturally at all without alluding to the anti-Judaic theses. Christian scriptural teaching and preaching per se is based on a method in which anti-Judaic polemic exists as the left hand of its christological hermeneutic" (Ruether 1997: 121). Adding to this hermeneutic dimension, Ruether notes "[t]his tradition informed the prevailing way in which the Christian community was taught, through its preachers and teachers, to look at, not only the Jews of Old Testament and New Testament times, but at the Jewish community of their own times" (see ibid.: 121f.). This echoes the inversion of the historical and the prophetic discussed in this work. Against this interpretation of anti-Judaism as a central element in a Christian self-reflection, MacLennan has tried to reject the idea that the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature contains any form of anti-Judaism. Rather, those writings should be understood as "attempts on the part of the particular Christian writer, in a specific place, during a period of time, to say something about the uniqueness and importance of the Christian Way to the Christian community in whatever form that might have taken at the time" (MacLennan 1990: xx). As pointed out in the chapter 4.3.4, the occupation of a respective author with something else but the Jews is no viable excuse but a proof for the anti-Jewish framework accompanying this "Christian Way".

³⁷⁶ Rokeah's argumentation is opposed forcefully by Neusner 1984; for a critical, but less polemical approach, see Ferguson 1984.

intriguing *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity. A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*, Miriam Taylor takes Harnack's, Ruether's and Rokeah's hypothesis to its logical extreme (see Taylor 1995). Taylor comments:

“[W]here close attention is paid to the context, substance, spirit, tone and orientation of the Christian texts, the inward rather than outward apologetic focus of the anti-Jewish passages is revealed. [...] The patristic writers were preoccupied, rather, with Judaism on a symbolic level, and more specifically, with the internal theological questions raised by the church's supersessionary claims vis-à-vis Judaism, and by its attempts to forge a *via media* between appropriation and rejection of different elements of the Jewish tradition” (Taylor 1995: 4).

Two objectives are therefore realized in the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature. A demarcation from Judaism as original carrier of the prophecy Christianity claims and a clarification of the theological position of the writer him- or herself. Just as in Justin's *Dialogue*, the *Adversus Iudaeos* counters inner-Christian competitors by employing “the Jews” as an empty signifier. Disregarding its actual closeness to Jewish ritual or a Jewish background, the other side is accused of performing Jewish practices, of employing a Jewish mode of exegesis or of being Jewish (most apparent in the sermons John Chrysostom analyzed below). In this process, the adjective “Jewish” takes the meaning of a general deviation from what the respective author considers truthful.

While encounters and debates between Christians and Jews most probably occurred and may even find their echo in some of the dialogues, the *Adversus Iudaeos*' most popular genre, the one-sided and polemic portrayal of the Jewish opponent renders it highly improbable that the treatment depends on the real Jews. Just as in the Gospels, the empirical world seems to be overwritten by the theological and social needs and intentions of the respective authors. This is not to say that those texts do not echo their surroundings and are not dependent on external factors. Rather, this study argues that the development of this genre rests on other factors than the Jewish-Christian relationship³⁷⁷. Once the empirical conflict is rejected as a cause for anti-Jewish polemics (Simon), the inner-Christian struggle and the socio-political situation emerge as alternative explaining variables whose validity is tested in this work. In this case, one would expect the image of “the Jews” to alternate with the changing battle-lines of inner-Christian debates and the position the respective author takes in this confrontation.

³⁷⁷ Judith Lieu has recently proposed a valuable work on the distinction between *Image and Reality* (1996).

In fact, the first four centuries saw a “deep transformations of Christian discourse itself” (Stroumsa 1996: 16) also affecting the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature³⁷⁸. The varying depiction and semantic position of “the Jews” (see MacLennan 1990: 152) responds to this transformation that is expressed further in a changing agenda of the respective authors³⁷⁹. Stroumsa comments:

“The context and meaning of the rejection of the Jews in the Gospel of John, for instance, are vastly different from Chrysostom’s anti-Jewish invective. We cannot speak of a single early Christian or Patristic attitude toward Jews and Judaism, or imply its existence. Both the relationship of Christianity to Judaism and the Christian’s perceptions of Jews were totally different at the end of the fourth century than they had been three hundred years previously” (Stroumsa 1996: 16).

Rejecting the attempt to compare the comparison of two writings as far apart as the Gospel of John and the writing of Chrysostom, Stroumsa focuses his analysis on the development that occurred in these three hundred years – the changing “parameters of Christian identity” (ibid.: 17). The following section, which traces anti-Jewish arguments as they appeared in selected sources from the 2nd to the 4th century, aims to reconstruct not the history of Jewish-Christian encounter but of a proto-Catholic reflection on theological issues. The centrality “the Jews” take in this process has become common currency in contemporary scholarship. For example, Ruether comments that the *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition “represents the overall method of Christian exegesis of the Old Testament” (Ruether 1997: 121). MacLennan seconds that “nearly all of the major early Christian writers wrote something (a dialogue, an essay, a letter, a poem) ‘*adversus Iudaeos*,’ ‘against the Jews.’” (MacLennan 1990: xvii).

The chosen samples for this study vary in length and literary style. Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (c. 160 C.E.) and *Verus Israel* (c. 162 C.E.) range among the oldest of the Patristic anti-Jewish texts and testify to the incremental process of detachment from the Jewish framework. Tertullian’s *Adversus Iudaeos* is the first great

³⁷⁸ Ruether had argued that the literary tradition of *Adversus Iudaeos* had remained more or less stable from the second to the sixth century (see Ruether 1997: 123). At the same time, Ruether notes in agreement with the present study, that “[t]he same repertoire of themes was constantly adapted by each author to the specific occasion and context in which he wrote” (ibid.). The author of the present study disagrees with Ruether, however, on the question what kind of challenge those writers responded to (Ruether follows Simon by pointing to a “live and proselytizing Judaism that continued to challenge Christianity”, ibid.)

³⁷⁹ Something Stroumsa may call “the overall theological attitude” (Stroumsa 1996: 16).

work in Latin whose length is unparalleled in early Patristic literature. John Chrysostom outlines his perspective on Christianity vis-à-vis Judaism in his Homilies *Against the Jews*, a series of public lectures. The literary form varies from sermons (John Chrysostom) to treatises (Tertullian) to dialogues (Justin Martyr). While the common goal of all of the writers considered in this section is an increased sense of the “Christian” self, they centre their portrayal around a changing image of Judaism and “the Jews”. The following analysis shows that the writers draw from a more or less stable pool of basic themes (some of them transmitted from the apostolic period), images and arguments while the form of presentation and the intensity of the polemic varies greatly.

6.2.1 Justin Martyr – Filling the Toolbox

In Justin’s writing one finds the first anti-Jewish polemic of a Patristic author (see Schreckenberg 1999: 182). Some accusations familiar from the analysis of the New Testament texts are reassessed, others introduced adding to the pool of anti-Jewish arguments for later writers. Boyarin comments: “Justin is our earliest source for both heresiology and the notion that the Gentile church has replaced the Jews as Israel” (Boyarin 2004: 17). The following does not intend a full synopsis of the arguments laid out in the *Dialogue*, one of the longest texts in early Christianity³⁸⁰. Rather, it focuses on the employment of “the Jews” in the *Dialogue* (see also chapter 5.2.1). Their form differs from Justin’s *Apologies*. While in the *Apologies*, Justin had depicted Judaism as “preparation of the Gospel” (Lieu 1996: 148), the *Dialogue* describes it as “a viable religious alternative, pursuing its own piety in obedience to God’s Law” (ibid.). This acknowledgment of Judaism, albeit far from later Patristic positions, does not mean that anti-Jewish imagery is absent in this text.

Throughout the *Dialogue*, Justin addresses Trypho’s position as “the Jews” or “you” marking a clear opposition between himself and an indiscriminate Jewish position addressed as “Trypho” (see Setzer 1994: 144; Horbury 1998: 127). Still, this opposition does not yet assume the characteristics of a juxtaposition between two entirely separated entities. In the 8th *Dialogue*, Trypho challenges Justin to turn to God by keeping the law (circumcision, *kashrut*, holy celebrations). Justin accepts those demands as divinely

³⁸⁰ see, for example, Stylianopoulos 1975; Skarsaune 1987; Lieu 1996: 113-140. This has also been depicted with regard to its role in an anti-Marcionite polemic in chapter 5.2.1.

inspired (though as a punishment for “sinful people” or the “hardness of heart”, see Just. Dial. 23; 45; 47). He even grants the Mosaic Law a limited validity for Jewish believers, provided they do not “compel those Gentiles who believe in this Christ to live in all respects according to the law given by Moses, or choose not to associate so intimately with them” (ibid. 47; cf. Remus 1986: 66). However, even if a Gentile should submit to the Mosaic Law, Justin continues, he may still be saved (see ibid. 47, cf. 29³⁸¹). Campenhausen comments:

“Die Schrift und das Gesetz in der Schrift offenbaren die Wahrheit Gottes; sie sollen gegen die Juden prophetische Bundesgenossen des Christusglaubens sein, aber für die Christen selber soll das Gesetz nicht mehr gelten; es soll dennoch von Gott erlassen sein und war nicht nur typisch-prophetisch, sondern auch wörtlich ernst zu nehmen“ (Campenhausen 1968: 115).

In the 11th *Dialogue*, Justin argues that the covenant on which the Mosaic Law is founded can only claim a limited temporality concluding that the coming of Christ has rendered the Mosaic Law obsolete. He then contrasts the Mosaic/ritual Law to the natural/moral law to which all men are liable (see Just. Dial. 11; 45). Thereby proclaiming the irrelevance of the Mosaic Law for salvation he argues that it has never been intended as sign of divine election. In fact, what Judaism has taken as proof of divine favor has been a sign of its condemnation. Circumcision was not meant as a sign of divine election but to mark “the Jews” for punishment (e.g. to bar them from the entry to Jerusalem), food-laws have been given to make “the Jews” remember God at any time and the Mosaic Law was given not by recognition but to control sinfulness and the Jew’s “hardness of heart”³⁸². Their lack of faith is also the reason for the miserable contemporary situation of “the Jews” which is nothing but a punishment of God (see Tyson 2005: 206).

To Justin, the advent of Christ is the realization of divine prophecy, which, he struggles to prove throughout the *Dialogue*, has been foretold in the Jewish scriptures. To prove this, he employs a strategy of reading the scriptures metaphorically (e.g. Just. Dial. 40-42; 90f.) and appropriating biblical characters living before Moses (such as Jacob or Abraham) as Christian (see e.g. ibid. 119; 123; cf. Remus 1986: 66). This interpretative

³⁸¹ This relative laxity on ritual practice is mirrored further in the way Justin portrays Trypho (see Lieu 1996: 111f.). This illustrates once more that an unbroken tradition of Catholic dogma does not exist. While Christians like Paul or Justin allowed for ritual observance among Christian Jews, proto-Catholic writers slowly started to adopt a stricter position on the matter (see chapter 6.2.3).

³⁸² see ibid. 16; 18-23; 27; 44; 47; 53; 68; 95; 114; 123; 137; 173. Lieu notes that the term “hardness of the heart” appears little in Christian literature before Justin (see Lieu 1996: 146. fn- 132). With Justin it “becomes the most comprehensive term for the Jews” (see ibid.: 146).

strategy is contrasted by Justin's denigration of a "Jewish" way to read their scriptures "carnally" leading them to miss the true, i.e. "allegorical" meaning of divine prophecy (see Just. Dial. 14³⁸³). This Jewish inability to see the truth is also the reason why the Jewish scriptures are now in possession of Christianity: "your Scriptures, or rather not yours, but ours. For we believe them; but you, though you read them, do not catch the spirit that is in them" (ibid. 29; cf. 123f.; cf. Schreckenberg 1999: 192). The same is true, Justin maintains, for the Jewish prophecy (see Just. Dial. 82.1).

Justin therefore sees Judaism superseded in every regard (see Richardson 1969: 10; Lieu 1996: 113-140 for the following). Christian sacrifices are superior (see Just. Dial. 117) as Christians are the new race of high priests (see ibid. 116) and the new holy people (see ibid. 110; 119). Former sacrifices in the temple have been substituted by bread and wine in the Eucharist (see ibid. 41), the spiritual circumcision of faith in Christ has substituted physical circumcision (see ibid.), the seventh day of the week has been superseded by the eighth (see ibid.) and the twelve bells traditionally attached to the priest's robe have become the Twelve Apostles (see ibid. 42). All of this culminates in the conclusion that the community of the Christ-believers now assumes the position of the true Israel:

"For the true spiritual Israel, and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (who in uncircumcision was approved of and blessed by God on account of his faith, and called the father of many nations), are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ" (ibid. 11).

The section on the proto-Catholic reaction to Marcion has demonstrated how an appropriation of the Jewish prophecy and an intensified reliance on its authority is influenced by a shift in argumentative strategy vis-à-vis the Marcionite threat. This process of re-interpreting Jewish scriptures as a proof for Jesus' messianic status from a position external to Judaism leads Justin to develop the claim to the true Israel (see Richardson 1969: 31; Schreckenberg 1999: 188-192). Arguing that there are "two seeds of Judah, and two races, as there are two houses of Jacob: the one begotten by blood and flesh, the other by faith and the Spirit" (Just Dial. 135) Justin underlines that Christ and the community of his followers have been foretold in the Jewish scriptures. Thus, Christianity is the fulfillment of the true meaning of prophecy:

³⁸³ Justin also uses the notion of a supposed blindness to illustrate this point, see Just. Dial. 12; 27; 97; 123; 134. Schreckenberg comments on his exegetical strategy: "Hier sind dauerhafte Maßstäbe gesetzt für die Art und Weise, in der die Kirchenväterzeit innerbiblische Scheltreden aus ihrem Zusammenhang löst und anachronistisch gegen die Juden der eigenen, sehr viel späteren Zeit wenden" (Schreckenberg 1999: 186). This aspect is discussed in the following chapter on John Chrysostom.

“As therefore from the one man Jacob, who was surnamed Israel, all your nation has been called Jacob and Israel; so we from Christ, who begat us unto God, like Jacob, and Israel, and Judah, and Joseph, and David, are called and are the true sons of God, and keep the commandments of Christ” (ibid. 123).

To maintain his claim, Justin introduces the notion of the spiritual and the physical Israel. This group of the redeemed is to be made up of Jews and Gentiles alike as there is no path to redemption except through faith in Jesus (see ibid. 47; 64). For Justin, Remus concludes, “there is no continuing theological validity, no continuing theological space, for Jewish communities alongside Christianity” (Remus 1986: 77).

The claim to supersession sustains the denigration of “the Jews”. Throughout the *Dialogue*, Justin thus juxtaposes the faithful community of Christ-believers to a faithless Judaism (see e.g. Just. Dial. 46; 110; 116; 119; 122; 130; see Lieu 1996: 136f.). This Judaism is illustrated in bleak colors. To Justin, “the Jews” have always persecuted their prophets just as they are responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus (see Just. Dial. 16; 26; 93; 95; 133). However, “the Jews” are not only the enemies of Jesus but also want to torture his followers though they are not able to do so now (see ibid. 16f.; 95; cf. Lieu 1996: 135³⁸⁴). Likewise, they curse Jesus and his believers in their synagogue (see Just. Dial. 16; 47; 93; 95f.; 108; 133³⁸⁵):

“for you have slain the Just One, and His prophets before Him; and now you reject those who hope in Him, and in Him who sent Him--God the Almighty and Maker of all things--cursing in your synagogues those that believe on Christ. For you have not the power to lay hands upon us, on account of those who now have the mastery. But as often as you could, you did so” (ibid. 16).

Justin describes “the Jews” as godless people (see Just. Dial. 92; 120), even “children of hell” (Just. Dial. 122) that stand in alliance with demons and devils (see Just. Dial. 131; cf. Lieu 1996: 147f.). The *Dialogue* detaches “the Jews” from their contemporary context

³⁸⁴ Setzer comments: “Hatred of Christians by Jews in Justin’s work always appears in tandem with Jewish mistreatment of Jesus. Justin may have been inventing charges so that his work echoes the Passion” (Setzer 2004: 143). A page later, she concludes: “Ironically, Justin provides evidence that Jews, at the time of his writing, were not personally killing or attacking Christians, however he might have attributed to them a desire to do so” (Setzer 2004: 144).

³⁸⁵ The line “You dishonour and curse...” (16.3) has been taken as evidence for the anti-Christian thrust of the Birkat Ha’Minim (see Horbury 1998: 67-110, see discussion of the Birkat Ha’Minim above). However, Lieu notes that “Justin’s language is too inexact to make a clear contribution to the disputed history of that prayer” (Lieu 1996: 134).

so that they become a theologically charged antagonistic principle of the world (see Schreckenberg 1999: 187). From this juxtaposition of “the Jews” to the believers in Christ one can draw two conclusion on the situation in which the *Dialogue* was composed. (1) the Jewish mission has failed as Justin is condemning “the Jews” instead of appeasing and attracting them; (2) Justin’s Christianity is in the process of moving out of the Jewish orbit.

6.2.2 Tertullian – Appropriating Scripture

“The versatility of the technique is exemplified, for instance, in the work of Tertullian, where we find evidence of the use of associative anti-Judaism from all possible angles. Tertullian feels free to associate his opponents with 'Judaism' both in his capacity as defender of orthodoxy, and again later as a proponent of heterodoxy. [...]. Because it was a source of tradition which belonged to the Christian movement as a whole, the anti-Judaic corpus could be used for purposes of illustration to prove a variety of arguments, even conflicting arguments” (Taylor 1995: 182)

Tertullian’s *Adversus Judaeos*³⁸⁶ is the first anti-Jewish treatise in Latin (see Opelt 1980: 28). An early of his works, it draws most of its inspiration from Justin’s *Dialogue* and Irenäus’ *Against Heresies* (see Dunn 2004: 66f.). The similarity between this treatise and parts of Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* has led scholars to doubt its authenticity (see Evans 1972a: xix). While traditional scholarship mostly rejected Tertullian’s authorship modern scholars have come to accept the treatise as an unfinished version preparing for the much larger *Adversus Marcionem* (see Dunn 2004: 63-65, discussed in chapter 5.2.2). One may then be led to wonder about this reappearance of anti-Jewish passages in Tertullian’s treatise against Marcion. There appears to be a kind of identification, one mirrored in similarities between Justin’s two *Apologies* and the anti-Jewish attacks in his *Dialogue*. Harnack comments:

“Es war die billigste Weise sich mit den Gnostikern selbst abzufinden, dass man sie einfach wie ‘Juden’ oder wie Griechen behandelte, und die Zusammenstellung von Marcioniten und Juden findet sich ja bekanntlich wirklich sehr häufig“ (Harnack 1883: 70).

Tertullian frames his treatise against the Jews as the record of a Dialogue between a

³⁸⁶ Introduction and translation of the text in Geoffrey D. Dunn 2004: 63-104. The following citations follow Dunn.

Christian and a Pagan convert to Judaism (see Tert. Adv. Jud. 1.1). Scholars assume its addressee to be either Christian (see Schreckenberg 1999: 218; Binder 2012: 196f.) or Christian and Jewish (see Dunn 2004: 67). Dunn comments that the dialogue “is one of the most scripturally based treatises he [Tertullian] wrote” (ibid.: 68). Indeed, questions of exegesis and possession of the Jewish scriptures form the central focus of Tertullian’s argument. Claiming that the Jewish scriptures constitute the prequel to the new faith, he concludes that “the Jews” should admit their own deception (see Tert. Adv. Jud. 11.11; 14.11) since they have already been punished by the destruction of their Temple (see ibid. 10.19; 13.28). As in other dialogues, treatises and pamphlets before and after it, *Adversus Iudaeos* is composed to prove the truth of Christianity vis-à-vis Judaism. Repeating many of the arguments known from previous writers such as Justin Martyr, it testifies to a continued preoccupation with Christian self-construction via Jewish scriptures.

To Tertullian, the notion of the “two people” is crucial (see ibid. 1.3ff.; cf. Schreckenberg 1999: 222³⁸⁷). This generates a framework in which the natural can be opposed to the Mosaic Law (see 2nd chapter). This notion also supplies the very framework for the reinterpretation of binary narrative structures in the Jewish scriptures. Thereby Tertullian divides the scriptural unity of judgment and promise. Venturing to claim all positive biblical references for the Church he designates all condemnation to “the Jews”. The notion of the “two people” thus goes along with the passing of election, already familiar from Justin:

“[A]ccording to the records of the divine Scriptures the Jewish people – that is the more ancient – were devoted to idols, as they had deserted God, and were addicted to images, as they had abandoned the divinity. [...] [O]ur people – that is, the later – having forsaken the idols to which previously we used to be devoted, were converted to the same God from whom Israel departed [...]. For thus the younger people [...] rose above the older people, while it was obtaining the grace of divine honour from which Israel has been divorced” (Tert. Adv. Jud. 1.6, cf. ibid. 12).

For Tertullian, just as for Justin Martyr, his theological conception rests on the assumption that the Mosaic Law meant a *temporary* albeit divine measure whose abrogation following Jesus has been justified by the Jewish scriptures itself (see ibid. 3.11; 4.1; 6.1-

³⁸⁷ “Needless to say, this exegesis calls for extraordinary distortion of the actual meaning of the biblical texts. There the Israel which is chastised and the Israel whose messianic fulfillment is predicted are the same. The messianic fulfillment of Israel includes the ingathering of believers from among the nations. In the Church’s reading of these texts, however, the messianic Israel is identified with the believing Gentiles, in antithetical relationship to the chastized Israel, the reprobate Jews” (Ruether 1997: 140f.).

4). The carnality of the Jewish rites is contrasted with the dimension of the spiritual and the eternal – the circumcision of the soul has substituted the circumcision of the flesh (see *ibid.* 3.7; 4.1-7; 6.1) just as an eternal Sabbath has substituted the celebration of the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week (see *ibid.* 4.1-7; 6.1) and the carnal sacrifices have been substituted by the spiritual sacrifice of praise (see *ibid.* 5.5-7; 6.1). This is expressed pointedly with the onset of the sixth chapter:

“Therefore, because of this, it follows that, in the preceding time, when all those commands of yours had been given carnally to the people of Israel, a time would come in which the commands of the ancient law and of the old ceremonies would cease, and the promise of a new law, the acceptance of spiritual sacrifices, and the offer of the new covenant would come” (*ibid.* 6.1).

Tertullian’s interpretation of the scriptures typically proceeds by identifying two poles such as Jacob and Esau, Sarah and Hagar, Rachel and Leah or Cain and Able. These two poles are then interpreted as an allegory affirming the Jewish/Christian division of the older serving the younger (Jacob and Esau), the slave-woman and the free woman (Hagar and Sara), the young and beautiful and the old and ugly (Leah and Rachel), the murderer and the righteous victim (Cain and Able). One can find a reference to the story of Jacob and Esau already in Paul’s Epistle to the Romans (9:6-13):

“And the LORD said unto her [Rebekah], Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger” (Gen. 25:23).

Just as Esau serves the younger, Jacob, who inherits God’s favor it is foretold that the synagogue is going to serve the church (see e.g. Tert. Adv. Jud. 1.4; 3.8; Tert. Adv. Marc. 3.24). Tertullian also points to the story of Cain and Abel to prove this hierarchy. Not only is the older brother (Cain/Judaism) said to serve the younger (Able/Christianity) but the form of sacrifice (fruit of the earth vs. fruit of the flock) is also supposedly foretold (see Tert. Adv. Jud. 5.1f.). Furthermore, the older brother (Cain/“the Jews”) slaying the younger (Able/Jesus) can be taken as a reference to the passion-narrative (see *ibid.* 5). Just as in the reference to Jacob and Esau, this reference to Able and Cain does not originate in Tertullian but Justin who had already compared the Jewish circumcision to the mark of Cain:

“For the circumcision according to the flesh, which is from Abraham, was given for a sign;

that you may be separated from other nations, and from us; and that you alone may suffer that which you now justly suffer; and that your land may be desolate, and your cities burned with fire; and that strangers may eat your fruit in your presence, and not one of you may go up to Jerusalem” (Just. Dial. 16; cf. Tert. Adv. Jud. 3.3-6³⁸⁸).

Like the story of Sarah and Hagar, Patristic writers frequently turn to the story of Rachel and Leah for a passage proving the shift of divine election. Rachel, the beautiful and young Church, is contrasted to Leah, the weak-eyed and old *synagoga* prominent in medieval Christian art. Consider the following passage in Justin’s *Dialogue*:

“The marriages of Jacob were types of that which Christ was about to accomplish. For it was not lawful for Jacob to marry two sisters at once. And he serves Laban for [one of] the daughters; and being deceived in [the obtaining of] the younger, he again served seven years. Now Leah is your people and synagogue; but Rachel is our Church. [...] Leah was weak-eyed; for the eyes of your souls are excessively weak” (Just. Dial. 134).

The topos of Jewish blindness has a long history in early Christianity (and probably originates in a sectarian Jewish argument about the correct interpretation!). For Patristic writers, it emerges as an explanation for the failure of the Jewish mission by pointing to an *intrinsic and eternal* incapability of “the Jews” to recognize Jesus and understand their own scriptures. Just as “the Jews” have always failed to recognize the truth, they also failed to recognize Jesus as Christ (see Ruether 1997: 161f.; Kampling 1990: 125). Ruether comments that “the Jews, in not receiving Christ, do not and never have received God’s word, and have never known God through their Scriptures, since these Scriptures are revealed through God’s Word” (Ruether 1997: 162). In a way, then, this amends the function of the topos of prophet-persecution identified above.

Kampling comments on the way this allegorical approach to the Jewish scriptures as a long and timeless prophecy for the coming, teaching and suffering of Jesus in turn influences a Christian interpretation. Caught within a classic version of the hermeneutic circle, the anti-Judaic conception of “Jewish blindness” dictates an interpretation in which any person with bad sight mentioned in the Jewish scriptures must be an expression of the Jewish antagonists in the Gospels. As Leah has bad eyes, she becomes the symbol for the *synagoga* (see Kampling 1990: 131). This is crucial for the development of a proto-Catholic sense of itself through an epistemic antisemitism, because the framework of anti-

³⁸⁸ Ruether and Schreckenberg have noted that behind this idea of a divine condemnation to wander the earth lurks the medieval image of the Wandering Jew (see Ruether 1997: 147; Schreckenberg 1999: 223).

Jewish exegesis starts to perpetuate itself, producing ever more examples from this generative principle.

Accordingly, Tertullian's exegesis proceeds throughout the Jewish scriptures by isolating images and reading them as a prophetic metaphor for Christianity. Isaac, the younger son and Ismail, the older, are an allegory for Judaism (born from the slave Hagar) serving the younger Christianity (born from the freewoman Sarah; see Tert. Adv. Marc. 5.4³⁸⁹). The Binding of Issac indicates the "the death of the Christ" (Tertullian, Adv. Jud. 10.6) willed by his father. The Biblical Joseph, harassed and sold by his brothers prefigures Jesus' suffering (see *ibid.*). The lamb killed for Passover is a metaphor for Jesus and the wood Moses uses in the desert to purify water becomes a metaphor for the cross and baptism (see Tertullian, Adv. Jud. 13.12; cf. Schreckenberg 1999: 219).

The introduction of a conception of the "two people" and of "Jewish blindness" supports two central aspects identified above as characteristic for proto-Catholic Christology during the second century: (1) the appropriation of the exegesis of Jewish scriptures and (2) justification of the Gentile community as fulfillment of Jewish prophecy. In this process, the Pauline conception is appropriated to fit the later scheme. Originating with Justin Martyr, the relationship between the Church and Judaism is reassessed as one of supersession, in which the "unbelieving Jews are cast off, and the believing gentile people take their place" (Ruether 1997: 137). The divine election of the Gentile Church is thus foretold in the Jewish scriptures. To the Patristic writers, "there is one covenant, *promised* to Abraham, *foretold* by the prophets, and *fulfilled* in the Gentile Church, who accepted the Messiah promised to Israel" (Ruether 1997: 137).

As pointed out before, this perspective had the advantage to refute both Jewish (and Christian) ritual practice and the Marcionite rejection of the Jewish prophecy. The Gentile Church of Justin, Tertullian and Chrysostom is the "true Israel" (see cf. Tert. Adv. Jud. 3.13). Tertullian's exegesis perpetuates this perspective. "The Jews" have always persecuted their prophets just as they persecuted Jesus (see Tert. Adv. Jud. 9.2; 10.9; 13.20; Adv. Marc. 3.18, 23; 4:15; 5:15). Responsibility for the death of Jesus rests solely on the

³⁸⁹ This echoes a passage in the Epistle to the Galatians: "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all" (Gal. 4:21-26).

shoulders of “the Jews” (see Tert. Adv. Jud. 8.18) though Tertullian does not yet elaborate on the idea of deicide, i.e. the murder of God. This is reserved to the third Patristic author, John Chrysostom, bishop of Antioch, analyzed below.

Before turning to Chrysostom, another word on the question if “the Jews” Tertullian refers to are real or not. As already pointed out, there are two positions in scholarship. One side represented by Adolf von Harnack argues that “the Jews” are the “straw men” of the Christian writers striving to prove their theological position (Harnack 1883: 63; cf. Lieu 1996: 265; Schreckenberg 1999: 220). With reference to Tertullian, Hermann Tränkle comments that “the Jews” in his writings point to a topological tradition: “Es kann kein Zweifel darüber bestehen: Tertullians Polemik ist eine Scheinpolemik, sein Gegner ein gedachter” (Tränkle 1964: lxxiv). Parkes comments:

“There is no other adequate foundation than the theological conceptions built up in the first three centuries. [...] [T]he main responsibility must rest upon the theological picture created in patristic literature of the Jew as a being perpetually betraying God and ultimately abandoned by it” (Parkes 1934: 375).

On the other hand, scholarship since Simon insists that an interaction between Judaism and Christianity did take place and that this interaction influenced theology (Dunn 2004: 48, Binder 2012). This identification of the discursive “Jews” with the real Jews has been able to win a large number of scholars to take this encounter as causal for the shape “the Jews” take in Christian writings of this time. To those scholars, “the Jews” figure prominently in Christian writing *because* there was a Christian-Jewish encounter (see e.g. Simon 1986: 146; Dunn 2004: 67; Binder 2012: 203-207).

Against this, the present study maintains that the mere fact of a Judaeo-Christian interaction is not sufficient to conclude on its *causal relevance* for the development of an episteme of antisemitism in early Christian theology. The previous section on Marcion has pointed to inner-Christian struggles as an alternative explanation for the development of “the Jews”. To be sure, “the Jews” are a concern for Marcion and his critiques alike because both refer to Jewish writings. However, this genealogical reference should not serve as a distraction from the contemporary framework that triggered the specific employment and shape of “the Jews”. This corresponds with Judith Lieu’s comment that Tertullian did not complete the *Adversus Iudaeos* because “it was only a ‘shadow polemic’ and lacked the urgency of a living conflict, that is, until it could be recycled against Marcion” (Lieu 1996: 265; referring to Tränkle 1964: lxx-lxxiv).

In the chapter on the proto-Catholic reaction to Marcion it has been noted that the anti-Jewish polemic was far less central to Tertullian's (and Justin Martyr's) corpus than the refutation of "heretics" and Pagans (see Opelt 1980: 28; cf. Tränkle 1964: lxxiif.). This secondary function is mirrored further in the adoption of motives from Tertullian's anti-Pagan polemics in his anti-Jewish writings (see Opelt 1980: 210; cf. Parkes 1934: 110-112). A desire to refute Marcion led Tertullian to alter the traditional anti-Judaic themes and update their discursive position. The general focus of this update was not so much on "the Jews" themselves than on proving the continuity of the Jewish prophecy with Jesus against Marcion (see Schreckenberg 1999: 216). This leads Efroymson to the conclusion that it was not the negative image of "the Jews" as such, but their extended function that marks the importance of Tertullian for a development of early Christian antisemitism (see Efroymson 1979: 103f.).

6.2.3 John Chrysostom – A Bid for Internal Stratification

"The Jew as he is encountered in the pages of fourth-century writers is not a human being at all. He is a 'monster', a theological abstraction, of superhuman cunning and malice, and more than superhuman blindness. He is rarely charged with human crime, and little evidence against him is drawn from contemporary behavior, or his action in contemporary events" (Parkes 1934: 158)

John Chrysostom (347-407 C.E.) was born in Antioch to a high-ranking civil servant (see Chadwick 2001: 480; Campenhausen 1993: 138-152 for the following). The city of Antioch had not only been the first place where Jesus-followers had been called "Christians" (see Acts 11:26); it also prided itself on its famous school for Bible studies and an active group of monks and famous theologians. Three years of studies in general rhetoric laid the foundation for Chrysostom's later career as a preacher earning him the honorary title "The Golden tongued" by the sixth century (see Campenhausen 1993: 141). When he was appointed a lecturer at the end of his studies, he refused to accept the vocation and adopted the ascetic lifestyle of a monk instead. In the winter of 380/381 C.E., Chrysostom was called back into the city by bishop Meletios, who consecrated him as deacon of his main Church soon after. Being also an elected presbyter, Chrysostom now concerned himself with communal work while struggling to continue his literary activity.

During the time of his work as a presbyter, Chrysostom started to make a name for himself

as a preacher. His high reputation led to a nomination as bishop of Constantinople in 397 C.E., the highest religious office within the Church of the Eastern Empire. The new job, however, did not fit his talents. Chrysostom therefore remains to be remembered as one of the most prominent bishops of the fourth century for his sermons, among them six sermons against the Jews. Some scholars have counted those “Discourses against Judaizing Christians”³⁹⁰ among “the most violent and tasteless of the anti-Judaic literature” (see Ruether 1997: 173) calling Chrysostom “the master of anti-Jewish invective” (Simon 1986: 217³⁹¹) and “one of the most virulent antisemites of the church” (Kimelman 1981: 240³⁹²).

The eight homilies *Contra Iudaeos* interrupt a series of sermons against the Arians³⁹³ (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 1.1.1). They were delivered during the time of Jewish celebrations. Two sermons before New Years (*Rosh Ha'Shanah*), Yom Kippur and the Feast of Tabernacles (I and II) in 386 C.E. Another sermon before Passover (III), three again before and after New Years, Yom Kippur and the Fest of Tabernacles in 387 C.E. (IV-VIII)³⁹⁴. In these sermons, Chrysostom turns against Christians attending Jewish service (see e.g. Chrysostom, c. Jud. 1.1.4f.), polemicizes against Jewish ritual practices and the synagogue, and provides a set of arguments for those Christians wanting to confront fellow “Judaizers” (see e.g. *ibid.* 1.4.3ff.). In the first sermon, he addresses those Christian “Judaizers” directly:

“Do you not shudder to come into the same place with men possessed, who have so many unclean spirits who have been reared amid slaughter and bloodshed? Must you share a greeting with them and exchange a bare word? Must you not turn away from them since they are the common disgrace and infection of the whole world?” (*ibid.* 1.6.7).

Considering the setting and addressee of the sermons scholars conclude that

³⁹⁰ Paul W. Harkins translates the title as *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*, a term pointing to Chrysostom’s addressee. His translation is used in the following (see Harkins 1999).

³⁹¹ “[T]he master of anti-Jewish invective is without question St. John Chrysostom. In him all the complaints and all the insults are gathered together. It is here that we see most plainly the fusion of the several elements that went to make up the Christian polemic; the themes of popular anti-Semitism, the specifically theological grievances, the use of biblical texts. And all these are presented with such violence and at times such a coarseness of language as to be without parallel” (Simon 1986: 217).

³⁹² Campenhausen fails to mention those sermons or the anti-Jewish dimension of Chrysostom in his famed introduction (see Campenhausen 1993). His characterization of the bishop is one of almost unmitigated praise, describing him more than once as “der unermüdliche Prediger und Exeget des Gottesworts, der Erzieher und treue Mahner seiner Gemeinde, der Freund und Fürsorger aller Armen, Bedrängten und Hilfsbedürftigen” (*ibid.*: 137).

³⁹³ Aetius, founder of the neo-Arian party, was born and ordained in Antioch (see Wilken 1983: 10f.).

³⁹⁴ For an assessment of the sermons regarding their difference in anti-Jewish thrust, see Harkins 1999: xlviii; for a discussion of the dating of the sermons, see *ibid.*: l-lxii; for an account of the editing history, consult Meeks/Wilken 1978: 83f.

Chrysostom's main thrust is towards Christians following Jewish rituals³⁹⁵. Since Chrysostom's main objective is to urge his dogmatic perspective onto his listeners, the sermons against the Jews are not "primarily, or in most cases at all, interested in the doing of contemporary Jews" (Parkes 1934: 72). Rather, the image of "the Jews" produced in the sermons points to a proto-Catholic Christian tradition of portraying "the Jews" as adversaries to the faith, murderers of the prophet and persecutors of the faithful with whom there should be no interaction whatsoever.

At the same time, one can see a further development of the image of "the Jews" in Chrysostom's polemics. Continuing and extending the works of previous Patristic writers, the preacher portrays them as a threat to Christianity far more central than "heretic" voices (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 1.6.4; cf. Laird 2013: 133f.). The relationship is thus inverted; while Tertullian uses anti-Pagan charges against "the Jews" (e.g. the charge of persecution), Chrysostom puts "the Jews" in the position of arch-heretics whose practice is mirrored in diverging interpretations of Christianity, e.g. the Anomoeans (see Laird 2013: 135). This inversion may be one reason that intensity of Chrysostom's polemics against "the Jews" increases, even though he delivers them at a time when Christianity was no longer in any political or religious danger and competition between Judaism and Christianity had been all but decided (see Parkes 1934: 163).

The closeness of Chrysostom's depiction of "the Jews" to earlier interpreters permeates all the sermons. As Tertullian and Justin Martyr before him, Chrysostom argues that the destruction of the Temple has rendered the Mosaic Law invalid (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 3.3.6f.). While "the Jews" of old broke every law possible, their observance after Jesus' coming is even more perverse, since with Jesus all Law has been abrogated. Their observance of the Mosaic Law is nothing more but a refusal to accept Jesus as the Messiah and thus, divine will:

"When there was need to observe the Law, they trampled it under foot. Now that the Law has ceased to bind, they obstinately strive to observe it. What could be more pitiful than people who provoke God not only by transgressing the Law but also by keeping it" (see *ibid.* 1.2.3; cf. 4.4.2f.; 7.1.3).

Chrysostom tells the story of "the Jew's" as a story of "those people who never failed to attack their own salvation" (*ibid.* 1.2.3). All the while God had remained true to his people

³⁹⁵ see e.g. Parkes 1934: 72; Williams 1935: 133; Meeks/Wilken 1978: 32f.; Wilken 1983: 67; Harkins 1999: xlix.

(“the Jews”) they had continued to reject his demands, sinned against his law and engaged with demons (cf. *ibid.* 1.6.6f.). The crucifixion of Jesus by the hand of “the Jews” moved them beyond the scope of divine patience and forgiveness (see *ibid.* 1.2.1-1.2.4; 6.2.8-6.2.10). Chrysostom stresses that this fall from divine protection is most apparent in the destruction of the Temple already foretold by the words of the prophets in the Jewish scriptures (see *ibid.* 4.6.1-4.6.3).

However, Chrysostom does not stop here. The fourth sermon takes the Mosaic Law as evidence for the malicious practice of “the Jews”. Employing an argument already familiar from previous authors, Chrysostom points out that the Mosaic Law was given to “the Jews”, not as a redemptive but a punitive measure to “restore them to that level of minimal humanity from the bestiality into which they had fallen in Egypt” (Ruether 1997: 152). The image emerging from this depiction is that of an apostate people, punished by God and disowned of its prophecy. Chrysostom preaches:

“And this is what God did. He saw the Jews choking with their mad yearning for sacrifices. He saw that they were ready to go over to idols if they were deprived of sacrifices. I should say, he saw that they were not only ready to go over but that they had already done so. So he let them have their sacrifices” (Chrysostom, c. *Jud.* 4.6.5).

As in Tertullian, Justin Martyr or Luke, Chrysostom’s sermons treat the empirical reality as secondary to the spiritual insight (faith) that is of unquestionable validity. Proto-Catholic antisemitism preordains perception. Since “the Jews” have killed Jesus, they *must* be guilty of an eternal sinfulness. In his sixth sermon, Chrysostom notes pointedly:

“You did slay Christ, you did lift violent hands against the Master, you did spill his precious blood. This is why you have no chance for atonement, excuse, or defense. In the old days your reckless deeds were aimed against his servants, against Moses, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. Even if there was ungodliness in your acts then, your boldness had not yet dared the crowning crime. But now you have put all the sins of your fathers into the shade. Your mad rage against Christ, the Anointed One, left no way for anyone to surpass your sin. This is why the penalty you now pay is greater than that paid by your fathers.” (*ibid.* 6.2.10).

The interpretation of Christianity as fulfillment of Jewish prophecy is the only acceptable truth. This truth is merely illustrated by contemporary events. This also implies that since the murder of Jesus was an expression of “the Jews” eternal evil character their contemporaries must also be evil. Underlining this nature and behavior, Chrysostom

makes it very clear that his “Jews” refer not the empirical behavior of an Antiochian Jewish community but from a Christian tradition. James Parkes concludes:

“It is evident that Chrysostom's Jew was a theological necessity rather than a living person. If he looked different from the actual Jews living in Antioch it was part of the malice of the Jew, one of the snares of the devil, set to catch the unwary Christian” (Parkes 1934: 166).

However, the misinterpretation of the scriptures by the Jews must also be mirrored in their lifestyle³⁹⁶. Therefore, “the Jews” have fallen to “gluttony and drunkenness” (Chrysostom, c. Jud., 1.2.5). When they are supposed to repent they really are “having a drunken party” (ibid.). With the onset of the eighth sermon, the preacher outlines his conception of “drunkenness without wine” (ibid. 8.1.1) signifying the “undisciplined passion” (ibid. 8.1.2), the “grip of anger” (ibid. 8.1.3) and “impious man who blasphemes God, who goes against his laws and never is willing to renounce his untimely obstinacy” (see ibid. 8.1.4). All those characteristics are – of course – embodied in “the Jews”. Consider further the following passage from the first sermon:

“But the Jews neither know nor dream of these things. They live for their bellies, they gape for the things of this world, their condition is no better than that of pigs or goats because of their wanton ways and excessive gluttony. They know but one thing: to fill their bellies and be drunk, to get all cut and bruised, to be hurt and wounded while fighting for their favourite charioteers” (ibid. 1.4.1).

The same is also true for the synagogue which is the object to some of Chrysostom’s most violent attacks. He describes it as a “theater” (ibid. 1.2.7), a “den of robbers” (ibid. 1.3.1), “a lodging for wild beasts” (ibid.) and a “brothel” (ibid.). He rages on calling the synagogue the “dwelling place of demons” (ibid. 1.3.3), a “place of idolatry” (ibid.) and a “shrine[...] of men who have been rejected, dishonored, and condemned” (ibid. 1.3.7).

For Chrysostom, the murder of Christ has reversed the eschatological order of the world. While the Gentiles have become “Children of God”, “the Jews” have sunken to a sub-human level. It is therefore no accident that Chrysostom uses the term “dogs” (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 1.2.1f.) to describe their status after Jesus’ death. The notion of animals accompanies the whole of Chrysostom’s sermons. Consider two following short

³⁹⁶ The method Chrysostom employs follows the scheme of “taking prophetic condemnations, isolating them completely from the context in which they are recorded and the circumstances in which they were uttered and from which they derive their meaning, and applying them to the present” (Simon 1986: 219).

passages from the first sermon:

“When brute animals feed from a full manger, they grow plump and become more obstinate and hard to hold in check; they endure neither the yoke, the reins, nor the hand of the charioteer. Just so the Jewish people were driven by their drunkenness and plumpness to the ultimate evil; they kicked about, they failed to accept the yoke of Christ, nor did they pull the plow of his teaching” (ibid. 1.2.5).

The bishop believes that the rejection of Jesus has moved “the Jews” to a lower level than the rest of (Gentile) humanity. They are even worse than wild animals:

“Wild beasts oftentimes lay down their lives and scorn their own safety to protect their young. No necessity forced the Jews when they slew their own children with their own hands to pay honor to the avenging demons” (ibid. 1.6.8).

Chrysostom leaves no doubt about the destiny of those animals:

“Although such beasts are unfit for work, they are fit for killing. And this is what happened to the Jews: while they were making themselves unfit for work, they grew fit for slaughter” (ibid. 1.2.6).

For Chrysostom, “the Jews” are no longer potential converts. They are the morally corrupted enemies of God. Their badness has made God turn away from them and inspired the passing of divine election to Christianity. They are not only the enemies of the physical body of Jesus but a threat to his symbolic body as well that is the contemporary community of believers (see ibid. 1.3.5-1.3.7; cf. Stacey 1998: 13³⁹⁷). Like animals unwilling to work, their rejection of Jesus has rendered them fit for slaughter.

With the murder of Jesus, “the Jews” have lost all divine favors and all means of communication with God (see ibid. 1.2f.; 3.3³⁹⁸). Instead, they have turned to the devil, an image Chrysostom emphasizes frequently throughout his sermons (see Schreckenberg

³⁹⁷ “The New Testament redactors had long ago appointed Jews to be the enemies of Christ's historical body, while St. John Chrysostom and many other Patristic authors had presented Jews (and the Judaizing Christians whom they inspired) as primary threats to the integrity and unity of the body of Christ which was the Church” (Stacey 1998: 13).

³⁹⁸ While the idea that “the Jews” are godless and without any connection to the divine is in apparent opposition to Paul's position (e.g. Rom. 9.4; 10.2), Chrysostom frequently quotes Paul to support his own position. From this, one can conclude that for Chrysostom, the proto-Catholic side had succeeded in domesticating Paul for their own theology. This process fits well with the historical development of the Catholic canon emerging by the end of the fourth/beginning of the fifth century.

1999: 326). This detachment from the divine is also the reason why the Christian community must be separated completely from the synagogue and its conduct. He begins this argument in the first sermon by introducing the separation of good scriptures and bad empirical Jews already familiar from earlier writers:

“Will any place where these books are be a holy place? By no means! This is the reasons above all others why I hate the synagogue and abhor it. They have the prophets but do not believe them; they read the sacred writings but reject their witness” (Chrysostom, c. Jud., 1.5.2).

Striving to provide reasons supporting his demand for a complete separation between “Judaism” and “Christianity”, Chrysostom adopts an argumentative structure familiar from (Christian) orthodoxy illustrated in the following passage:

“Finally, if the ceremonies of the Jews move you to admiration, what do you have in common with us? If the Jewish ceremonies are venerable and great, ours are lies. But of ours are true, as they *are* true, theirs are filled with deceit. I am not speaking of the Scriptures. Heaven forbid! It was the Scriptures which took me by the hand and led me to Christ. But I am talking about the ungodliness and present madness of the Jews” (ibid. 1.6.5).

One may detect an echo of the juxtaposition of the old Israel of the flesh (empirical Jews) and the Israel of the spirit that is the Church maintaining a positive connection to the Jewish prophecy. However, Chrysostom also introduces the charge of deicide thus dealing a last and final blow to any position maintaining positive relations with (empirical) Judaism:

“If a man were to have slain your son, would you endure to look upon him, or to accept his greeting? Would you not shun him as a wicked demon, as the devil himself? They slew the Son of your Lord; do you have the boldness to enter with them under the same roof?” (ibid. 1.7.5).

The accusation of Christ-murder (Christostonia) or Deicide had already accompanied the earliest accounts of the crucifixion of Jesus. Starting with Matthew, it reappears in Luke, John and Acts and was emphasized in some of the apocryphal gospels, Christian poetry (e.g. Melito of Sardis) and the writings of the Church Fathers (see Trachtenberg 1983: 20). However, the *explicit* accusation of deicide (Chrysostom calls it *theoktonian*) remained rare until the Nicaean Council in 325 C.E. As empirical Judaism certainly posed

no life threat to Christianity anymore, this intensification must also result from reasons other than an empirical Jewish threat.

*

As noted in chapter 6.1.3, the Nicaean Council marks a “coercive turn” (Mayer 2013: 13) in early Christianity. The emerging Christian-Roman elite was increasingly capable to force their orthodox interpretation of the faith onto the wider Christian world (for a hint of the complexity of this development, see Ayres 2004: 78ff.). This process of internal stratification meant that believers adhering to Jewish rituals suddenly found themselves to be “heretics”³⁹⁹. Chrysostom is very clear in his commitment to the council (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 3.3). Maintaining that “Christians cannot believe in Christ and also worship in synagogues and observe Judaic rites” (Neusner 1987: 61), Chrysostom’s polemics are an expression of this intolerant form of Christianity that had proclaimed a war on the heterodox conduct (see Ruether 1997: 171-173). From the onset, he says plainly, there are only two options – with the Jews or with the Christians:

“Do you fast with the Jews? Then take off your shoes with the Jews, and walk barefoot in the marketplace, and share with them in their indecency and laughter. [...] What excuse will you have, you who are only half a Christian? Believe me, I shall risk my life before I would neglect any one who is sick with this disease” (Chrysostom, c. Jud. 1.4.7).

A direct effect from this binary construction, one central concern of Chrysostom’s sermons is the “Judaizing disease” (ibid. 1.4.4), i.e. Christians participating in Jewish rites and following Jewish customs (see Ruether 1997: 170). Evaluating the meaning of this accusation one should recall that Jewish ritual observance was far from scandalous for earlier Patristic writers such as Paul or Justin Martyr. Also by Chrysostom’s polemics it appears that Christians were “frequenting the synagogues quite often” (Kimelman 1981: 239; cf. Kinzig 2002: 21) during his time. The preacher reveals this himself when lamenting the “perverse custom” (Chrysostom, c. Jud. 1.1.5) of Christians attending the festivities of the “pitiful and miserable Jews” (ibid.) and admits a few sections later that “many [...] respect the Jews and think their present way of life is a venerable one”

³⁹⁹ Against this, McDonald notes: “The church in the fourth century was open to new words from the Lord just as Christians in the first and second centuries were. Likewise, some Christians in the second century were just as opposed to some Christian writings as those in the fourth century were” (McDonald 2007: 321f.). McDonald is certainly right when pointing out that the rejection of internal diversity was already characteristic of a group of Christians during the second century. However, it is important to highlight that an increase of the coercive power of this group led to an intensified process of internal stratification, forcing one specific interpretation onto all other Christians.

(ibid. 1.3.1). He comments:

“There are many in our ranks who say they think as we do. Yet some of these are going to watch the festivals and others will join the Jews in keeping their feasts and observing their fasts” (ibid. 1.1.5).

Chrysostom even seems to admit that the “Judaizing” Christians and possibly even Chrysostom himself had been following Jewish rites such as celebrating Easter at the same date as Passover (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 3.3.1; 3.6.1). Apparently, then, even Chrysostom affirm the presence of a considerable number of Christ-believers in the Antiochian community who regarded Judaism as an important framework to their own faith. When Chrysostom demands the separation of all ties to Judaism he is thus *introducing a new conception* to an established religious heterodoxy.

Marcel Simon correctly assumes that the group of Christians Chrysostom calls “Judaizers” did not spontaneously decide to combine Christian faith with Jewish rituals (see Simon 1986: 145). Likewise, Meeks and Wilken are right to assess that the fact that Chrysostom calls some Christians “Judaizers” “does not prove that they saw themselves in that light” (Meeks/Wilken 1978: 34). Rather than the result of an active proselytizing from “Jews” (see Simon 1986: 145⁴⁰⁰) or Jewish Christians⁴⁰¹, Chrysostom’s sermons testify to an active promotion of the Nicaean decision. Instead of an active Jewish proselytization (see Simon 1986: 145;) or “the increasing strength of various Christian heresies” (Feldman 1993: 443⁴⁰²), Chrysostom’s violent rejection of established religious conduct drove a wedge into the Antiochian community. Meeks’ and Wilken’s are thus correctly assuming that it is “Chrysostom himself and other leaders of the church who are exceptional” (Meeks/Wilken 1978: 34). Consider further this passage in Rodney Stark’s *The Rise of Christianity*:

“I think we can safely accept Chrysostom’s claims about widespread Christian involvement in Jewish circles, since his audience would have known the true state of affairs. But rather than dismiss Chrysostom as merely a raving bigot or as an unscrupulous manipulator of Jewish scapegoats, why not see him as an early leader in the movement to

⁴⁰⁰ cf. Wilken 1967: 328; Harkins 1999: xliii.

⁴⁰¹ see Ladner 1971: 358; Neusner 1987: 62; Harkins 1999: xxxix.

⁴⁰² As noted above, the notion of “heresy” only emerges in the process of the establishment of proto-Catholic Orthodoxy. To speak of strength of heresies thus means to adopt an orthodox perspective for a time when it was only growing to dominance amidst a largely heterodox field of beliefs.

separate a church and synagogue that were still greatly intertwined?” (Stark 1996: 66).

Kimelman notes accordingly, “that it was the church leadership that strove to keep Christians away from the synagogue and not the Jews who were excluding them” (Kimelman 1981: 239; Meeks/Wilken 1978: 35). This re-framing of Chrysostom’s position that has a substantial effect on an understanding of the “Judaizing disease” (cf. Boyarin 1999: 12f.). Because If this inversion of the traditional interpretation of Chrysostom’s homilies *as a reaction* can claim validity, there is no more need to explain the presence of an active group of “Judaizers” in Chrysostom’s community. Instead of identifying or inventing a party of proselytizing Jews or heretic Christians, Chrysostom’s polemics now become the intervention into an established heterodoxy among Antiochian Christians⁴⁰³.

Opposing the idea that a Jewish threat lurks behind the charge of “Judaizing”, Kimelman points to the fact that even Chrysostom himself fails to produce evidence for his accusation that “the Jews” “laugh at you, scoff at you, jeer at you, dishonor you, and reproach you” (see Chrysostom, c. Jud. 8.8.9). It is as if he is conscious of this lack of evidence when conceding: “Even if they do not do it openly, do you not understand that they are doing this deep down in their hearts?” (ibid.). Kimelman concludes:

“If one of the most virulent antisemites of the church cannot produce evidence for official Jewish denigration of Christians, then its existence is seriously called into question” (Kimelman 1981: 240; cf. Parkes 1934: 164⁴⁰⁴).

It is not by accident that the rest of Chrysostom’s eighth sermon is dedicated to underlining the authority of the Nicaean Council against the authority of an established tradition. In a sense, even the Nicaean decision to change the date of Eastern testifies to the pervasiveness of Jewish ritual conduct among Christians (see Wilken 1983: 76f). From all the points raised above, one can draw the conclusion that it was Chrysostom (and not a group of “Judaizing” Christians or Jews!) who aimed to enforce orthodoxy in the religious life of the community in Antioch. He employs the term “Judaizing” as an

⁴⁰³ This goes well with the observation that interaction between Christians and Jews in Antioch had remained on good terms until the fourth century (see Meeks/Wilken 1978: 32f.). For a discussion of Christian-Jewish relations during the fourth century, see Stroumsa 2007.

⁴⁰⁴ Simon notes this lack of evidence himself when commenting that the Christian anti-Jewish writing “did not base its arguments on ascertainable facts, not even, for that matter, on the hearsay evidence of popular gossip, but on a particular kind of exegesis of the biblical writings, an exegesis that interpreted them in the light of the death of Christ as a long indictment of the chosen people” (Simon 1986: 223). However, this lack of evidence remains without consequences for his conflictual framework.

argumentative tool against an accepted and established Christian conduct. The sermons of Chrysostom therefore do not supply evidence to a Jewish-Christian confrontation or an active Jewish rivalry for converts but to the intensification of proto-Catholic intolerance. The radicalization of anti-Judaism in Chrysostom is but an expression of this push for internal stratification in fourth-century Christianity.

6.3. Conclusion – Proto-Catholicism & “the Jews”

“Though the patristic authors may not have envisioned, or intended, the translation of these falsifying images into sociological realities [...], they had sown the seeds, at least conceptually, *theo*-logically, that is, in the name of God, for massive, continuous evil.” (Katz 1991: 49)

Markus divides the development of the “Catholic Church” into two subsequent stages (see Markus 1980: 5⁴⁰⁵). During the first phase, proto-Catholic communities focused on the self-identification of the emerging Catholicism resting on a delineation from its competitors, not the identification of a true doctrine (see *ibid.*: 7). It was marked by the development of “yardsticks [...] whereby the claims of groups to be ‘churches’ could be tested: the apostolic tradition, the rule of faith, the New Testament canon” (*ibid.*: 5). During this first phase, the bishops⁴⁰⁶ established an institutional structure as “*Rechtskirche*”, i.e. its ability to excommunicate, its exclusivity and its representation through the episcopacy. These conditions developed over the second century (see Barnikol 1933, affirmed in Ehrman 2003: 141-143).

However, this first phase is not yet concerned with the doctrine of orthodoxy and the stratification of Christianity that accompanies it. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the fact that the early Patristic writers still allow for “a range of [theological] options within limits defined by a central, unifying core” (Markus 1980: 8). Only with the third century did proto-Catholicism start focusing on Catholic dogma (see *ibid.*: 10). As

⁴⁰⁵ for an overview on scientific discussions of the emergence of Catholic Christianity, see Dunn 1990: 341-344.

⁴⁰⁶ In *Constantine and the Bishops* (2000), H. A. Drake highlights the role of the bishops for the development of Christianity: “The bishop is the figure who gave the movement cohesion and stability. If one thing made Christianity a player, that one thing would be the capacity Christians showed for organizing and maintaining their membership, creating in the person of the bishop a leader who, by means of frequent communication and a habit of assembling with other bishops to deal with common needs and problems, eventually was capable for defining a common message, establishing criteria for identifying a canon of sacred texts, and coordinating their activities to a degree unprecedented for a nongovernmental body in the ancient world” (Drake 2000: 103).

demonstrated in this work, this development gains shape through internal and external conflicts. Accordingly, Drake notes that until well into the fourth century, Christianity “was still by later standards simply a loose assemblage of local congregations, held together by regular meetings of their bishops, but still differing significantly in character and even in fine points of belief” (Drake 2006: 112). There was no unity among the Christian communities of the first four centuries – however, a line of thought had started to develop that later culminated in the emergence of Nicaean Christianity.

Those proto-Catholic polemics against other theological positions (e.g. Marcion, Gnosticism, “Judaizers”) testify to a process of self-definition by demarcation – a process unfolding in a series of inner-Christian struggles. The writings of Justin Martyr and Tertullian are active in constructing this threshold. Only during the third century did proto-Catholicism start focusing on the development of dogma (see Markus 1980: 10). With the onset of this second phase came a policy aiming “for as complete an elimination of doctrinal and institutional diversity as possible” (ibid.: 13). The Nicaean Council marks this process of an increasingly active diversion from the Jewish framework. Together with the developing notion of Orthodoxy, “the Jews” now become a signifier for anything that does not conform to the proto-Catholic dogma.

Chrysostom’s position in relation to “the Jews” is consistent with this development in two ways – as evidence and as contribution. It is part of this development that Chrysostom’s polemics render the treatment of Tertullian and Justin Martyr comparably lenient. As in the case of those two earlier writers, the present study maintains that the changes of the position and meaning of “the Jews” are rooted not so much in a Jewish-Christian confrontation but in two other factors – an increasing pressure exerted on this conduct by the emerging proto-Catholic position and a “widespread Christian infatuation with Judaism” (Meeks/Wilken 1978: 31). As in the case of Tertullian and Justin, the bishop short-circuits the empirical reality by bringing his allegorical reading of the Scriptures to life, imposing “the Jews” in their historical nature onto the Antiochian situation⁴⁰⁷.

The previous two chapters traced the way “the Jews” change their discursive shape and

⁴⁰⁷ This primacy of eschatology may also provide a part of an explanation to why later accusations such as that of ritual murder, well poisoning or host desecration were so readily accepted by medieval Christian writers. Steven Katz comments: “After the combined hermeneutical assault of the New testament and the patristic writings, the Jew is never again to be ‘a man like other men.’ He has become a *mythic* creature. [...] The Jew, as Jesus, [...] becomes an enfleshment of cosmic powers. But whereas the latter is the embodiment of good, the overflowing symbol of bountiful grace, the former is the incarnation of evil, the symbol of passionate anti-godly defiance” (Katz 1991: 49).

position according to challenges the respective author encounters while slowly moving to the center of a proto-Catholic self-perception. This perception rested increasingly on the dual structure of appropriation of the Jewish scriptures, which soon became “a primary means of Christian self-definition” (Lieu 2006: 221) and a denigration of “the Jews” as the original carriers of divine provenance. As proto-Catholic Christianity was increasingly moving out of Judaism’s scope, the image of “the Jews” as an apostate people and Christ-murderers became a principle symbol of the fallenness of the world⁴⁰⁸. An accusation already identified in the Gospels and repeated throughout the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature was that “the Jews” were eternal prophet killers. John’s notion that “the Jews” had “never heard their prophets, always rejected the prophets, ever refused to repent at the prophets’ call, and, finally, regularly killed the prophets” (Ruether 1997: 124).

Proto-Catholic theology thus increasingly developed in juxtaposition to “the Jews”. The sermons of Chrysostom mark just a point of culmination of this tendency that stands in close connection to the spectacular rise of Christianity to state religion. Considering the obstinacy of the Christians Chrysostom addresses, it appears as if proto-Catholicism developed ahead of their own communities and their idea of the Christian religion and religious tolerance. Considering this, one should add a third stage to the development of a proto-Catholic formation of antisemitism: the rise of a certain branch of early Christianity to Roman state religion. Only by this alliance between Constantine and proto-Catholic Orthodoxy did it become the dominant force in Christianity and, by the end of the fourth century, part of the normative, religious and political establishment of the Roman Empire (cf. Drake 2000). Fredriksen comments:

“What changed with Constantine [...] was the nature, and thus the consequences, of the argument. Earlier, the intra-Christian polemic between different groups had fundamentally been name calling; now, the invective of one side could inform government policy. [...] What primarily distinguished the orthodox from their rivals [...] was power” (Fredriksen 2006: 588).

⁴⁰⁸ On a side note, Ruether comments that this method also “turns the Jewish Scriptures, which actually contain the record of Jewish self-criticism, into a remorseless denunciation of the Jews, while the Church, in turn, is presented as totally perfect and loses the prophetic tradition of self-criticism” (Ruether 1997: 131; elaborated on p. 160, 164f.). After the eschatological phase had itself become historical as Christian era the Church established itself as just another set of disciplinary and cultic practices. The separation of criticism and promise comprising the Jewish scriptures in Christian exegesis blocks further reflection: “Christian spiritualization becomes false consciousness about its own reality, fantasizing its own perfection as unable to cope with its own hypocrisy” (Ruether 1997: 160).

As pointed out in the previous chapter, Nicaea signifies an expansion of the surfaces of application for the theological image of “the Jews” to other areas of society such as Roman law or civil conduct. This marks a watershed for the way empirical Jews were affected by proto-Catholicism as an epistemic image of “the Jews” now moved to the center of the Roman Empire making them a central element in the self-perception of the emerging Christian Europe (cf. Ruether 1997: 122f.). By tying “the Jews” increasingly closer to the question of identity and time – Jews as *past* Christ-murderers; Jews as *present* ritual murderers and persecutors; Jews as *future* witnesses of Christ's resurrection – the Patristic writers moved “the Jews” to the center of a Christian sense of time and history. When the proto-Catholicism rose to dominance in the late 4th century, the former Roman power shifted slowly to incorporate the Christian theological frame (and vice versa as shown below). This affected all levels of society; its structures, its legislation and the way people perceived themselves and their surroundings. The change from the Pagan and polytheistic frame to Christian monotheistic theology inspired a thorough epistemic rupture at whose end an episteme of antisemitism emerged.

This effort for a proto-Catholic self-definition against an image of “the Jews” took on a more political tone once the Church rose to the position of state religion of the Roman Empire by 380 C.E. The messianic gathering of all the nations now became identified with the *Pax Romana*. The older separation between the Messianic age foretold in the second coming and the present time disappear in the writings of the post-Nicaean Chrysostom (see Ruether 1997: 143). Writing about a century and a half after Tertullian, the “Golden Tongued” Chrysostom was at the forefront of interpreting the political developments as evidence that the Messianic age had arrived: idolatry was crushed, demons routed and the true faith needed to be installed if brotherhood and peace had to reign universally. In this adoption of the universalistic idea of the Roman Empire, only “the Jews” remain excluded as the other side to the Messianic fulfillment realized by the Christian Church (see *ibid.*: 144).

7. Changing the Frame – From Judaism to Paganism

7.1 Transmission & Dissemination – Gentile Attitudes towards Judaism

The previous chapters were concerned with tracing the movements of “the Jews” in proto-Catholic theological writing. The following chapter takes the double-function as test-case and – potentially – additional argument for the focus this work proposes. Exploring the attitudes of Pagan writers towards “the Jews”, the first section explores the way a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism marks a continuation, shift or rupture with antiquity. It is concluded that Christian writers indeed integrated Pagan anti-Jewish imagery while the very mode of this integration sets Christian discourses apart from Pagan polemics. In the process of making Christianity more adaptable to the world of late antiquity “the Jews” came to play a vital role in the development of an organizational structure of an ever-expanding Christianity. The second part of the following chapter investigates the extent to which the adoption and transformation of some of the Pagan anti-Jewish imagery satisfied the needs of the respective Christian communities. The chapter concludes that a construction vis-à-vis “the Jews” helped to attract new converts and that a proto-Catholic antisemitism provided the social cohesion of an ever-diversifying Christianity.

7.1.1 Pagan Attitudes towards Judaism in Antiquity

“By comparison with the cognitive spaces that anti-Judaism would later colonize, those that it occupied in pre-Christian antiquity were tiny islands. It is only thanks to the effects of historical projection that they loom so large” (Nirenberg 2013: 15)

While the previous work has been concerned with the slow movement of “the Jews” to the center of a proto-Catholic theology, analysis now turns to Pagan traditions of anti-Judaism. The Jewish scriptures inform the reader that threats against the Jewish people were constant and dire – e.g. the Exodus from Egypt, the destruction of the first Temple and their attempted annihilation by the Persian Haman, recorded in the book of Esther⁴⁰⁹. While the historicity of those accounts remains disputed among scholars (see e.g.

⁴⁰⁹ For more evidence of Pagan attitudes towards Jews, see Yavetz 1997; Schäfer 1998.

Sevenster 1975: 181f.), debate also focuses on the question whether the term “antisemitism” properly grasps the motivation behind those events. Unsurprisingly, the answer scholars tend to give depends on the definition they employ. Following the definition used in this work, the term “antisemitism” is reserved for a discursive formation designating an epistemic quality to “the Jews”. While Pagan discourses against “Jews” tend to qualify as xenophobia, possibly even a specific type of “Judeaophobia” (Schäfer 1998) the present study maintains that those discourses ultimately fail to pass the epistemic threshold. In antiquity, “the Jews” are only rarely employed to make sense of the world and self of the respective author. One should thus use the term anti-Judaism or anti-Judean polemic and reserve the term episteme of antisemitism for the Catholic formation and its precursors.

There is more debate still on the extent of this anti-Judaism. Some scholars assume negative attitudes towards Jews were “the norm” (Daniel 1979: 46) in antiquity, possibly especially “virulent among the cultivated classes” (Goldstein 1939: 346). Others reach the opposite conclusion that there “was no special discrimination against Judaism” (Sherwin-White 1967: 100; Isaac 1969: 95-99). Based on alternative definitions of “anti-Judaism” and its relation to other cases of hatred, contemporary scholars tend to assume the simultaneous presence of enmity and attraction⁴¹⁰. Those discussions are connected closely to the question of a Christian responsibility for (modern) antisemitism. Granting a larger degree of hatred to Paganism can serve an apologetic function for Christianity (see Davies 1969: 62-65). Downplaying those Pagan attitudes tends to increase the Christian responsibility for its enmity against Judaism (see Ruether 1997: 28⁴¹¹).

Jews had settled and prospered in Greek and (later) Roman cities since the times of Alexander the Great. They adopted Greek as their every-day language marked by the publication of their sacred texts, the *Septuaginta*, in Greek by 200 B.C.E.⁴¹² While the

⁴¹⁰ see Sevenster 1975: 191, 218; Feldman 1993: 123-125; Fredriksen 2003: 45. Such a mixture of attraction and enmity seems most likely to have been the case. In much the same way, many Christians maintained good relationships with Jews. To be sure, antisemitism as it is defined in this work does not necessitate bad relations on the individual level but describes *a way of perceiving world and self through an image of “the jews”*.

⁴¹¹ For scholars highlighting Christian responsibility for antisemitism, see Sandmel 1978: 5; Ben-Chorin 1980: 212; critical Bauer 1963: 13; Thoma 1979: 19.

⁴¹² This adoption was a more or less voluntary reaction to the cultural hegemony of the Hellenistic culture, as Schürer notes apropos the time preceding the Maccabean revolts: “Encircled by these Hellenistic towns, little Judaea could naturally not escape the influence of Greek customs and ways. They began to encroach on it more and more. Even the needs of daily life made it necessary to acquire Greek, the universal language; otherwise intercourse and trade with foreign lands would have been impossible. With the language went also the habits, and indeed the entire culture of Greece. At the beginning of the second century B.C., the progress of Hellenism in Palestine must have already been considerable. For only thus is it possible to explain the fact that part of the nation, the aristocratic and educated classes in

encounter of Judaism and Hellenism may at times have been a process of “creative interpenetration of Jewish and Greek ideas” (Fredriksen 2010: 17; cf. Hengel 1969), the Maccabean revolts (c. 167-140 B.C.E.) were sparked by measures of compulsory Hellenization ordered by the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes⁴¹³. It was in the context of these revolts that Judea first moved into the Roman political orbit as Jewish leaders sought military support for their struggle against the Seleucid Empire⁴¹⁴. Ending 80 years of practical independence, the year 63 B.C.E. saw the partial incorporation of Judea as client kingdom into the Roman Empire (full annexation was not completed until 6 C.E., see Schäfer 2010: 126ff.). Thirty years after this incorporation, Rome annexed Egypt, ultimately bringing “all the Jews in the known world except the large and ancient settlements in Parthia [...] under Roman rule” (see Smallwood 1976: 2). The changing fate of the Jewish people is reflected in Roman attitudes towards the Jewish people. Gager distinguishes three channels for the development of those attitudes: (1) official policy, (2) the view of the Roman *literati* and (3) popular attitudes in Rome and the Roman Empire (see Gager 1983: 41⁴¹⁵).

Struggling to point to the causes for the development of negative attitudes, some scholars point to religious reasons (see e.g. Sevenster 1975: 89), others focus on socio-political aspects⁴¹⁶. Most scholars, however, stresses that real differences between Judaism and Paganism/Christianity lay behind the animosities⁴¹⁷. As the image of “the Jews” shifted

particular, willingly consented to the Hellenising programme of Antiochus Epiphanes, and indeed promoted it” (Schürer 2014: 145).

⁴¹³ see Smallwood 1976: 3; cf. Schäfer 2010: 42-76; Schürer 2014: 143ff. Relationship between Greek and Jewish inhabitants appears to have deteriorated at an early point in time. When it comes to the Roman Empire, Sherwin-White notes that animosity between the two groups had already solidified (see Sherwin-White 1967: 86f.). One of the most prominent outbursts of anti-Jewish actions during antiquity took place in the city of Alexandria by 38 C.E. and left thousands of Alexandria’s Jewish inhabitants dead (discussed in this section).

⁴¹⁴ This was documented in several treaties of allegiance, see Wilken 1967: 317; cf. Schäfer 2010: 63-66. Smallwood comments that Rome’s “support for the Jews was never more than moral and verbal. Rome did not raise a single military finger to save Judas, who was defeated and killed in battle almost immediately, but merely sent a letter to Demetrius I [the successor of Antiochus V] protesting at his oppression of the Jews and threatening to make war on him if he gave them any further grounds of complain. No practical support was in fact ever given to the Jews, and probably none was meant, as Rome had no intention of embroiling herself in a distant war unless her own interests were directly affected” (Smallwood 1976: 6). The series of renewed diplomatic treaties stalls by the turn of the century probably “because it was no longer of any practical value to either side” (ibid. 1976: 11).

⁴¹⁵ cf. Daniel 1979: 47 for a different classification.

⁴¹⁶ see e.g. Wilcken 1909: 786f.; Wilken 1967: 315f. Economical aspects seem to have played a minor role and find almost no mentioning in contemporary scholarship (see Parkes 1934: 372; Leipoldt 1950: 472f. for a discussion; exception in Feldman 1993: 107-113). Consider also Wilcken’s argument: “Auf politischem Gebiet ist die Antipathie dadurch gesteigert worden, daß die Juden immer sehr loyale Anhänger des jeweiligen Machthabers waren und sich dadurch nach und nach wichtige Privilegien zu sichern wußten“ (Wilcken 1909: 786). This passage makes the (antisemitic) claim that the Jews have always been cooperating with the respective powers to gain advantages.

⁴¹⁷ cf. Wilcken 1909: 785f.; Radin 1915: 209; Leipoldt 1933: 20f.; 1950: 470; Marcus 1946: 61f.; Maier 1963: 46; Sherwin-White 1967: 93; Sevenster 1975: 89; Sandmel 1978: 1; Daniel 1979: 58-60; Mayer 1991: 34; Wistrich 1991: xviii; Feldman 1993: 416-445; Wolfram Kinzig calls approaches highlighting

considerably over the centuries⁴¹⁸, cultural differences may be a necessary but in no way a sufficient condition for animosities. In demarcation from a correspondence theoretical assumption, therefore, a more recent position has turned to the dynamic processes *within* the Roman society for an explanation of the emergence and development of anti-Jewish imagery (see Nirenberg 2013: 37-44⁴¹⁹).

The Alexandrian anti-Jewish riots of 38 C.E. supply the *locus classicus* in scholarship on anti-Judaism/antisemitism in antiquity (see e.g. Bergmann/Hoffmann 1987, Schäfer 1998, Nirenberg 2013). There is no agreement among scholars on the reasons behind one of the worst anti-Jewish pogroms in antiquity. While Bergmann/Hoffmann provide a functionalistic explanation arguing that a real conflict of political interests was behind this outburst of antisemitic violence⁴²⁰, Feldman has highlighted the role of economic competition in the confrontation (see Feldman 1993: 113-117). Schäfer, on the other hand, fervently rejects functionalistic arguments pointing to “an ancient and deeply rooted hostility between Jews and Egyptians” (Schäfer 1998: 159) which in turn supported the Greek side in its political struggle (see *ibid.*: 159f.). Gager, Wilcken and, more recently, Nirenberg have developed a hypothesis of dislocated aggression (see below). Before considering these alternative explanations, a short account on the political situation in Alexandria in which the riots unfolded⁴²¹.

the differences between Jews and their surrounding cultured “functionalists” (see Kinzig 2002: 12). The usual course of the “functionalist” argument in Sevenster: “the most fundamental reason for pagan anti-Semitism almost always proves to lie in the strangeness of the Jews midst ancient society [...] their way of life and their customs, which always forced a certain degree of segregation upon them. The Jews were never quite like the others; they were always inclined to isolate themselves; they had no part in the morals and customs of the people about them, nor in that syncretism that was meant to be so tolerant. There was always something exceptional about the religion of the Jews, and this made them difficult in social intercourse, ill-adapted to the pattern of ancient society” (Sevenster 1975: 89). Analogous in Daniel: “Regardless of one's conclusions as to the ultimate fault, it is evident that Jewish exclusiveness became a major factor in the poor relations between the races” (Daniel 1979: 60). It is probably unfair to find in those statements an echo of Leipoldt's racist explanation for antisemitism (see Leipoldt 1933: 16ff.; esp. p. 31 “es fehlte dem Judentume an innerer Verbundenheit mit seinem Wirtsvolke”) but one should at least be sensible to the closeness of the argument. Peter Schäfer argues instead that the functionalist assumption inverts the actual relationship. To argue that Jewish particularity is “the *reason* for pagan anti-Semitism is to confuse cause with pretext, to hold the Jews themselves responsible for what others do to them” (Schäfer 1998: 209). “To what degree the Jews were separate is not important” (*ibid.*: 210), Schäfer continues, “[t]he only crucial question is what the Greco-Egyptian and Greek authors made out of it [...] it is [...] *their* attitude which determines anti-Semitism” (*ibid.*).

⁴¹⁸ see Sevenster 1975: 180ff.; Meagher 1979: 4ff.; Langmuir 1990b: 7.

⁴¹⁹ That this may be true for different kinds of discrimination does not weaken the argument but strengthen the general validity of the explaining variables it identifies as relevant – discrimination is enhanced not by the behavior of the denoted group but by the discriminating society.

⁴²⁰ see Braunert 1980: 47; Bergmann/Hoffmann 1987: 20; criticized in Schäfer 1998: 157-159.

⁴²¹ Bergmann/Hoffmann note that the sources allow us to reconstruct the complexity of the socio-political situation between Roman authorities, Jewish inhabitants and Greek nationalists in Alexandria fairly well. Among them, the Jewish sources (Josephus, Philon) remain the most extensive and valuable (see Bergmann/Hoffmann 1987: 15).

Roman legions had conquered Egypt in 30 B.C.E. and brought the economically crucial Greek colony Alexandria under its rule. The year of 24/23 B.C.E. saw the introduction of a poll-tax (“Laography”) for all non-Hellenistic inhabitants of the city including Jews. Since the Jewish inhabitants had previously enjoyed the same legal treatment as the Hellenic citizens, the tax signified a social declassification (see Braunert 1980: 45-47⁴²²). In 37 C.E., Caligula, sympathetic to the Alexandrian nationalists, became Caesar. This put Flaccus, the imperial legate of Alexandria and a critic of Caligula, into a precarious position, leading him to ask Alexandrian nationalists to influence Caligula in his favor. The balance in the power triangle thus tilted to the side of the Greek nationalists. When the Jewish king Agrippa, a close friend of Caligula, visited the city in 38 C.E., the Jewish side tried to gain some lost ground. Anti-Jewish riots broke out soon afterwards. Sparked on the question whether the legal status of Greek citizenship was to be granted to Jewish inhabitants of Alexandria or not, the outbreak of violence was a targeted and organized action (see Bergmann/Hoffmann 1987: 27-33).

A record of the events survives in Flavius Josephus' treatise *Against Apion* (see Josephus 2008), written some fifty years after the events occurred (see Goodman 1999⁴²³). Josephus composed *Against Apion* as a reply to an anti-Jewish treatise by Apion an incurred Alexandrian Greek national, popular writer and anti-Jewish publicist (see Stern 1976: 389f.). Since an original of Apion's treatise has not reached the present, scholars have turned to reconstruct its main line of argument from Josephus' text. On the aim of its attack, Mason underlines that Josephus accuses Apion of anti-*Judean* polemics (as opposed to anti-Jewish polemics), since the concept of religion had not yet been created (see Mason 2007: 492f.):

“Rather than suggesting that Apion has confused categories, that being a *Ioudaios* is actually a ‘religious’ matter or the like, he accepts the ethnic character of these labels but accuses Apion of not looking hard enough for parallel cases of ‘dual nationality’” (Mason 2007: 493).

Searching for arguments, Apion retold many accusations he had found in the writings of the Egyptian priest Manetho⁴²⁴. At the same time, there are also elements of Apion's own

⁴²² For a historical account of Jewish diaspora-communities in antiquity, consult *ibid.*: 31-39

⁴²³ For a reconstruction of the account, see Schäfer 1998: 136-156. Goodman comments: “I suggest that Josephus' reason for composing *Against Apion* was the need to counter the great weight of anti-Jewish propaganda produced by and for the Flavian dynasty after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem in 70 CE” (Goodman 1999: 55). Schäfer rings a critical note on the value of Josephus' book noting that it is “[t]he least reliable witness” (Schäfer 1998: 156).

⁴²⁴ see Ruether 1997: 24f.; Meagher 1979: 8-10, Gager 1983: 42f. For a discussion of earlier

ingenuity. For example, Apion argues that the Jewish Sabbath is derived from the Egyptian word for disease of the groin, which the Jews are said to have developed on their flight from Egypt underlining that the people that left Egypt in Exodus was comprised of lepers, the blind and the lame (see Stern 1976: 396). Furthermore, Apion claims that Jewish laws are unjust and their abstention from pork ridiculous. The same applies to rituals such as circumcision are. Apion repeats the story of Mnaseas (c. 200 B.C.E.) that “the Jews” worship the head of an ass in their temple. He adds a story about Antiochus Epiphanes, who, in entering the Temple in Jerusalem, discovered a Greek man kept prisoner for the annual sacrifice (see Josephus 2008: 2.9). This points to an alleged Jewish custom of kidnapping a (Greek) stranger, fattening him for a year, murdering him in a customary ritual, eating his flesh, swearing an oath of hostility against the Greek and then throwing his remains into a pit (see Stern 1976: 411f.). “The Jews” are also accused of disloyalty to the Roman state as they do not worship the same gods and do not erect statues to honour the emperor (see Josephus 2008: 2.6). Concerning the question of citizenship for Jews living in Alexandria, Apion seems to have argued that since they had come from Syria “the Jews” should be excluded from civic responsibilities and thus privileges (e.g. the grain dole) (see *ibid.* 2.4f.).

It is worth to note that Apion’s attacks on the Jewish history and religion are motivated by a contemporary political conflict. This points to the hypothesis of “dislocated aggression” that finds the roots of the conflict in a Greek desire for independence from Rome⁴²⁵. From this perspective, “the Jews” serve as substitutes for an attack on the Roman power. Evidence in support of this hypothesis has been found in accusations that the emperors “were friends of the Jews” (Gager 1983: 49), calling Caesar “the cast-off son of the Jewess Salome” (*ibid.*: 50) and describing the Roman Senate as filled with “impious Jews” (*ibid.* ⁴²⁶). At the same time, the Roman governor Flaccus seems to have cooperated with the pro-Alexandrian nationalists to gain their favor. This provides another reason to why their influence mounted during the time preceding the Alexandrian riots. Traces of this influence can be detected in political measures issued by Flaccus,

interpretations that do not find antisemitism in Manetho’s writing, consult Sevenster 1975: 184-188; Gabba 1989: 633. Braunert proposes that this connection to the Egyptian tradition of anti-Jewish polemic shows that an alliance had formed between the Hellenistic upper-class and the Egyptian lower stratum (see Braunert 1980: 42f.).

⁴²⁵ see Smallwood 1976: 233ff.; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 286; Nirenberg 2013: 37-40; cf. Bergmann/Hoffmann 1987: 20f. for a critique.

⁴²⁶ An earlier example of an anti-Judaic riot that had broken out in Elephantine (Upper Egypt) during the fifth century B.C.E., when “the Jews” had been attacked as “agents of a foreign hated power, Persia” (Marcus 1946: 62) accompanied by a “revival of Egyptian nationalist feeling at the end of the fifth century B.C.E.” (*ibid.*; cf. Schäfer 1998: 121-135). Marcus comments: “Here for the first time we have an instance of antisemitism based on the feeling of a subject population that the Jews were the instruments of their foreign oppressors” (Marcus 1946: 62).

such as the seizure of synagogues, the declaration of “the Jews” to be aliens and strangers and the resettlement of the Jewish population into a single residential area (see *ibid.*: 47f.).

An answer to the question as to why violence erupted in Alexandria depends on how one weighs the single parties and their importance in the outburst of violence. There are good reasons to assume that negative ascriptions to “the Jews” were employed as discursive vehicle by Alexandrian Greek nationalists to enhance their political aims. As the Roman governor Flaccus translated those polemics to political practice, he provided for a strengthening of the pro-Alexandrian group. The pro-Alexandrian anti-Jewish polemic thus supplied a framework for solving two things at once: weakening a rival group within the city *and* attacking the Roman authorities without risking an open revolt. In this sense, the hypothesis of dislocated aggression is reconcilable with the importance of social dynamics stressed by Bergmann/Hoffmann (1987: 35). Considering its double-structure, it takes little wonder that the Alexandrian case had no effect on the wider Roman legislation, especially following the violent death of Caligula and the ascension of Claudius (see Gager 1983: 52; Bergmann/Hoffmann 1987: 45). The Alexandrian sentiment, however, found its way into Roman society as Apion became well-known as a Roman writer (see Gager 1983: 62). Gager comments it is “virtually certain that Egyptian anti-Semitic traditions began to influence Roman opinion” (*ibid.*).

7.1.2 Elitist and Popular Attitudes – Curiosity and Rejection

Gager identifies two more channels for anti-Judaism besides official measures – attitudes among the elite and the populace. Various sources testify to the changing image the Greco-Roman world had of Judaism as it appears to have been “widely discussed, examined, appreciated and criticized” (Gager 1983: 84). Scholars note several positive references made to “the Jews” in literature during antiquity⁴²⁷. During the Hellenistic era (late fourth to mid-first century B.C.E.), Jews are depicted from their first appearance in the writings of Theophrastus down to Poseidonius as a people of philosophers (see *ibid.*: 39). The first descriptions of the Jewish people in the Roman sphere emerges within ethnographic writing about the people surrounding the expanding Roman Empire. Those writings did not intend a vilification of the people it describes but were intended as an introduction of foreign customs and beliefs to a Roman audience (see *ibid.*: 68ff.). At

⁴²⁷ see Daniel 1979: 47f.; Gager 1983: 82-87; Feldman 1993: 123-125.

the same time, accounts as to the character and the history of the Jewish people served as template for anti-Jewish discursive elements present in Apion or Tacitus (see Stern 1980: 24-31). Some scholars note that negative references occurred in these writings only when the Jewish behavior “really showed potential for major unrest” (Wilken 1967: 317; cf. Daniel 1979: 22).

To be sure, a string of anti-Jewish writing existed in Egypt during early antiquity, represented by authors like Manetho (third century B.C.E.) and revived by Apion during the Alexandrian revolt in the first century C.E. (see Feldman 1993: 127-129⁴²⁸). Around the turn of the millennium, the attitude of the Roman writers had become more negative than the persistence of a Roman policy of tolerance would suggest⁴²⁹. If one were to compile a list of Greek and Roman writers that at one point or another produced violent outbursts against the Jewish people, it would read like a who is who of first-century-antiquity, and include, Cicero, Horace, Ovid, Seneca, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, Plutarch, Tacitus, Juvenal and Cassius Dio, to name but a few (cf. Stern 1976, 1980). The famous Roman writer Cicero has gained almost iconographic prominence for his depiction of Judaism as *barbara superstitio* – foreign and anti-Roman. The attacks of Roman authors focus mainly on three aspects; non-compliance (monotheism, refusal to pray to the Roman emperor), sorcery (future telling, medicine), and superstitions (dietary laws, Sabbath, circumcision, credulity⁴³⁰). By the time of the emergence of Christianity, a set of anti-Jewish polemics was common currency among Pagan literary circles (see Gültzow 1990: 105-107).

In this regard, Tacitus' (c. 56 – 120 C.E.) account is especially noteworthy. His *Historia*, Book V, Sections 2-13 is supposed to be “the most detailed account of the history and religion of the Jewish people extant in classical Latin literature” (Stern 1980: 1). In the tradition of ethnographic writing, it discusses different accounts on the origin of the Jewish people. Tacitus invokes the “Egyptian” exodus-narrative passed on by the priest Manetho (recorded in Josephus Flavius *contra Apionem*, see Josephus 2008). Ranging among “[o]ne of the most persistent views” (Daniel 1979: 50) in antiquity, it told the story that the Jewish people had been expelled from Egypt because they were suffering leprosy and scabies (see *ibid.*). Tacitus then turns to the present Jewish religion. Acknowledging customs such as abstention from pork, the use of a special bread (Mazzah) and the

⁴²⁸ see above; cf. Gabba 1989 for critical assessment.

⁴²⁹ In accordance with scholars like Wilken, Stern and Applebaum, Gager notes that the position of these Roman authors emerged in the course of subsequent Judean revolts around the turn of the century (see Gager 1983: 36).

⁴³⁰ see Goldstein 1939: 352-360; Daniel 1979: 49-64; Feldman 1993: 123-176.

observance of the Sabbath and the sabbatical year as antique, i.e. entitled to a place of honor (see Wilken 1967: 316; Stern 1980: 39), Tacitus notes:

“the other customs of the Jews are base and abominable, and owe their persistence to their depravity: for the worst rascals among other peoples, renouncing their ancestral religions, always kept sending tribute and contributing to Jerusalem, thereby increasing the wealth of the Jews; again, the Jews are extremely loyal toward one another, and always ready to show compassion, but toward every other people they feel only hate and enmity. [...] They sit apart at meals and they sleep apart, and although as a race, they are prone to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women; yet among themselves nothing is unlawful. They adopted circumcision to distinguish themselves from other peoples by this difference. Those who are converted to their ways follow the same practice, and the earliest lesson they receive is to despise the gods, to disown their country, and to regard their parents, children, and brothers as of little account” (Tacitus, *Historia*, Book V., Section 5:1-2; translated by C.H. Moore, cited after Stern 1980: 26).

Note that this section was written by one of the most popular Roman historians of his time. It entails the idea of moral degeneration (“worst rascals, prone to lust”), of unfaithfulness (“renouncing their ancestral religions”), of selfishness and greed (“sending tribute and contributing to Jerusalem”) and disloyalty (“towards every other people they feel only hate and enmity, despise the gods, disown their country”). “The Jews” are presented as a tight-knit community which only supports its own members. This may well supply an early conception of a Jewish conspiracy. Tacitus’ depiction, composed around the year 100-110 C.E., serves as an example for the increasing anti-Jewish sentiments found in Pagan literary circles during the first century.

However polemical and aggressive Tacitus’ tone, he still concedes that the Jewish people follow their own ancient customs and “in this respect [...] behave like the rest of humanity” (Feldman 1993: 130). This acceptance of ancient customs marks a general limit to an antique hatred against “the Jews”. Pagan authors may have ridiculed the Jewish people for their traditions or even feared them for their peculiarities or their potential to stir civil unrest – but they did not dispute Judaism’s legitimacy. This has led Fredriksen to conclude:

“Pagan ‘anti-Judaism,’ in sum, seems simply an occasional subspecies of a more general contempt for foreign customs and the obverse expression of Graeco-Roman patriotic pride. Converts, not ‘native’ Jews, stimulated the greatest hostility” (Fredriksen 2003: 47).

The Gentile depiction of “the Jews” and Judaism arose as part of a general polemic against

foreigners and their customs. Some of the most vitriol attacks came from later Roman authors rejecting the idea that Pagans should adopt the Jewish faith. As faith was associated with a specific ethnicity passed on through bloodlines, conversion was an act similar almost to child adoption and people who performed it came under the suspicion of treachery (see Fredriksen 2010: 26f.). Considering those aspects, one must conclude that “the Jews” were not central to the antique perception of the world. Lacking the epistemic quality, those antique discourses fall short of this work’s definition of antisemitism.

*

An increasingly negative attitude of the literary elite stands in contrast to a more ambivalent popular attitude towards Judaism. The little evidence available is discussed in Sevenster (1975: 190f.) and Mason (2006: 140-145). While Feldman notes that there was an “extreme bitterness felt by the masses toward the Jews” (Feldman 1993: 426), Sevenster and Mason stress that there was a considerable number of people that were attracted to Judaism as an ancient religion (see Sevenster 1975: 191-196; Mason 2006: 140-145⁴³¹). This attraction appears to have manifested not in direct conversions but in gradual and partial adoption of Jewish rites and beliefs (see Chadwick 1967: 11; Daniel 1979: 63). In this spirit, Spence rings a note of caution:

“[T]he pagans should not be lumped together by scholars in a way that they were not lumped together in life. The relationship of the Roman elite to a foreign *superstitio* was a lot more hostile than that of the majority of the Roman population [...]. The religious economy of the Roman masses was pluralistic and would have generally been open to, if uninterested in, yet another Eastern cult” (Spence 2004: 359⁴³²).

Evidence for this attraction may be detected in Roman literary anti-Jewish polemics explicitly designed to encounter this attractiveness of Judaism (see Mason 2006: 141f.). Accordingly, Jewish peculiarities figure prominently in Roman satirical writing, introducing the connection of circumcision and perversion, Sabbath and laziness,

⁴³¹ The question how one relates the factor “Roman literature” and “Roman official policy” to “popular attitude” decides on the conclusion drawn. Daniel appears to equate the attitude of the literati with popular feeling and therefore tends to draw a picture more dire than, say, Wilken who focus on the legal side and its demise (Wilken) or Spence’s focus on sociological aspects of the interaction (see Daniel 1979: 49, Wilken 1967: 317, Spence 2004: 359).

⁴³² Spence is referring to a popular Roman perspective on Christians, though the same also applies to Judaism.

abstention from pork and impiety (see Gager 1983: 56-59⁴³³). For example, Juvenal's (c. 60-130 C.E.) *Satires* are mainly concerned with the question of foreign cultural influence on the capital of imperial Rome. It is therefore possible, as Daniel notes, that an attraction to Judaism among one part of society became a reason for animosity by another:

“For a race and religion, already despised for its exclusiveness and real or alleged hatred of humanity, to attract a significant number of converts and sympathizers was a sure formula for resentment, and especially so since the Graeco-Roman world looked down on Jews as superstitious, credulous, odd, and lowly both in class and in origin” (Daniel 1979: 63; cf. Baron 1962: 191).

Gager comments that the conservative and nationalistic perspective was “part of a larger movement [...] which saw in the presence of foreign peoples and cults in Rome the demise of the old Roman ways” (Gager 1983: 65). Accordingly, Juvenal judges the Mosaic laws as antithetical to everything Roman. Again, his polemics against the Sabbath, circumcision and abstinence from pork may serve to illustrate the attraction these practices have had for the Gentile population of Rome (see Stern 1980: 102-107). One can thus conclude carefully that the population professed both great admiration and intense rejection of religious Judaism.

A deep-seeded tradition of tolerance appears to have set the conditions *and* limits for anti-Jewish discourses, policies and violence (see Katz 1991: 47). A more widely shared negative image of Judaism seems to have arisen only by the late first century and resulted mainly from a deterioration of the relationship between Judeans and Romans following the two Judean revolts that shook the Roman Empire. Moses and Judaism now became identified with rebellion and misanthropy in the highest of the Roman literary circles⁴³⁴.

7.1.3 “The Jews” between Paganism and Christianity

“Roman writers attacked Jews because of circumcision, abstention from pork, observance of the sabbath, and other Jewish practices. Christians too made the same charges, but the

⁴³³ Chadwick comments: “In the ancient world everyone knew at least three things about the Jews: they would not be associated either directly or indirectly with any pagan cult (which seemed antisocial), they refused to eat not only meat that had been offered in sacrifice to the gods but also all pork (which seemed ridiculous), and they circumcised their male infants (which seemed repulsive)” (Chadwick 1967: 18f.).

⁴³⁴ for the treatment of the figure of Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism, consult Gager 1972.

In his catalogue of ancient antisemitic accusations, Juster notes that close to every Pagan accusation against Jews reappears in Christian literature. For example, a passage of Claudius’ anti-Jewish pamphlet, “the plague of the world”, is repeated in the homilies of St. John Chrysostom (see Simon 1986: 211⁴³⁵). The fact that Chrysostom’s homilies were published three centuries after Claudius has been taken as a proof for “how tenacious the old prejudices and hatreds were, in spite of the religious revolution that had intervened, and how fixed [...] the formula [were] in which they were expressed” (Simon 1986: 211). Likewise, libels of child-murder had first appeared in the writings of Roman and Greek historians and biographers (see Cohn 1976: 6). Simon comments again that the charge appears to be rooted in the Pagan custom to “ascribe great potency to human blood, especially to the blood of children, in the preparation of sorcerers spells” (Simon 1986: 222). Charges of child-murder and cannibalism on the other hand “belonged to one particular traditional stereotype: the stereotype of the conspirational organization or secret society engaged in a ruthless drive for political power” (Cohn 1976: 7).

As noted above, those charges depreciated “Christian” and “Jewish” practices alike (Cohn 1976: 2-9) as both remained victims of the same discrimination until the third century (see Seeliger 1990: 90-93). After this period, however, Christian writers start to integrate Pagan accusations against “the Jews”, e.g. the charge of child-murder appearing from the fifth century onwards (see Jessopp/James 1896: lxiif.). This observation contrasts with Langmuir’s assertion that the structure of polytheistic culture itself *prevented* anti-Jewish elements from being transmitted to the Christian monotheistic frame (see Langmuir 1990a: 57⁴³⁶). Instead, the present study agrees with scholars such as Wilken, Simon and

⁴³⁵ I am aware of Langmuir’s critique that the anti-Judaism of Pagan times should not be called antisemitism because the respective “anti-Judaic hostility thus differed little from many other instances of ethnocentric hostility throughout history” (Langmuir 1990b: 7, cf. Klassen 1986: 7f.) and because of the great cultural difference “those cultures could hate or ridicule Jews without feeling any threat, other than the fact of difference, to the foundations of their own sense of identity” (Langmuir 1990b: 6). Since Persians, Greeks, Romans and Egyptians hated Jews because of *real* Jewish characteristics, Langmuir argues, one should not call their animosity “antisemitism” (see *ibid.*). There is in fact a decisive difference between Pagan and proto-Catholic attitudes towards “Jews”. However, this difference is not appropriately grasped with the categories “real” or “chimerical” but with the epistemic quality those accusations assume in proto-Catholic discourses.

⁴³⁶ “For, since paganism shared few fundamental premises with Judaism, it did not recognize Judaism as a vital challenge but saw it rather as an alien alternative that attracted proselytes from the lower orders. Precisely because the character of pagan anti-Judaism depended of the character of classical polytheistic culture, it could not be transmitted to Christianity to any serious degree” (Langmuir 1990a: 57). Against this, consider Grayzel’s comment: “It seem unhistorical to argue that the dislike of the Jews which had displayed itself among the pagans in Egypt and Western Asia did not carry over into the circles of gentile Christianity. On the contrary, Christianity could profit from this dislike. For, whereas Judaism in its efforts at proselytization had to overcome this feeling among the pagans, Christianity afforded an additional excuse for indulging it. Christianity enabled the Jew-hating pagan to deny Jewish pretensions and to turn the Scriptures, which the Jews had used so effectively against the gentiles, against the Jews

Ruether who argue that the Pagan anti-Jewish imagery was “transformed and incorporated into a framework that expressed the Christian, not the pagan, motivation” (Ruether 1997: 30⁴³⁷).

This remarkable change from being a victim of an accusation to being its main proponent mirrors the detachment from a Jewish framework that accompanied the rise of Christianity to Roman state religion. Older Pagan accusations were now assimilated to fit the new religious scheme, e.g. the charge of sickness that had first appeared in the writing of the Egyptian priest Manetho possibly reappears in the Christian tradition as a charge of idolatry (see Ruether 1997: 29⁴³⁸). Likewise, the Pagan rejection of circumcision and dietary regulations is adjusted for a Christian theological framework as a practice made obsolete by the advent of Jesus (see Wilken 1967: 319; Simon 1986: 210). In the same spirit, the charge of Jewish impiety shifts to a charge of apostasy and obduracy, lamenting the continuing existence of post-Christian Judaism. Other Pagan polemics are directly adopted by Christian writers, such as the idea that the Sabbath is an excuse for laziness and that the destruction of the Temple a symbol of divine punishment (see *ibid.*: 212, Ruether 1997: 29).

An example for the simultaneous shift of accusations from a Pagan to a Christian framework and of Christianity from a Jewish to a pagan framework can be found in the charge of cannibalism. A classic charge in the Pagan arsenal of anti-Judaism, it was also employed to denigrate “Christians” at first (see Chadwick 1967: 26). The charge reappears among Christian post-Constantine apologists to depreciate “the Jews” (see Isaac 1968: 54, fn. 1⁴³⁹). In contrast, it is crucial to note that Christian writers omit some of the Pagan charges against Jews, e.g. the denigration of a distaste for images or the idea that “the Jews” worship an ass in their temple. Some scholars explain this omission pointing to a principal incompatibility with the Christian framework (see Simon 1986: 210; Ruether 1997: 28f.⁴⁴⁰). Proto-Catholic writers appear to have omitted Pagan charges either because the attack was aimed at a feature of their own faith (e.g. sanctity of worship

themselves” (Grayzel 1946: 84).

⁴³⁷ cf. Wilken 1967: 319; Simon 1986: 208.

⁴³⁸ This change is more than just a shift from the social to the religious sphere (see Wilken 1967: 319). Besides the fact that a conception of “religion” was only emerging, each Christian writer constructed its own relation to and image of “Judaism”.

⁴³⁹ For primary evidence of such accusations against Christians, see Origen (*Against Celsus*, VI.40), Aristides 17, Tatian 25, Justin, *First Apology* 26, Theophilus *To Autolycus* III.4, Tertullian, *Apology* IV.11. (see Rokeah 1982: 67, footnote 74 for a defense against the assumption that these rumors had been spread by Jews).

⁴⁴⁰ For example, Tertullian's *Apology* makes explicit reference to the legend of Ass-worship (see Tertullian *Apol.* 16:3). For records on the “Libel of Jewish Ass-worship”, see Rokeah 1982: 214f.; 1983: 69-71.

to an invisible god) or because the denigration of Judaism was directed towards a Christian continuity with the Jewish prophecy (e.g. Marcion's anti-Jewish arguments). Some of the discursive elements in Christian antisemitism were thus surely taken from Paganism and reworked to fit the Christian theological frame⁴⁴¹.

Rosemary Ruether can be counted among the proponents of the idea that the roots of antisemitism lie in a development in Christian theology. As already pointed out, Ruether repeatedly argues against an emphasis on the Pagan roots of Christian charges, thus stressing the Christian responsibility. While this study finds itself largely in agreement with Ruether, it is important to underline that one can highlight the Pagan origin of a charge and still maintain the importance of a proto-Catholic theological framework for the development of a Christian episteme of antisemitism. The previous work has tried to underline how the course of proto-Catholic thought is the single most important cause for its emergence. While the Pagan world did possess an inconsistent image of "the Jews" that remained marginal to its self-understanding, the proto-Catholic perspective installed "the Jews" in the center of its world-view. While Pagan charges may thus reappeared in Christian writing, their position in the discursive framework has changed substantially. In this sense, one can point to the Pagan background of some accusations while still agreeing with Ruether's conclusion that the Christian formation of antisemitism constituted "a uniquely new factor on the picture of antique anti-Semitism" (Ruether 1997: 28⁴⁴²).

The previous pages gave an idea of the way isolated discursive elements may become a source for the development of a solid (proto-Catholic) episteme of antisemitism. At the onset, analysis underlined that this development results not from a kind of trauma but from a series of traceable historical events and developments. The change from the Jewish to the Pagan framework marks another crucial prerequisite for the emergence of an episteme of antisemitism. While an increasing number of Gentile converts also transported some discursive elements into the early Christian communities, internal struggles with other interpretations of Christianity saw the emergence of the dual strategy of appropriation of the scriptures and denigration of empirical Judaism. This process led to a centralization and intensification of the juxtaposition between the proto-Catholic position and "the Jews". Writers now based their "arguments [...] on a particular kind of exegesis of the biblical writings, an exegesis that interpreted them in the light of the death of Christ as a long indictment of the chosen people" (Simon 1986: 223). Accordingly, one

⁴⁴¹ see Hyam 1974: 278, Cohn 1976: 2-9, Meagher 1979: 11f.; Mayer 1991: 49; critical Sandmel 1978: 5, Langmuir 1990a: 57.

⁴⁴² cf. Isaac 1969: 95-99; Simon 1986: 250ff., Taylor 1995: 116-121.

contribution of Christianity to the history of Jew-hatred may be found in its theological method of argument and its specific techniques of combat (see *ibid.*: 215).

As time progressed, the position of anti-Jewish polemic shifted and its functionality changed as it expanded to the political realm. While Christianity rose to power in the Roman Empire during the fourth century, anti-Jewish legislation followed with a delay. This is in accordance with Ruether's conclusion that "[i]t was this theological root and its growth into a distinctively Christian type of anti-Semitism that were responsible for reversing the tradition of tolerance for Jews in Roman law" (Ruether 1997: 28). The present work argues, however, that this results not so much from religious proximity (*Faith and Fratricide*) but from a rise of a *particular stream within Christianity* and its perspective attaining an encompassing dominance.

7.2 Modes of Integration – Means of Cohesion

7.2.1 Sociology and the Episteme of Antisemitism

"How a movement which began among Jews, yet failed to gain any substantial following either in Palestine or in the Dispersion and was popularly regarded at the outset by Gentiles as a despised Jewish cult, could in the course of forty years become predominantly a gentile movement, and in course of the years that followed come to be the only legal religion of the Roman world at large, is one of the riddles of history that has tested the skill of many an interpreter to solve" (Case 1923: 73)

One of the most important developments the young Christian faith underwent during the first three centuries of its existence was a shift from a Jewish framework with its spiritual base in Judea to a Pagan framework based in Rome⁴⁴³. This was influenced by multiple factors: (1) political developments (demise of the Judean community after 70 C.E., discrimination by Roman officials), (2) internal developments (internal theological struggles, the process of institutionalization and canonization) and (3) social factors (the

⁴⁴³ Proto-Catholic authors such as Justin Martyr pride themselves frequently of the Gentile dominance in Christianity (see e.g. Just. Dial. 109; 119; 122). Further evidence can be found in (later) polemics of proto-Catholic writers such as Tertullian or Irenaeus against the Ebionites, a group of Christians adhering to *kashruth*, circumcision and the Jewish calendar (see Chadwick 1967: 22f.). In all of those cases, polemics are directed against an adherence to a Jewish conduct (see Ehrman 2003: 99-103). This goes well with the observation that the charge of "Judaizing" appeared only around the turn of the first century (see *ibid.*: 143f.). Chadwick comments: "From Irenaeus onwards, Jewish Christianity is treated as a deviationist sect rather than as a form of Christianity with the best claims to continuity with the practice of the primitive church at Jerusalem" (Chadwick 1967: 23). As pointed out above and in contradiction to what Christian writing sometimes suggests, Christian communities remained diverse for centuries to come.

increasing influx of Pagan converts⁴⁴⁴, concerns for social cohesion).

What were the reasons for the success of Christianity among Gentile citizens living in the Roman Empire? In a study from 1923, the American scholar Shirley Jackson Case argues that Christianity came “with but few traditional heritages and in a form as yet largely undetermined in detail” (Case 1923: 76). Thus, Case assumes, the Christian Gospel was flexible enough to meet the “specific needs within the syncretistic life of the age” (ibid.: 97⁴⁴⁵). This volatile and non-specific dogmatic character at first meant an important advantage because the movement could adjust its preaching to “religious values in terms of the satisfactions which the Gentiles themselves were seeking” (ibid.: 122; cf. Drake 2000: 94). Two Judean wars had led to a deterioration of political relations between Judea and the Roman Empire. Together with the growing percentage of Gentile Christians, this provoked an increasing rhetorical distance from Judaism among some Christian writers.

The (Gentile) Christians of the second century found alternative answers to this situation, of which two have been identified above. While the Gentile Christian Marcion opted for

⁴⁴⁴ In *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (1924), Harnack concludes that the mission to the Pagans was not a part of the initial teachings of Jesus but arose with the Gentile mission personified in Paul (see Harnack 1924a: 39ff.). Dibelius comments in his 1919-book *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*: “Was die Christen, die etwas von Jesus wußten, dazu brachte, ihr Wissen zu formen und planmäßig zu vererben, war nicht die Sorge um die Nachwelt, denn die war diesen in Enderwartung lebenden Menschen fremd. Vielmehr trieb sie die werbende Tätigkeit, zu der sie sich verpflichtet fühlten, also die Mission, zu solcher Gestaltung und Weitergabe“ (Dibelius 1967: 12f.; cf. Case 1923; Bultmann 1931: 4; Sanders 1969: 281). Recently, scholars have taken up an impulse by MacMullen (1984) doubting that Christianity was significantly concerned with proselytizing until the third century. In the opening essay to the edited volume *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity* (Vaage 2006b) Vaage comments: “[I]t is not at all obvious, at least to me, however zealous later Christians may have been about the ultimate truth and authority of their particular view of things, that this persuasion, for the first century or two of its existence, programmatically sought or even thought about seeking to convert the known world or a significant percentage of it ‘to Christ.’ While Christianity plainly emerged, developed, and spread throughout the Mediterranean basin, that it did so, within the confines of the Roman Empire, intentionally or self-consciously as a particular social (political; philosophical) project, with the recruitment of new members as a founding feature of its official purpose, is anything but clear” (Vaage 2006a: 16). Consider also Donaldson’s statement in the same volume: “Paul was not the originator, either deliberately or inadvertently, of a missionary movement, for which he would be the prototype, and which eventually was successful in its project of Christianizing the Roman Empire. After the first century, professional itinerant missionaries seem to have played no significant role in the spread of the movement. This is due, at least in part, to the fact that the movement had been planted, already by the end of the first century CE, in significant centres throughout much of the empire [...] from which it could spread through more spontaneous, informal, or ordinary means” (Donaldson 2006: 136f.).

⁴⁴⁵ cf. ibid.: 115f.; Harnack 1924a: 324f.; Bauer 1964: 240; Chadwick 1967: 24; Köster 1980: 172; Vaage 2006c: 257. Köster notes: “Das Christentum [...] war weder einfach aus dem Judentum entstanden, noch etwa ohne weiteres aus der Predigt Jesu. Von diesen beiden Ausgangspunkten herkommend hat sich das Christentum stärker als andere religiöse Bewegungen seiner Zeit auf die verschiedensten kulturellen und geistigen Strömungen einstellen können und dabei sehr viel fremdes Gut aufgenommen, ehe es als synkretistische Religion den Anspruch durchsetzen konnte, Weltreligion zu sein” (Köster 1980: 172). Chadwick sees Christianity’s message of charity and love as reason for its success (see Chadwick 1967: 54-60). In opposition to Chadwick, Dodds points to Christianity’s “very exclusiveness, its refusal to concede any value to alternative forms of worship” (Dodds 1968: 133) as the reason for its success.

a complete detachment from Judaism, proto-Catholic apologists claimed continuity with the Jewish prophecy. This position became increasingly ambivalent as Christianity moved increasingly out of the scope of its original Jewish framework. It takes little wonder, then, that this Gentile Christianity soon eradicated any remaining references to the framework of Jewish ritual.

The influence of the Gentile framework is reflected in language, terminology and a shifting theological focus. Already in early Patristic writings, one can therefore detect a struggle to maintain a Christian profile vis-à-vis a growing interest on the sides of a Pagan public in the Roman Empire⁴⁴⁶. The Patristic writers confronted this situation by sharpening Christianity's profile, situating Christianity as the *tertium genus* (third race) and the *verus Israel* (true Israel⁴⁴⁷). At the same time, the change to the Pagan framework supplies a central condition for the development of an episteme of antisemitism among proto-Catholic writers. The specificity of the proto-Catholic response has led to the question: Why did a group within the new religion decide to keep the Jewish scriptures and prophecy even after it had left a Jewish framework?

The “political and religious conservatism” (Simon 1986: 79; cf. Chadwick 1967: 68f.) of Roman society lent credibility to a religion to the degree it could claim a long history. Together with the Marcionite interpretation, this put pressure on proto-Catholic Christian writers to highlight the oldness (antiquity) of the Christian religion. To adjust Christianity to the needs and opinions of Gentile converts and to debilitate criticism, proto-Catholic authors thus shifted the focus away from an earlier concentration on newness and originality (see Simon 1986: 79) to a notion of continuity. The tendency to appropriate the *Jewish* position was emphasized as Christianity moved closer to the Pagan framework of the Roman Empire. Writers now set out to demonstrate that they “were the true, authentic Israel, preexistent and eternal” (Simon 1986: 92), claiming the Jewish scriptures and the prophecy as their own.

Proto-Catholic writers slowly develop a discursive strategy that could do both – maintaining the older arguments vis-à-vis Jewish claims to prophecy and adjusting them to meet internal challenges more contemporary to those Gentile authors. Rather than an unbroken chain of (Christian Jewish) tradition this development of a Christian episteme

⁴⁴⁶ Drake notes how the Christian message tried to maintain both, mission and identity: “If the commandment to love neighbour and enemy alike was the incentive for Christians to reach out to the world, and equally strong injunction to worship no god but the True God ensured that Christians would keep their own identity as they did so” (Drake 2000: 84).

⁴⁴⁷ see Harnack 1924a: 259ff.; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 219-222; see Droge 2006: 244.

of antisemitism thus emerges as a response to contemporary challenges. Considering there were other viable options (the Jewish Paul, the Judean interpretation, the Marcionite perspective) one can conclude that a proto-Catholic claim to continuity marks a desire for continuity that ultimately remains contingent and idiosyncratic. Case's sociological perspective suggests that the evolution of Christian communities and of the socio-political realities of the Roman Empire inspired an increased functionality of "the Jews" for proto-Catholic writers. The last analytical section is dedicated to an exploration of this functional aspect the discursive Jews may have played for the nascent faith.

7.2.2 Problems of Diversity – The Two Edges of Success

While the early communities of Christ-believers had been made up of Jews (see Schoeps 1956: 5), the diaspora communities were marked by an ever-growing percentage of Gentile converts. At first, those communities appear to have maintained a close connection to the Jewish framework (still detectable in Chrysostom's sermons). Evidence for this Jewish character can be discerned in (1) the Greek translation of the Bible, the *Septuaginta* as basic text for most Christian communities, (2) the idea of a central religious and social space for religious existence (*Synagoga* → *Ekklesia*⁴⁴⁸), (3) a non-Pagan, monotheistic worship conducted with words alone (praying, sermon, hymns, etc., see Gülzow 1990: 114f.). As Christian communities became increasingly more Gentile in composition, however, they integrate aspects of Paganism and its cults (see Lundskow 2006: 236f.). An ever-growing distance to a Jewish ritual practice⁴⁴⁹ culminated in the Nicene delineation from Jewish ritual conduct and its religious framework⁴⁵⁰. This process had already started early in the second century when Christian authorities had started working towards a removal of this earlier attachment to Judaism.

As pointed out in the previous section, Christian's struggled to maintain their own profile

⁴⁴⁸ Stegemann/Stegemann underline the social and an empirical meaning of the term *Ekklesia* (Hebr. *qahal*) as gathering/convention and as community (see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 228-230).

⁴⁴⁹ Such as circumcision or the keeping of Sabbath; see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 219-221.

⁴⁵⁰ As pointed out above, the Council of Nicaea marks a process that changed the dates of Christian celebrations (e.g. detaching Eastern from Passover), condemned Jewish rites (Shabbath, circumcision), and, ultimately, prohibited social contact between Christians and Jews. At the same time, this insistence on a separation testifies to the enduring relevance the Jewish framework had for the Gentile and Jewish Christian communities even following Constantine's conversion to Christianity. Therefore, the development away from the Jewish framework was by no means automatic and needed the continued effort of religious authorities not uncommonly meeting the passive resistance of the community (Chrysostom's sermons testify to this).

in the face of an ever-increasing Gentile proportion among its believers. With official discrimination a pressing reality, non-Jewish Christian writers had good reasons to fear the political consequences of a clear-cut opposition to Pagan religions (which was much more a mindset including a multitude of beliefs and rituals than a religion in today's sense). One mindless utterance of a bishop and the whole community may become subject to one of the occasional outbursts sweeping through the Eastern Roman Empire during the first centuries. Another reason for a careful delineation from Paganism could lie in the ongoing internal competition among different Christian communities whose survival of each interpretation depended on the influx of new converts. Rowan Williams notes on the rules of attraction for this contest:

“[W]hat has staying power (and is *seen* as having staying power, and so pursued for that reason) is what offers a public, a social, identifying context for the believer – institutional, narrative and behavioural norms” (Williams 1989: 10).

The first Pagan converts seem to have come from communities previously sympathetic to Judaism (see Chadwick 1967: 11; Gager 1983: 112; Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 223f.). Success in the wider Pagan world, however, was not to be secured without attracting a larger number of Pagans as well.

Regarding this, it may have seemed advisable to introduce some familiar elements from the Pagan world-view to Christology (for a discussion of the role of the Apologists vis-à-vis the Christian martyr, see Drake 2000: 84f.⁴⁵¹). An example for this process may be found in the way Christian missionaries did not refute the existence of other gods (“demons”) but advertised Christ as the greater protector from harm (see Case 1923: 131). Likewise, the substitution of baptism for circumcision (Paul) allowed Pagans to convert to Jewish Christianity without the strenuous effort of circumcision and the study of religious laws⁴⁵². While ideas of heaven, the afterlife and good vs. evil are reconcilable with a Pagan imagination, even myths initially connected to the Jewish scriptures gain a

⁴⁵¹ “While the two are not mutually exclusive – martyrs could be apologists, and apologists martyrs – they represent different impulses, the martyr standing for rigor and exclusion, the apologist for cooperation and inclusion. Thus they also represent an internal tension in Christianity which at all times has been an important dynamic for the movement” (Drake 2000: 85).

⁴⁵² see Gültzow 1990: 114f.; cf. Rokeah 1982: 91-94; Gager 1983: 66; Lundskow 2006: 234. Exploring Christian claims of miracles, Remus has demonstrated that it was common practice among early proto-Catholic apologists to “reorient the social and cultural worlds of contemporary paganism to fit their experience and conception of Christianity” (Remus 1986: 60). The same is true for the conception of Christianity which was explained with reference to Paganism “thus establishing points of contact” (ibid.). In Justin Martyr, one can observe further how a claim to Judaism's antiquity can serve as proof that (good) Paganism is merely a derivative of Christianity (see ibid.).

Roman ring if adjusted to the story of Romulus and Remus (see Lundskow 2006: 237⁴⁵³). Is it possible that this adjustment to the Pagan imagination also expanded to the integration of anti-Judaic imagery (see Thoma 1979: 19⁴⁵⁴)?

*

Christians of the first centuries saw themselves as an exclusive community in which the believers had been reborn in Christ (see 2 Cor 5:17⁴⁵⁵). This new identity promised to abolish social, national and even gender distinctions (for a critical view, see Mayer 1983: 217ff.). A fierce advocate of this idea, Paul claimed the complete eradication of all differences under the faith in Christ (see Gal 3:28). Furthermore, the notion of rebirth found a place in Paul's theological model of transcendence of the Pagan-Jewish split, from former flesh (law/sin, death) to spirit (resurrection/faith, life) (see e.g. Rom 6:3f.; 7:1-6; 8:6-11). Horrell comments:

“What is happening here is similar to one of the possibilities social identity theorists mention for the reduction of intergroup conflict: that through ‘recategorization’ a new and broader identity transcends and encompasses identities that previously defined and divided separate groups. [...] The new community in Christ includes Jews and Gentiles slaves and free persons, men and women, and unites them all; with a common identity in Christ they are brothers and sisters” (Horrell 2002: 320).

Apparently, this detachment of faith from ethnicity was successful in attracting many different converts to the new faith (see e.g. Meeks 1982⁴⁵⁶). The plain language of the

⁴⁵³ For more changes, see Lundskow 2006: 236-239. Lundskow develops his arguments in direct refutation of Stark's *The Rise of Christianity* (1996), the “first credible attempt to apply rational-choice theory beyond the modern world” (Lundskow 2006: 223). Against Stark's focus on rupture and change, Lundskow concludes: “Christianity did supersede paganism, but not perfectly, nor did it transform ancient culture or class relations. The patrician class often chose Christianity, but most other people had it forced on them. For those who refused to surrender their pagan traditions, Christianity obtained a compromise – change your beliefs and acknowledge the Christian God (and most importantly, his earthly ruler) as supreme, and you may continue with your pagan celebrations” (Lundskow 2006: 247).

⁴⁵⁴ Thoma assumes a binary opposition between antisemitic Paganism and Christian naivety: “Man muß dieses christlich-ursprüngliche Nichtdurchschauen der Gefährlichkeit des Antisemitismus als das erste Verhängnis der jüdisch-christlichen Religionsgeschichte bezeichnen” (Thoma 1979: 19). However, the preceding analysis has shown that the opposition between the community of the faithful and “the Jews” is moving to the centre of theologizing in the New Testament. One can therefore conclude upon a mutual encroachment of Pagan attitudes and Christian message for their mutual benefit (see below).

⁴⁵⁵ cf. Case 1923: 134; MacMullen 1984: 17-24. The notion of “rebirth” resembles closely to the way Salo W. Baron depicts the process of Jewish conversion in rabbinical eyes (see Baron 1964: 12).

⁴⁵⁶ E. R. Dodds's *Pagans and Christians in an Age of Anxiety* (Dodd 1968) demonstrates how the growth of Christian communities in the first two centuries coincided with a deep social and identity crisis of the later Roman Empire (see Dodds 1968: 132-134). In response, people were looking for new frames of reference and membership to which an early Christian community may have supplied the most effective answer to this “need to belong” (ibid.). On the other hand, Theißen has argued that a crisis did not erupt in the Roman Empire until the third century C.E. The very stability of the first two centuries thus becomes

Pauline Epistles has been taken by some as further evidence that Christianity's most important target-group consisted in the people of the lower strains of society⁴⁵⁷. Since the 1960s, scholars have challenged this idea of a "proletarian" make-up, concluding that a much greater share of converts seems to have come from the middle and upper classes⁴⁵⁸. Almost an inversion of the previous perspective, George Lundskow assumes the success in attracting the upper classes may have made the decisive difference in the struggle between Gnostic and Orthodox Christianity (see Lundskow 2006: 239f.).

Be it as it may, the Pauline letters testify to a *great diversity* within and among the early Christian communities (see e.g. 1 Cor 4:8-13; 11:30). This heterogeneity created problems, "chief among which is internal division, of which Christianity has always had plenty" (Drake 2000: 78). The earliest known records of those Christian communities "reveal a community that was deeply divided over its purpose, its mission, even its origins" (Drake 2000: 80). Christian communities thus found themselves in a situation of constant internal conflict between theological disputes and disputes on institutionalization (see Gager 1975: 35; Drake 2000: 78f.). Horrell finds an early reaction to those conflicts in the Pauline Epistles, concluding: "[T]he Pauline view is crucial for the development of Christian identity precisely because it creates a group identity that is something new" (Horrell 2002: 319). Paul manages to construct this group identity, Horrell maintains, "by transferring to them the positive labels of Israel, the people of God" (ibid.: 321). This group identity defines itself in appropriation of Jewish labels and through a common faith in Jesus as Christ (see ibid.: 319; cf. Meeks 1982: 271f.⁴⁵⁹). The teaching contained in the Gospel accounts can be read in a similar manner as an attempt "to maintain its distinctive identity and outlook, and not just to promote ethical conduct among its members" (see Esler 1994: 8). As the communities continued to grow, however, those early strategies may have proven insufficient.

"A successful mass movement" (Drake 2000: 80), Drake comments, "needs to find a way to accommodate a variety of needs and interests, and this means it must learn to live with tension and ambiguity" (ibid.). The charismatic leadership that had sustained the

an argument for the possibility to organize Christian communities, build Christian institutions and develop its dogma. By the third century, the situation turned around as Christianity became a factor of stability for the weakened state (see Theißen 2004: 305).

⁴⁵⁷ see Case 1923: 126f.; Dodds 1968: 134; Gager 1982: 261-265.

⁴⁵⁸ see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 249; cf. Theißen 2004: 123-124; Lundskow 2006: 239; cf. Meeks 1993: 111-157. This perspective is re-establishing a position from 19th century scholarship as in Ramsay or Mommsen; see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 249-271.

⁴⁵⁹ Boyarin notes that this did not necessarily remove those communities from the Jewish framework (see Boyarin 2004: 1-31).

community in its early stages stopped working as an integrative factor by the end of the first century for two reasons. First, because the initial leadership had mostly been killed or removed (see Horrell 2002: 322f.) and second, as Max Weber points out, charismatic authority yields its power-base once it fails to satisfy the needs of its followers (see Weber 1922; Gager 1975: 67⁴⁶⁰). Common rituals, social interaction and charismatic leadership may have been a good base for the initial phase of a Christian group formation. However, by the end of the first century they were increasingly less able to produce lasting identifications among the different classes and backgrounds of the Christian communities.

As the first century came to an end, the communities continued to grow extensively. It is likely that this intensified the quest for alternative sources of social cohesion. Only one of the problems arising after the demise of the charismatic leaders was the question of succession of authority (see Gager 1975: 68), another lay in the coordination of an increasing number of people and communities. Christian authorities reacted with different strategies to institutionalize their faith. It therefore comes as no surprise that the second century saw the emergence of a variety of Churches (e.g. the Marcionite Church or the Roman Church⁴⁶¹). This process of institutionalization accompanied an increasing internal stratification (rule of faith, apostolic succession, Church legislation) that came to a hold by the fourth century (Nicaea).

Meanwhile, a new conflict arose when “[s]ystems of authority, patterns of belief and control of funds and property had turned the early household communities into an interlinked, empire-wide organization that increasingly mirrored the structure of the empire itself” (Hall 2006: 415). Decreasing the original “sense of belonging with comparable communities” (Williams 1989: 12), an increasingly institutionalized proto-Catholic Christianity found itself in desperate need for alternative sources of cohesion. How did those communities generate this integrative power? What strategies did they

⁴⁶⁰ This does not mean that the stage of early charismatic authority simply disappeared as it underpinned Christian writings that became a part of the Christian canon (see Gager 1975: 67). Max Weber comments on the role of charismatic leadership in traditional societies: “Das Charisma ist *die* große revolutionäre Macht in traditionellen gebundenen Epochen. Zum Unterschied von der ebenfalls revolutionierenden Macht der »ratio«, die entweder geradezu von außen her wirkt: durch Veränderung der Lebensumstände und Lebensprobleme und dadurch mittelbar der Einstellungen zu diesen, oder aber: durch Intellektualisierung, *kann* Charisma eine Umformung von innen her sein, die, aus Not oder Begeisterung geboren, eine Wandlung der zentralen Gesinnungs- und Tatenrichtung unter völliger Neuorientierung aller Einstellungen zu allen einzelnen Lebensformen und zur ‘Welt’ überhaupt bedeutet“ (Weber 1922).

⁴⁶¹ To be sure, this movement away from the initial form of community organization was interrupted repeatedly by smaller groups that demanded a return to the beginnings of the faith. This interruption continued to accompany the development of Christianity all the way to the great Schism of Eastern and Western Church and the break between Catholicism and Protestantism. One reason the intervening parties could claim legitimacy may be that traces of the charismatic structure of the early communities had been preserved in the texts that comprise the New Testament (see Gager 1975: 75f.).

develop surpassing the Paulinian frame? What role could “the Jews” have played in this regard?

7.2.3 “The Jews” as a Means of Social Cohesion

“Hatte nun das 'Gesetz' mit ihm das Volkstum seine Geltung in den neuen christlichen Gemeinden verloren [...], so musste, um dem Zerfließen zu begegnen, eine neue bindende Macht eintreten: die katholische Kirche hat sie im Laufe des zweiten Jahrhunderts in dem kombinierten Gedanken 'des Glaubens' und 'der apostolischen Überlieferung' gefunden” (Harnack 1924b: 14f.)

“We should never underestimate our predisposition to believe whatever is presented under the guise of an authoritative report and is also consistent with the mythological structure of a society from which we derive comfort, and which it may be uncomfortable to dispute” (Kermode 1980: 113)

During the early 20th century, the school of *Form Criticism* pointed out that the writings in the New Testament and the literary production of the Patristic authors *aimed to fulfill contemporary social and practical functions by “directing, upbuilding, and consolidating of the common life”* (Case 1923: 173, my italics). The previous work has demonstrated the centrality “the Jews” came to play in early Christian theologizing. Highlighting the role inner-Christian debates had on the development of the anti-Jewish formation, analysis further enquired into the modes of adoption and adaption Christianity developed in reaction to the external and internal influences.

Most likely, the Pagan converts infused the early communities with a specific knowledge and self-conception derived from the place of original, social and religious background (the term “Gentile” and “Pagan” tends to gloss over the differences in class, origin and faith of the converts). Bringing with them a “heritage of habit, desire, and judgments” (Case 1923: 121), the Gentile influx thus also started to shape the emerging Christian theology. By the end of the fourth century, Christianity and the Roman Pagan framework had enclosed each other to a degree that allowed for its integration as Roman state religion. In this process, Christianity was certainly not a passive actor and one should not underestimate its creative reworking of the Pagan traditions it incorporated. The first hypothesis explored regarding this process of mutual encroachment is that Christian writers adopted a specific contemporary understanding of “Jews” to make the Christian message easier to understand.

To explore this hypothesis, the following passage leaves the concrete historical frame for a few paragraphs and resort to a theoretical conception developed by the Italian scholar Umberto Eco. In an essay of his collection *Im Wald der Fiktionen*, Eco describes the curious kind of confusion of fiction and reality occurring when traces of things familiar to the recipient (be it stereotypes, literature or religious beliefs) reappear in a different setting (Eco discusses the reappearance of elements from fictional literature in the *Protokolle der Weisen von Zion*). Albeit the truth-claim of literature and religion, religion and politics may be fundamentally different, Eco concludes that the familiar raises the credibility of a given discourse (see Eco 2004: 182f.). If one adopts those insights to the framework of early Christianity one would arrive at a conclusion much like this one: Christianity developed an aura of authenticity for Pagan converts by including traces of Pagan religious, political, social and philosophical discourses into the discourse of a given community. This process that does not necessarily have to be intentional or strategic to exert its validifying effect.

Eco's reflections suggest that the element familiar to the convert raises the religion's credibility. This raises the temptation to adopt the message to a common pool of knowledge of the group of potential converts – if any such is to be found. This is where “the Jews” become a convenient reference point because all participants know things about them that combine appeal (of antiquity, morality and monotheism) and rejection (political and theological). An emphasis on “the Jews” serves two ends at once: it positively distinguishes the Christian faith from “the Jews” as it points to their shortcomings (blindness, killing of the prophets, etc.) and it creates a common ground for the converts gathering under the roof of Christian communities.

If this assumption can claim some legitimacy, a second hypothesis emerges: anti-Judaism was crucial to produce social cohesion within the Christian communities. It was the common denominator on which its members could agree, one connecting multiple groups separated by class, age, gender, origin and education. From a sociological perspective, communities generate belonging (a) through charismatic leaders (Jesus, James, Peter, Paul), (b) a conceptual framework such as the faith in Christ, (c) following common rituals and (d) identifying common lines of distinction. Pondering the question of social cohesion for early Christian groups, scholars such as Chadwick argue that the “unity of the scattered Christian communities depended on two things – on a common faith and on a common way of ordering their life and worship” (Chadwick 1967: 32). Dodds agrees

that “a common way of life” (Dodds 1968: 136) and the “human warmth” (ibid.: 137) of social interaction formed the two major aspects which held those early communities together. Horrell also agrees that the early Christian communities followed a rudimentary set of religious rites and performances such as Baptism and Eucharist (see Horrell 2002: 316). Drake adds eternal salvation as a common goal to Chadwick’s list and notes that Christianity was fuelled by a central tension between an idea of the salvation (the ark) and an idea of purity (the beacon, see Drake 2000: 84).

The structure of the Christian communities in the first two centuries was not the same as the structure of the church in the third century, especially in the larger cities of the Empire (see Markus 1980: 12). Over barely two centuries, the Church had developed into a major political factor, a process in which it possibly ran the danger of losing touch to its base and therefore to the origins that had motivated people to convert to this religion in the first place. Christianity once again had to confront a problem of cohesion. Markus notes:

“The lines which marked the Christians off from the world around them were becoming increasingly blurred as Christianity became more ‘respectable’ and as more and more Christians came to share the culture, the values, tastes and life-styles of their non-Christian contemporaries” (Markus 1980: 12).

With the increasing distance from its original structure, human warmth and common prayer became less effective as unifying factors. Rather, the development of doctrinal norms and institutional structures helped to maintain a sense of community as they “came to take their place in defining Christianity” (ibid.⁴⁶²). This shifting of emphasis to the dogmatic level, however, meant that one had to look for alternative sources that could provide social cohesion. Scholars have pointed to a common demarcation from the external world (Jewish and Pagan) as one source to generate social cohesion among Christian communities (see Simmel 1908: 310f.; Coser 1956: 87-110; cf. Gager 1975: 80-82⁴⁶³). Another strategy has been identified in the demarcation of competing claims to the faith as “heresies” (e.g. Marcionism; see Horrell 2002: 326-328; cf. Gager 1975: 79-88).

⁴⁶² Markus calls it a “Durkheimian principle” (Markus 1980: 12) that the development of doctrinal clarity coincides with the development of a clear and distinguished institutional structure.

⁴⁶³ In this regard, Markus has pointed to the crucial role the cult of the saints and martyrs began to play in the Christian Church after its rise to state religion (see Markus 1990: 24; cf. p. 139-155 for the impact this development had on the late Roman cityscape). This development is mirrored in Tertullian’s argument that the will for martyrdom distinguished real Christians from imitators and pretenders (see Markus 1980: 6). Markus’ argument is supported further by the fact that the term *Ekklesia* frequently appears in early records of anti-Christian violence (see Acts 8:1,3; 9:31; 11:22; 20:17; 1Cor 15:9; Gal 1:13; see Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 229). It seems suffering was closely connected with true Christian identity in the self-construction of these communities.

Combined with the emergence of written Gospels, the slow formation of a Christian canon the introduction of the division between the “orthodox” and the “heretical” helped to produce a base for an authoritative proto-Catholic interpretation (see Horrell 2002: 325-331; cf. Boyarin 2004).

One can suppose further that “the Jews”, considering their central role for the development of Christology in the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature and considering their negative position in Roman literary circles of the first century, played a role in this century-long quest for a renewed base of the Christian Church. Not only could “the Jews” supply a sense of a common threat and enemy, they also became a feature “*within* the most basic activity of communicating about Jesus that make for the precarious evolution of a ‘normative’ Christianity” (Williams 1989: 18). A negative image of “the Jews” established a link between Pagan converts and a Christian framework. Their position between Pagan stereotypes and proto-Catholic theology may well have made them a crucial discursive element in a proto-Catholic quest for a renewed framework for social cohesion. One is thus led to conclude that “the Jews” were not only central to the attraction of converts but also for the consolidation of Christian communities.

7.3 Conclusion – Dawn of the Dispositive

“Das Judentum wurde zum Schatten, gegenüber dem sich dauernd das christliche Licht abhob. Damit war auch die Möglichkeit gegeben, daß die wirklich vorhandenen Juden immer wieder Opfer dieses Schattens wurden, ohne daß sie sich dagegen wehren konnten, denn der Schatten existierte auf der Ebene der Dogmatik unabhängig von ihnen” (Lutz 1993: 326)

The previous chapter explored precursors to Christian images of “the Jews”. It identified many traces of a Pagan anti-Judaism among the Roman elites and populace but concluded that it ultimately fell short of crossing the epistemic threshold. However, it supplied a pool of discursive elements whose appropriation and reworking in the development proto-Catholic framework proved to enrich the latter. Things are different when it comes to the function a Pagan tradition of negative portrayal of “the Jews” performed. Taking a more sociological perspective, the last section focused on the way Pagan prejudices and a proto-Catholic tradition *Adversus Iudaeos* may have interacted in raising the validity of a mission to the Pagan and supporting a quest for renewed social cohesion among the diverse member of early Christian communities.

The question of social cohesion accompanied early Christianity from its onset. Held together by charismatic leadership at first, it soon had to look for alternative sources that could generate a sense of belonging. When the Church entered the process of its own institutionalization it had to find an alternative strategy to generate social cohesion. This culminated in the subsequent development of dogma, canon and the idea of orthodoxy as central pillars of Christianity. I have proposed the hypothesis that a discourse on “the Jews” took a pivotal role in generating group-cohesion by bridging Pagan and Christian prejudices and by sharpening the church's profile vis-à-vis competing interpretations. As some of the discursive elements in the emerging Christian episteme of antisemitism provided a sense of continuity for Gentile converts and Jewish Christians alike, “the Jews” served as a bridgehead between communities ridden with internal frictions between groups divided by differences in class, gender, religion, education and geographic origin.

Surely, inner-Christian debates and the shift from a Jewish to Pagan framework mark important prerequisites for the establishment of “the Jews” in the center of proto-Catholic theologizing. The proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism may have remained a marginal phenomenon of only one religious group within the Roman Empire if it had not risen to become the Roman state religion by the late fourth century. With this development, the proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism was widened to include official Roman policy and the structure of Christianity itself. The last chapter has served as a corrective for a too enthusiastic embrace of the initial hypothesis. It may well be that the proto-Catholic employment of “the Jews” at the center of its understanding of self and world furthered its quest to become the dominant force in the nascent religion and the Roman Empire. It can be said with certainty, though, that the integration of formerly Pagan anti-Jewish stereotypes into proto-Catholic theology and its rise to state religion marks a decisive point for the emergence of a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism in the center of a Western self-construction lingering on until the present day.

8. Results

8.1 Rethinking the Causal Framework

The present study reconstructed the emergence and dissemination of a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism during the first four centuries C.E. Rather is only one of many scholars assuming the Church developed its anti-Judaism because of a closeness to its mother-religion. However, this hypothesis cannot be maintained if one takes the multiplicity of early Christian positions into account. The “birth trauma” does not stand at the beginning of Christianity but results from a century-long development within a strain of the nascent faith. The previous chapters have attempted a reconstruction of this development. Another popular explanation accompanying the discussion is that competition between the church and the synagogue had given rise to these animosities (Marcel Simon et al.). Analysis has shown time and again that this conflictual hypothesis lacks evidence in the face of the larger historical trajectory regarding the correspondence of polemic and supposed Jewish threat. While anti-Jewish polemics intensify over time the supposed Jewish threat certainly decreased with the growing recognition and institutionalization of the nascent faith.

This is not to say that a Christian-Jewish encounter did not take place. Quite the opposite! The chapter on John Chrysostom demonstrated that Christians and Jews probably interacted intensely and that their relations probably included the whole spectrum of possible interactions from friendly to hostile⁴⁶⁴. Judith Lieu has demonstrated that even a tradition as textual and artificial as the *Adversus Iudaeos* writings can inform the contemporary on certain aspects of the Jewish-Christian encounter⁴⁶⁵. It is another question, however, to connect this interplay to the emergence of a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism. For this, one would need a theoretical framework establishing a causal link between the increasing centrality of the image of the Jew in theology and the empirical encounter. It is here that the present work has intended to present an alternative that could explain the emergence and dissemination of a proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism.

⁴⁶⁴ see Simon 1986: 271-305; Lieu/North/Rajak 1992a; critical Munk 1954: 259-265. Mayer notes that recent scholarship tends to assume a mixed record for this interaction (see Mayer 2013: 8-10; cf. Lampe 2003, Ascough 2005, and Vaage 2006).

⁴⁶⁵ Paget’s critique of Taylor’s *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity* concludes with the argument that a Christian *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition can in fact inform the modern interpreter on contemporary empirical Judaism. Pointing to Lieu, he assumes “a complex interplay in the Christian presentation of the Jew between image and reality” (Paget 2010a: 73).

As analysis moved from Paul to the Gospels to Marcion and the Patristic writer, it focused increasingly on inner-Christian struggles and the socio-historical context. The case studies underlined a remarkable convergence of anti-Jewish invective and the dynamics of the proto-Catholic refutation of “heretic” voices such as Marcion. Its most important expression was a strategy of appropriation of Jewish scriptures and denigration of empirical Jews. This meant a decisive evolution in a Christian perspective on “the Jews” preparing for an episteme of antisemitism traces of which can already be detected in the Gospels and Paul. The last chapter then explored precursors to Christian images of “the Jews” and the function they performed in a mission to the Pagan population and for the early Christian communities.

The emergence of antisemitism resulted not from a quasi-natural opposition between early “Christianity” and “Judaism” but within a specific stream of the early Christ I decided to call – somehow retroactively – proto-Catholicism. The writers analyzed in this work did not consider themselves Catholic as the concept had not been created yet. At the same time, they did help to bring its conception along – especially if one focuses on the image of “the Jews” and the interpretation of New Testament texts. “The Jews” did not emerge in the center of a proto-Catholic perception of self and world until the second century. Before turning to the theoretical coordinates of the “antisemitism dispositive”, the following section scrutinizes the consequences this study could have for a historical analysis of Christian anti-Judaism/antisemitism.

8.1.1 On the Notion of “Judaizing” – Simon Reconsidered

“the most compelling reason for anti-Semitism was the religious vitality of Israel”
(Simon 1986: 232)

In his seminal work *Verus Israel*, Simon argues that the Church has always been “in conflict with Judaism” (Simon 1986: 135). This underlines Simons assumption that an empirical conflict between Judaism and Christianity lies behind most negative statements on Judaism in early Christian documents from the Gospels to the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature. Many scholars working in this field after 1945 have followed Simon’s central assumption⁴⁶⁶. Those scholars assume that there is a causal connection between the

⁴⁶⁶ see e.g. Wilken 1967; Idinopulos/Ward 1977; Kampling 1984; Frend 1984; Skarsaune 1987; Horbury

scriptural “Jews” and the existence of a hostile empirical encounter. Simon comments: “The problem of Jewish expansion and of the spread of its influence is bound up with that of anti-Semitism” (ibid.: 395). Wilken amends: “Christian anti-Semitism in the fourth and fifth centuries tells us something not only about Christianity at the time but also about Judaism” (Wilken 1967: 327).

However, a steady stream of critique has accompanied this reiteration of the “conflict theory”⁴⁶⁷. A renewed interest in the Christian-Jewish encounter in scholarship perpetuated insights into the diverse reality of early “Christianity” and “Judaism” alike (see Limor/Stroumsa 1996: VII). One of its most important champions of this scholarship, David Boyarin, stresses that while Judaism forms a background for emerging “Christianity” both are not yet divided along “religious” lines⁴⁶⁸. Since “Judaism” and “Christianity” cannot be regarded as separated entities during most of the first two centuries for most of the believers, it seems almost tautological to speak of a Judeo-Christian conversation. With *Verus Israel* still being among the most frequently cited works on early Christianity and its attitude towards Judaism, this section focuses on Simon’s arguments and contrasts them to the results of the present study.

Jesus himself was born, raised and educated a Jew. His teachings probably made frequent use of rabbinic literature leading Cunningham to conclude “there is no question that he operated well within the range of acceptable Jewish diversity” (Cunningham 2010: 49⁴⁶⁹). There is much evidence that most of the earliest Christ-followers also stayed within the framework of Judaism as its members “saw themselves as Jews, who [...] did not reject the Torah and its Commandments” (Stow 1992: 12). In those Christian Jewish messianic communities, Jewish rituals were followed, the Mosaic Law observed and the Jerusalem temple frequented for prayer (for evidence in the Gospels, consult Mt. 5:17-20; Acts 2:46;

1998 and to some extent also Ruether 1979 (consult Paget 2010a: 44 for further sources). Kampling appears to have partially revised his position in a later essay (see Kampling 1990: 134).

⁴⁶⁷ see e.g. Rokeah 1982; Taylor 1995; Spence 2004. Mayer/Neil doubt whether there is a consistent scientific mode that could be called „conflict theory”. In a recent publication, they note that “until very recently religious conflict per se has rarely been a topic of investigation with regard to this earlier time period” (Mayer 2013: 9). The explicit focus on theoretical aspects of the conflictual assumption indeed signals a new critical awareness in scholarship. At the same time, its reaffirmation testifies to a continuing interest in Judeo-Christian conflict as explaining variable for early Christian anti-Judaism/antisemitism. For a theoretical reflection on the notion of conflict in scholarship, cf. Mayer 2013.

⁴⁶⁸ see Parkes 1934: 119; Marcus 1999: 116; Boyarin 2004. The break-away of “Christianity” from “Judaism” with its peculiar insistence on continuity originates in Christian communities outside of Judea. It took the demise of the older Judean power-base, the development of a proto-Catholic doctrine and its rise to political dominance to force this perspective on other Christians as well. In delineation from “heretics” such as Marcion and from syncretistic practices, post-Nicaean Christianity adopted the strategy of appropriating Jewish scriptures and prophecy, depreciating empirical Judaism and shifting a Christian ritual conduct to the Gentile framework.

⁴⁶⁹ see Case 1923: 38ff.; Baron 1952: 67; Isaac 1968: 74; Flusser 1969: 225.

15:1, 5). Further evidence can be found in the fact that other Jews do not seem to have regarded the early Christ believers as apostates or even “heretics”. Their believe in Jesus as the Messiah did not put them outside the fold of Judaism.

The same can be said of Paul. While his soteriological interpretation of the figure of Jesus and his insistence on a law-free Gospel marks an important and disputed development, he continued to accept two gospels as legitimate – one for the Jews and one for the Gentiles (see Gal. 1:6; 2:7; 2 Cor. 11:4⁴⁷⁰). After all, Paul argued for the *inclusion* of the Gentiles into the old covenant. The second century and the debate between Marcion and proto-Catholic apologists marks the point when “Paul” reemerges as an authority for a Gentile Christian position. While Marcion referred to Paul to authorize his rejection of Judaism, the proto-Catholic side claimed Paul as a figure demonstrating the continuity of a non-Jewish Christianity with Jewish prophecy. In a way, then, Christianity had to leave the fold of Judaism before passages in Paul’s epistles and other writings could be re-interpreted as part of an anti-Jewish self-construction.

The demise of Judean Christianity did not correspond directly with the radical rejection of Jewish practices. Rather, early Christian writers of the first and second century, such as Justin Martyr, still tolerated ritual observance within their communities as they were situated within a heterodox religious framework that included multiple interpretations of the faith. It is not unlikely to assume that many Christians continued to regard themselves as Jewish and adhered at least to parts of the Jewish rituals. Only with the Council of Nicaea in 325 C.E. a group of Christians rose to power that introduced measures to separate Christianity from Judaism and strove to stratify the existing faith. The fact that these changes met opposition within the Christian communities can be taken as further evidence for the idea that the Nicaean agreement expresses the position of a specific party within Christianity that was by no means shared by all early Christians.

Traces of this struggle are detectable until the end of the fourth century (see Simon 1986: 316) and beyond, e.g. in polemics of proto-Catholic authors such as Chrysostom trying to enforce the decisions of Nicaea. The same authors established the term “Judaizing” by the second century to counter internal competition and to install their perspective⁴⁷¹.

⁴⁷⁰ Consider further the passages where Paul speaks of “my” gospel in Rom. 16:25; 1 Cor. 15:1; 2 Cor. 4:3; Gal 1:11; 2:2, see Smith 1957: 124, fn. 25.

⁴⁷¹ It is important to note that the term draws its rhetoric strength from an anti-Jewish bias already established among those early writers. If matters connected to “the Jews” would have been encountered with more leniency, it would have been a purely descriptive term and as such unfit for polemical employment.

Likewise, the term “heresy” was defined with respect to the degree of Judaism – too much was called “Judaizing”, too little “Gnosticism” (see Koester 1980: 393-401⁴⁷²). Simon and other scholars sharing the conflictual assumption tend to assume that “Judaizing” denotes a relatively stable phenomenon threatening the church and *causing* her anti-Jewish reactions⁴⁷³. Wilken concludes accordingly: “The virulence of Christian anti-Semitism is a sign of the vitality of Judaism in the later empire” (Wilken 1967: 328).

While conceptions of and attitudes towards “Jewish” influences alternate considerably even among Patristic authors, the Council of Nicaea 325 C.E. marks the triumph of an intolerant form of Christianity. The present study has argued that it is no surprise that the fourth century saw an intensification of the crusade against “Judaizing”. Christian authors now became increasingly intolerant of any form of heterodoxy or religious diversity within their own communities. A developing Christian Orthodoxy started to define its own faith by increasingly strict standards and constructed groups as out-groups that had considered themselves Christian before. If this assumption is correct, “Judaizing” does not refer to a stable group of Christian “Judaizers” pressuring Christian writers to defend themselves and their faith. Rather, it testifies to the development of Catholic dogma that employed the term “Judaizing” to push its agenda. Boyarin comments:

⁴⁷² On the “making of heretics”, cf. Burrus 1995; Lyman 1997; King 2003.

⁴⁷³ see Simon 1986: 145, 239; cf. Wilken 1967: 328; Ruether 1997: 170-172; Gager 1983: 118; Feldman 1993: 288ff. Simon assumes that the intensity of Christian anti-Judaism correlates with the intensity of proselytizing activity and anti-Christian actions of the “real Jews” (see Simon 1986: 233). In the introduction to her book *Augustine and the Jews* (2010), Paula Fredriksen distinguishes three positions as to the question of Jewish proselytizing regarding the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature. The maximalist approach taken by Simon supposes that anti-Jewish Christian polemic plus actual conversions provides for a fierce opposition between a Jewish and Christian mission. A second approach represented by J. Carleton Paget (2010b) develops a middle ground by assuming a partial mission of some Jews at some places (see Paget 2010b: 179f.). The third approach Fredriksen calls “minimalist” is advocated by Binder (2012: 207) and Fredriksen herself. It assumes that Jewish-Christian contacts, controversy and conversions do not supply sufficient evidence to conclude upon vigorous opposition (see Fredriksen 2010: XVIII, fn. 8; for more sources, consult Mason 2006: 139f.). In an earlier essay, Fredriksen sums up her own position as follows: “Jews did not need to advertise their activities to incite pagan interest, and the missionary position is both untenable and unnecessary as an explanation for it” (Fredriksen 2003: 56). If indeed there were sporadic and local cases of Jewish proselytizing, Fredriksen argues, this “cannot have provided the white-hot competition that supposedly accounts [...] for the ubiquity and hostility of the *contra Iudaeos* tradition” (ibid.). In addition to Fredriksen’s categories, Stéphanie E. Binder thinks that an active group of Jewish missionaries among Christians is an unlikely presence, commenting: “[N]either biblical nor traditional Judaism has ever advocated the notion of proselytism, in other words, Judaism has never had a mission to convert people to Judaism” (Binder 2012: 207). Supported by scholars such as Martin Goodman (Goodman 1994; 2007a) and Shaye J. D. Cohen (2010a, b), Binder rejects the notion that a concerted Jewish proselytizing took place among Gentiles. She continues: “It was only around 1900 that it became taken for granted that it was part of the essence of Judaism to be missionary. This was under the influence of Protestant and sometimes antisemitically-oriented scholarship, that wanted to see in Judaism’s proselytism the source of Christian missionary endeavours. The stance that Judaism was missionary and prepared the field for Christianity gained strength among scholars. But modern scholars deny that this characterises early Judaism” (Binder 2012: 207). This underlines yet again that the idea that Christian missionary practice grew out of Judaism and that Jewish proselytizing provoked Christian anti-Judaism is a contested assumption, based on a highly problematic theoretical framework (cf. fn. 474).

“The self-definition by certain Christians of Christianity over and against Judaism and the self-definition of orthodoxy as opposed to heresy are closely linked, for much of what goes under the name of heresy in these early Christian centuries consists in one variety or another of Judaizing, or, sometimes the opposite, as in the case of Marcion, of denying any connection with the Bible and the ‘Jewish’ God. *Heresy, then, is always defined with reference to Judaism*” (Boyarin 2004: 12, italics M.C.).

The same is true for the term “Judaizing” at times appearing as polemical accusation against “fellow Christians who were thought to be too attached to some aspect or other of Jewish ritual or tradition” (Taylor 1995: 40), at others it serves to defame the opposing theoretical positions in an inner-Christian discussions (e.g. Tertullian calling Marcion a “Judaizer” and vice versa⁴⁷⁴). This terminological flexibility is especially notable because a detachment of “the Jews” from any perceivable connection to Judaism hints to the fact that its employment is motivated by factors other than the empirical encounter. The present study has demonstrated that one of those factors lies within the specific development of proto-Catholic dogma.

8.1.2 Discursive and Empirical “Jews” – Image and Reality

“[N]either the Christian adoption of Israel, the church’s use of the Septuagint and Jewish exegetical practices, nor its use of so-called ‘traditional Jewish teachings’ confirms ongoing social contact between the church and the synagogue. These practices quickly became a part of the tradition carried by the church and were perpetuated because they were Christian; that is, because they belonged to the church, rather than because they were Jewish” (Spence 2004: 9)

For Simon, a common recourse to the Jewish scriptures proves that an actual controversy with empirical Jews must be behind the *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition (see Simon 1986: 146, 172f.). Referring to the dialogues as a frequent trope in this type of literature, Simon concludes pointedly:

“A controversy over scripture can only have started between Jews and Christians, were the opposing sides were agreed in recognizing the authority of scripture, and where both laid claim to it as their own” (ibid.: 138⁴⁷⁵).

⁴⁷⁴ see Harnack 1883: 64; Baron 1964: 8; Taylor 1995: 182.

⁴⁷⁵ To be sure, Simon recognizes the possibility of another explanation – a “convention of directing apologetic against the Jews” (Simon 1986: 138) – but this possibility subsequently drops out of sight. Neusner supplies an alternative explanation for this seeming confrontation, noting that discussions were

Simon apparently assumes that the very fact that a body of Christian anti-Jewish literature exists supplies considerable evidence for the active and threatening presence of Judaism during the first centuries. A negative portrayal of the discursive “Jews” must therefore reflect an empirical Jewish aggression – if Christian authors agitate against “the Jews”, there must be some truth to it (see *ibid.*: 138; 145). While the present study rejects this idea of direct proportionality between discursive “Jews” and empirical Jews, Simon strikes a chord assuming the discursive “Jews” are motivated by factors outside of the text. However, the behaviour of empirical Jews may well be the worst external factor available to explain this discursive development. While a Christian-Jewish encounter most probably did take place, it does not need to be considered *causal* for the development of a proto-Catholic Christian episteme of antisemitism.

Adolf von Harnack was among the first to assume that “the Jews” in Christian anti-Jewish writing do not reflect real Jews but mere “straw men” of the Christian argumentation (see Harnack 1883: 63). Since then, many scholars have worked to validate Harnack’s assumptions⁴⁷⁶. The discursive image of “the Jews” as it appears in Christian writings is dominated by a reference to the Jewish scriptures and a desire to stress a specific theological interpretation. The most apparent conclusion would therefore be that the image of “the Jews” depends on the author’s theological position. The present study has indeed demonstrated a degree of interdependence between theological position and portrayal of “the Jews”. If the respective author is arguing for the disconnection of the Jewish religion from the Christian message, his “Jews” emerge as adherents to the other God (e.g. Marcion); if the author wants to claim Jewish prophecy for his own faith, his “Jews” emerge as ignorant, vicious and spiteful subjects punished by God (e.g. Justin Martyr or Tertullian).

Towards the end of his *Verus Israel*, Simon assumes that the anti-Jewish writings were a “defensive reflex of the orthodox hierarchy” (Simon 1986: 232) against “the existence of the pro-Jewish sentiments among the [Christian] laity” (*ibid.*). This he calls the “real explanation” (*ibid.*) for Christian antisemitism. On the next page, however, he concludes

based on the same terms and tradition *insofar as the Christian authors laid claim to them*. He comments “by confrontation I mean not actual face-to-face discourse but substantive debate, each party speaking to its own group in its own idiom, to be sure, on issues defined in the same terms, through the medium of the same modes of argument, with appeal to the same facts” (Neusner 1987: 1). As Christianity and Judaism confronted common political challenges, Neusner argues, they engaged in a debate in which “different people [were] talking to different people about some of the same things” (*ibid.*: 4).

⁴⁷⁶ see Moore (1921); Parkes (1934); Tränkle (1964); Flannery (1965); Frend (1976); Ruether (1979); Rokeah (1982) and Taylor (1995).

“the most compelling reason for anti-Semitism was the religious vitality of Judaism” (Simon 1986: 232) whose extreme forms “can only be explained in terms of a still active [Jewish] proselytizing movement” (Simon 1986: 233). Taken together, those two assessments do not add up. Either was “Judaizing” a term emerging because of an internal struggle *or* the religious vitality of Judaism caused the accusation.

Simon remains curiously blurry on this question, somehow assuming that both is true – theological over-determination and empirical confrontation. The multi-causal explanation Simon implies (but does not outline) would need (a) a conception of antisemitism that assumes the empirical Jews to be causal for its development, (b) a conception of the relationship between the semantic and the empirical sphere⁴⁷⁷ and (c) a model to link the two to the production of discourses such as the *Adversus Iudaeos* (see e.g. Lieu 1996). Simon fails to provide any of those theoretical aspects to substantiate his hypothesis leading him to contradictory statements such as the one above. Scholarship has moved on since Simon to support a strong scepticism towards identifying the “Jews” in Christian writing with any contemporary group of Jews. The same is true for the idea of Jewish “persecution”, a *terminus technicus* until recently (refuted by Stegemann/Stegemann 1997: 292f.⁴⁷⁸).

Simon and Kampling may well be right when remarking that the mere fact “the Jews” are dissimilar from the empirical Jews does not prove their absence (see Kampling 1984: 16; Simon 1986: 130, 140). This partial overlapping of image and reality is not only probable, it is even necessary if the sample-group is large enough (there will always be Jewish child-murderers if the n-group is large enough and the observation lasts long enough). The

⁴⁷⁷ Simon does not seem to have any conception for the difference between a semantic and a historical level of analysis: “Whether they [the opponents of *Adversus Iudaeos*] were Jews or Judaizers matters little, for in either case it is Judaism which this literature is taking to task. Whether it is firsthand or secondhand Judaism is of no importance” (Simon 1986: 173). One wonders how this lack of distinction could in turn be used author to support the strong hypothesis of an enduring *empirical* Christian-Jewish competition. If “in either case it is Judaism which this literature is taking to task”, one should further explore what reason there is for the developing depreciation of Jewish ritual and the fierce claim to Jewish scriptures among proto-Catholic authors.

⁴⁷⁸ For the problematic aspects that accompany the idea of an active “Jewish persecution” consider also Richardson: “Jewish persecution [...] because it was originally an *intra muros* controversy, played a more creative role than did Roman opposition. The latter was concerned with Christianity only after it became separate, the former helped to make it a separate entity and to see that it was recognized as such by the Roman authorities” (Richardson 1969: 47). Put in simpler terms, Richardson argues that Jewish persecution plays a decisive function for the creation of a Christianity outside of the synagogue. One should be very careful to reproduce the Christian narrative by drawing “a direct line between the part played by the Jews in the death of Jesus and their part in the subsequent persecutions of those who followed him” (ibid.: 46). Parkes’ seminal work on the other hand demonstrates that a position highlighting the intertextual nature of an image of the Jews does not exclude an affirmative conclusion on the question of Jewish proselytizing (see Parkes 1934: 95f. vs. 107-114). The crucial question lies in the assumed causality between both factors. While Parkes seems to refrain from identifying the one with the other, Simon concludes the opposite.

current work raises doubts as to the causal relevance this overlapping has as an explanatory variable for the emergence of a Christian episteme of antisemitism⁴⁷⁹. The question raised is therefore not whether some information on empirical Judaism could be derived from Christian writing. The works of Simon, Lieu and others demonstrate that those texts indeed serve as important albeit partisan sources for a reconstruction of a Jewish reality. The interest of the present work lies in a conception of antisemitism that can explain the emergence of an episteme of antisemitism without reference to the empirical Jews.

8.1.3 An Episteme of Antisemitism – Towards an Alternative Causality

“Therefore, it is not sufficient to study *both* history and discourse. It is the history of Christian discourse, its transformations throughout the first centuries, which must stand at the core of our research if we are to understand the paradoxical radicalization of anti-Judaism in theological discourse over time” (Stroumsa 1996: 17)

From the early writings in Paul to the Gospels, from their appropriation in Marcion to the *Adversus Iudaeos* literature the present study has aimed to reconstruct the process in which “the Jews” became central for proto-Catholic theology. Reviewing this process, one is led to the conclusion that this development was not without alternative. A proto-Catholic episteme of antisemitism did not result from a kind of birth trauma or natural necessity. Its increasing centrality and intensity resulted from a series of historical events, emerging as a strategy to fend off competing claims to the Christian truth and to stabilize proto-Catholic identity and communities. This development was triggered by a continued claim to Jewish prophecy from an increasingly non-Jewish position. The intensification of anti-Jewish polemics at a time when the Jewish legal status was already deteriorating (most clearly that’s the case in Chrysostom) underlines the causal detachment of the discursive Jews from any empirical group of Jews. “The Jews” had become a strategic discursive element in a bid for internal stratification of post-Nicaean Christianity.

⁴⁷⁹ In their daily contact, the relationship between Jews and Christian appears to have been more lenient than the polemics suggest (see Parks 1934: 118f.). As demonstrated in the case of Chrysostom, the Patristics themselves are the carriers and aggravators of an anti-Jewish Christian theology “whose aggressive [sic] rhetoric helped transform anti-Jewish theological argument into what can be called antisemitic prejudice” (Stroumsa 1996: 20).

Considering the topos of Jewish persecution. The correspondence-theory would ask how and why this image appears on the discursive level by turning to the empirical behavior of Jewish groups: Where and how did Jews persecute Christians? The analysis would go on defining a group of “Jews” and some factors sufficient to justify the charge of persecution (or for “killing Jesus” or for “worshipping the devil”). This would necessarily decenter alternative explanations for this charge such as intertextual elements (“the Jews” persecuted Jesus), theological elements (“the Jews” have always persecuted their prophets) or socio-political strategies (accusing “the Jews” instead of the Roman authorities for persecution⁴⁸⁰).

The correspondence-theory assumes a controlled relationship between discursive elements and empirical reality. While such a relationship does exist in science, it does not in antisemitism. Instead, this analysis argues that the *suggestion* of correspondence between discursive elements and reality is central for antisemitism. Treating the actions of empirical Jews as an implicit or explicit variable for the development of anti-Judaism/antisemitism perpetuates this antisemitic suggestion. This study has taken a different path. From its results can conclude that “the Jews” derive their shape from different discursive sources (e.g. Jewish scriptures, Christian writings, Gentile prejudices) and serve multiple functions in the respective texts and their (re-)interpretation. Ultimately, a correspondence-theoretical framework lacks a conception dimension to grasp this difference between discourse, empirical reality and the changing position of “the Jew” to both.

The present study maintains that the “material drawn from life” (Simon 1986: 130) is already the result of selection and interpretation. This goes well with the observation that early Christian texts are marked by a remarkable continuity of themes and accusations associated with “the Jews”. Even if these authors sometimes refer to empirical events, they integrate those events into a preordained mode of interpretation and depiction. The pattern betrays the affiliation of the *Adversus Iudaeos* tradition with an episteme of antisemitism. The images and themes relevant for this discursive object (“the Jews”) derive from a tradition of Christological writing (see Ruether 1997: 123). The persistence and intensification of anti-Judaism testifies to the perpetuation of this textual tradition. In this way, the methodology presented in this study aims to integrate the separation of the discursive from the empirical “Jews”. This implies a shift that scholarship has only

⁴⁸⁰ Munck remarks that the mistake of this method of conclusion “besteht darin, dass man Rückschlüsse von einer Wirkung zur einer ganz bestimmten Ursache zieht und dabei übersieht, dass die Wirkung auch die Folge einer ganz anderen Ursache sein könnte” (Munck 1954: 264).

recently started to explore (see Taylor 1995; Nirenberg 2013).

Proto-Catholic discourses are functional in at least three respects – they are apologetic by opposing inner-Christian rivals or refuting Roman charges, they carry socio-political relevance by providing a framework for internal cohesion and external proselytization and they are theological by promoting a certain perspective on Christianity highlighting continuity with Jewish prophecy while at the same time refuting the Jewishness of Christianity. A sensibility for these aspects in the respective text implies a focus on intertextuality deriving its structure from a mix of intertextual recognition and rejection, e.g. a positive reference to Jewish scriptures and a refutation of Marcionite Christianity. This work has aimed to demonstrate that an analysis sensitive to those dynamics can supply an alternative and in parts even better explanation for why “the Jews” *moved* to the center of proto-Catholic writing during the first four centuries. It also helps explain why an anti-Jewish polemic intensified at a point in time when empirical Judaism had already lost most of its former privileges.

Would the episteme of antisemitism emerging by the beginning of the second century have remained within the limited scope of early Christian communities, it would not have come to play a crucial part in European and world history. The present work has reconstructed how a series of loosely related events led to the subsequent rise of this school of religious thought to Roman state religion. This process not only had a strong impact on the structure of the Church; the universalism of the victorious group also became a part of the Roman Empire. Its specific and peculiar self-construction around “the Jews” subsequently became a general feature of an Occidental (Christian) perception of world and self. It is this universality of an epistemic level that I want to call a dispositive. I can now return to the question asked at the onset of this work: Why the Jews? If the antisemitism dispositive lies at the very heart of Western power and subjectation it also explains the constant availability of “the Jews” for a conception of world and self. The last part of this work outlines some of the main methodological tenets lying behind the idea of an antisemitism dispositive.

8.2 The Antisemitism Dispositive

Why is it that “the Jews” remain at the center of perception? It has been noted at the beginning of this work that an answer depends on the theoretical model one assumes for antisemitism. Such a model is both necessary and indispensable if one wants to formulate any hypothesis regarding its emergence and dissemination of antisemitism. Even if a hypothesis is not formulated *expressis verbis*, it still accompanies every work implicitly manifesting in the variable the scholar chooses (and omits), the time-frame it sets or the terminology it employs. Of course, this also includes the present work. The title of it, “The Antisemitism Dispositive”, suggests a post-structuralist methodology. Indeed, the analysis above has implicitly ventured to demonstrate the applicability and potential of such a model.

What is antisemitism and why does it pertain? Is it because of the inclination of an individual and its refusal to accept the complexities of the modern world (Horkheimer/Adorno)? Is it inextricably bound to the national state (Klaus Holz)? Is it the – at least partial – result of a Jewish encounter with a dominant society with both sides sharing responsibility (Hannah Arendt, Marcel Simon)? As laid out, the approach adopted for the present analysis does not follow a psychological model focusing on motivations, dispositions, intents and subconscious motives of a subject or a group. It also does not refer to a correspondence-theoretical model that understands antisemitism as originating in historical experiences with the empirical Jews. Rather, it defines antisemitism as an order of knowledge, an episteme structuring the perception of self and world of the respective authors and their audiences.

With this concluding section, I want to outline the theoretical framework of the antisemitism dispositive that underlies the present work. Besides the works of Michel Foucault, this conceptual outline is indebted to Daniel Boyarin’s *Border Lines* (2004) and his insistence on the epistemic dimension of knowledge (see *ibid.*: 4) as well as Karen King’s *What is Gnosticism* (2003) and her combination of Foucault’s discourse analysis with Bourdieu’s notion of habitus (see *ibid.*: 239-247).

8.2.1 Discursive Formations – Formations of Antisemitism

The following methodology is based on the conceptual work of the French philosopher Michel Foucault. It draws mainly from Foucault's most comprehensive methodological work *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Foucault 2010, originally published in 1969 as *L'archéologie du savoir*). Foucault defines *discourse* as “the group of statements that belong to a single system of formation” (Foucault 2010: 107). This *group of statements* can be called a discourse if they occur in a field outlined and regulated by certain finite, generative rules. Those *rules of formation* are defined as a system of relations “that govern[...] a group of verbal performances” (ibid.: 116) within a given spatio-temporal context. Rules of formations constitute the basic principle of a discursive formation insofar as they confine the field of possible occurrences and regulate the specific modes of dispersion, distribution and transformation for a group of statements. Thus, the rules of formation are not so much a set of definite rules than an organizing principle.

This organizing principle derives from *discursive practices*. Foucault defines those practices not as enunciations but as the practical side to the rules of formation, “a body of anonymous, historical rules, [...] determined in the time and space that have defined a given period” (Foucault 2010: 117). Thereby, Foucault underlines that those enunciations (and the discursive elements thereby produced) are always situated “within a given social, economic, geographical, or linguistic area” (ibid.; i.e. the specific functions “the Jews” perform in each text against an episteme of antisemitism governing their appearance⁴⁸¹). Discursive practices set “the conditions of operation of the enunciative function” (ibid.), regulating the dispersion of discursive objects and outlining a field of possible statements (see ibid.: 115).

Once numbers of statements follow a regulated mode of dispersion, they constitute a discursive formation defined as “the general enunciative system that governs a group of

⁴⁸¹ King stresses that an insistence on the work a certain formation performs does not necessarily imply a functionalist approach. Rather, “it avoids essentialism in that religious expressions such as myth are understood to be socially constructed; it avoids a purely functionalist approach in that the construction of myth is understood within the dynamics of Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus*. [...] The practices of meaning-making are always involved in constructing, deconstructing, and reconstructing the structures of *habitus*, in reinscribing and contesting the power relations of the divisions of the social order. Yet consciousness of what one is doing is always limited by the constraints of *habitus*, by one’s acceptance of the way things are” (King 2003: 241). Thus King agrees with essentialists “that religion has a basis in social and material reality, a reality that is by no means entirely arbitrary” (ibid.). At the same time, she sides with functionalists that “religious practices are directed toward and achieve certain ends” (ibid.) that are at the same time deliberate (because authors want something) and unconscious (because they reproduce the structure of the *habitus*).

verbal performances” (ibid.: 116). While the rules of formation and discursive practices therefore determine the frame for a discursive formation, the formation itself is never a full realization of those rules (see ibid.: 67; i.e. while the antisemitism dispositive supplies continuity to the emergence of formations of antisemitism, each formation takes a specific shape that distinguishes it from other formations such as Sovjet communist and National Socialist antisemitism). As discourses are merely partial manifestations of the rules of formation underlying those practices the method of discursive analysis always supplies a secondary and thus incomplete image. A discursive analysis of antisemitism means dealing with the effects of a structure of antisemitism.

Within the framework of a discursive formation, statements coalesce around a number of themes, concepts and objects (e.g. “the Jews”) that tend to assume specific positions and perform specific functions in relation to other discursive and non-discursive fields. Determining a “principle of vacuity [...], a distribution of gaps, voids, absences, limits, divisions” (ibid.: 119), discursive practices do not only regulate the possible places and forms in which statements can occur but also their silences (i.e. what can and cannot be said about “the Jews” in Christian writings of a certain period?). Such a “limited system of presences” (ibid.) is governed by three elements: (1) its surfaces of emergence, (2) its position with regard to other discursive and non-discursive fields and (3) its relevance for strategies of power.

- (1) Discursive elements are constructed on the *surfaces of emergence* (see Foucault 2002: 226). Those surfaces are found locally at the level of family, work environment, immediate social groups, religious community, etc. but also within a more general frame such as science, art, media, economy, politics, medicine or the system of law. In the context of the current work, “the Jews” appear in early Christian theologizing (surface of emergence). The discursive practice is then governed by the connection of the surfaces to “specific authorities” (ibid.: 66) deriving from the field of legality, tradition, and education.
- (2) Any discursive formation or any one of its elements can potentially be used in other discursive and non-discursive fields. If such an inclusion takes place, the elements gain a specific and new function (see ibid.: 68). As a result, a field of discursive relations is created between the formation and the *surfaces of application* on which the discursive practice appears. In the present work, I have frequently pointed to the functional variability of “the Jews” as discursive elements in different fields like theology, politics or social dynamics such as

group-cohesion or the integration of new converts.

- (3) On a more abstract level, Foucault stresses that each discursive practice also serves as a “tactical element[...]” (Foucault 1998: 101) within various strategies of power determining the “regulated ways [...] of practising the possibilities of discourse” (Foucault 2010: 70). With regard to the context of this work, this function may be found in the complicity of a discourse and “the Jews” and modes of subjection in the Christian Church as well as, from the fourth century onwards, the Roman Empire.

There is only a limited manifestation of the rules of formation on the surface of the discourses (i.e. while an episteme of antisemitism determines the body of knowledge on “the Jews”, this knowledge never fully manifests itself). This limited manifestation provides for the specific order that makes a discourse speak of specific objects in a specific way (see *ibid.*: 46; e.g. “the Jews” are constructed as the “evil world” in John’s binary outlook, while they appear as “heretics” in texts directed against Marcion). The partial manifestation of discursive practices thus participates in the process of *forming* objects and putting them in order by a set of “relations established between authorities of emergence, delimitation, and specification” (*ibid.*: 44). It is in this sense that discourses and their regulative system (rules of formation/discursive practices) are “a totality, in which the dispersion of the subject and his discontinuity with himself may be determined” (*ibid.*: 55).

What about the author of the text? Foucault does not exclude the subject from his analysis but aims at a relocation of his/her position within the framework of discursive practices. Asking for the specific “positions and functions that the subject could occupy in the diversity of discourse” (*ibid.*: 200), Foucault maintains that a specific discursive practice allows only for certain subject-positions (e.g. Christian/Gentile/Jew, doctor/patient/visitor, man/woman etc.). Discursive practices thus constitute a framework for the position subjects can assume once they enter the formation. This point has been illustrated in the present study by way of a dual structure within inner-Christian debates from the second century onwards – the “right” side refers to itself as “Christian”, while the opposing side is accused as a “Jew” or “Judaizer” of some sorts.

Following Foucault in that “any discursive practice may be defined by the knowledge that it forms” (*ibid.*: 183), a *formation of antisemitism* should be defined as an order of knowledge as far as it forms knowledge on “the Jews”. Foucault notes that such

“knowledge” is always situated within discursive practices and therefore related to strategies of power (see Foucault 1998: 98). This body of knowledge, Foucault maintains, “is not an expression that more or less adequately ‘reflects’ a number of ‘objective data’ or real practices” (Foucault 2010: 194). Rather, it is “inscribed [...] in the field of different practices in which it finds its specificity, its functions, and its network of dependencies” (ibid.). A formation of antisemitism should always be analyzed with reference to its discursive and non-discursive environment.

8.2.2 On Genealogy – Emergence and Dissemination

For Foucault, an analysis of the contemporary shape of a formation of antisemitism should be amended by a genealogical analysis. The adoption of such a temporal perspective allows for the extraction of a pattern of coexistence, succession, and intervention between predating and coeval discursive events (see Foucault 2010: 57). The adoption of a genealogical perspective enables the scholar to trace the shifting relations between the surfaces of emergence and application, i.e. its function in different discursive and non-discursive fields (such as the shifting function of antisemitism in different surfaces of application over the first centuries). Underlining the historicity of an episteme of antisemitism also means stressing the contingent character of this formation of early Catholic antisemitism. This perspective has led me to refute the notion of birth trauma or other arguments of necessity for the emergence of early Christian antisemitism.

A genealogical perspective allows the scholar to determine (1) the functional position of the formation in its socio-historical context (e.g. to refute Marcionism or to solve socio-political problems) and (2) the shifting relations between discursive elements and their patterns of dissemination (e.g. a shifting centrality of “the Jews” in Christian discourse, its growing intensity and changing referents). A discursive formation constitutes and is constituted by discursive practices that “give[...] rise to the chance series of these events and fix[...] its limits” (Foucault 2010: 229). This implies that a certain perspective on Christology, with the Jews at its center, restricts the enunciations and possible actions that can be performed (thus severely restricting any chance of engaging in Christian theology without accepting its episteme of antisemitism). At the same time, “the Jews” as discursive objects of Christian theology may appear unaltered on the discursive surface for decades but still shift their position within an over-all power-strategy or regarding

other fields of application.

This process can be illustrated by the incremental expansion of the surface of application from inner-Christian matters to a wider legal and socio-political sphere during the fourth century. While the surface of the discourse does not necessarily change, its function certainly does. This underlines the importance of an analysis that is dedicated not only to the surface of emergence but also to the functions a certain discourse performs – its surface of application. As has been argued at the beginning of this work, this double-focus on emergence and application sheds doubt on the practicability of the distinction between anti-Judaism and antisemitism as far as they are considered to differ only by their surface of emergence (leaving the Shoah to one side, a difference in *impact* for modern vs. classical modes of Jew-hatred is hard to maintain⁴⁸²).

Discursive formations do not establish homogeneous series of discursive events as they maintain a polyvalent character. The same formula may be re-utilized for shifting surfaces of application (e.g. the Jewish, Marcionite and Orthodox “Paul”) just as there may exist contradictory currents within the same text (see Foucault 1998: 102). This has been demonstrated above in a critique of Gager’s heuristic: While a polemic may appear to use intra-Jewish arguments, it may only echo an earlier discourse. Furthermore, a proto-Catholic perspective would employ Jewish arguments in order to maintain its claim to continuity, not to underline its inner-Jewish position. Rather, a simultaneous emphasis of continuity (with the Jewish prophecy) and denigration (of the Jewish people) becomes the very feature of proto-Catholic anti-Judaism/antisemitism. A frequent reference to Jewish scriptures and prophecy is no evidence for an internal position. From the perspective of this work, discursive events are understood as “tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations” (ibid.: 101f.).

An analysis of temporal shifts occurring within formations of antisemitism, then, does not only imply an analysis of the way formations of antisemitism generate new objects or alter old ones. Likewise, it does not merely refer to the way a discursive event is extended to surfaces of application formerly untouched. Although both aspects are necessary features to such an analysis, the scholar should also scrutinize the discursive events regarding their function in other (non-)discursive fields on two levels: “their tactical

⁴⁸² An insistence on the racist nature of modern antisemitism (versus religious anti-Judaism) concentrates merely on the surface of emergence, not its application. This is especially problematic regarding the current period of analysis – while the surface of emergence remains in the religious field, its application varies substantially.

productivity” (ibid.: 102) in relation to power/knowledge and “their strategical integration” (ibid.) as local tactics into an over-all power-strategy. Thus, the analysis of the emergence of antisemitism in proto-Catholic Christianity also asked in what way a specific appropriation of “Paul” as anti-Jewish served the emerging Orthodox framework.

In this scheme, an analysis of the position of discourses within a network of surrounding discursive and non-discursive fields helps to understand their emergence and the specific position “the Jews” assume in this arrangement. To what specific needs does a shift in the discursive elements, their introduction into a new field or disappearance on an old one reply? In what way is their application a tactical integration for a new problem? Such were the questions that led analysis when turning to the proto-Catholic employment of “the Jews” in the struggle with Marcion just as it inspires a reassessment of Luke-Acts in this struggle. It further allows for an exploration of the role “the Jews” may have played in a quest to generate social cohesion among the many members of the developing Christian Church.

Drawing on Foucault's outline of his procedure in *Discipline and Punish* (Foucault 1991) and concluding the previous thoughts on methodology consider the following guideline for analysis:

- (1) Do not concentrate the analysis on the “principles of classification, ordering and distribution” (Foucault 2010: 220) of objects alone. Rather, “the Jews” as discursive objects of antisemitic formations should be analyzed regarding the “complex social function” (Foucault 1991: 23) they perform, i.e. their response to a certain need, their connection to other (non-)discursive fields of application and other “positive and useful effects which it is their task to support” (ibid.: 24).
- (2) Regard discursive practices not simply as consequences of social, economic or national issues but as discursive practices “possessing their own specificity” (ibid.: 23), i.e. their own modes of rarity, productivity and historical dissemination. “Jews” do not only perform social functions. Their shape also depends on a discursive genealogy they carry along. As antisemitism performs vital functions for societies, it also follows its own rules of formation.
- (3) Look for the similarities that the history of the antisemitism dispositive shares with the history of other discursive series (e.g. with human sciences, history, politics and the development of the juridical sphere): Do these series overlap? Is there a third variable, a common matrix under which these series and their history

can be united (for Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* it is the way in which the body became “invested by power relations”, *ibid.*: 24)?

- (4) Consider antisemitic formations less as manifestations of animosity against the empirical or discursive Jews and more as integral parts of overall processes of subjectation, i.e. the way in which power inscribes itself into the individual and produces it as a governed subject with a stable identity. Had proto-Catholicism indeed aimed their polemics towards empirical Jews, their relevance in discourse would have faded with the political relevance of the empirical Jews. The endurance of discourses *Adversus Iudaeos* points to a wider function of which this work has pointed out a few.

8.2.3 The Antisemitism Dispositive

At the onset of this work, antisemitism has been defined as an episteme, i.e. a universe of possible knowledge within which things are said and thought. The work has traced how this episteme was slowly established as “the Jews” moved to the center of (proto Catholic) Christian theologizing and an ever-more useful in internal Christian debates and a potent tool for socio-political challenges. It has been argued that this episteme surpasses the level of the dispositive only at a point when a Catholic perspective becomes the universal perspective within Christianity and, ultimately, the Roman Empire. The concept of the antisemitism dispositive as developed in this work grants a measure of continuity to the episteme. It conceptualizes how an episteme of antisemitism becomes a general feature of an Occidental Christian perception of world and self and thus a feature of European subjectivation. Its potential as a conceptual approach lies in its potential to reply to the question: *Why the Jews?*

Foucault defines the *dispositive* as an apparatus, i.e. the system of relations between heterogeneous elements “consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions” (Foucault 1980: 194). Foucault extends this definition towards three directions: (1) In extension of the term “episteme” which he developed in *The Order of Things* (Foucault 2002) the “dispositive” aims to include discursive as well as non-discursive aspects. (2) The dispositive traces the interplay between these elements as “shifts of position and modifications of function” (Foucault

1980: 195) whose distribution may “vary [...] widely” (ibid.). (3) The dispositive is an apparatus that has “as its major function at a given historical moment that of responding to an *urgent need*” (ibid.).

From these three aspects, one can derive that (1) there is always a functional element to the reiteration of certain discursive elements, (2) the discursive elements may shift position and function while moving through the spacio-temporal sphere and (3) the dispositive also includes non-discursive elements such as architecture, images or music. Foucault seems to have intended to extend his notion of the episteme. The conceptual frame thus outlined confronts the question of an antisemitic discursive practice on a level that is both, more abstract and more particular than concepts focusing on psychological conditions (of the subject or a group), the semantic level of antisemitic discourses, or the correspondence-theoretical model of antisemitism that identifies the discursive object with empirical reality.

An analysis in the framework of the antisemitism dispositive focusses on specific local instances of discursive practices and the given socio-historical context in which they occur. It traces their connection with a surface of emergence and the functions it performs in other discursive and non-discursive fields (surface of application). Lastly, it identifies the universe of possible knowledge it generates as decisive threshold for the term “antisemitism” (epistemic threshold). Thus, the antisemitism dispositive replies to a question that is as pressing as the answer science has given remained unsatisfying: “The Jews” reappear through the ages, countries and political systems not only because of a psychic condition of the discriminating societies and subjects but because there is an episteme of antisemitism that supplies a body of knowledge on “the Jews”. This reservoir is not only easily accessed, it is also intimately connected to overall strategies of power, and thus, subjection. Since subjects are constructed through this power, antisemitism (just as racism or sexism) becomes a normal feature of a way to perceive the world. As a consequence, knowledge on the discursive “Jews” is clouded by an aura of authenticity making their employment ever more plausible and arbitrary in its employment by opposing forces.

Between a conception of eternal antisemitism and a conception highlighting historical context, the antisemitism dispositive occupies an intermediary position. On the phenomenological level, it insists on the singularity of any given case in its context. The manifestation of antisemitism always appears in its specific adoption in a respective

contemporary framework. At the same time, the dispositive also stresses that each manifestation of antisemitism draws from a body of (epistemic) knowledge stored in architecture, art and language, in science, politics and theology. Ultimately, the antisemitism dispositive supplies a model that helps to explain the availability of “the Jews” while allowing for the potential discontinuity between single formations of antisemitism. This potential to integrate both, variation and continuity, may well be its central amendment for a study on antisemitism.

8.3 Towards a Definition of Antisemitism?

“Jews, a Jew, can be God incarnate, they can be the devil incarnate (or his lieutenants); but they can never again be *merely* human beings. [...] What remains constant, even in large segments of the modern consciousness [...] is this transcendentalizing of ‘the Jews’” (Katz 1991: 49)

Christianity could have gone down many paths: It could have stayed a Jewish sect. It could have become entirely Pagan. It could have developed a middle ground that would have not been built on the rejection of Judaism but on an appreciation of its Jewish heritage and an estimation of Judaism as origin of its own faith. Regarding the emergence of early Christian antisemitism, scholars tend to underestimate the multiple and complex positions people chose for themselves; historical determination and conceptual consistency is usually formulated from the position of someone looking back. Considering the results of this work I am convinced that it is a mistake to assume things could not have turned out differently had another side prevailed.

When the present analysis set out to reconsider the intrinsic logic of determination underlying the conception of birth trauma it did so by noting that Christianity knew various kinds of relationships to Judaism. Marcion and Jewish Christianity are only two examples for the kinds of other streams in the multitude of early Christianity of which we know not - mostly because of the victory of Catholic Orthodox Christianity. However, the proto-Catholic victory was in fact so thorough that even present scholarship on this early period tends to liken its specific perspective on Judaism to the perspective of (Catholic and Orthodox) Christianity *per se*. What we must understand is that we have learned to look at those manifestations of antisemitism before and after the fourth century through the lens of a set episteme of antisemitism.

Analysis of antisemitism therefore needs to proceed carefully when identifying its variables as there is a risk that the approach it chooses reiterates the antisemitic knowledge that is written into the DNA of Western scholarship. Likewise, a study must consider the ways in which a given discursive formation establishes a field of dissemination and silence by itself (this is what Karen King means when pointing to the “limits of consciousness and intentionality”, see King 2003: 246). Ultimately, I want to maintain that there is no proper way to analyze antisemitism but many perspectives leading to multiple explanations. This, however, does not prove the futility of antisemitism studies. Rather, it is this variety of explanations that gives us an idea of the complexity of the phenomenon. I regard the multiplication of perspective as the core business of scholarship.

With this work, I have tried to induce a fresh, post-structuralist perspective on antisemitism. This has shed light on things that have remained in the shadow of the analytical spotlight for too long. At the same time, I am well aware of the limits and potential shortcomings accompanying this work. I thus want to end by expressing my hope that this thought will be taken up by other researchers. This, indeed, will have made this work worthwhile.

Bibliography

- Aichele, George, 2001: The Control of Biblical Meaning. Canon as Semiotic Mechanism. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania.
- Aland, Barbara, 1973: Marcion. Versuch einer neuen Interpretation. Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 70, Issue 4 (1973): 420-447.
- Aland, Barbara, 2001: Sünde und Erlösung bei Marcion und die Konsequenz für die sog. beiden Götter Marcions. p. 147-157 in: Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat (eds.), Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung. Marcion and His Impact on Church History. Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion. August 2001 in Mainz. Berlin und New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Alkier, Stefan, 2010: Neues Testament. Tübingen/Basel: A. Francke Verlag.
- Allert, Craig D., 2002: Revelation, Truth, Canon, and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue With Trypho. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Almog, Shmuel (ed.), 1988a: Antisemitism through the Ages. Translated by Nathan H. Reisner. Oxford/New York/Beijing: Pergamon Press.
- Almog, Shmuel (ed.), 1988b: Preface. p. ix-xi in: ibid. (ed.), Antisemitism through the Ages. Translated by Nathan H. Reisner. Oxford/New York/Beijing: Pergamon Press.
- Arendt, Hannah, 2008 [1986]: Elemente und Ursprünge totaler Herrschaft. Antisemitismus, Imperialismus, totale Herrschaft. München/Zürich: Piper Verlag.
- Ascough, Richard (ed.), 2005: Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Auchter, Thomas, 2004: Zur Psychoanalyse des Antisemitismus. Online: http://www.aixpaix.de/autoren/auchter/Referat_Auchter_0303.pdf (viewed 28.02.2012).
- Ayres, Lewis, 2004: Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Balás, David L., 1980: Marcion Revisited: A "Post-Harnack" Perspective. p. 95-108 in: W. Eugene March (ed.), Texts and Testaments. Critical Essays on the Bible and the Early Church Fathers. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.
- Barnard, L.W., 1964: The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr. Vol. 14, Fasc. 4 (1964): 394-406.
- Barnard, L.W., 1966: Justin Martyr. His Life and Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barnes, T. D., 1984 [1968]: Legislation against the Christians. p. 32-50 in: ibid., Early Christianity and the Roman Empire. London: Variorum Reprints.
- Barnes, Timothy D., 1981: Constantine and Eusebius. Cambridge/Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press.
- Barnes, Timothy David, 1985: Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study. Reissued with corrections and a postscript. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Barnes, Timothy, 2011: Constantine. Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire. Malden/Oxford/West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barnikol, Ernst, 1933: Die Entstehung der Kirche im zweiten Jahrhundert und die Zeit Marcions. Zweite Auflage. Kiel: Walter G. Muhlau Verlag.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer, 1946: Foreword. p. VII-IX in Koppel S. Pinson (ed.), Essays on Antisemitism. With a Foreword by Salo W. Baron. Second edition. Revised and Enlarged. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer, 1952: A Social and Religious History of the Jews. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Volume II. Christian Era: The First Five Centuries. New

- York: Columbia University Press.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer, 1962 [1952]: A Social and Religious History of the Jews. Volume I. To the Beginning of the Christian Era. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. New York/London: Columbia University Press.
 - Baron, Salo Wittmayer, 1964: History and Jewish Historians. Essays and Addresses. Compiled with a Foreword by Arthur Herzberg and Leon A. Feldman. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
 - Barth, Markus, 1968: Jews and Gentiles: The Social Character of Justification in Paul. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, Vol. 5 (1968): 241-267.
 - Barth, Markus, 1973: Die Stellung des Paulus zu Gesetz und Ordnung. *Evangelische Theologie* 33 (1973): 496-546.
 - Barth, Markus, 1977: Das Volk Gottes. Juden und Christen in der Botschaft des Paulus. p. 45-134 in: *ibid.* et al. (eds.), *Paulus - Apostat oder Apostel? Jüdische und christliche Antworten*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.
 - Barthes, Roland, 1997 [1988]: The Death of the Author. p. 142-148 in: *ibid.*, *Image – Music – Text*. Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
 - Barton, John, 1997: Holy Writings, Sacred Texts. The Canon in Early Christianity. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
 - Barton, John, 2002: Marcion Revisited. p. 341-354 in: Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
 - Bartsch, Hans-Werner, 1967: Die antisemitischen Gegner des Paulus im Römerbrief. p. 27-43 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Bauckham, Richard, 2007: James and the Jerusalem Community. p. 55-95 in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
 - Bauer, Bruno, 1843: *Die Judenfrage*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Otto Verlag.
 - Bauer, Walter, 1964 [1934]: *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage mit einem Nachtrag. Herausgegeben von Georg Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Bauer, Yehuda, 2003: Problems of Contemporary Antisemitism. Lecture given in 2003 by Yehuda Bauer, Jewish Studies at UC Santa Cruz. Online: <http://web.archive.org/web/20030705131522/http://humanities.ucsc.edu/JewishStudies/docs/YBauerLecture.pdf> (viewed 21.02.13).
 - Baum, Gregory, 1963: *Die Juden und das Evangelium. Eine Überprüfung des Neuen Testaments*. Einsiedeln: Verlagsanstalt Benziger & Co.
 - Baum, Gregory, 1974: Introduction. p. 1-22, in: Rosemary Radford Ruether, Faith and Fratricide. *The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: The Seabury Press.
 - Baum, Gregory, 1975: Geleitwort. p. 7-9 in: Charlotte Klein, *Theologie und Anti-Judaismus. Eine Studie zur deutschen theologischen Literatur der Gegenwart*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Baur, Ferdinand Christian, 1831: Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom. *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*. Jahrgang 1931. 4. Heft: 61-206.
 - Baur, Ferdinand Christian, 1863: *Kirchengeschichte Der Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte*. Erster Band. Dritte Ausgabe. Tübingen: L. Fr. Fues.
 - Baur, Ferdinand Christian, 1968: *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi – Sein Leben und*

- Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristentums. Erster Theil. Neudruck der 2. Auflage 1866-1867. Osnabrück: Otto Zeller.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian, 1845: Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Sein Leben und Wirken, seine Briefe und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums. Stuttgart: Verlag Becher & Müller.
 - Baynes, Norman H., 1929: Constantine The Great And The Christian Church. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Becker, Adam H. and Annette Yoshiko Reeds (eds.), 2003b: The Ways that never Parted. Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Becker, Adam H. and Annette Yoshiko Reeds, 2003a: Introduction. p. 1-33 in: *ibid.* (eds.), The Ways that Never Parted. Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Becker, Eva-Marie, Stefan Scholz (ed.), 2012: Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion. Kanonisierungsprozesse religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart. Ein Handbuch. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
 - Ben-Chorin, Schalom, 1970: Paulus. Der Völkerapostel in Jüdischer Sicht. München: Paul List Verlag.
 - Ben-Chorin, Schalom, 1980: Antijüdische Elemente im Neuen Testament. *Evangelische Theologie* 40 (1980): 203-214.
 - Bennett, W. J., 1975: The Herodians of Mark's Gospel. *Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 17, Fasc. 1 (1975): 9-14.
 - Benz, Wolfgang, 2010: Antisemitismusforschung als akademisches Fach und öffentliche Aufgabe. p. 17-32 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* 19. Berlin: Metropol Verlag.
 - Benz, Wolfgang, 2015: Antisemitismus. Präsenz und Tradition eines Ressentiments. Schwalbach: Wochenschau Verlag.
 - Berger, David, 2010: Antisemitism. An Overview. p. 3-12 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue. Essays in Jewish-Christian Relations*. Brighton: Academic Studies Press.
 - Bergmann, Werner und Mona Körte, 2004: Antisemitismusforschung in den Wissenschaften. Berlin: Metropol.
 - Bergmann, Werner, und Christhard Hoffmann 1987: Kalkül oder „Massenwahn“? Eine soziologische Interpretation der antijüdischen Unruhen in Alexandria 38 n. Chr. p. 15-46 in: Rainer Erb und Michael Schmidt (eds.), *Antisemitismus und jüdische Geschichte. Studien zu Ehren von Herbert A. Strauss*. Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Autorenverlag.
 - Bienert, Wolfgang, 1990: Markion - Christentum als Antithese zum Judentum. p. 139-144 in: Herbert Frohnhofen (Ed.), *Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Hamburg: Steinmann & Steinmann.
 - Bienert, Wolfgang, 2001: Marcion und der Antijudaismus. p. 191-205 in: Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung. Marcion and His Impact on Church History. Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion. August 2001 in Mainz*. Berlin und New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Bieringer, R., D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), 2001a: Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
 - Bieringer, R., D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, 2001b: Wrestling with Johannine Anti-Judaism: A Hermeneutical Framework for the Analysis of the Current Debate. p. 3-44 in: *ibid.* (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Assen: Royal Van

Gorcum.

- Binder, Stéphanie E., 2012: *Tertullian, On Idolatry and Mishnah Avodah Zarah. Questioning the Parting of the Ways between Christians and Jews*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Blackman, E. C., 1978 [1948]: *Marcion and his Influence*. New York: AMS Press.
- Blank, Josef, 1990: Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? „Die Anfänge der Nazoräersekten bis zum Ende des zweiten Tempels“. p. 50-63 in: Herbert Frohnhofen (Ed.), *Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Hamburg: Steinmann & Steinmann.
- Blasi, Anthony J., Jean Duhaime, Paul-André Turcotte (eds.), 2002: *Handbook of Early Christianity. Social Science Approaches*. Walnut Creek/Lanham/New York/Oxford: AltaMira Press.
- Blum, Matthias, 1999: Antijudaismus im lukanischen Doppelwerk? Zur These eines lukanischen Antijudaismus. p. 107-149 in: Rainer Kampling, (ed.), „Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...“ Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh.
- Blumenkranz, Bernhard, 1968: Die Entwicklung im Westen zwischen 200 und 1200. p. 84-135 in: Karl Heinrich Rengstorff und Siegfried von Kortzfleisch (eds.), *Kirche und Synagoge. Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden. Darstellungen mit Quellen*. Band I. Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.
- Bokser, Ben-Zion, 1973: Justin Martyr and the Jews. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 64, No. 2 (1973): 97-122.
- Bokser, Ben-Zion, 1974: Justin Martyr and the Jews II. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 64, No. 3 (1974): 204-211.
- Bornkamm, Günther, 1987 [1969]: *Paul*. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, 2003a: Die Ziele der reflexiven Soziologie. Chicago-Seminar, Winter 1987. p. 95-249 in: *Reflexive Anthropologie*. Aus dem Französischen von Hella Beister. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, 2003b: *Reflexive Anthropologie*. Aus dem Französischen von Hella Beister. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1992: *Homo Academicus*. Übersetzt von Bernd Schwibs. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1993: *Sozialer Sinn. Kritik der theoretischen Vernunft*. Übersetzt von Günter Seibt. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Boyarin, Daniel, 1994: *A Radical Jew. Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Boyarin, Daniel, 1999: *Dying for God. Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Boyarin, Daniel, 2003: Semantic Differences; or, „Judaism”/“Christianity”. p. 65-85 in: Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reeds (eds.), *The Ways that never Parted. Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Boyarin, Daniel, 2004: *Border Lines. The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Boyarin, Daniel, 2009: Rethinking Jewish Christianity. *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 99.1 (2009): 7-36.
- Boyarin, Daniel, 2012: *The Jewish Gospels. The Story of the Jewish Christ*. New York: The New Press.
- Brakke, David, 2006: Self-differentiation among Christian groups: the Gnostic and their opponents. p. 245-260 in: Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1. Origins to Constantine*. Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press.
- Brandon, S. G. F., 1957: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. Second Edition. London: S.P.C.K.
 - Brandon, S. G. F., 1967: *Jesus and the Zealots. A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
 - Brandt, Henry G., 2002: *Freude an der Thora. Freude am Dialog*. Herausgegeben von Manfred Keller und Andreas Nachama. Bochum: Kamp.
 - Braunert, Horst, 1980: Jüdische Diaspora und Judenfeindschaft im Altertum. p. 29-48 in: Kurt Telschow und Michael Zahrt (eds.), *Politik, Recht und Gesellschaft in der griechisch-römischen Antike. Gesammelte Aufsätze und Reden*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
 - Broadhead, Edwin K., 2010: *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus. Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Brocke, Michael, 1971: Das Judentumsbild neuer Jesusbücher. *Freiburger Rundbrief*, Jg. 23, Nr. 85/88 (1971): 50-59.
 - Broer, Ingo, 1992: Die Juden im Urteil der Autoren des Neuen Testaments. Anmerkungen zum Problem Historischer Gerechtigkeit im Angesicht einer verheerenden Wirkungsgeschichte. *Theologie und Glaube* 82 (1992): 2-33.
 - Brown, E. Raymond, 1983: Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, but types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 74-79.
 - Brown, Peter, 1971: *The World of Late antiquity. From Marcus Aurelius to Muhammad*. London: Thames and Hudson.
 - Brumlik, Micha, 1990: Johannes: Das judenfeindliche Evangelium. p. 6-21 in: Dietrich Neuhaus (ed.), *Teufelskinder oder Heilsbringer – Die Juden im Johannes-Evangelium*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
 - Bultmann, D. Rudolph, 1931: *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - Bultmann, D. Rudolph, 1963 [1941]: *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. Erklärt von D. Rudolf Bultmann. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
 - Bultmann, Rudolf, 1925: *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*. Gießen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann.
 - Bultmann, Rudolph, 1984: *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 9. Auflage, durchgesehen und ergänzt von Otto Merk. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Bunzl, Matti, 2007: *Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Hatreds Old and New in Europe*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
 - Burckhardt, Jacob, 2013: *Die Zeit Constantin's des Großen*. Herausgegeben von Hartmut Leppin, Manuela Keßler und Mikkel Mangold unter Mitarbeit von Ernst Ziegler. München/Schwabe/Basel: C. H. Beck.
 - Burkill, T. A., 1959: Anti-Semitism in St. Mark's Gospel. *Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 3, Fasc. 1/2 (1959): 34-53.
 - Burrus, Virginia, 1995: *The Making of a Heretic. Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*. Berkley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
 - Cadbury, Henry J., 1927: *the Making of Luke-Acts*. London: Macmillan.
 - Campbell, William S., 2008: *Paul and the Creation of Christian Identity*. London/New York: T & T Clark.
 - Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr von, 1968: *Die Entstehung der Christlichen Bibel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr von, 1993 [1955]: *Griechische Kirchenväter*. 8. unveränderte Auflage. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: Verlag W, Kohlhammer.
 - Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr von, 1995 [1960]: *Lateinische Kirchenväter*. 7.

- unveränderte Auflage. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: Verlag W, Kohlhammer.
- Carter, Warren, 1999: Response to Amy-Jill Levine. p. 47-62 in: William R. Farmer (ed.), *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
 - Carter, Warren, 2007: *Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?* p. 155-179 in: Matt Jackson-McCabe (ed.), *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Case, Shirley Jackson, 1923: *The Social Origins of Christianity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Chadwick, Henry, 1965: Justin Martyrs Defence of Christianity. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library [BJRL]* 47 (1965): 275-297.
 - Chadwick, Henry, 1966: *Early Christian Thought and The Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement, and Origen*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - Chadwick, Henry, 1967: *The Early Church*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
 - Chadwick, Henry, 1991 [o. 1978]: Conversion in Constantine the Great. XVI p. 1-11, in: ibd. (ed.), *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church*. Aldershot: Variorum.
 - Chadwick, Henry, 2001: *The Church in Ancient Society. From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Chamberlain, Huston Stewart, 1939 [1921]: *Mensch und Gott: Betrachtung über Religion und Christentum*. 5. Auflage. Volksausgabe. München: Verlag von F. Bruckmann. Online: <http://www.hschamberlain.net/menschundgott/menschundgott.html> (viewed 06.01.2015).
 - Chilton, Bruce, 2007: Justin and Israelite Prophecy. p. 77-87 in: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Chrysostom, Saint John, 1999 [1979]: *Discourses against Judaizing Christians*. Translated by Paul W. Harkins. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
 - Clabeaux, John J., 1989: *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul. A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
 - Clark, Kenneth W., 1950: The Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. p. 1-24 in: Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren (eds.), *New Testament Manuscript Studies. The Materials and the Making of a Critical Apparatus*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Claussen, Detlev, 1987: *Vom Judenhass zum Antisemitismus*. Darmstadt: Luchterhand.
 - Cohen, Shaye J. D., 2010a [1991]: Adolf Harnack's "The mission and expansion of Judaism": Christianity Succeeds where Judaism Fails. p. 309-315 in: ibid. (ed.), *The Significance of Yavneh and Other Essays in Jewish Hellenism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Cohen, Shaye J. D., 2010b [1992]: Was Judaism in Antiquity a Missionary Religion? p. 299-308 in: ibid. (ed.), *The Significance of Yavneh and Other Essays in Jewish Hellenism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Confino, Alon, 2014: *A World Without Jews: The Nazi Imagination from Persecution to Genocide*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 - Conzelmann, H., 1964 (o. 1954): *Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. 5. Auflage. Unveränderter Nachdruck der 4., verbesserten und ergänzten Auflage. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Conzelmann, Hans, 1974 [1966]: Der geschichtliche Ort der lukanischen Schriften im Urchristentum. p. 236-260 in: Georg Braumann (ed.), *das Lukas-Evangelium. Die redaktions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Forschung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Coser, Lewis A., 2011 [1956]: *The Functions of Social Conflict*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Cosgrove, Charles H., 1982: Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon. *Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho, Vigiliae Christianae*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (1982): 209-232.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, 1987 [1983]: *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design*. Foreword by Frank Kermode. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, 2001: Anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel as a Theological Problem for Christian Interpreters. p. 68-91 in: R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Cunningham, Philip A., 2010: Jews and Christians from the Time of Christ to Constantine's Reign. p. 47-62 in: Albert S. Lindemann and Richard S. Levy (eds.), *Antisemitism: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup, 1962: The Particularity of the Pauline Epistles as a Problem in the Ancient Church. p. 261-271 in: *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesausgabe, Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Daniel, Jerry, L., 1979: Anti-Semitism in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, No. 1 (1979): 45-65.
- Daniélou, Jean, 1964: *The Theology of Jewish Christianity. The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. Volume One*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Daniélou, Jean, 1969: Christianity as a Jewish Sect. p. 275-282 in Arnold Toynbee (ed.), *The Crucible of Christianity. Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Davies, Alan T. (ed.), 1979a: *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
- Davies, Alan T., 1969: *Antisemitism and the Christian Mind. The Crisis of Conscience after Auschwitz*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Davies, Alan T., 1979b: Introduction. p. xiii-xvii, in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
- Davies, W. D., 1967: *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. Second Edition. New York and Evanston: Harper Torchbooks.
- Davies, W. D., 1977: Paul and the People of Israel. *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977): 4-39.
- Davies, W. D., 1980: *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. Fourth Edition, with a new preface. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Davies, W. D., 1999: Paul: from the Jewish point of view. p. 678-730 in: *ibid.*, William Horbury and John Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism. Volume Three. The Early Roman Period*. Cambridge at. al.: Cambridge University Press.
- De Jonge, Henk Jan, 2001: The 'Jews' in the Gospel of John. p. 239-259 in: R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M., 1963: Why were the early Christians persecuted? *Past and Present*, No. 26 (1963): 6-38.
- De Wette, W.M.K., 1870: *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte*. Vierte Auflage bearbeitet und stark erweitert von Lic. th. Franz Overbeck. Leipzig: Verlag S. Hirzel.
- Deutscher Bundestag, 2011: Bericht des unabhängigen Expertenkreises Antisemitismus. Antisemitismus in Deutschland – Erscheinungsformen, Bedingungen, Präventionsansätze. Online: <http://dip21.bundestag.de/dip21/btd/17/077/1707700.pdf> (viewed 07.06.12).
- Dibelius, Martin, 1939: *Jesus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

- Dibelius, Martin, 1960: Jesus. Dritte Auflage mit einem Nachtrag von Dr. Werner Georg Kümmel. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Dibelius, Martin, 1967 [1966]: Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. Unveränderter Nachdruck der fünften Auflage 1966. mit einem Nachtrag von Gerhard Iber. Herausgegeben von Günther Bornkamm. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Dibelius, Martin, 1971 [o. 1942]: Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert. p. 47-105 in: Richard Klein (ed.), Das frühe Christentum im römischen Staat. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Diner, Dan, 2007: Reflections on Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. p. 47-53 in: Matti Bunzl (ed.), Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. Hatreds Old and New in Europe. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Dodds, C. H., 1963: Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dodds, E. R., 1968: Pagans and Christians in an Age of Anxiety. Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donaldson, Terence L., 2006: "The Field God Has Assigned". Geography and Mission in Paul. p. 109-137 in: Leif Vaage (ed.), Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Drake, H. A., 2000: Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Drake, H. A., 2006: The Impact of Constantine on Christianity. p. 111-136, in: Noel Lenski (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Droge, A. J., 2006: Self-Definition vis-à-vis the Graeco-Roman world. p. 230-244 in: Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1. Origins to Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dulzin, Arye L. 1988: Remarks. p. 9 – 10 in: Yehuda Bauer (ed.), Present-Day Antisemitism. Proceedings of the Eighth International Seminar of the Study Circle on World Jewry under the auspices of the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog. Jerusalem, 29-31 December 1985. Israel: The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D., 2004: Tertullian. London/New York: Routledge.
- Dunn, James D. G., 1990a: Jesus, Paul, and the Law. Studies in Mark and Galatians. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Dunn, James D. G., 1990b [1977]: Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity. Second Edition. London: SCM Press/Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.
- Dunn, James D. G., 1991: The Partings of the Ways. Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity. London: SCM Press/Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.
- Dunn, James D. G., 1992: The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period. p. 177-211 in: ibid. (ed.), Jews and Christians. The Partings of the Ways. A.D. 70-135. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Siebeck.
- Dunn, James D. G., 1994: How New was Paul's Gospel? The Problem of Continuity and Discontinuity. p. 367-388 in: L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson (eds.), Gospel in Paul. Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Dunn, James D. G., 1996: Two Covenants or one? The Interdependence of Jewish and

- Christian Identity. p. 97-122 in: Hermann Lichtenberger (ed.), *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. Band III Frühes Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dunn, James D. G., 2001: The Embarrassment of History: Reflections on the Problem of 'Anti-Judaism' in the Fourth Gospel. p. 47-67 in: R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
 - Dunn, James D. G., 2006: *The Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. Second Edition. London: SCM Press.
 - Dunn, James D. G., 2009: *Beginning from Jerusalem. Christianity in the Making. Volume 2*. Michigan/Cambridge: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company.
 - Dunn, James D.G., 2003 [1998]: *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. London/New York: T & T Clark.
 - Eckardt, Arthur Roy, 1967: *Elder and Younger Brothers. The Encounter of Jews and Christians*. New York: Scribner.
 - Eckert, Wilhelm Paul, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), 1967a: *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Eckert, Wilhelm Paul, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), 1967b: Einführung. p. 7-14 in: *ibid.* (eds.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Eckert, Willehad Paul und Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich, 1964: *Judenhaß – Schuld der Christen?! Versuch eines Gesprächs*. Essen: Hans Driewer Verlag.
 - Eco, Umberto, 1992: *Die Grenzen der Interpretation*. Aus dem Italienischen von Günter Memmert. München/Wien: Carl Hanser Verlag.
 - Edwards, Mark, Martin Goodman, Simon Price and Christopher Rowland, 1999: Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World. p. 1-13 in: Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price (eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Efroymson, David P., 1979: The Patristic Connection. p. 98-117, in: Alan T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
 - Ehrlich, Ernst Ludwig, 1967: Paulus und das Schuldproblem, erläutert an Römer 5 und 8. p. 44-49 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Ehrman, Bart D., 2003: *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
 - Ehrman, Bart D., 2004: *The Christianity Battles. What if Ebionite Christians, Marcion Christians, or Gnostic Christians had been more convincing? Interview by Deborah Caldwell*. <http://www.beliefnet.com/Faiths/Christianity/2004/08/The-Christianity-Battles.aspx> (accessed 08.07.2014).
 - Ehrman, Bart. D., 2011: *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Updated And With a New Afterword.
 - Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried, 1820: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Erster Band. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: Weidmannische Buchhandlung.
 - Elliott, J. K., 2010: *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*.

- Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Elmer, Ian J., 2011: Pillars, Hypocrites and False Brothers. Paul's Polemic against Jerusalem in Galatians. p. 123-153 in: Oda Wischmeyer and Lorenzo Scornaienchi (ed.), *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
 - Engberg-Pedersen, Troels (ed.), 2001: *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Louisville/London/Leiden: Westminster John Knox Press.
 - Taylor, Vincent, 1933: *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. Eight Lectures*. London: Macmillan and Co.
 - Epp, Eldon Jay, 1966: *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Esler, Philip F., 1994: *The first Christians in their Social Worlds. Social-Scientific approaches to New Testament interpretation*. London/New York: Routledge.
 - Esler, Philip, 1987: *Community and gospel in Luke-Acts. The Social and political motivations of Lucan theology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Ettinger, Shmuel, 1988: Jew-Hatred in its Historical Context. p. 1-12 in: Shmuel Almog (ed.), *Antisemitism through the Ages*. Translated by Nathan H. Reisner. Oxford/New York/Beijing: Pergamon Press.
 - Evans, Craig A., 2007: The Jewish Christian Gospel Tradition. p. 241-277 in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
 - Evans, Ernest (ed.), 1972a: *Tertullian. Adversus Marcionem*. Edited and Translated by Ernest Evans. Books 1 to 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - Evans, Ernest (ed.), 1972b: *Tertullian. Adversus Marcionem*. Edited and Translated by Ernest Evans. Books 4 to 5. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - Farmer, William R. (ed.), 1999: *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
 - Farmer, William R., 1980: Peter and Paul: A Constitutive Relationship for Catholic Christianity. p. 219-236 in: W. Eugene March (ed.), *Texts and Testaments. Critical Essays on the Bible and the Early Church Fathers*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.
 - Feldman, Louis H., 1993: *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World. Attitudes and interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - Fenichel, Otto, 1993: Elemente einer psychoanalytischen Theorie des Antisemitismus. p. 35-57 in: Ernst Simmel (Ed.), *Antisemitismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
 - Ferguson, Everett, 1980: The Covenant Idea in the Second Century. p. 135-162 in: W. Eugene March (ed.), *Texts and Testaments. Critical Essays on the Bible and the Early Church Fathers*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.
 - Ferguson, John, 1984: Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict. By David Rokeah. In: *The Heythrop Journal*, Vol. 25, Issue 3 (July 1984): 402-403.
 - Fine, Robert, 2012: Newsletter of the European Sociological Association, Issue 33, Winter 2012. Online: www.europeansociology.org/docs/ESA_Newsletter_Winter2012_HR.pdf (viewed 22.01.13).
 - Fischel, Jack R. and Susan M. Ortmann, 2004: *The Holocaust and Its Religious Impact. A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography*. Westport/London: Praeger.
 - Flannery, Edward H., 1965: *The Anguish of the Jews. Twenty-Three Centuries of Anti-Semitism*. Preface by John M. Oesterreicher. New York: The Macmillan Company.
 - Flannery, Edward H., 1973: Anti-Judaism and Anti-Semitism: A Necessary Distinction. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 10 (1973): 581-588.
 - Flusser, David, 1969: Jesus in the Context of History. p. 215-234 in Arnold Toynbee

- (ed.), *The Crucible of Christianity. Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Flusser, David, 1974: Ulrich Wilckens und die Juden. *Evangelische Theologie* 34 (1974): 236-243.
 - Flusser, David, 1980: Das Schisma zwischen Judentum und Christentum, *Evangelische Theologie* 40 (1980): 214-239.
 - Flusser, David, 1990: *Das Christentum – eine jüdische Religion*. München: Kösel Verlag.
 - Flusser, David, 1999 [o. 1968]: *Jesus*. Dargestellt von David Flusser. Überarbeitete Neuauflage. Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.
 - Foschepoth, Josef, 1993: *Im Schatten der Vergangenheit. Die Anfänge der Gesellschaften für Christlich-Jüdische Zusammenarbeit*. Mit einem Vorwort von Werner Jochmann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - Foucault, Michel, 1980 [1977]: *The Confession of the Flesh*. interview. pp. 194-228 in: Colin Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon Books.
 - Foucault, Michel, 1990 [1988]: *Politics, Philosophy, Culture. Interviews and Other Writings. 1977-1984*. Translated by Alan Sheridan and Others. Edited with an Introduction by Lawrence D. Kritzman. New York: Routledge.
 - Foucault, Michel, 1991 [1977]: *Discipline and Punish*. Tr. Alan Sheridan. *The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin Books.
 - Foucault, Michel, 2002: *The Order of Things. An archaeology of the human sciences*. London: Routledge.
 - Foucault, Michel, 2004 [2003]: *Society must be defended*. Tr. David Macey. London: Penguin Books.
 - Foucault, Michel, 2010: *The Archaeology of Knowledge. And the Discourse of Language*. Tr. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage Books.
 - Fox, Robin Lane, 1986: *Pagans and Christians*. New York: Viking Press.
 - Fraikin, Daniel, 1986: *The Rhetorical Function of the Jews in Romans*. p. 91-105 in: Peter Richardson and David Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. 1. *Paul and the Gospels*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Frankemölle, Hubert, 1991: *Evangelium und Wirkungsgeschichte. Das Problem der Vermittlung von Methodik und Hermeneutik in neueren Auslegungen zum Matthäusevangelium*. p. 31-90 in: Lorenz Oberlinner und Peter Fiedler (eds.), *Salz der Erde – Licht der Welt. Exegetische Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*. Festschrift für Anton Vögtle zum 80. Geburtstag. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
 - Frankemölle, Hubert, 1994: *Matthäuskommentar 1*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag.
 - Frankemölle, Hubert, 1999: *Antijudaismus im Matthäusevangelium? Reflexionen zu einer angemessenen Auslegung*. p. 73-106 in: Rainer Kampling, (ed.), *“Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...” Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus*. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh.
 - Fredriksen, Paula, 2000: *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews. A Jewish Life and the Emergence of Christianity*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
 - Fredriksen, Paula, 2003: *Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City. What Parting of Ways?* p. 35-63 in: Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reeds (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted. Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Fredriksen, Paula, 2006: *Christians in the Roman Empire in the First Three Centuries CE*. p. 587-606 in: David S. Potter (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Malden/Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

- Frend, W. H. C., 1965: *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church. A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Frend, W. H. C., 1984: *The Rise of Christianity*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Frend, William Hugh Clifford, 1976 [o. 1970]: A Note on Tertullian and the Jews. IV p. 291-296 in: *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries*. London: Variorum Reprints.
- Frosh, Stephen, 2005: *Hate and the 'Jewish Science'. Anti-Semitism, Nazism and Psychoanalysis*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gabba, Emilio, 1989: The Growth of Anti-Judaism or the Greek Attitude towards the Jews. p. 657-656 in: W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism. Volume Two. The Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge at. al.: Cambridge University Press.
- Gager, John G., 1972: *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. New York/Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Gager, John G., 1975: *Kingdom and Community. The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Gager, John G., 1982: Shall we Marry Our Enemies? *Sociology and the New Testament*. *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 256-265.
- Gager, John G., 1983: *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gager, John G., 2000: *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gamble, Harry Y., 1995: *Books and Readers in the Early Church. A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Gamble, Harry Y., 2006: Marcion and the 'canon'. p. 195-213 in: Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1. Origins to Constantine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd, 1986a: Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative in Luke and Acts. p. 127-153 in: Peter Richardson and David Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol. 1 Paul and the Gospels*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd, 1986b: Judaism of the Uncircumcised in Ignatius and Related Writers. p. 33-44 in: Stephen G. Wilson (ed.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 2. Separation and Polemic*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd, 1986c: Paul and the Law in Galatians 2-3. p. 37-57 in: Peter Richardson and David Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol. 1 Paul and the Gospels*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd, 1987: *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Gaston, Lloyd, 2005: The impact of new perspectives on Judaism and improved Jewish-Christian relations on the study of Paul. *Biblical Interpretation* 13,3 (2005): 250-254.
- Gilman, Sander L., 1990 [1986]: *Jewish Self-Hatred. Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ginzel, Günther Bernd und Günter Fessler (ed.), 1997: *Die Kirche und die Juden. Versuch einer Bilanz*. Gerlingen: Lambert Schneider.
- Goldmann, Felix, 1924: *Das Wesen des Antisemitismus. Zweite verbesserte Auflage*. Berlin: Philo Verlag.
- Goldstein, Horst (ed.), 1979: *Gottesverächter und Menschenfeinde? Juden zwischen Jesus und frühchristlicher Kirche*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag.
- Goldstein, N. W., 1939: Cultivated Pagans and Ancient Anti-Semitism. *Journal of Religion* 19, No. 4 (1939): 346-364.
- Goodacre, Mark, 2001: *The Synoptic Problem. A Way Through the Maze*. London/New

- York: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Goodenough, Erwin R., 1923: *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung.
 - Goodenough, Erwin R., 1968 [1966]: *The Perspective of Acts*. p. 51-59 in: Leander E. Keck and James Louis Martin (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts*. London: S.P.C.K.
 - Goodman, Martin, 1989: *Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity*. *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 79 (1989): 40-44.
 - Goodman, Martin, 1994: *Mission and Conversion. Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - Goodman, Martin, 1999: *Josephus' Treatise Against Apion*. p. 45-58 in: Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price (eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Goodman, Martin, 2007a [1992]: *Jewish Proselytising in the First Century*. p. 91-116 in: ibid (ed.), *Judaism in the Roman World. Collected Essays*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
 - Goodman, Martin, 2007b [1996]: *The Function of Minim in Early Rabbinic Judaism*. p. 163-173 in: ibid (ed.), *Judaism in the Roman World. Collected Essays*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
 - Goodman, Martin, 2007c [1998]: *Josephus and Variety in First-Century Judaism*. p. 33-46 in: ibid (ed.), *Judaism in the Roman World. Collected Essays*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
 - Goodspeed, Edgar J., 1927 [1926]: *The Formation of the New Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Goppelt, Leonhard, 1954: *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag.
 - Grant, Robert M., 1980: *The Social Setting of Second-Century Christianity*. p. 16-29 in: E. P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume One. The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*. London: SCM Press.
 - Grässer, Erich, 1964: *Die antijüdische Polemik im Johannesevangelium*. *New Testament Studies*, Vol. 11, Issue 1 (1964): 74-90.
 - Gräßer, Erich, 1967: *Die Juden als Teufelssöhne in Johannes 8, 37-47*. p. 157-170 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Grayzel, Solomon, 1946: *Christian-Jewish Relations in the First Millennium*. p. 79-92 in Koppel S. Pinson (ed.), *Essays on Antisemitism. With a Foreword by Salo W. Baron*. Second edition. Revised and Enlarged. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations.
 - Green, Bernard, 2010: *Christianity in Ancient Rome. The First Three Centuries*. London: T&T Clark International.
 - Grosser, Paul E. and Edwin G. Halperin, 1979 [1976]: *Anti-Semitism. The Causes and Effects of a Prejudice*. Foreword by Robert St. John. Preface by Prof. Franklin H. Littell. Scaucus: Citadel Press.
 - Gubler, Marie-Louise, 1977: *Die frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu. Eine motivgeschichtliche Darstellung aufgrund der neueren exegetischen Forschung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - Gültzow, Henneke, 1990: *Soziale Gegebenheiten der Trennung von Kirche und Synagoge und die Anfänge des christlichen Antijudaismus*. p. 95-120 in: Herbert Frohnhofen (Ed.), *Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Hamburg: Steinmann & Steinmann.
 - Ha'am, Ahad, 1912: *Selected Essays*. Translated from the Hebrew by Leon Simon. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.

- Haacker, Klaus, 1988: Elemente des heidnischen Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament, in: Evangelische Theologie 48 (1988): 404-419
- Haas, Christopher J., 1983: Imperial Religious Policy and Valerian's Persecution of the Church, AD 257-260. Church History 52, Issue 02 (1983): 133-144.
- Haenchen, Ernst, 1977: Die Apostelgeschichte. Neu übersetzt und erklärt von D. Ernst Haenchen. 7., Durchgesehene und verbesserte Auflage dieser Neuauslegung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Haenchen, Ernst, 1982 [1971]: The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hagner, Donal A., 2007: Paul as a Jewish Believer – According to His Letters. p. 96-120 in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), Jewish Believers in Jesus. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Hahn, Hans-Joachim and Olaf Kistenmacher (eds.), 2015: Beschreibungsversuche der Judenfeindschaft. Zur Geschichte der Antisemitismusforschung vor 1944. Berlin/München/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Hahneman, Geoffrey Mark, 1992: The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hakola, Raimo, 2007: The Johannine Community as Jewish Christians? Some Problems in Current Scholarly Consensus. p. 181-201 in: Matt Jackson-McCabe (ed.), Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hall, Stuart George, 2006: Institutions in the pre-Constantinian *ecclesia*. p. 415-433 in: Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1. Origins to Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanson, Richard, 1989: The achievement of orthodoxy in the fourth century AD. p. 142-156 in: Rowan Williams, The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harder, Günther, 1967: Jesus und das Gesetz (Matthäus 5, 17-20). p. 105-118 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Hare, Douglas R. A., 1967a: The Relationship between Jewish and Gentile Persecution of Christians. Journal of Ecumenical Studies, Vol. 4 (1967): 446-456.
- Hare, Douglas R. A., 1967b: The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St Matthew. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hare, Douglas R. A., 1979: The Rejection of the Jews in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. p. 27-47, in: Alan T. Davies (ed.), Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1883: Die Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani: nebst Untersuchungen über die antijüdische Polemik in der alten Kirche. Die Acta Archelai und das Diatessaron Tatians. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1888: Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Erster Band. Die Entstehung des Kirchlichen Dogmas. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung J. C. B. Mohr.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1889: Das Neue Testament um das Jahr 200. Theodor Zahn's Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Freiburg: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1906: Lukas der Arzt. Der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.

- Harnack, Adolf von, 1914: Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments und die wichtigsten Folgen der neuen Schöpfung. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1923: Neue Studien zu Marcion. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1924a: Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Vierte verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage mit elf Karten. Erster Band. Die Mission in Wort und Tat. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 1924b: Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Eine Monographie zur Geschichte und Grundlegung der Katholischen Kirche. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- Harnack, Adolf von, 2005: Das Wesen des Christentums. Sechzehn Vorlesungen vor Studierenden aller Fakultäten im Wintersemester 1899/1900 an der Universität Berlin gehalten von Adolf v. Harnack. Herausgegeben von Claus-Dieter Osthöfener. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Harrington, Daniel J., 2004: How Jewish was Mark's Gospel? p. 343-359 in: Alan J. Avery-Peck, Daniel Harrington and Jacob Neusner (eds.), When Judaism And Christianity Began. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Haury, Thomas, 2002: Antisemitismus von links. Kommunistische Ideologie, Nationalismus und Antizionismus in der frühen DDR. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.
- Hays, Richard B. 1989: Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Hays, Richard B., 2008: What Is "Real Participation in Christ?" A Dialogue with E. P. Sanders on Pauline Soteriology. p. 336-351 in: Fabian E. Udoh et. al. (eds.), Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities. Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Heemtsra, Marius, 2010: The *Fiscus Judaicus* and the Parting of the Ways. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Heer, Friedrich, 1967: Gottes erste Liebe. 2000 Jahre Judentum und Christentum. Genesis des Österreichischen Katholiken Adolf Hitler. München: Bechtle Verlag.
- Heer, Friedrich, 1968: Der Glaube des Adolf Hitler. Anatomie einer politischen Religiosität. München: Bechtle Verlag.
- Heil, Johannes, 1997: "Antijudaismus" und "Antisemitismus" - Begriffe als Bedeutungsträger. p. 92-114 in: Wolfgang Benz (ed.), Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung 6 (1997). Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag
- Hengel, Martin, 1969: Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hengel, Martin, 1985. Studies in the Gospel of Mark. London: SCM Press.
- Hengel, Martin, 1992: The Pre-Christian Paul. p. 29-52 in: Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire. London/New York: Routledge.
- Henrix, Hans Hermann and Wolfgang Kraus (eds.), 2001: Die Kirchen und das Judentum. Bd. II: Dokumente von 1986-2000. Paderborn: Verlag Bonifatius/Gütersloher Verlagshaus/Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Henrix, Hans Herrmann and Boschki, Reinhold (eds.), 2011: Die Kirchen und das Judentum. Dokumente von 2000 bis heute, Band III (unter Mitarbeit von Andreas Menne). Online: <http://www.nostra-aetate.uni-bonn.de/kirchliche-dokumente/online-publikation-die-kirchen-und-das-judentum/online-publikation-die-kirchen-und-das-judentum> (viewed 18.09.2015).

- Herford, Robert Travers, 1962: The Pharisees. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Herman, Simon N., 1988: The Reaction of Jews to Antisemitism: A Framework for a Social Psychological Analysis. p. 283-296 in: Yehuda Bauer (ed.), Present-Day Antisemitism. Proceedings of the Eighth International Seminar of the Study Circle on World Jewry under the auspices of the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog. Jerusalem, 29-31 December 1985. Israel: The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Herzl, Theodor, 1920 [1896]: Der Judenstaat. Staatsschrift. Achte Auflage. Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag. Online: <http://ldn-knigi.lib.ru/JUDAICA/Herzl-Judenstaat.pdf> (viewed 14.02.13).
- Heschel, Susannah, 1988: Jüdisch-feministische Theologie und Antijudaismus in christlich-feministischer Theologie. p. 54-103 in: Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz (ed.), Verdrängte Vergangenheit, die uns bedrängt. Feministische Theologie in der Verantwortung für die Geschichte. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Hill, C. E., 2007: Was John's Gospel among Justin's *Apostolic Memoirs*? p. 88-94 in: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), Justin Martyr and His Worlds. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hill, Craig C., 1992: Hellenists and Hebrews. Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hill, Craig C., 2007: The Jerusalem Church. p. 39-56 in: Matt Jackson-McCabe (ed.), Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hirschberg, Peter, 2007: Jewish Believers in Asia Minor according to the Book of Revelation and the Gospel of John. p. 217-238 in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds), Jewish Believers in Jesus. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Hoffmann, Christhard, 1994: Christlicher Antijudaismus und moderner Antisemitismus. Zusammenhänge und Differenzen als Problem der historischen Antijudaismusforschung. p. 293-317 in: Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz (ed.), Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph, 1984: Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity. An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Holz, Klaus und Jan Weyand, 2015: Von der Judenfrage zur Antisemitenfrage. Frühe Erklärungsmodelle von Antisemitismus. p. 172-188 in: Hans-Joachim Hahn and Olaf Kistenmacher (eds.), Beschreibungsversuche der Judenfeindschaft. Zur Geschichte der Antisemitismusforschung vor 1944. Berlin/München/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Holz, Klaus, 2001: Nationaler Antisemitismus. Wissenssoziologie einer Weltanschauung. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition.
- Horbury, William, 1998: Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Horbury, William, 1998: Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Horkheimer, Max und Theodor W. Adorno, 2003: Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Horner, Timothy J., 2001: "Listening to Trypho". Justin Martyr's *Dialogue* Reconsidered. Leiden/Paris/Sterling: Peeters.
- Horrell, David G., 2002: "Becoming Christian": Solidifying Christian Identity and Content. p. 309-335 in: Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, Paul-André Turcotte (eds.), Handbook of Early Christianity. Social Science Approaches. Walnut

- Creek/Lanham/New York/Oxford: AltaMira Press.
- Hulen, Amos B., 1932: Dialogues with the Jews as Sources of Early Jewish Arguments against Christianity. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51 (1932): 58-70.
 - Hummel, Reinhart, 1963: Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum im Mattäusevangelium. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Hurd, John C., 1986: Paul Ahead of His Time. 1 Thess 2:13-16. p. 21-36 in: Peter Richardson and David Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. 1 Paul and the Gospels. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Hvalvik, Reidar, 2007: Paul as a Jewish Believer – According to the Book of Acts. p. 121-153 in: *ibid.* and Oskar Skarsaune (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
 - Hyldahl, Niels, 1966: Philosophie und Christentum. Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins. Kopenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard.
 - Idinopulos, Thomas and Robert B. Ward, 1977: Is Christology Inherently Anti-Semitic? *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (1977): 193-214.
 - Isaac, Jules, 1968: Jesus und Israel. Wien/Zürich: Hans Deutsch Verlag.
 - Isaac, Jules, 1969 [o. 1956]: Genesis des Antisemitismus. Vor und nach Christus. Wien/Frankfurt/Zürich: Europa Verlag.
 - Jackson-McCabe, Matt (ed.), 2007a: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Jackson-McCabe, Matt, 2007b: What's in a Name? The Problem of "Jewish Christianity". p. 7-38 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Jaroš, Karl, 2008: *Das Neue Testament und seine Autoren. Eine Einführung*. Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
 - Jervell, Jacob, 1972: The Divided People of God. The Restoration of Israel and Salvation for the Gentiles. p. 41-74 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Luke and the people of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
 - Jervell, Jacob, 1984a: Paul in the Acts of the Apostles: Tradition, History, Theology. p. 68-76 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *The Unknown Paul. Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
 - Jervell, Jacob, 1984b: The Mighty Minority. p. 26-51 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *The unknown Paul. Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
 - Jervell, Jacob, 1996: *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Jonas, Hans, 1999: *Gnosis. Die Botschaft des fremden Gottes*. Herausgegeben und mit einem Nachwort versehen von Christian Wiese. Frankfurt am Main/Leipzig: Insel Verlag.
 - Jongkind, Dirk, 2006: One Codex, Three Scribes, and Many Books: Struggles with Space in *Codex Sinaiticus*. p. 121-135 in: Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (eds.), *New Testament Manuscripts. Their Texts and Their World*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
 - Josephus, Flavius, 1980 [1977]: *Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges*. Aus dem Griechischen. Übersetzung von Heinrich Clementz. Wiesbaden: Fourier Verlag.
 - Josephus, Flavius, 2008: *Against Apion*. Tr. William Whiston. Online: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/2849/2849-h/2849-h.htm> (viewed 06.11.15).
 - Judaken, Jonathan, 2008: So what's new? Rethinking the 'new antisemitism' in a global age. *Patterns of Prejudice*, Vol. 41. No. 4-5, 2008. Online: <https://umdrive.memphis.edu/jjudaken/public/publications/PoP%20New%20Antisemitism.pdf?uniq=-5aa3> (viewed 08.01.13).

- Kampe, Walther, 1964: Geleitwort. p. 9-10 in: Willehad Paul Eckert, Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich (Eds.), *Judenhaß – Schuld der Christen?! Versuch eines Gesprächs*. Essen: Hans Driewer Verlag.
- Kampling, Rainer (ed.), 1999a: “Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...” Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh.
- Kampling, Rainer, 1984: *Das Blut Christi und die Juden. Mt. 27:25 bei den lateinischsprachigen christlichen Autoren bis zu Leo dem Großen*. Münster: Aschendorff.
- Kampling, Rainer, 1990: Neutestamentliche Texte als Bausteine der späteren *Adversus-Judaeos*-Literatur. p. 121-138 in: Herbert Frohnhofen (Ed.), *Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Hamburg: Steinmann & Steinmann.
- Kampling, Rainer, 1999b: “Und er ging nach seiner Gewohnheit am Sabbat in die Synagoge. Jesuanisches zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des christlichen Antijudaismus. p. 53-72 in: *ibid.* (ed.), “Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...” Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh.
- Kampling, Rainer, 1999c: Vorwort. p. 9-13 in: *ibid.* (ed.), “Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium...” Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh.
- Kampling, Rainer, 2002a [1997]: Antijudaismus von Anfang an? Zur Diskussion um den neutestamentlichen Ursprung des christlichen Antijudaismus. p. 85-100 in: *ibid.*, *Im Angesicht Israels. Studien zum historischen und theologischen Verhältnis von Kirche und Israel*. Herausgegeben von Matthias Blum. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Kampling, Rainer, 2002b: Eine offene Frage – theologische und historische Implikationen der Antijudaismusforschung, in: *Theologische Revue* 98/3 (2002): 179-196.
- Kampling, Rainer, 2002c: *Im Angesicht Israels. Studien zum historischen und theologischen Verhältnis von Kirche und Israel*. Herausgegeben von Matthias Blum. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Kampling, Rainer, 2004: Theologische Antisemitismusforschung. p. 67-81 in: Werner Bergmann und Mona Körter (Eds.), *Antisemitismusforschung in den Wissenschaften*. Berlin: Metropol.
- Käsemann, Ernst (ed.), 1970b: *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Käsemann, Ernst, 1968 [1966]: Ephesians and Acts. p. 288-297 in: Leander E. Keck and James Louis Martin (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts*. London: S.P.C.K.
- Käsemann, Ernst, 1970a: Begründet der neutestamentliche Kanon die Einheit der Kirche? p. 124-133 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Käsemann, Ernst, 1970c: Zusammenfassung. p. 399-410 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Das Neue Testament als Kanon. Dokumentation und kritische Analyse zur gegenwärtigen Diskussion*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Käsemann, Ernst, 1971 [1967]: *Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17. 2. unveränderte Auflage*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Käsemann, Ernst, 1978: *An die Römer. Kommentar zum Paulusbrief von Ernst Käsemann*. 3., überarbeitet Auflage. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt Berlin.
- Katz, Jacob, 1989: *Vom Vorurteil bis zur Vernichtung. Der Antisemitismus 1700-1933*.

- Aus dem Englischen von Ulrike Berger. München: C. H. Beck.
- Katz, Steven T., 1991: Ideology, State Power, and Mass Murder/Genocide. p. 47-89 in: Peter Hayes (ed.), *Lessons and Legacies: The Meaning of the Holocaust in a Changing World*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
 - Kelber, Werner H., 1996: Metaphysics and Marginality in John. p. 129-154 in: Fernando Segovia (ed.), *What is John? Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
 - Kermode, Frank, 1980 [1979]: *The Genesis of Secrecy. On the Interpretation of Narrative*. Cambridge/Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press.
 - Kierspel, Lars, 2006: *The Jews and the World in the Fourth Gospel. Parallelism, Function, and Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Kimelman, Reuven, 1981: *Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity. p. 226-244 in: E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and Alan Mendelson (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume Two. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
 - King, Karen, 2003: *What is Gnosticism*. Cambridge/London: The Belknap Press.
 - Kinzig, Wolfram, 2002: Nähe und Distanz. Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Beschreibung der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen. p. 9-27 in: *ibid.* and Cornelia Kück (eds.), *Judentum und Christentum zwischen Konfrontation und Faszination. Ansätze zu einer neuen Beschreibung der jüdisch-christlichen Beziehungen*. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
 - Kinzig, Wolfram, 2004: *Harnack, Marcion und das Judentum. Nebst einer kommentierten Edition des Briefwechsels Adolf von Harnacks mit Houston Stewart Chamberlain*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
 - Klassen, William, 1986: Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: The State of the Question. p. 1-19 in: Peter Richardson and David Granskou (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol. 1 Paul and the Gospels*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Klausner, Joseph, 1950: *Von Jesus zu Paulus. Übertragung aus dem Hebräischen unter Mitwirkung des Verfassers von Dr. Friedrich Thieberger*. Jerusalem: The Jewish Publishing House.
 - Klein, Charlotte, 1975: *Theologie und Anti-Judaismus. Eine Studie zur deutschen theologischen Literatur der Gegenwart*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Klein, Charlotte, 1978: *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press
 - Klein, Georg, 1988 : Ein Sturmzentrum der Paulusforschung. *Verkündigung und Forschung* 33/1, (1988): 40-56.
 - Klinghardt, Matthias, 2003: Die Veröffentlichung der christlichen Bibel und der Kanon. *ZNT* 12 (2003), Themenheft Kanon: 59-64.
 - Klug, Brian, 2003: The collective Jew: Israel and the new antisemitism. *Patterns of Prejudice*, Vol. 37. No. 2. Online: http://www.academia.edu/740230/The_collective_Jew_Israel_and_the_new_antisemitism (viewed 08.01.13).
 - Klug, Brian, 2007a: A Contradiction in the 'New Europe'. p. 54-60 in: Matti Bunzl (ed.), *Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia. Hatreds Old and New in Europe*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
 - Klug, Brian, 2007b: The State of Zionism. *The Nation*, June 18th, 2007. Online: <http://www.thenation.com/article/state-zionism?page=full> (viewed 20.02.13).
 - Knox, John, 1942: *Marcion and the New Testament. An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Knox, John, 1950: *Chapters in the Life of Paul*. New York/Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press.

- Knox, John, 1968 [1966]: Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus. p. 279-287 in: Leander E. Keck and James Louis Martin (eds.), Studies in Luke-Acts. London: S.P.C.K.
- Koenig, John, 1979: Jews and Christians in Dialogue. New Testament Foundations. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Koester, Helmut and James M. Robinson (Eds.), 1971: Trajectories through Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press
- Kohn-Ley, Charlotte, Ilse Korotin (eds.), 1994: Der Feministische "Sündenfall". Antisemitische Vorurteile in der Frauenbewegung. Wien: Picus Verlag.
- Kortzfleisch, Siegfried, Wolfgang Grünberg and Tim Schramm, 2009: Vorwort. p. 11-14 in: ibid. (ed.), Wende-Zeit im Verhältnis von Juden und Christen. Berlin: EB-Verlag.
- Köster, Helmuth, 1980: Einführung in das Neue Testament. Im Rahmen der Religionsgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kraus, W. (ed.), 1997a: Christen und Juden. Perspektiven einer Annäherung. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Kraus, W., 1997b: Christologie ohne Antijudaismus? Ein Überblick über die Diskussion. p. 21-48 in: ibid. (ed.), Christen und Juden. Perspektiven einer Annäherung. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Kraus, W., 1997c: Einführung. p. 1- 5 in: ibid. (ed.), Christen und Juden. Perspektiven einer Annäherung. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Kuhn, Thomas S., 1996: The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Third Edition. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg, 1970: Das Neue Testament. Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme. 2., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. Freiburg/München: Verlag Karl Alber.
- Kurth, Christina, 1998: Der Prozess Jesu aus der Perspektive jüdischer Forscher. Kirche und Israel 13/1 (1998): 3-24.
- Kushner, Tony, 1989: The persistence of prejudice. Antisemitism in British society during the Second World War. Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press.
- Kuula, Kari, 1999: The Law, the Covenant and God's Plan. Volume 1. Paul's Polemical Treatment of the Law in Galatians. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ladner, Gerhart B, 1971: Aspects of Patristic Anti-Judaism, Viator 2 (1971): 355-63.
- Laird, Raymond J., 2013: John Chrysostom and the Anomoeans: Shaping an Antiochene Perspective on Christology. p. 129-149 in: Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil (eds.), Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Lake, Kirsopp, 1904: The Influence of Textual criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament. An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Leiden, On January 27, 1904. Oxford: Parker & Son.
- Lambrecht, Jan, 2001: "Synagogues of Satan" (Rev 2:9 and 3:9): Anti-Judaism in the Book of Revelation. p. 514-530 in: R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Lampe, Peter, 2003: From Paul to Valentinus. Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries. Translated by Michael Steinhauser. Edited by Marshall D. Johnson. London: T & T Clark International.
- Landvai, Paul, 1971: Antisemitism without Jews. Communist Eastern Europe. New York: Doubleday
- Langmuir, Gavin I., 1990a: Anti-Judaism as the Necessary Preparation for Antisemitism. p. 57-62 in: ibid., Toward a Definition of Antisemitism. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Langmuir, Gavin I., 1990a: The Transformation of Anti-Judaism. p. 63-99 in: ibid.,

- Toward a Definition of Antisemitism. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Langmuir, Gavin I., 1990b: Introduction. p. 1-17 in: *ibid.*, Toward a Definition of Antisemitism. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
 - Langmuir, Gavin I., 1990d: Toward a definition of Antisemitism. p. 311-352 in: *ibid.*, Toward a Definition of Antisemitism. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
 - Langmuir, Gavin I., 1990e: Tradition, History, and Prejudice. p. 42-54 in: *ibid.*, Toward a Definition of Antisemitism. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
 - Lapidé, Pinchas, 1979: Jesu Tod durch Römerhand. Zur blasphemischen These vom 'Gottesmord' durch die Juden. p. 239-255 in: Horst Goldstein (ed.), Gottesverächter und Menschenfeinde? Juden zwischen Jesus und frühchristlicher Kirche. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag.
 - Lapidé, Pinchas, 1993: Paulus – zwischen Damaskus und Qumran. Fehldeutungen und Übersetzungsfehler. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
 - Leighton, Christopher M., 1994: Introduction to the Revised Edition. p. 16-66 in: Norman A. Beck, Mature Christianity in the 21st Century. The Recognition and Repudiation of the Anti-Jewish Polemic of the New Testament. Expanded and Revised Edition. With a Prologue and Introduction by Christopher M. Leighton. New York: Crossroad.
 - Leipoldt, Johannes, 1933: Antisemitismus in der alten Welt. Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke.
 - Leipoldt, Johannes, 1950: Antisemitismus. p. 469-76 in: Theodor Klauser (ed.), Reallexikon für die Antike und Christentum. Band I. Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlags-G.M.B.H.
 - Leistner, Reinhold, 1974: Antijudaismus im Johannesevangelium? Darstellung des Problems in der neueren Auslegungsgeschichte und Untersuchung der Leidensgeschichte. Bern/Frankfurt am Main: Herbert Lang.
 - Lendvai, Paul, 1971: Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe. London: MacDonald.
 - Lepsius, Rainer, 1993: Das Erbe des Nationalsozialismus und die politische Kultur der Nachfolgestaaten des „Großdeutschen Reiches“. p. 229-245 in: *ibid.* (ed.), Demokratie in Deutschland. Soziologisch-historische Konstellationsanalysen. Ausgewählte Aufsätze. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - Levine, Amy-Jill 1999: Anti-Judaism and the Gospel of Matthew. p. 9-36 in: William R. Farmer (ed.), Anti-Judaism and the Gospels. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
 - Lieu, Judith, 1992: History and theology in Christian Views of Judaism. p. 79-96 in: *ibid.*, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire. London/New York: Routledge.
 - Lieu, Judith, 1994: 'The Parting of the Ways': Theological Construct or Historical Reality? *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 (1994): 101-119.
 - Lieu, Judith, 1996: Image and Reality. The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
 - Lieu, Judith, 2001: Anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel: Explanation and Hermeneutics. p. 126-143 in: R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
 - Lieu, Judith, 2006: Self-definition vis-à-vis the Jewish matrix. p. 214-229 in: Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (eds.), The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 1. Origins to Constantine. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Lieu, Judith, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), 1992a: Introduction. p. 1-8 in: *ibid.* (eds.), The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire. London/New

- York: Routledge.
- Lieu, Judith, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), 1992b: *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*. London/New York: Routledge.
 - Limor, Ora and Guy G. Stroumsa (eds.), 1996: Introduction. p. VII-VIII in: *ibid.* (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Loewenstein, Rudolph M., 1951: *Christians and Jews. A Psychoanalytic Study*. New York: International Universities Press.
 - Löhr, Winrich, 2001: Did Marcion distinguish between a Just God and a Good God? p. 131-146 in: Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung. Marcion and His Impact on Church History. Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion. August 2001 in Mainz*. Berlin und New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Loveday, Alexander, 1999: The Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text. p. 15-44 in: Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price (eds.), *Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Lüdemann, Gerd, 1987: *Das frühe Christentum nach den Traditionen der Apostelgeschichte. Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - Luedemann, Gerd, 1988: Acts of the Apostles as a Historical Source. p. 109-125 in: Jacob Neusner (ed.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism. Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
 - Lukas, Volker, 2008: Rhetorik und literarischer 'Kampf'. Tertullians Streitschrift gegen Marcion als Paradigma der Selbstvergewisserung der Orthodoxie gegenüber der Häresie. Eine philologisch-theologische Analyse. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
 - Lundskow, George, 2006: The Concept of Choice in the Rise of Christianity: A Critique of Rational-Choice Theory. p. 223-248 in: Warren S. Goldstein (ed.), *Marx, Critical Theory, and Religion. A Critique of Rational Choice*. Leiden/Boston: Brill
 - Lutz, Ulrich, 1993: Der Antijudaismus im Matthäusevangelium als historisches und theologisches Problem. Eine Skizze. *Evangelische Theologie* 53 (1993): 310-327.
 - Lyman, Rebecca J., 2007: Heresiology: The invention of 'heresy' and 'schism'. p. 296-313 in: Agustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 2. Constantine to c. 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Lyman, Rebecca, 1997: The Making of a Heretic: The Life of Origen in Epiphanius Panarion 64. *Studia Patristica* Vol. XXXI (1997): 445-451.
 - MacDonald, Dennis Ronald, 1984: *The Legend and the Apostle. The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
 - Mach, Michael, 1996: Justin Martyr's *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo* and the Development of Christian Anti-Judaism. p. 27-47 in: Ora Limor and Guy G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - MacLennan, Robert S., 1990: *Early Christian Texts on Jews and Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
 - MacMullen, Ramsay, 1984: *Christianizing the Roman Empire. (A.D. 100-400)*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 - Maier, Johann, 1963: Die religiös motivierte Judenfeindschaft I. p. 22-47 in: Karl Thieme (Ed.), *Judenfeindschaft. Darstellung und Analysen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei.
 - Malherbe, Abraham J., 2000: *The Letters to the Thessalonians. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York/London et. al.: Doubleday.
 - Malina, Bruce J., 1976: *Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a*

- Hypothetical Definition. *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, Vol. VII, No. 1 (1976): 46 – 57.
- Marcus, Jacob Rader, 1999: *The Jew in the Medieval World. A Source Book: 315-1791*. Revised edition with an introduction and updated bibliography by Marc Saperstein. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.
 - Marcus, Ralph, 1946: *Antisemitism in the Hellenistic-Roman World*. p. 61-78 in Koppel S. Pinson (ed.), *Essays on Antisemitism*. With a Foreword by Salo W. Baron. Second edition. Revised and Enlarged. New York: Conference on Jewish Relations.
 - Markus, R. A., 1980: *The Problem of Self-Definition: From Sect to Church*. p. 1-15 in: E. P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition. Volume One. The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*. London: SCM Press.
 - Markus, Robert, 1990: *The End of Ancient Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Marr, Wilhelm, 1879: *Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum. Vom nicht confessionellen Standpunkt aus betrachtet. Vae Victis. Achte Auflage*. Bern: Rudolph Costenoble.
 - Martyn, James Louis, 1979: *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Second Edition. Nashville: Parthenon Press.
 - Martyr, Justin, 2003: *Dialogue with Trypho*. Translated by Thomas B. Falls. Revised and with a New Introduction by Thomas P. Halton. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.
 - Mason, Steve, 2003: *Josephus and the New Testament*. Second Edition. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
 - Mason, Steve, 2006: *The Contra Apionem in Social and Literary Context. An Invitation to Judean Philosophy*. p. 139-173 in: Leif Vaage (ed.), *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Mason, Steve, 2007: *Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History*, *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, Vol. 38 (2007): 457- 512.
 - May, Gerhard and Katharina Greschat (eds.), 2001: *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung. Marcion and His Impact on Church History. Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion. August 2001 in Mainz*. Berlin und New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - May, Gerhard, 1987: *Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions. The Second Century 6.3, Fall 1987*: 129-151.
 - Mayer, Anton, 1983: *Der zensierte Jesus. Soziologie des Neuen Testaments*. Mit einem Geleitwort von Norbert Greinacher. Olten/Freiburg: Walter-Verlag.
 - Mayer, Reinhold, 1991: *Altheidnischer Judenthaß und innerjüdische Polemik. Das judenfeindliche Dogma und seine Entstehungsgeschichte*. p. 34-52 in: Günther Bernd Ginzler (ed.), *Antisemitismus. Erscheinungsformen der Judenfeindschaft gestern und heute*. Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik.
 - Mayer, Wendy and Bronwen Neil (eds.), 2013: *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
 - Mayer, Wendy, 2013: *Religious Conflict: Definitions, Problems and Theoretical Approaches*. p. 1 – 19 in: *ibid.* and Bronwen Neil (eds.), *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
 - McDonald, Lee Martin and James A. Sanders, 2002: *The Canon Debate*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
 - McDonald, Lee Martin, 2007: *The Biblical Canon. Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
 - McDonald, Lee Martin, 2010: *What Do We Mean by Canon? Ancient and Modern*

- Questions. p. 8-40 in: *ibid.* and James H. Charlesworth (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Scriptures. The Function of "Canonical" and "Non-Canonical" Religious Texts.* London/New York: T&T Clark.
- McLaren, James S., 2013: *Early Christian Polemic against Jews and the Persecution of Christians in Rome by Nero.* p. 39-50 in: Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil (eds.), *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam.* Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
 - Meagher, John C., 1979: *As the Twig Was Bent.* p. 1-26, in: Alan T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity.* New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
 - Meeks, Wayne A. and Robert L. Wilken, 1978: *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era.* Missoula: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature.
 - Meeks, Wayne A., 1979: *Zur Soziologie des Urchristentums. Ausgewählte Beiträge zum frühchristlichen Gemeinschaftsleben in seiner gesellschaftlichen Umwelt.* München: Christian Kaiser Verlag.
 - Meeks, Wayne A., 1982: *The Social Context of Pauline Theology.* *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 266-277.
 - Meeks, Wayne A., 1993: *Urchristentum und Stadtkultur. Die soziale Welt der paulinischen Gemeinden.* Aus dem Amerikanischen Englisch übersetzt von Sieglinde Denzeln und Susanne Naumann. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
 - Merkel, Helmut, 1994: *Israel im lukanischen Doppelwerk,* *New Testament Studies* 40, Issue 3 (1994): 371-398.
 - Messerschmidt, Astrid, 2008: *Postkoloniale Erinnerungsprozesse in einer postnationalsozialistischen Gesellschaft – vom Umgang mit Rassismus und Antisemitismus.* *Peripherie. Zeitschrift für Politik und Ökonomie in der Dritten Welt.* No. 109/110 "Vom Erinnern und Vergessen." Online: http://www.zeitschrift-peripherie.de/109-110_Messerschmidt_Er.pdf (viewed 19.06.12).
 - Metz, Johann Baptist, 1984: *Im Angesichte der Juden.* *Christliche Theologie nach Auschwitz.* *Concilium* 20/5 (1984): 382-389.
 - Metzger, B. M., 1950: *The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament.* p. 25-68 in: Merrill M. Parvis and Allen P. Wikgren (eds.), *New Testament Manuscript Studies.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman, 2005: *The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration.* Fourth Edition. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Metzger, Bruce M., 1987: *The Canon of the New Testament. Its Origin, Development, and Significance.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - Minns, Denis and Paul Parvis (eds.), 2009: *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr. Apologies.* Edited with a Commentary on the Text by Dennis Minns and Paul Parvis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - Moll, Sebastian, 2007: *Justin and the Pontic Wolf.* p. 145-151 in: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Moore, George Foot, 1921: *Christian Writers on Judaism.* *The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (1921): 197-254.
 - Moreau, Jacques, 1971: *Die Christenverfolgung im Römischen Reich.* Zweite Auflage. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Moule, C. F. D., 1966: *The Birth of the New Testament.* Second Edition, with Minor Revisions. London: Adam & Charles Black.
 - Munck, Johannes, 1954: *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte.* Copenhagen:

- Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus.
- Munck, Johannes, 1956: Christus und Israel. Eine Auslegung von Röm 9-11. Copenhagen: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus.
 - Mußner, Franz, 1967: Die bösen Winzer nach Matthäus 21,33-46 p. 129-134 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Mußner, Franz, 1988: Traktat über die Juden. Zweite, überarbeitete Auflage. München: Kösel-Verlag.
 - Mußner, Franz, 1991: Dieses Geschlecht wird nicht vergehen. Judentum und Kirche. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder.
 - Mußner, Franz, 1995: Kommende Schwerpunkte Biblischer Theologie. p. 237-251 in: Christoph Dohmen and Thomas Söding (eds.), Eine Bibel – zwei Testamente. Positionen Biblischer Theologie. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh.
 - Neuhaus, Dietrich (ed.), 1990: *Teufelskinder oder Heilsbringer – Die Juden im Johannes-Evangelium*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
 - Neusner, Jacob, 1984: Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity. London: SPCK.
 - Neusner, Jacob, 1984: Rokeah's "Jews, Pagans, and Christians in Conflict". The Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series, Vol. 74, No. 3 (Jan., 1984): 313-320.
 - Neusner, Jacob, 1987: Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine. History, Messiah, Israel, and the Initial Confrontation. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Neusner, Jacob, 1995: Was Rabbinic Judaism Really 'Ethnic'? The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 57 (1995): 281-305.
 - Nirenberg, David, 2013: Anti-Judaism. The Western Tradition. New York/London: W. W. Norton & Company.
 - Norelli, Enrico, 2001: Marcion: ein christlicher Philosoph oder ein Christ gegen die Philosophie? p. 113-130 in: Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat (eds.), Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung. Marcion and His Impact on Church History. Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion. August 2001 in Mainz. Berlin und New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Oeming, Manfred und, 2003: Das Hervorwachsen des Verbindlichen aus der Geschichte des Gottesvolkes Grundzüge einer prozessual-soziologischen Kanon-Theorie. ZNT 12 (2003), Themenheft Kanon: 52-58.
 - Opelt, Ilona, 1980: Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
 - Osten-Sacken, Peter von der, 1976: Leistung und Grenze der johanneischen Kreuzestheologie. Ev. Th. 36, 1976: 154-176
 - Osten-Sacken, Peter von der, 1977: Das paulinische Verständnis des Gesetzes im Spannungsfeld von Eschatologie und Geschichte. Erläuterungen zum Evangelium als Faktor von theologischem Antijudaismus. Evangelische Theologie 37 (1977): 549-587.
 - Osten-Sacken, Peter von der, 1978: Von der Notwendigkeit theologischen Besitzverzichts. p. 244-251 in: Rosemary Ruether, Nächstenliebe und Brudermord. Die theologischen Wurzeln des Antisemitismus. München. Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Osten-Sacken, Peter von der, 2005: Institut Kirche und Judentum (1960-2005) – Geschichte, Ziele, Perspektiven. p. 7-16 in: Rudolf W. Sirsch (ed.), Bilanz und Perspektiven des christlich-jüdischen Dialogs. Epd-Dokumentation Nr. 9/10, 1. März 2005. Online: http://www.deutscher-koordinierungsrat.de/sites/default/files/downloads/DKR/Bilanz_und_Perspektiven.pdf

(viewed 08.07.15).

- Overbeck, Franz, 1872: Über das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zur Apostelgeschichte. *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 15 (1872): 305-349.
- Overbeck, Franz, 1882: Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur. *Historische Zeitschrift*, Bd. 48, H. 3 (1882): 417-472.
- Overbeck, Franz, 1919: *Christentum und Kultur. Gedanken und Anmerkungen zur modernen Theologie.* Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Carl Albrecht Bernoulli. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co.
- Overman, J. Andrew, 1990: *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism. The Social World of the Matthean Community.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Pagel, Elaine Hiesey, 1975: *The Gnostic Paul. Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Paget, J. Carleton, 2010a: Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity. p. 43-76 in: *ibid.*, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Paget, J. Carleton, 2010b: Jewish Proselytism at the Time of Christian Origins: Chimera or Reality? p. 149-183 in: *ibid.*, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Paget, James Carleton, 2007: The Definition of the Terms *Jewish Christian* and *Jewish Christianity* in the History of Research. p. 22-52 in: Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (eds), *Jewish Believers in Jesus.* Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Paget, James Charleton, 1994: *Epistle of Barnabas. Outlook and Background.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.
- Pancaro, Severino, 1975: The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of St. John. *New Testament Studies* 21 (1975): 396-405.
- Parker, D. C., 1997: *The Living Text of the Gospels.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, David C., 2012: *Textual Scholarship and the making of the New Testament. The Lyell Lectures Oxford.* Trinity Term 2011. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, David, 2012: *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament. The Lyell Lectures.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parkes, James, 1934: *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Anti-Semitism.* London: The Soncino Press.
- Parkes, James, 1938 [1930]: *The Jew and his Neighbour: A Study in the Causes of Anti-Semitism.* London: Student Christian Movement Press.
- Parkes, James, 1979: Preface. p. v-xi, in: Alan T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity.* New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
- Parvis, Merrill M., 1952: The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal. *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (1952): 165-174.
- Parvis, Paul, 2007a: Justin, Philosopher and Martyr. The Posthumous Creation of the Second Apology. p. 38-49 in: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Parvis, Sara, 2007b: Justin Martyr and the Apologetic Tradition. p. 115-127 in: *ibid.* and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Bellinzoni, A. J., 1967: *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Pearson, Birger A., 1971: 1. Thessalonians 2:13-16. A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation. *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971): 79-94.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, 1971: *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine.* Vol. 1 *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition.* Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

- Petersens, Erich 1933. Die Kirche aus Juden und Heiden. Drei Vorlesungen. Salzburg: Verlag Anton Pustet.
- Pinkser, Leo, 1912 [1882]: Autoemanzipation. Mahnruf an seine Stammesgenossen von einem russischen Juden. Dritte Auflage. Brunn: Jüd. Buch- und Kunstverlag.
- Pinsker, Leo, 1917: "Auto-Emanzipation!" von einem russischen Juden. Mit einer Vorbemerkung von Achad Haam. Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi, 2013: Rewriting: The Path from Apocryphal to Heretical. p. 87-108 in: Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil (eds.), Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Plaskow, Judith, 2005: The Coming of Lilith. Essays on Feminism, Judaism, and Sexual Ethics, 1972-2003. Edited with Donna Berman. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Poliakov, Léon, 1979 [1977]: Geschichte des Antisemitismus. I. Von der Antike bis zu den Kreuzzügen. Worms: Verlag Georg Heintz. → franz. Original "Du Christ aux Juifs de Cour" (1955)
- Radin, M., 1915: The Jews among the Greeks and Romans. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Räisänen, Heikki, 1988: Paul, God, and Israel: Romans 9-11 in Recent Research. p. 178-206 in: Jacob Neusner et. al. (eds.), The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Räisänen, Heikki, 1991: The Redemption of Israel. A Salvation-Historical Problem in Luke-Acts. p. 94-114 in: Petri Lohmanen (ed.), Luke-Acts. Scandinavian Perspectives. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Räisänen, Heikki, 2001 [1997]: Marcion and the Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism: A Reappraisal. p. 191-205 in: ibid. (ed.), Challenges to Biblical Interpretation. Collected Essays 1991-2001. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill.
- Räisänen, Heikki, 2001: Interpreting Paul. p. 85-99 in: ibid. (ed.), Challenges to Biblical Interpretation. Collected Essays 1991-2001. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill.
- Räisänen, Heikki, 2008: A Controversial Jew and His Conflicting Convictions. p. 319-335 in: Fabian E. Udoh et. al. (eds.), Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities. Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Rajak, Tessa, 1999: Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. p. 59-80 in: Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price (eds.), Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pagans, Jews, and Christians. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rebenich, Stefan, 2009: Late Antiquity in Modern Eyes. p. 59-92 in: Philip Rousseau (ed.), Blackwell Companion to Late Antiquity. Malden/Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Reinhartz, Adele, 2001: Jews and Jews in the Fourth Gospel. p. 341-356 in: R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.), Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- Remus, Harold, 1986: Justin Martyr's Argument with Judaism. 59-80 in: Stephen G. Wilson (ed.), Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 2. Separation and Polemic. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Rendtorff, Rolf and Ekkehard Stegemann (ed.), 1980: Auschwitz – Krise der christlichen Theologie. Eine Vortragsreihe. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag.
- Rendtorff, Rolf and Hans Hermann Henrix (eds.), 1988: Die Kirchen und das Judentum Dokumente von 1945-1985. Paderborn: Verlag Bonifatius/München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Rendtorff, Rolf, 1989: Hat denn Gott sein Volk verstoßen? Die evangelische Kirche und das Judentum seit 1945. Ein Kommentar. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich, 1968: Das Neue Testament und die Nachapostolische Zeit. p.

- 23-83 in: *ibid.* und Siegfried von Kortzfleisch (eds.), *Kirche und Synagoge. Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden. Darstellungen mit Quellen. Band I.* Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.
- Rensberger, David, 1999: *Anti-Judaism and the Gospel of John.* p. 120-157 in: William R. Farmer (ed.), *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels.* Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
 - Rese, Martin, 1991: "Die Juden" im lukanischen Doppelwerk. Ein Bericht über eine längst nötige „neuere“ Diskussion. p. 61-79 in: Claus Bussmann und Walter Radl (eds.), *Der Treue Gottes trauen. Beiträge zum Werk des Lukas.* Für Gerhard Schneider. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder.
 - Richardson, Peter and David Granskou (eds.), 1986: *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 1. Paul and the Gospels.* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Richardson, Peter, 1969: *Israel in the Apostolic Church.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Riddle, D. W., 1934: Die Verfolgungslogien in formgeschichtlicher und soziologischer Beleuchtung. *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Band 33, Heft 3 (1934): 271-289.
 - Riddle, Donald W., 1931: *The Martyrs. A Study in Social Control.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Rist, Martin, 1942: Pseudoepigraphical Refutations of Marcionism, *Journal of Religion* 22, No. 1 (1942): 39-62.
 - Ritschl, Albrecht, 1857: *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche. Eine kirchen- und Dogmengeschichtliche Monographie.* Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
 - Rives, J. B., 2001 [1995]: *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage from Augustus to Constantine.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - Robinson, James M., 1971: Introduction: The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship. p. 1-19 in: Helmut Koester and James M. Robinson (Eds.), *Trajectories through Early Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
 - Rokeah, David, 1982: *Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict.* Jerusalem-Leiden: The Magnes Press.
 - Rokéah, David, 2002: *Justin Martyr and the Jews.* Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
 - Rosenberg, Alfred, 1934: *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine Wertung der seelisch-geistigen Gestaltenkämpfe unserer Zeit.* 33.-34. Auflage. München: Hoheneichen-Verlag. Online: <https://ia700408.us.archive.org/23/items/DerMythusDes20Jahrhunderts/DerMythusDes20.Jahrhunderts.pdf> (viewed 06.01.2015).
 - Roth, Dieter, 2015: *The Text of Marcion's Gospel.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.
 - Ruether, Rosemary Radford, 1997 [o. 1995]: *Faith and Fratricide. The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism.* New York: The Seabury Press.
 - Ruether, Rosemary, 1978: *Nächstenliebe und Brudermord. Die theologischen Wurzeln des Antisemitismus.* München. Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Saldarini, Anthony J., 1991: The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict. p. 38-61 in: David L. Balch (ed.), *Social History of the Matthean Community. Cross Disciplinary Approaches.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Sanders, E.P., 1969: *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition.* London: Cambridge University Press.
 - Sanders, E.P., 1977: *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A comparison of Patterns of Religion.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
 - Sanders, E.P., 1983: *Paul, The law and the Jewish People.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
 - Sanders, E.P., 1986: Paul on the Law, His Opponents, and the Jewish People in Philippians 3 and 2 Corinthians 11. p. 75-90 in: Peter Richardson and David Granskou

- (eds.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 1. Paul and the Gospels*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Sanders, E.P., 2008: *Comparing Judaism and Christianity. An Academic Autobiography*. p. 11-41 in: Fabian E. Udoh et. al. (eds.), *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities. Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
 - Sanders, Ed Parish and Margaret Davies, 1994 [1989]: *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM Press/Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.
 - Sanders, Jack T., 1987: *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press.
 - Sanders, Jack T., 1993: *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants. The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations*. London: SCM Press LTD.
 - Sanders, Jack T., 2002: *Establishing Social Distance between Christians and Both Jews and Pagans*. p. 361-382 in: Anthony J. Blasi, Jean Duhaime, Paul-André Turcotte (eds.), *Handbook of Early Christianity. Social Science Approaches*. Walnut Creek/Lanham/New York/Oxford: AltaMira Press.
 - Sandmel, Sandmel, 1978: *Antisemitism in the New Testament?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
 - Sänger, Dieter, 1988: *Neues Testament und Antijudaismus. Versuch einer exegetischen und hermeneutischen Vergewisserung im innerchristlichen Gespräch. Kerygma und Dogma 34 (1988): 210-231*
 - Sänger, Dieter, 2011: *Literarische Strategien der Polemik im Galaterbrief*. p. 155-181 in: Oda Wischmeyer and Lorenzo Scornaienchi (ed.), *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
 - Sartre, Jean-Paul, 1995: *Anti-Semite and Jew. An Exploration of the Etiology of Hate*. New York: Schocken Books. Online: http://abahlali.org/files/Jean-Paul_Sartre_Anti-Semite_and_Jew_An_Exploration_of_the_Etiology_of_Hate_1995.pdf (viewed 19.02.13).
 - Schäfer, Peter, 1998 [1997]: *Judeophobia. Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.
 - Schäfer, Peter, 2010: *Geschichte der Juden in der Antike. Die Juden Palästinas von Alexander dem Großen bis zur arabischen Eroberung. 2., durchgesehene Auflage*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - Schechter, Solomon, 1915: *Higher Criticism – Higher Antisemitism*. p. 35-39 in: *ibid.*, *Seminary Addresses and Other Papers*. Cincinnati: Ark Publishing.
 - Schelkle, Karl Hermann, 1967: *Die 'Selbstverfluchung' Israels nach Matthäus 27, 23-25*. p. 148-156 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Schmid, Ulrich, 1995: *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung. Band 25*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Schmid, Ulrich, 2001: *Marcions Evangelium und die neutestamentlichen Evangelien*. p. 67-77 in: Gerhard May and Katharina Greschat (eds.), *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung. Marcion and His Impact on Church History. Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion. August 2001 in Mainz*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Schmithals, Walter, 1960: *Zur Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51, Heft 3-4 (1960): 225-245.
 - Schmithals, Walter, 1963: *Paulus und Jakobus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Schmithals, Walter, 1980: Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.
- Schmithals, Walter, 1982: Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich.
- Schneckenburger, Matthias, 1841: Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte. Zugleich eine Ergänzung der neueren Commentare. Bern: Chr. Fischer.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim, 1949: Theologie und Geschichte des Frühchristentums. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim, 1956: Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim, 1959: Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schoeps, Hans-Joachim, 1943: Die Jüdischen Prophetenmorde. *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*. Band 2. Uppsala: Wretmans Boktryckeri/Zürich: Max Niehans Verlag.
- Scholtissek, Klaus, 1999: Antijudaismus im Johannesevangelium? Ein Gesprächsbeitrag. p. 151-181 in: Rainer Kampling, (ed.), "Nun steht aber diese Sache im Evangelium..." Zur Frage nach den Anfängen des christlichen Antijudaismus. Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich: Schöningh.
- Schottroff, Luise and Marie-Theres Wacker (Eds.), 1996: Von der Wurzel getragen. Christlich-feministische Exegese in Auseinandersetzung mit Antijudaismus. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill.
- Schottroff, Luise, 1990: Befreiungserfahrungen. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des Neuen Testaments. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Schramm, T. L. 1974: The use of Ioudaios in the Fourth Gospel. An Application of Some Linguistic Insights to a New Testament Problem. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Schreckenberg, Hans, 1999: Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.-11. Jh.). 4., überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Schürer, Emil, 2014: A History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135). Volume I. A new English Version. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar. London/New York: Bloomsbury.
- Schwegler, Albert, 1846: Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues.
- Schweitzer, Albert, 1930: Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Siebeck.
- Seeliger, Hans Reinhard, 1990: Gemeinsamkeiten in der antijüdischen und antichristlichen Polemik in der Antike. p. 88-94 in: Herbert Frohnhofen (Ed.), Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Hamburg: Steinmann & Steinmann.
- Setzer, Claudia, 1994: Jewish responses to early Christians. History and Polemics, 30 - 150 C.E. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sevenster, J.N., 1975: The Roots of Pagan Antisemitism in the Ancient World. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Sherwin-White, A. N., 1952: The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again. The Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, 3/2 (1952): 199-213.
- Sherwin-White, Adrian N., 1967: Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sider, Robert D. (ed.), 2001: Christian and Pagan in the Roman Empire. The Witness of Tertullian. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Sidorsky, David, 1988: Against the Idea of Antisemitism: Agenda Priorities, Empirical

- Disagreement, and Conceptual Issues. p. 147-171 in: Yehuda Bauer (ed.), *Present-Day Antisemitism. Proceedings of the Eighth International Seminar of the Study Circle on World Jewry under the auspices of the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog*. Jerusalem, 29-31 December 1985. Israel: The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore (ed.), 1988: *Verdrängte Vergangenheit, die uns bedrängt. Feministische Theologie in der Verantwortung für die Geschichte*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore (ed.), 1994a: *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
 - Siegele-Wenschkewitz, Leonore, 1994b [1982]: *Mitverantwortung und Schuld der Christen am Holocaust*. p. 1-26 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen*. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
 - Sim, David C., 1998: *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism. The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Gospel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
 - Theißen, Gerd, 2011: *Kritik an Paul im Matthäusevangelium? Von der Kunst verdeckter Polemik im Urchristentum*. p. 465-490 in: Oda Wischmeyer and Lorenzo Scornaienchi (ed.), *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
 - Sim, David C., 2011: *Polemical Strategies in the Gospel of Matthew*. p. 491-515 in: Oda Wischmeyer and Lorenzo Scornaienchi (ed.), *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
 - Sim, David C., 2013: *Conflict in the Canon: The Pauline Literature and the Gospel of Matthew*. p. 71-86 in: Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil (eds.), *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
 - Simmel, Ernst, 1993: *Antisemitismus und Massen-Psychopathologie*. p. 58-100 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Antisemitismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
 - Simmel, Georg, 1908: *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.
 - Simon, Marcel, 1986 [1948]: *Verus Israel*. Oxford u.a.: Oxford University Press.
 - Skarsaune, Oskar, 1987: *The Proof from Prophecy. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
 - Skarsaune, Oskar, 2007a: *Jewish Believers in Jesus in Antiquity – Problems of Definition and Sources*. p. 3-21 in: *ibid.* and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
 - Skarsaune, Oskar, 2007b: *Justin and His Bible*. p. 53-76 in: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Skarsaune, Oskar, 2007b: *The History of Jewish Believers in the Early Centuries – Perspectives and Framework*. p. 745-781 in *ibid.* and Reidar Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus*. Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
 - Slusser, Michael, 2007: *Justin Scholarship. Trends and Trajectories*. p. 13-21 in: Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (eds.), *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Smallwood, E. Mary, 1956: *Domitian's Attitude Toward the Jews and Judaism*. *Classical Philology*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (1956): 1-13.
 - Smallwood, E. Mary, 1976: *Jews under Roman Rule: from Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
 - Smiga, George M., 1992: *Pain and Polemic. Anti-Judaism in the Gospels*. New York/Mahwah: Paulist Press.

- Smith, Morton, 1957: Pauline Problems. Apropos of J. Munck, 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'. The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 50, No. 2 (1957): 107-131.
- Sohm, Rudolph, 1909: Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus. p. 335-390 in: Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Siebenundzwanzigster Band. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner
- Speigl, Jakob, 1970: Der römische Staat und die Christen. Staat und Kirche von Domitian bis Commodus. Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Spence, Stephen, 2004: The Parting of the Ways: The Roman Church as a Case Study. Leuven: Peeters.
- Stark, Rodney, 1996: The Rise of Christianity. A Sociologist Reconsiders History. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Stegemann, Ekkehard W. and Wolfgang Stegemann, 1997: Urchristliche Sozialgeschichte. Die Anfänge im Judentum und die Christusgemeinden in der mediterranen Welt. Zweite durchgesehene und ergänzte Auflage. Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
- Stegemann, Ekkehard W., 2004: Von der Schwierigkeit, sich von sich zu unterscheiden. Zum Umgang mit der Judenfeindschaft in der Theologie. p. 47-66 in: Werner Bergmann und Mona Körter (Eds.), Antisemitismusforschung in den Wissenschaften. Berlin: Metropol.
- Stegemann, Wolfgang, 1998: Gab es eine jüdische Beteiligung an der Kreuzigung Jesu? in: Kirche und Israel 13/1 (1998): 46-58.
- Stendahl, Krister, 1954: The School of St. Matthew. And its Use of the Old Testament. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell [u.a.].
- Stendahl, Krister, 1976: Paul Among Jews and Gentiles. And Other Essays. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Sterling, Eleonore, 1969: Judenhaß, die Anfänge des politischen Antisemitismus in Deutschland (1815-1850). Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.
- Sterling, Gregory, 1992: Historiography and Self-Definition. Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill.
- Stern, Menahem, 1976: Greek and Latin authors on Jews and Judaism. Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary. Volume One. From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press.
- Stern, Menahem, 1980: Greek and Latin authors on Jews and Judaism. Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary. Volume Two. From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press.
- Stöhr, Martin, 1967: Diskussionsbericht. p. 195-213 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (Eds.), Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Stowers, Stanley K., 1994: A Rereading of Romans. Justice, Jews, and Gentiles. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Stowers, Stanley K., 2008: What Is "Pauline Participation in Christ". p. 352-371 in: Fabian E. Udoh et. al. (eds.), Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities. Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Strauss, Herbert A., 1988: Antisemitism as a Political Tool. p. 125-145 in: Yehuda Bauer (ed.), Present-Day Antisemitism. Proceedings of the Eighth International Seminar of the Study Circle on World Jewry under the auspices of the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog. Jerusalem, 29-31 December 1985. Israel: The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Strecker, Christian, 1996: Paulus aus einer 'neuen Perspektive'. Der Paradigmenwechsel in der jüngeren Paulusforschung. Kirche und Israel 11/1 (1996): 3-18.

- Stroumsa, Guy G., 1996: From Anti-Judaism to Antisemitism in Early Christianity? p. 1-26 in: *ibid.* and Ora Limor (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos: Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stroumsa, Guy, 2007: Religious Dynamics between Christians and Jews in Late Antiquity (312–640). p. 149-172 in: Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Volume 2. Constantine to c. 600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore, 1975: *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*. SBL Dissertation Series 20. Montana: University of Montana.
- Sumney, Jerry L., 2007: Paul And Christ-Believing Jews Whom He Opposes. p. 57-80 in: Matt Jackson-McCabe (ed.), *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sunberg, Albert C., 1968: Towards a revised history of the New Testament Canon. *Studia Evangelica*, Vol. 4 (1968): 452-461.
- Sundberg, A. C., 1968: Towards a Revised History of the New Testament Canon. p. 452-461 in: F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica. Vol IV. Papers presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1965*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Sundberg, Albert C., 1964: *The Old Testament of the Early Church*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sundberg, Albert C., 1973: Canon Muratori: A Fourth-Century List. *The Harvard Theological Review* 66, No. 1 (1973): 1-41.
- Taguieff, Pierre-André, 2004: *Rising from the muck: The New Anti-Semitism in Europe*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Tal, Uriel, 1975: *Christians and Jews in Germany. Religion, Politics, and Ideology in the Second Reich, 1870-1914*. Translated by Noah Jonathan Jacobs. Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press.
- Tal, Uriel, 2004: Religious and Anti-religious Roots of Modern Anti-Semitism. p. 171-190 in: *ibid.*, *Religion, Politics and Ideology in the Third Reich. Selected Essays*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Joan E., 1990: The Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention? *Vigilae Christianae* 44 (1990): 313-334.
- Taylor, Miriam S., 1995: *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity. A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*. Leiden, New York, Köln: E. J. Brill
- Taylor, R. E., 1961: Attitudes of the Fathers toward Practices of Jewish Christians. *Studia Patristica* Vol. IV (1961): 504-511.
- Theißen, Gerd, 1977: *Soziologie der Jesusbewegung. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Theißen, Gerd, 1990: Aporien im Umgang mit den Antijudaismen des Neuen Testaments. p. 535-553 in: Matthias Blum, Christian Macholz und Ekkehard W. Stegemann (eds.), *Die hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Theißen, Gerd, 2004: *Die Jesusbewegung. Sozialgeschichte einer Revolution der Werte*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Thieme, Karl (Ed.), 1963b: *Judenfeindschaft. Darstellung und Analysen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei.
- Thieme, Karl, 1963a: Die religiös motivierte Judenfeindschaft II. p. 48-79 in: *ibid.* (Ed.), *Judenfeindschaft. Darstellung und Analysen*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Bücherei.
- Thomas, Clemens, 1979: *Verhängnis, Mißverständnis und Schuld beim frühen*

- Eindringen der Judenfeindschaft in die christliche Botschaft. p. 13-27 in: Horst Goldstein (ed.), *Gottesverächter und Menschenfeinde? Juden zwischen Jesus und frühchristlicher Kirche*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag.
- Tiede, David L., 1988: "Glory to Thy People, Israel": Luke-Acts and the Jews. p. 327-341 in: Jacob Neusner (ed.), *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism. Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
 - Townsend, John T., 1979: *The Gospel of John and the Jews: The Story of a Religious Divorce*. p. 72-97 in: Alan T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York/Ramsey/Toronto: Paulist Press.
 - Tränkle, Hermann, 1964: Einleitung. p. xi-cxxviii in: Q. S. F. Tertulliani, *Adversus Iudaeos*. Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar. Herausgegeben von Hermann Tränkle. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
 - Trilling, Wolfgang, 1964: *Das wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. München: Kösel-Verlag.
Trinity Press International.
 - Trobisch, David, 1996: *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*. Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz.
 - Turner, H. E. W., 1978 [o. 1954]: *The Pattern of Christian Truth A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church*. London: A. R. Mowbray.
 - Tyson, 2005: *Anti-Judaism in Marcion and His Opponents. Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations. Volume 1 (2005-2006): 196-208*. Online:
<http://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/scjr/article/view/1359/1269> (access 16.07.2015).
 - Tyson, Joseph B. (ed.), 1988: *Luke-Acts and the Jewish people. Eight Critical Perspectives*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
 - Tyson, Joseph B., 1992: *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
 - Tyson, Joseph B., 2003: *From History to Rhetoric and Back: Assessing New Trends in Acts Studies*. P. 23-42 in: Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele (eds.), *Contextualizing Acts. Lukan Narrative and Greco-Roman Discourse*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
 - Tyson, Joseph B., 2006: *Marcion and Luke-Acts. A Defining Struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
 - Ullmann, Walter, 1976: *The Constitutional Significance of Constantine the Great's settlement*, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (1976): 1-16.
 - Ulrich, Eugene, 2002: *The Notion and Definition of Canon*. p. 21-35 in: Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
 - Vaage, Leif (ed.), 2006b: *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Vaage, Leif, 2006a: *Ancient Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success. Christians, Jews, and Others in the Early Roman Empire*. p. 3-19 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Vaage, Leif, 2006c: *Why Christianity Succeeded (in) the Roman Empire*. p. 253-278 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
 - Valtnik, Eveline, 1996: *Feministisch-christliche Identität und Antijudaismus*. p. 1-26 in: Schottroff, Luise and Marie-Theres Wacker (Eds.), *Von der Wurzel getragen. Christlich-feministische Exegese in Auseinandersetzung mit Antijudaismus*. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill.

- Voigt, Sebastian, 2015: Intellektuelle politische Interventionen. Bernard Lazares Auseinandersetzung mit dem Antisemitismus im Frankreich des späten 19. Jahrhunderts. p. 149-171 in: Hans-Joachim Hahn and Olaf Kistenmacher (eds.), Beschreibungversuche der Judenfeindschaft. Zur Geschichte der Antisemitismusforschung vor 1944. Berlin/München/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Volkov, Shulamit, 2000a: Antisemitismus als kultureller Code. p. 13-36 in: ibid. (ed.), Antisemitismus als kultureller Code. Zehn Essays. München: C.H. Beck.
- Volkov, Shulamit, 2000b: Das geschriebene und das gesprochene Wort. Über Kontinuität und Diskontinuität im deutschen Antisemitismus. p. 54-75 in: ibid. (ed.), Antisemitismus als kultureller Code. Zehn Essays. München: C.H. Beck.
- Wacker, Marie-Theres, 1996: Den/Dem anderen Raum geben. Feministisch-christliche Identität ohne Antijudaismus. p. 247-269 in: Schottroff, Luise and Marie-Theres Wacker (Eds.), Von der Wurzel getragen. Christlich-feministische Exegese in Auseinandersetzung mit Antijudaismus. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill.
- Watson, Francis, 2007: Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. Beyond the New Perspectives. Revised and Expanded Edition. Michigan/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Weber, Max, 1922: Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Erster Teil. Die Wirtschaft und die gesellschaftlichen Ordnungen und Mächte. III. Die Typen der Herrschaft. 4. Charismatische Herrschaft. Online: <http://www.textlog.de/7415.html> (viewed 11.11.15).
- Wengst, Klaus, 1990a: Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus. Ein Versuch über das Johannesevangeliums. München: Christian Kaiser Verlag.
- Wengst, Klaus, 1990b: Die Darstellung „der Juden“ im Johannes-Evangelium als Reflex jüdisch-judenchristlicher Kontroverse. p. 22-38 in: Dietrich Neuhaus (ed.), Teufelskinder oder Heilsbringer – Die Juden im Johannes-Evangelium. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
- Westerholm, Stephen, 2004: Perspectives Old and New on Paul. The “Lutheran” Paul and his Critics. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Weyand, Jan, 2015: Die Entstehung der Antisemitismustheorie aus der Debatte über Judenemanzipation. p. 47-65 in: Hans-Joachim Hahn and Olaf Kistenmacher (eds.), Beschreibungversuche der Judenfeindschaft. Zur Geschichte der Antisemitismusforschung vor 1944. Berlin/München/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Wiese, Christian, 1994: Jahwe- ein Gott nur für Juden? p. 27-94 in: Leonore Siegele-Wenschkewitz (ed.), Christlicher Antijudaismus und Antisemitismus. Theologische und kirchliche Programme Deutscher Christen. Frankfurt am Main: Haag und Herchen.
- Wiese, Christian, 1999: Wissenschaft des Judentums und protestantische Theologie im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Ein Schrei ins Leere? Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wilcken, Ulrich, 1909: Zum Alexandrinischen Antisemitismus. p. 783-839 in: Abhandlungen der Philologisch-Historischen Klasse der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Siebenundzwanzigster Band. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Wilckens, Ulrich, 1970: Das Neue Testament. Übersetzt und kommentiert von Ulrich Wilckens. Beraten von Werner Jetter, Ernst Lange und Rudolf Pesch. Hamburg/Zürich/Köln: Furche Verlag/Benziger Verlag/Zwingli Verlag.
- Wilckens, Ulrich, 1974: Das Neue Testament und die Juden. Evangelische Theologie 34 (1974): 602-611.
- Wilde, Robert, 1949: The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Wiles, Maurice, 1967: The Divine Apostle. The Interpretation of St. Paul’s Epistles in the Early Church. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilhite, David E., 2007: Tertullian the African. An Anthropological Reading of

- Tertullian's Context and Identities. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wilken, Robert L., 1967: Judaism in Roman and Christian Society. *Journal of Religion* 47, No. 4 (1967): 313-330.
 - Wilken, Robert L., 1971: Judaism and the Early Christian Mind. A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 - Wilken, Robert L., 1983: John Chrysostom and the Jews. Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
 - Wilken, Robert L., 1984: The Christians as the Romans Saw Them. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 - Williams, Rowan, 1989: Does it make sense to speak of pre-Nicene orthodoxy? p. 1-23 in: Rowan Williams, *The Making of Orthodoxy. Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Williams, Arthur Lukyn, 1935: *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance*. London: Cambridge University Press.
 - Willitts, Joel, 2009: The Friendship of Matthew and Paul: A Response to a Recent Trend in the Interpretation of Matthew's Gospel. *HTS* 65 (2009): 150–58.
 - Willoughby, Harold, R., 1929: *Pagan Regeneration. A Study of Mystery Initiations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
 - Wilson, Stephen G., 1986: Marcion and the Jews. p. 45-58 in: *ibid.* (ed.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Volume 2. Separation and Polemic*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
 - Wilson, Stephen G., 1995: *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70-170 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
 - Wimsatt, W.K. and Monroe Beardsley, 1954: The Intentional Fallacy. p. 3-18 in: W. K. Wimsatt (ed.), *The Verbal Icon. Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
 - Winter, Paul, 1964: Zum Prozeß Jesu. p. 93-101 in: Willehad Paul Eckert, Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich (eds.), *Judenhaß – Schuld der Christen?! Versuch eines Gesprächs*. Essen: Hans Driewer Verlag.
 - Winter, Paul, 1967: Zum Prozeß Jesu. p. 95-104 in: Wilhelm Paul Eckert, Nathan Peter Levinson, Martin Stöhr (eds.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
 - Winter, Paul, 1974 [1961]: *On the Trial of Jesus*. Second Edition. Revised and Edited by T. A. Burkill and Geza Vermes. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
 - Wirth, Wolfgang, 1991: Judenfeindschaft von der frühen Kirche bis zu den Kreuzzügen. p. 53-80 in: Günther Bernd Ginzler (ed.), *Antisemitismus. Erscheinungsformen der Judenfeindschaft gestern und heute*. Köln: Verlag Wissenschaft und Politik.
 - Wistrich, Robert S., 1991: *Antisemitism. The Longest Hatred*. New York: Pantheon Books.
 - Wistrich, Robert S., 2005: European Antisemitism Reinvents itself. American Jewish Committee. Online: <http://www.ajc.org/atf/cf/%7B42D75369-D582-4380-8395-D25925B85EAF%7D/wistrich.pdf> (viewed 01.09.15).
 - Wistrich, Robert, 1988: Anti-Zionism as an Expression of Antisemitism in Recent Years. p. 175-187 in: Yehuda Bauer (ed.), *Present-Day Antisemitism. Proceedings of the Eighth International Seminar of the Study Circle on World Jewry under the auspices of the President of Israel, Chaim Herzog. Jerusalem, 29-31 December 1985*. Israel: The Vidal Sassoon International Center for the Study of Antisemitism. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
 - Wyschgorod, Michael, 1991: A Jewish View of Christianity. p. 104-119 in: Leon Klenicki (ed.), *Toward a Theological Encounter. Jewish Understandings of Christianity*.

Mahwah: Paulist Press.

- Yavetz, Zvi, 1997: Judenfeindschaft in der Antike. Mit einer Einleitung von Christian Meier. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Yuval, Israel, 2007: Zwei Völker in deinem Leib. Gegenseitige Wahrnehmung von Juden und Christen in Spätantike und Mittelalter. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Zahn, Theodor, 1886: Studien zu Justinus Martyr, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 8 [1886]: 1-84.
- Zahn, Theodor, 1901: Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Eine Ergänzung zu der Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Zahn, Theodor, 1975a [1888-1889]: Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Band 1. 1. und 2. Hälfte. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Zahn, Theodor, 1975b [1890-1892]: Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons. Band 1. 1. und 2. Hälfte. Hildesheim/New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Zeev, Pucci Ben, 1998: Jewish Rights in the Roman World. The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck.
- Zeitlin, Solomon, 1964: Who crucified Jesus? New York: Bloch Publishing Company.
- Ziemann, Benjamin, 2005: „Linguistische Wende“ und „kultureller Code“ in der Geschichtsschreibung zum modernen Antisemitismus. p. 301-322 in: Wolfgang Benz (ed.), Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung 14. Berlin: Metropol Verlag.
- Zuntz, G., 1953: The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946. London: Oxford University.