Contents

Introduction
The study of Early Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism

Ada Taggar-Cohen

The framework of the interdisciplinary study of monotheistic religions at CISMOR made it possible for us to cooperate and look into an important theme in the long and sometimes painful relations between Christians and Jews. This year we chose the relationships between Judaism and Christians in late antiquity and the early periods of the Middle Ages as the topic for our annual conference on Jewish Studies. As the papers presented in this volume reveal, the first millennium CE saw a constant struggle between the two religions as their adherents were striving to establish their respective identities. Theological as well as ritual issues were at the core of the debates, and diverse stories are found in both Jewish and Christian sources.

In a recent book-review by Paula Fredriksen, Professor Emerita at Boston University, three recently published books on Judaism and the New Testament are reviewed. Fredriksen opens her review with the following comment: "The intrinsic Jewishness of the New Testament—and that of its two prime figures, Jesus and Paul—has long been obscured because of two simultaneous and linked accidents of history: the rise of Gentile Christianity and of Rabbinic Judaism." As Christianity developed it "tried to distinguish the Jesus of history from the Christ of doctrine" and only by the 19th and 20th centuries did scholars go back to look for "the historical Jesus". She then points out that "particularly since the 1950s, with the shifting of the quest from schools of theology to departments of comparative religion in liberal arts faculties, scholars of different faiths and of none have cooperatively joined in the search. In current scholarship, in schools of theology no less than in faculties of religion, to be a Jewish historian of Christianity, particularly of ancient Christianity, is no rarity."[1)]

The School of Theology of Doshisha University and the research center of CISMOR, being part of the described phenomenon, are now taking part in this global discussion.

This year's conference, which took place over two days with additional two days for students' workshops, enjoyed the participation of two well-known overseas scholars who specialize in the fields of Early Christianity and Judaism in antiquity: Professor Ora Limor from the Open University in Israel and Professor Peter Schäfer from Yale University in the USA. They both

delivered public lectures and participated in workshops together with scholars from Japan, including Akira Echigoya, Moriyoshi Murayama, Ritsu Ishikawa and Yutaka Maekawa (all from Doshisha University); Hiroshi Ichikawa (Tokyo University); and Atstuhiro Asano (Kwansei Gakuin University), all of whom delivered papers and comments which enriched the discussions during our workshops.

The conference was conducted in a non-chronological order regarding the historical developments in Christianity and Judaism due to the difference in arrival dates of the scholars from abroad. However, the order of material as arranged for the current publication follows a historical order, starting with Early Christianity and then moving on to the Middle Ages. Following is a short introduction to the main papers (see also the comments that follow each workshop).

The contributions by Peter Schäfer touched on the very sensitive period of the growth of Christianity during the first centuries CE. Addressing the Hebrew term "*minim*", meaning "heretics", used by the Jewish rabbis to identify those Jews who "engaged in expanding the borderlines and softening the all too rigid idea of the one and only God", Schäfer argued that the rabbis shaped their own identity while debating not only with sects and groups outside Judaism; the main "opponents" of the rabbis were not necessarily the "pagans" and the Christians, but rather "colleagues who entertained ideas that the rabbis were fighting against." The borders between "outside" and "inside" categories were blurred. Further, by offering interpretations of the use the rabbinical sources made of the figures of David and Metatron, and how they treated the two in relation to God, Schäfer shows how semi-divine entities are found besides God in the Judaism of the early Christian period. In the workshop Schäfer spoke of the way the Talmud has related to the figure of Jesus as part of the attitude the rabbis developed towards Christianity at that period. Schäfer emphasized that the Talmud does not relate to Jesus as a historical figure, and that there is a clear difference between the way the Babylonian Talmud and the Palestinian Talmud speak of him. An interesting observation was made at the end of his paper regarding the fact that the Babylonian Talmud has "proudly pronounced the *Jewish* victory over the Christian claim of the new covenant" which he sees "as a onetime event in Jewish history, under the very peculiar circumstances under which Jews and Christians lived in the Persian-Sasanian Empire - with the Christians and not the Jews as the persecuted minority".

With the contribution by Atsuhiro Asano, "Partings of the Ways in the Apostolic Fathers", we were introduced to the social context of the search of a separate and defined identity of the Christians through constant comparisons with the Jewish world of the rabbis. Asano deals with

the ways Christians tackled central issues of religious concepts essential in Judaism, and their adaptation in a new and different interpretation. He examines issues such as "covenant", "the acceptance of the Torah and its status in the Christian world", and "The Jewish (Jerusalem) Temple". Asano suggests a gradual process by which Christianity separated itself from Judaism based on the study of the epistles. Asano uses the texts of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Epistle of Ignatius "in order to observe the phenomena of partings of the ways in the early part of the second century CE". These texts bear witness to an era of identity-building.

The contribution by Yutaka Maekawa presents a crucial question concerning the mention of Jews in the Gospels—"Is it history or story?" Maekawa studies the question by using a literary method including the following criteria: structure/form, rhetoric, setting, character, and plot. Through looking at the mention of Jews in the Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke and John, Yutaka discusses each mention in the Gospels while trying to establish whether the story is a mere legend, or whether it includes some historical facts. He presents in sequence the mentions of the Jews in the different texts looking at ideological as well as psychological aspects of their manifestations. His study, thus, reveals a complicated situation, where in some of the cases he could possibly point to a reality of historical facts, while most cases are considered by him to be of a legendary and fictitious character.

The contribution of Ora Limor moves us to the realm of the early Middle Ages, and the relations between Jews and Christians on the European continent. Limor starts her paper with the relationship between Christianity and Judaism or the dialogue between Ecclesia and Synagoga who, as she points out, are family related. The Christian-Jewish familial imagery of these relations is projected through some biblical figures, especially Jacob and Esau. These relations present the weakness of the one (Jewish) and the triumph and being the heir to the covenant of the other (Christian): "All Jews, those who lived in Jesus' times and those who lived in later generations, were guilty of his crucifixion," and thus punished by being banished from their land. These notions and convictions remained in European culture for centuries, causing the occasional persecutions of the Jews. These centuries in Europe saw the development of a genre of "Polemical debates between Christians and Jews", in which the ones written by Christians determined their "victory", while the ones written by Jews alluded to their own superiority. Limor described the developments of the separation of Jews from the Christian communities during the 12th to the 15th centuries, which brought about more resentment and hatred towards the Jews.

In the workshop that followed her public lecture Limor focused on the attitude of Jews to Mary "mother of God", especially as it was summarized, in the 13th century, in an anti-

Christian book by Jews titled *Nizzahon Vetus*, and later a book titled *Sefer Toledot Yeshu* ("The History of Jesus"). Limor shows how these Jewish derogatory stories were reacted to in the Christian world, by presenting three folkloristic Christian stories about Mary created in Palestine and Constantinople.

The two days of conference were complemented with two workshops, which took place during a graduate seminar for advanced students. Both Peter Schäfer and Ora Limor expanded on their lectures in these workshops. Peter Schäfer conducted textual study on the rabbinical texts dealing with David, while Ora Limor studied textual evidence of the Barcelona Disputation of 1263.

Through the study of the shaping periods of Christianity and Judaism, this conference offered an opportunity to see some of the intricate relations between these two rival religions, which have mutual roots in their past, but have created a separate core of beliefs and rituals over the two millennia of their co-existence.

Note

1) Paula Fredriksen, "What a Friend We Have in Jesus", *Jewish Review of Books* 9 (spring 2012) http://www.jewishreviewofbooks.com/publications/detail/what-a-friend-we-have-in-jesus; the three books on the New Testament reviewed by Fredriksen were all written by Jews. These are scholarly studies striving to show that Christian texts should not be alien to Jews.

The 5th CISMOR Conference on Jewish Studies

"Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages"

Part I

The Reactions of Jews to Early Christianity and Jesus

Jewish Responses to the Emergence of Christianity[1]

Peter Schäfer

Common wisdom has it that belief in the unity and uniqueness of God has been one of the firmly established principles of Jewish faith since time immemorial. This belief is considered to be forever recorded in the solemn beginning of the biblical *Shema'*, one of the daily prayers in Jewish worship: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord alone (*YHWH ehad*)."[2] Since the latter part of this declaration can also be translated as "the Lord is one," it contains *in nuce* an acknowledgment of Israel's God as the one and only God, with no other gods beside him, and is simultaneously a recognition of him as the one and undivided God, that is, not consisting of multiple personalities. This peculiar character of the Jewish God is generally captured under the rubric "monotheism"—although the view is becoming ever more accepted that such a category is highly problematic for the biblical period, let alone for those periods coming after the closure of the Hebrew Bible. The authors of the Hebrew Bible no doubt tried very hard to implement and enforce the belief in the one God in its double sense, but they also faced considerable resistance and were constantly fighting off attempts to thwart their efforts and—inspired by the customs of Israel's neighbors—to sneak in ideas that ran counter to any strict interpretation of monotheism. Thus it appears that the very notion of monotheism as a monolithic and stable entity is misleading and that we need to distinguish between the rigid and programmatic *rhetoric* of monotheism as opposed to its much less rigorous *practice*.

The rabbis of the Talmudic period after 70 C.E. encountered an even more complex environment. Regardless of how much they assumed and insisted on their God's unity and uniqueness, they were surrounded by people for whom such an idea was highly contested territory. The Greeks and Romans were amazed by the claim of a God reserved solely for the Jews, this exclusivity underscored by the Jewish God's strict aniconic character and a complete lack of images depicting him. The well-meaning among them nevertheless tried to integrate this elusive God into their pantheon as some form of *summum deum* or "highest heaven," whereas the mean-spirited parodied the Jewish beliefs or plainly concluded that the Jews must have been the worst of atheists.[3] The emerging Christian sect set out to elaborate the notion of the one and only God in terms of first a binitarian and then a trinitarian theology—that is, they took the decisive step to include God's Son in the godhead, later followed by the inclusion of a third divine figure,

the Holy Spirit. And the various groups that are commonly subsumed under the label "Gnosis" embraced the Neo-Platonic distinction between the absolutely and uniquely transcendent God (the first and highest principle) and the demiurge (the second principle) responsible for the mundane creation, which could easily (and derogatorily) be identified with the Jewish creator God.

The rabbis were certainly aware of such developments and responded to them. The rabbinic literature has preserved a wealth of sources that portray the rabbis as engaged in a dialogue, or rather debate, with people who present views that run counter to the accepted or imagined rabbinic norm system. Generally, these dialogue partners—commonly subsumed under the category *minim*, literally "kinds (of belief),"[4] that is, all kinds of people with divergent beliefs—are presented as opponents whose ideas need to be refuted and warded off; hence the customary translation of *minim* as "heretics" (because their ideas deviate from the norm established by the rabbinic majority). It goes without saying that these "heretics" did not escape the attention of modern scholarly research, which, from its inception, was focused on—if not outright obsessed with—identifying this elusive group of people that caused the rabbis so much trouble. The respective sources have been collected and exhaustively analyzed, more often than not with the explicit goal of identifying *the* particular and peculiar heretical "sect" behind each and every individual source. In other words, it was the implicit and unquestioned assumption of most of the relevant scholarship that within the wide spectrum of rabbinic sources we are indeed dealing with clearly defined boundaries between what was regarded as an accepted set of ideas and what was not regarded as such—hence, with boundaries between "orthodoxy" and "heresy"—and that almost all the varieties of heresies can in fact be identified as belonging to this or that heretical group.

The scholarly standard, still largely valid today, has been set by two major works: Travers Herford's *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*[5] and Alan Segal's *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*.[6] Quite distant in time and methodology, both nevertheless share—in retrospect—a rather naïve confidence in our ability to pin down the heretical "sects" addressed in the sources. Herford arrived at "Christianity" as the main target of rabbinical ire in a relatively effortless fashion, whereas Segal, with his more sophisticated methodological equipment and a much broader perspective, tried to mark out the full range of possibilities—from "paganism" in all its varieties through a more differentiated "Christianity" (Jewish Christians, gentile Christians, God-Fearers, Hellenized Jews) to "Gnosticism," this latter (in the vein of Hans Jonas) in still quite undifferentiated form. Despite its undoubtedly great progress in both methodology and results, *Two Powers in Heaven* remains trapped in that all too

rigid straitjacket of definable "religions," "sects," and "heresies" that know and fight each other with an equally well-defined set of ideas and beliefs.

This impasse was readdressed only recently, thanks above all to the work of Daniel Boyarin. In his book *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*[7] as well as in a series of articles,[8] Boyarin repeatedly and forcefully maintains that not only is the effort to identify the various heretical "sects" a vain one; moreover, and more importantly, he holds that there were no such heretical groups as well-defined entities distinct from the rabbis. In fact, when exposed to Christian ideas in particular, the rabbis were arguing not against an enemy from the outside but rather from within, that is, against their own colleagues who seemed unduly impressed with certain Christian views. He even goes so far as to suggest that we regard Christianity not as a "sect" within ancient Judaism against which the rabbis fought but as an integral part of the rabbinic mind-set. Much as I agree with the proposition (no well-defined heretical "sects" as opposed to "rabbinic Judaism"), I believe that Boyarin grossly overshoots the mark with respect to the conclusions he draws. In his desire to integrate Christianity into rabbinic Judaism he in fact blurs the boundaries and cavalierly disregards chronological and geographical (Palestinian versus Babylonian) distinctions (this becoming particularly obvious in his dealing with the Enoch-Metatron traditions, to which I will refer later).

But still, Boyarin has opened a window and allowed a fresh breeze to reinvigorate the scholarly debate about the *minim*. Indeed, it remains an important question as to what extent the rabbis were active partners in these discussions with the *minim*, that is, whether our rabbinic sources only reflect the fending off and repulse of such "heretical" propositions or whether they reveal hints that the (or rather some) rabbis were actively engaged in expanding the borderlines and softening the all too rigid idea of the one and only God. Phrased this way, the question does not assume that the discussions preserved in our rabbinic sources reflect the controversy of firmly established "religions"—"Jewish," "Pagan," "Christian," "Gnostic," or other—but allow for still fluid boundaries within (and beyond) which a variety of groups were competing with each other in shaping their identities. From this follows of necessity that the rabbis, in arguing against "heretics," were not always and automatically quarreling with enemies from the outside—however hard they may have tried to give precisely this impression—but also with enemies from within, that is, with colleagues who entertained ideas that the rabbis were fighting against.

In what follows I will present a couple of examples for the rabbis' discussions with the "heretics." In so doing I will indeed start with the assumption that the boundaries between "orthodoxy" and "heresy" have been fluid for a long time or, to put it differently, that the impact

of the various "heresies" was crucial to the rabbis in shaping their own identity. With regard to the "heresies," a picture is about to emerge that is much more diffuse than has been previously thought—with fluid boundaries even between the heretical groups and sects—and that renders fruitless any attempt to delineate these boundaries more sharply. Yet it seems safe to say that the main "opponents" of the rabbis were "Pagans" on the one hand (that is, Greco-Roman polytheism in all its diversity) and "Christians" on the other (again, in all its heretical variety and with its own struggle to define its identity).[9] This means that, whereas the emerging Christianity defined itself by making recourse to contemporary Judaism as well as to all kinds of groups and movements within itself, the emerging rabbinic Judaism defined itself by making recourse to *Christianity* (as well as to all kinds of groups and movements within itself). To be more precise: even the phrase "within itself" is ultimately misleading, since this "itself," far from being a stable entity, is the unknown quantity that we aim to describe. In other words, the paradigm of our unknown quantity is in constant flux and not always the same (i.e., not always either a straight "Judaism" or a straight "Christianity"). Depending on the context, it sometimes *is* "Christianity," and sometimes it is *inside* "Judaism"—with the "inside" and "outside" categories becoming ever more blurred.

If we take paganism and in particular Christianity as the most common determiner of those heresies confronting and shaping rabbinic Judaism, we find that the rabbis reacted in two ways: repulsion and attraction. Many of the debates between the rabbis and the heretics betray a sharp and furious rejection of ideas about God that smack of polytheism in its pagan or Christian guise, the latter making do with just two or three gods—that is, developing a binitarian or trinitarian theology. But such ideas were by no means alien to ancient Judaism: the frequent attacks against polytheistic tendencies in the Hebrew Bible forcefully demonstrate that the authors of the biblical books had good reason to attack polytheism; and the biblical and postbiblical speculations about "Wisdom" (*hokhmah*) and the "Word" (*logos*) prove beyond any doubt that Judaism was open to ideas that accepted divine or semi-divine powers next to God. Hence, one could regard their elimination with mixed feelings, and indeed, some rabbis were resistant to the Christian usurpation of their ideas and insisted that not only did they *originally* belong to them but that they *still* belonged to them. This re-appropriation of originally Jewish ideas about God and (semi) divine powers apart from him took two forms. First, certain Jewish groups elevated figures such as Adam, the angels, David, and above all Metatron to divine status, responding, I suggest, to the Christian elevation of Jesus; and second, other groups revived the idea of the suffering servant/ Messiah and his vicarious suffering despite (or because of) its Christian appropriation.

Of the many relevant sources I will focus here on David and Metatron.

David

We all know the famous biblical passage in the Book of Daniel that describes the vision of God ("the Ancient of Days") on his throne in heaven (Dan. 7:9):

> (7:9) I beheld till *thrones* were set in place, and the Ancient of Days (*'atiq yomin*) took his seat. His garment was like white snow, and the hair of his head was like pure wool. *His throne* was fiery flames, and its wheels were blazing fire.

If we read this verse with the eyes of the rabbis, we immediately discover a problem: why were thrones (in the plural) set in place when only one person (the Ancient of Days) takes his seat? Would he sit on several thrones? Hardly, since "*his throne* was fiery flames." What then about the other thrones? The easiest answer to this question (which in all likelihood is presupposed in the biblical text) would be that the other thrones were prepared for the members of the heavenly court—since the continuation in verse 10 explicitly states that the court sits down (presumably on the other thrones):

> (7:10) A river of fire streamed forth from before him; thousands upon thousands served him, and myriads upon myriads stood attending him. The court sat down and the books were opened.

Yet this seemingly simple solution to the problem is not the one the rabbis adopt. One possible answer is given by Rabbi Aqiva in the Babylonian Talmud:

> As it has been taught [in a Baraitha]: One (throne) was for him [God] and the other one was for David—these are the words of Rabbi Aqiva.

But Aqiva is immediately refuted by another rabbi:

> Rabbi Yose said to him: "Aqiva, how long will you make the Shekhinah profane?! Rather, one (throne) was for justice (*din*) and the other one was for mercy (*tzedaqah*)."

And yet another rabbi adds:

> Said Rabbi Eleazar b. Azariah to him [Aqiva]: "Aqiva, what have you to do with the Aggadah?! Confine yourself to the (study of) Nega'im [leprosy] and Ohalot [impurities spread by a corpse]! Rather, one was a throne and the other one was a footstool: a throne to take his seat on it, and a footstool in support of his feet." [10)]

This is a remarkable exchange, put into the mouth of three rabbis of the early second century C.E.—R. Aqiva, R. Yose (the Galilean), and their slightly older contemporary Eleazar b. Azariah.

Aqiva takes the plural of "thrones" in Daniel 7:9 literally and argues that if thrones were set up, then we are dealing with at least two thrones, that is, in addition to the throne for the Ancient of Days there must have been another throne for someone else, and this someone else was David. In other words, from Daniel 7:9 we learn that in fact one throne in heaven was set up for God and another for David. R. Yose vehemently disagrees with this exegesis proposed by Aqiva. He doesn't tell us what it is that he disapproves of, but we can guess at it. No, he argues, this evokes dangers that we would do best to avoid: the two thrones are not, God forbid, for God and David; rather, they are for two different attributes of the same God—the divine attributes of justice and mercy. For the third rabbi, Eleazar b. Azariah, this is still dangerous enough, and he prefers the rather simplistic explanation that one throne was for God to sit on it and the other one his footstool.

But why Aqiva's suggestion of David, and why was this perceived as dangerous? Since we are dealing with an exegesis of Daniel 7, which, following the vision of God on his throne, introduces the Son of Man, it is most likely that David in R. Aqiva's exegesis is not just the earthly King David but the Son of Man as the Davidic Messiah. So, what Aqiva is actually saying with his exegesis is that the thrones placed in heaven were reserved for God and the Messiah-King David. Although Daniel mentions God (the "Ancient of Days") only as taking his seat, we must infer from the plural of "thrones" that David also took his seat on the throne reserved for him.

This is no doubt a powerful—and extremely dangerous—solution to the problem raised by the plural of "thrones." I cannot trace here the history of the idea of the Son of Man (*bar enash/ben adam*) in ancient Judaism.[11] Suffice it to point to its climax in the New Testament in the Gospel of Mark where Jesus tells the High Priest:

> And you will see the Son of Man
> seated at the right hand of the Power
> and coming with the clouds of heaven.[12]

Jesus—whether it be the historical Jesus or Mark's Jesus is irrelevant for our purpose—candidly identifies himself here with the Son of Man of Daniel, explicitly referring to Daniel 7:13. The "Power" (*dynamis*) is a designation for God—in rabbinic Judaism the power or authority of the God who reveals himself (*gevurah* in Hebrew).[13] Yet unlike Daniel, he refers to another biblical verse, namely, Psalms 110:1, where it says:

> The Lord (*YHWH*) says to my lord (*adoni*):[14] "Sit at my right hand, until I make your enemies your footstool."

This is the famous psalm verse that would become part and parcel of the Christian doctrine of the *sessio ad dexteram* [sitting at the right hand of God].[15] The speaker, of course, is God, and the addressee is David, originally the Davidic king or a descendent of the Davidic dynasty. Yet what is at stake here is not some Davidic king but the Messiah as the descendant of David, that is, the Davidic Messiah. Among the various messianic expectations of ancient Judaism, the Messiah from the house of David definitely embodies that which would become the norm—certainly in the New Testament. The complicated genealogy of Matthew 1 makes it unambiguously clear that Jesus, the Messiah, is a descendant of the house of David, and a number of passages in the New Testament explicitly refer to our psalm verse in connection with the resurrected Jesus.[16] No doubt then, it is the Messiah Jesus, the offspring of David, who is portrayed as the "other" lord who takes his seat at God's right hand in heaven. And no doubt either that precisely this implication of the possible identification of the Son of Man with Jesus immediately sets off an alarm bell with R. Aqiva's rabbinic opponents (R. Yose and R. Eleazar b. Azariah), who try to defuse any such implication in R. Aqiva's exegesis—because it threatens to evoke that (in their view) most dangerous and detested of all heresies, Christianity, in its most provocative form. Both Jews and Christians shared a belief in the Davidic Messiah, and when Aqiva has his Messiah take his seat next to God in heaven, all rabbinic fences erected against this particular heresy are pulled down—with incalculable consequences for rabbinic Judaism.

So what we have here in the Babylonian Talmud is rabbinic polemics against Christianity, Christianity in its very essence, with the Messiah Jesus competing with the Jewish Messiah. But two points are crucial here. First, the polemic is directed against a rabbi (no less a rabbi than R. Aqiva), that is, we are confronted with *inner-Jewish* polemics. R. Aqiva's exegesis (certainly not the historical R. Aqiva of the second century C.E. but R. Aqiva as the symbol or the front man of certain rabbinic circles) reflects ideas circulating *within* rabbinic Judaism, ideas that were fervently contested and rejected by other rabbis. And secondly, such ideas appear only in the Babylonian Talmud and not in Palestinian sources. It is the Babylonian Talmud, I argue, that clearly reflects not just a dispute with Christian doctrines but a dispute with doctrines about a second divine or semi-divine figure next to God that found followers among the rabbinic fold in Babylonian Judaism. It is most likely that our discourse in the Babylonian Talmud even presupposes knowledge of the New Testament as a canonical text.

Metatron

My second example of the simultaneous attraction and rejection of originally Jewish ideas that were usurped, so to speak, by Christianity, is the figure of Metatron. But this one is much more complicated than the previous one. As is the case with the Davidic Messiah, it refers back to an original Jewish tradition, the pre-diluvian patriarch Enoch, but unlike the Davidic Messiah it *changes* the originally Jewish tradition in its attempt to *answer* the Christian message. Let me briefly explain this:

We know of the patriarch Enoch from the biblical book of Genesis. Unlike the other patriarchs (before him and after him) he lived "only" 365 years, and the Bible doesn't explain why; it just says:[17)]

> 21 And Enoch lived sixty and five years, and begot Methuselah.
> 22 And Enoch walked with God after he begot Methuselah three hundred years, and begot sons and daughters.
> 23 And all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty and five years.
> 24 And Enoch walked with God, and he was not; for God took him.

Hence, Enoch's life was apparently terminated by God because "God took him." But why did God "take" him? While the Hebrew Bible doesn't answer this question, the post-biblical Enoch literature tries to give an answer. It takes the phrase "Enoch walked with God" literally by arguing that God wanted him to be with him; and since God doesn't walk on earth any longer, Enoch must have ascended to heaven and stayed with God in heaven. This is what we learn from the First (Ethiopic) Book of Enoch (Book of the Watchers),[18)] the Similitudes or Parables of Enoch,[19)] and the Second (Slavonic) Book of Enoch:[20)] in order to stay with God in heaven Enoch needed to be transformed into an angel. The same is true for the much later Third (Hebrew) Book of Enoch (3 Enoch), which most likely dates from the post Talmudic period, that is, somewhere between the seventh and ninth century C.E.

But 3 Enoch goes much farther than any of its predecessors. There, Enoch ascends to heaven, is transformed into an angel and stays with God—yet this transformation is unheard of before. When Enoch appears in the highest heavens, the angels oppose the presence of "one born of a woman" among them, but God explains to them that this particular human being is "the choicest of them all" and that he is destined to serve his "throne of glory".[21)] Before he can begin his service—with the new name Metatron instead of Enoch (Metatron probably meaning "the one sitting next to the throne of God")—a process of transformation needs to take place, and this

is described in great detail: he is infused with divine wisdom,[22] enlarged and increased in size to enormous dimensions, and equipped with seventy-two wings and 365,000 eyes.[23] Then God provides him with a throne similar to his own throne of glory, placed at the entrance of the seventh palace, and has a herald announce that he is appointed God's servant as prince and ruler over all the heavenly forces. All the angels and princes of heaven are admonished:[24]

> Any angel and any prince who has anything to say in my [God's] presence should go before him and speak to him. Whatever he says to you in my name you must observe and do.

So Metatron becomes God's representative in heaven, his deputy and second in charge. Since he understands not only all the secrets of creation but also the "thoughts of men's hearts",[25] we might even conclude that not just the angels but also human beings are well advised to turn to him as the deputy and representative of God.

His transformation not yet finished, God fashions for him a majestic robe and a kingly crown and calls him his "Lesser YHWH (*YHWY ha-qatan*) . . . because it is written: My name is in him (Ex. 23:21)."[26] He inscribes on Metatron's crown the letters by which heaven and earth were created,[27] and all the angels in heaven fall prostrate when they see his majesty and splendor.[28] And then comes the ultimate transformation:[29]

> At once my flesh turned to flame,
> my sinews to blazing fire,
> my bones to juniper coals,
> my eyelashes to lightning flashes,
> my eyeballs to fiery torches,
> the hairs of my head to hot flames,
> all my limbs to wings of burning fire,
> and the trunk of my body to blazing fire.

In order to be transformed from the human being Enoch into Metatron, the highest angel in heaven, Enoch's human existence must be annihilated and turned into an angelic being of fiery substance. This procedure is reminiscent of what we are told in the 1st and 2nd Books of Enoch, but in none of these apocalypses does an angel come as close to God—not just in distance but also in his physical appearance and, above all, his rank—as does Metatron in 3 Enoch: he is enthroned (almost) like God, he looks (almost) like God, he has (almost) the same name as God, he knows all the heavenly and earthly secrets, including the thoughts of human beings, and he is worshiped (almost) like God. In sum, he is the perfect viceroy, who acts on behalf of God and to whom God has given unlimited power.

As was the case with David, the rabbis perceived such an unprecedented elevation of a human being as dangerous and couldn't leave it uncontested. A case in point is a midrash in Bereshit Rabba that the editor of one manuscript inserted into the text:

> Enoch walked with God. And he was not,[30] for God took him (Gen. 5:24).
> R. Hama b. R. Hoshayah said: ("And he was not" means) that he was not inscribed in the books of the righteous but in the books of the wicked.
> R. Aibu said: Enoch was a hypocrite, acting sometimes as a righteous, sometimes as a wicked man. (Therefore) the Holy One, Blessed be He, said: While he is (still) righteous I will remove him from the world.
> R. Aibu (also) said: He judged (that is, condemned) him on New Year, when he judges the whole world.[31]

But what was so dangerous about Metatron's elevation to the "Lesser God"? Scholars normally resort to the danger inflicted on Judaism as a "monotheistic religion."[32] This is true enough, but what precisely does it mean? As I mentioned at the beginning, "Monotheism" is a notoriously vague category that has never been monolithic and easy to define, neither in the Hebrew Bible nor in the subsequent Jewish tradition. I believe we can go a step further. Metatron was elevated by God to the highest angel in heaven, superior to all the other angels, and sharing with God all the divine attributes (name, size, throne, wisdom, and so forth). There is only one other figure on whom similar qualities are lavished: Jesus Christ. And indeed, some scholars have invested great effort into discovering some kind of heavenly *Makro-Anthropos* in the Second Temple period that prefigured the New Testament Jesus and that might be connected with Jewish speculations that came fully to the force in 3 Enoch.[33] Others, most notably Daniel Boyarin, wish to go a step further and see in Metatron a representative of the so-called "binitarian" theology, that is, a theology within the very heart of early (pre-Christian) Judaism, that develops the notion of two divine powers sharing among them the "divinity" (most prominently the hypostasized "Wisdom" and "Logos"). It is not the place here to discuss Jewish binitarianism, but whereas there can be no doubt in my view that pre-Christian Judaism (and not only Philo) was indeed sympathetic to such ideas and that the Christian adaptation of Wisdom and Logos speculations put an end to this sympathy,[34] I do not think that Metatron belongs to this illustrious company.[35] The title *YHWH ha-qatan* is unique to 3 Enoch and needs to be explained first and foremost within the parameters of the historical setting of 3 Enoch—unless one wants to claim that this particular tradition is much older than the rest of the material collected in 3 Enoch (which would be very difficult, to say the least) or to conjure up the chimera of "phenomenological" versus "historical" evidence.

If we take the rather late date of 3 Enoch seriously and do not ignore the chronological and geographic setting of the macroform (as I said before, chronologically 3 Enoch belongs to the post Talmudic period, and geographically most likely to Babylonia), the most obvious point of reference is clearly the New Testament. There is every reason to believe that the Babylonian Jews knew the New Testament, either directly, through the Diatessaron (the "Harmony" of the four Gospels composed by Tatian, presumably in Syriac) or the New Testament Peshitta (the Syriac translation of the four separate Gospels), or indirectly, through the medium of Syrian Church Fathers such as Aphrahat or Ephrem;[36] after all, Syriac and Babylonian Aramaic are closely related Aramaic dialects. Hence, I would like to turn the tables and suggest that instead of seeing 3 Enoch's Metatron as part of the fabric from which the New Testament Jesus emerged we try to understand the figure of Metatron as an *answer* to the New Testament's message of Jesus Christ. In this context, Guy Stroumsa has drawn our attention to the famous hymn in Paul's letter to the Philippians,[37] where it is said of Jesus[38] that he

> (6) though he was in the form of God (*en morphē theou*),
> did not regard equality with God
> as something to be exploited,
> (7) but emptied himself,
> taking the form of a servant (*morphēn doulou*),
> being born in human likeness.
> And being found in human form,
> (8) he humbled himself
> and became obedient to the point of death –
> even death on a cross.
> (9) Therefore God also highly exalted him (*hyperypsōsen*)
> and bestowed on him the name
> that is above every name (*to onoma to hyper pan onoma*),
> (10) so that at the name of Jesus
> every knee should bend,
> in heaven and on earth and under the earth,
> (11) and every tongue should confess
> that Jesus Christ is Lord,
> to the glory of God the father.

If we read this text in light of the Metatron traditions in 3 Enoch, some striking parallels become apparent—and some no less conspicuous differences. Christ, though conceived of in the "form of God," did not insist on his equality with God but rather assumed the "form of a servant (or slave)" and hence of a human being. After he died, God exalted him, that is, raised him from

the dead, gave him the name "above every name," whereupon all heavenly and earthly beings worshiped him and acknowledged him as the "Lord." The movement here is from the top down (from Christ's divine existence to his human form) and then again from the bottom up (from his human existence back to his original divine form). The latter movement is caused by God, exalting Jesus after his death and bestowing on him the most powerful name, that is, the name of the Lord. In Metatron's case there is only one movement, from the bottom up: he begins as a human being that, however, does not die but is exalted by God to heaven to assume there his angelic and almost divine function as God's deputy and viceroy, appearing in the form and with the attributes of God, bearing God's name, and worshiped by the angels. Ironically, it is in this state that he is called, together with the name of God, "servant." Hence, despite the similarities, the Metatron tradition suggests a dramatic reversal of the New Testament narrative. We do have a God-like figure, it posits, but this figure did not first originate in heaven and then relinquished its divinity in order to become human; on the contrary, this figure was fully human and chosen by God to be transformed into a divine being and to assume its function as God's servant and as the judge of angels and humans alike.

Another noticeable parallel appears in the letter to the Hebrews:[39)]

> (3) He [Jesus] is a reflection of God's glory (*apaugasma tēs doxēs*)
> and the exact imprint of God's very being (*charaktēr tēs hypostaseōs autou*),
> and he sustains all things by his powerful word.
> When he had made purification for sins,
> he sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high,
> (4) having become as much superior to angels (*kreittōn genomenos tōn anggelōn*)
> as the name he has inherited is more excellent than theirs.

Here Jesus is conceived as God's reflection and hypostasis—in a language obviously derived from the Jewish Wisdom speculation, as we know it in particular from the female figure in Proverbs 8[40)]—who returns to his divine origin after having purified humanity from their sins. Upon his return to heaven, God assigns to him a throne next to him and a special name (presumably the name of God). Both these qualities mark him as superior to all the angels, and the text continues to stress precisely this superiority: God calls him alone "my son" (v. 5),[41)] the angels are asked to worship him (v. 6),[42)] his throne is forever (v. 8),[43)] he will remain forever (v. 11),[44)] and he is asked to sit at God's right hand (v. 13).[45] The analogies and differences are very similar to those in the letter to the Philippians, though with a closer parallel here between Jesus' and Metatron's superiority to the angels.

So one could ultimately argue that Metatron indeed adopts the role of Jesus Christ, yet without the mythical and—for the Jewish reader—unacceptable package deal of Jesus' divine origin and human birth, let alone his cruel death on the cross. The savior quality of that divine figure, so dominant in the New Testament, is no doubt also present in the Metatron tradition: Metatron knows, and apparently judges, all the secrets in the hearts of his former fellow humans on earth.[46] This function of Metatron obviously stands in tension to the traditional role of the Messiah, but this tension seems to be deliberate (3 Enoch wants to have it both ways: the traditional messianic expectation as well as Metatron's new role)! To some extent, Metatron's powerful figure in 3 Enoch—*responding*, as I propose, to the Christian message—completes and concludes the movement of the Merkavah mystics, the earliest manifestation of Jewish mysticism: the ascent to heaven of some individuals has become unnecessary, or rather was replaced by that unique human being who ascended to heaven and then did not return but stayed there forever. With Metatron in heaven, there is no longer any need to send human representatives to heaven to assure the earthly community of God's continual love for Israel. Not unlike the Christians, 3 Enoch claims, we now have our own representative forever in heaven to take care of us—a savior who is one of us, true man and new God.

Notes

1) This article summarizes some of the ideas in my new book *The Jewish Jesus: How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012).
2) Deut. 6:4.
3) On this, see my *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1997), pp. 34ff.
4) Sometimes other terms are used, such as *tzadoqim* (literally "Sadducees"—of course not identical with the historical Sadducees), "nations of the world" (various "nations" representing various beliefs, also synonymous with "pagans"), or *apiqorsin* ("apostates"). On the latter, see recently Jenny R. Labendz, "'Know What to Answer the Epicurean': A Diachronic Study of the *'Apikoros* in Rabbinic Literature," *HUCA* 74 (2003), pp. 175–214.
5) R. Travers Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1903; reprint Jersey City, N.J.: Ktav, 2006).
6) Alan F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1977).
7) Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).
8) Daniel Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John,"

HTR 94 (2001), pp. 243–284; id., "Two Powers in Heaven; or, The Making of a Heresy," in Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, eds., *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 331–370; id., "The Parables of Enoch and the Foundation of the Rabbinic Sect: A Hypothesis," in Mauro Perani, ed., *"The Words of a Wise Man's Mouth Are Gracious" (Qoh 10,12): Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), pp. 53–72; and the as yet last incarnation of this article, id., "Beyond Judaisms: Meṭaṭron and the Divine Polymorphy of Ancient Judaism," *JSJ* 41 (2010), pp. 323–365. It is no easy task for the reader to cleave his or her way through Boyarin's rather longish articles to figure out what is new, all the more so as Boyarin is engaged in an endless debate with the secondary literature rather than with the sources.

9) I include what is called "Gnosis" or "Gnosticism" in the category of "Christianity," following the trend in recent scholarship that is reluctant to distinguish between "Christianity" and "Gnosis" as two stable entities that can neatly be separated.
10) *Babylonian Talmud,* Sanhedrin 38b.
11) See on this in more detail, Schäfer, *The Jewish Jesus*, pp. 73ff.
12) Mk. 14:62; and see Mt. 26:64; Lk. 22:69.
13) Cf. Arnold Goldberg, "Sitzend zur Rechten der Kraft: Zur Gottesbezeichnung Gebura in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur," *BZ* NF 8 (1964), pp. 284–293 = id., ed. Margarete Schlüter and Peter Schäfer, *Mystik und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums. Gesammelte Studien I* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), pp. 188–198.
14) In both cases the Septuagint translation of "lord" is *kyrios*.
15) See Christoph Markschies, "'Sessio as dexteram': Bemerkungen zu einem altchristlichen Bekenntnismotiv in der Diskussion der altkirchlichen Theologen," in id., *Alta Trinità Beata* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), pp. 1–69.
16) Cf. Acts 2:34f. ; 1 Cor. 15:25 ; Eph. 1:20 ; Heb. 1:13.
17) Gen. 5:21-24.
18) Dated to the late 3rd century B.C.E.
19) Dated to the late 1st century B.C.E.
20) Dates to the 1st century C.E.
21) Peter Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981), § 10.
22) Ibid., § 11.
23) Ibid., § 12.
24) Ibid., § 13.
25) Ibid., § 14.
26) Ibid., § 15.
27) Ibid., § 16.
28) Ibid.,§ 18.
29) Ibid., § 19.

30) Lit. for "then he was no more," as translated above.
31) Bereshit Rabbah 25:1.
32) See, e.g., most recently Alan Segal, "Religious Experience and the Construction of the Transcendent Self," in April D. DeConick, ed., *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (Atlanta, GA, and Leiden: Society of Biblical Literature and Brill, 2006), p. 29.
33) See Gedalyahu G. Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God: Some Notes on Metatron and Christ," *HTR* 76 (1983), pp. 269-288; Jarl E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), pp. 266-291; DeConick, "What Is Early in Jewish and Christian Mysticism?" in id., *Paradise Now*, p. 19; James R. Davila, "Melchizedek, the 'Youth,' and Jesus," in James R. Davila (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 267ff.; Moshe Idel, *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism* (London and New York: Continuum, 2007), pp. 108ff.
34) On this, see in particular Boyarin, above, n. 7.
35) On this, see my *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2009), p. 322ff.
36) On this, see the discussion in my book, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), especially pp. 122ff.
37) Stroumsa, "Form(s) of God," pp. 282ff.
38) Phil. 2:6-11.
39) Hebr. 1:3-4.
40) See Peter Schäfer, *Mirror of His Beauty: Feminine Images of God from the Bible to the Early Kabbalah* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 23ff.; Wisdom as *apaugasma* in Wisdom of Solomon 7:26, see id. *Mirror of His Beauty*, p. 35.
41) Referring to Ps. 2:7; 2 Sam. 7:14.
42) Referring to Deut. 32:43 (only in the LXX, not in the Masoretic text).
43) Referring to Ps. 45:6 (the throne there is God's throne!).
44) Referring to Ps. 102:26.
45) Referring to Ps. 110:1.
46) *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*, § 14.

Jesus in the Talmud

Peter Schäfer

Since my book *Jesus in the Talmud* has been translated into Japanese, I take it that most of you or at least some of you are familiar with its contents.[1)] Let me nevertheless start with rehearsing the most important presuppositions, problems involved, and results. Thereafter I will discuss some of the critique I received, both in serious reviews and in blogs in the Internet.

As the title says, the book looks at the figure of Jesus as represented in the Talmud. As far as the former is concerned, the figure of Jesus, I cannot emphasize enough, that by "Jesus" I do not refer to the historical Jesus, that is, I am not interested in the Talmudic references about Jesus as pieces of the puzzle to reconstruct the life-story of Jesus as he lived in the first century C.E. There can be no doubt that the Talmudic literature does *not* contribute to this question. It is important to me to re-emphasize this, since not only lay readers of the book misunderstood my intentions, even one of the scholarly referees of the manuscript (an eminent New Testament scholar), before it was published, was troubled by the fact that I do not exploit the Talmudic sources for the historical question of Jesus' life and death. I want to be very clear about this: The Jesus of the Talmud is a literary construct, and I treat him as such in my book.

As far as the second keyword of the title, Talmud, is concerned, I use "Talmud" in the broadest sense of the term for the entire corpus of rabbinic literature, that is, the literature left to us by the rabbis, the self-appointed heroes of the Judaism of the classical period between the first and the seventh century C.E. This literature includes the Mishna and the Tosefta (the early twin collections of legal decisions, edited around 200 C.E. and in the third century respectively), the midrashim (the rabbinic commentaries on the Hebrew Bible in their manifold form), and—in the more narrowly defined and technical sense of the word—the Talmud in its two manifestations, the Jerusalem or Palestinian Talmud (edited in the rabbinic academies of Palestine in the fifth century) and the Babylonian Talmud (edited in the rabbinic academies of Babylonia in the seventh century C.E.). However, if you look at the sources used in the book, you will immediately discover the overwhelming predominance of the Babylonian Talmud (the Bavli) vis-à-vis the other rabbinic sources. This has important implications for the results of the book. Ultimately, in calling the book *Jesus in the Talmud*, I emphasize the highly significant role played by the Babylonian Talmud and Babylonian Jewry.

Now, looking at these sources, it becomes immediately clear that there is not much of "Jesus" in the rabbinic-Talmudic literature (and this has become one of the major critical points against the book). Sure enough, Jesus does figure in the Talmud and related literature, as does his mother Mary. However, they do not appear in a coherent narrative; rather, they are scattered throughout the rabbinic literature in general and the Talmud in particular,[2] and often dealt with in passing, in conjunction with another subject as the major theme pursued. In fact, Jesus is mentioned in the Talmud so sparingly that in relation to the huge quantity of literary production culminating in the Talmud, the Jesus passages can be compared to the proverbial drop in the *yam ha-talmud* ("the ocean of the Talmud"). The earliest coherent narrative about Jesus' life from a Jewish viewpoint that we possess is the (in)famous polemical tract *Toledot Yeshu* ("Life-story of Jesus"), which took shape in Western Europe in the early Middle Ages, well beyond the period of our concern here—although, to be sure, some earlier versions may go back to Late Antiquity (a large project at Princeton University is devoted to this work).[3]

True, Jesus doesn't figure prominently in Talmudic literature, but I don't think this is a valid argument against the enterprise of trying to find out what role he plays in rabbinic Judaism. The figure of Jesus is, of course, part of the much larger picture of the relationship between what we call "Judaism" and "Christianity" in the first centuries C.E., and it is within this broader context that we need to evaluate it. If we keep this larger picture in mind, we cannot and must not exclude Jesus, just because he is mentioned only rarely and casually. Furthermore, my book sets out to precisely demonstrate this: that despite his rare appearance Jesus is treated in our sources with a very clear agenda, an agenda to be sure, that is quite different in the Palestinian and Babylonian sources, that is, the Palestinian Talmud and the midrashim on the one hand and the Babylonian Talmud on the other.

Although the rabbinic sources nowhere present a coherent narrative of Jesus' life and death, I nevertheless decided to arrange them in such an order that they roughly follow the New Testament narrative, beginning with Jesus' birth and concluding with his death. That is to say, the sequence of the sources discussed is entirely mine, not the work of (a) rabbinic editor(s). I am aware that this decision can be questioned, but I preferred a meaningful structure to a hodgepodge of literary fragments. Hence the first chapter begins with the first corner-stone of the New Testament Jesus narrative, his birth from the Virgin Mary. I show that the rabbis draft here, in just a few words, a powerful counter-narrative that is meant to shake the foundations of the Christian message: for, according to them, Jesus was not born from a virgin, as his followers claim, but out of wedlock, the son of a whore and her lover; therefore, he cannot be the Messiah of Davidic descent, let alone the Son of God.

The two following chapters focus on a subject that was of particular importance to the rabbis: their relationship with their students. A bad student was one of the worst disasters that could happen to the rabbinic elite, not only for the poor student but also for his rabbi who was responsible for him. In counting Jesus among the students who turned out badly, the rabbis pass upon him their harshest judgment. Moreover, I demonstrate that in Jesus' case the reproach with which they confront him clearly has sexual undertones (suspicion of his dubious origin and lewd sexual thoughts). The message, therefore, is that the new Christian sect/religion stems from a failed and insubordinate rabbinical student.

The next chapter does not deal with Jesus directly but with a famous late first/early second century C.E. rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, whom the Roman authorities accused of heresy. The precise kind of heresy is not specified, but I argue that it is indeed the Christian heresy that is at stake and that R. Eliezer was accused of being closely associated with a student of Jesus. Moreover, I demonstrate that again sexual transgressions are involved because the Christian cult was characterized as enticing its members into secret licentious and orgiastic rites. It is this conclusion that has drawn much critique, all the more so as it depends on the reading and philological analysis of just one sentence in the Tosefta Hullin version of the story. I translated this difficult sentence, following Johann Maier, as "Is it possible that they [R. Eliezer and his companions] were lying down for a meal (*hesebu*)[4] [= reclining for dining in company]? (No,) they [these accusers] err with regard to these matters!",[5] and I interpreted it as referring to their participation in a forbidden meal (symposium), either a Christian *agape* or some kind of orgiastic cult (*Bacchanalia*) or both, since a Christian meal could easily be misunderstood as a mysterious and conspiratorial cult with orgiastic rites. Most authors—and critics of my book—translate this sentence differently (and much more innocently) as meaning "Is it possible that these grey hairs (*ha-sevot*)[6] should err in such matters?" which has nothing to do with an orgiastic cult but simply refers to R. Eliezer as an old man who made a mistake. In the second edition of the German translation of my book I have come up with a slightly different and hopefully better philological interpretation of this strange sentence: I suggest that we read the crucial word in the Tosefta (*hsbwt*) not as *ha-sevot* ("the grey hairs") but as *hasibota*, meaning "Is it possible that *you* were lying down for a meal," that is, that *you* were engaged in a forbidden orgiastic cult?

The following chapter illuminates the magical healing power connected with the name of Jesus as it appears in two famous rabbinic stories. In both cases it is not the magical power as such that poses a problem (for, on the contrary, the efficiency of the magical power is taken for granted, even if exercised by a heretic and in the name of Jesus); rather, what is at stake is the *wrong*

magical power, that is, the magical power which competes with the authority of the rabbis and which invokes another authority—Jesus and the Christian community.

The last two chapters revolve around the death and punishment of Jesus. An elaborate story in the Babylonian Talmud about his trial and execution posits that he was not crucified but, according to Jewish law, stoned to death and then, as the ultimate *post mortem* punishment reserved for the worst criminals, hanged on a tree. My comparison of this rabbinic narrative with the Gospels shows some remarkable congruencies and differences, most conspicuous among the former the day before Passover as the day of Jesus' trial and execution (which concurs with the Gospel of John), and among the latter the rabbinic insistence on the fact that Jesus was indeed sentenced and executed according to Jewish and not to Roman law. I interpret this as a deliberate "misreading" of the New Testament, (re)claiming Jesus, as it were, for the Jewish people, and at the same time proudly acknowledging that he was rightly and legally executed because he was a Jewish heretic. Another story in the Bavli, immediately following the account of Jesus' execution, reports the trial and execution of Jesus' five disciples. In contrast to the futile exercises of most scholars to find here some vague reminiscences of Jesus' historical disciples, I read the story as in fact referring not to Jesus' disciples but to Jesus himself. It presents a highly sophisticated battle with biblical verses, a battle between the rabbis and their Christian opponents, challenging the Christian claim that Jesus is the Messiah and Son of God, that he was resurrected after his horrible death, and that this death is the culmination of the new covenant. Hence, instead of adding just another strange facet to the fantastic rabbinic stories about Jesus, this story is nothing short of an elaborate theological discourse that foreshadows the disputations between Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages.

The most bizarre of all the Jesus stories is the one, again only in the Bavli, that tells how Jesus shares his place in the Netherworld with Titus and Balaam, the notorious arch-enemies of the Jewish people. Whereas Titus is punished for the destruction of the Temple by being burned to ashes, reassembled, and burned over and over again, and whereas Balaam is castigated by sitting in hot semen, Jesus' fate consists of sitting forever in boiling excrement. This obscene story has occupied scholars for a long time, without any satisfactory solution. I suggest that it is again a deliberate, and quite graphic, answer to the New Testament and discuss two possibilities. The most obvious one is that it refers to the dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees about whether or not one needs to wash his hands before eating[7] and which Jesus resolves with arguing that what is important is not the purity of the hands and of the food—because food is processed within the body, and any inherent impurity will be excreted and ends up in the sewer—but the purity of

the "heart" (because it is processed through the mouth and, when uttered, starts a fatal life of its own). In other words, not food is impure but human intentions and actions are impure. Against this, the Talmud invents another perfect counter-narrative that ironically inverts Jesus' attack on the Pharisaic purity laws by having him sit in excrement and teaching him (as well as his followers) the lesson: you believe that only what comes out of the mouth defiles, well, you will sit forever in your own excrement and will finally understand that also what goes into the mouth and comes out of the stomach defiles.

The second interpretation of the Talmudic story that I propose is developed in analogy to Balaam's punishment: Balaam, as the Old Testament tells us,[8] incited Israel's women to sexual orgies—and hence is appropriately punished by sitting in what sexual orgies produce: semen. Similarly, Jesus incited Israel to eating—and hence is punished by sitting in what eating produces: excrement. And what is the "eating" that Jesus imposed upon his followers? No less a food than himself—his flesh and blood, that is, the Eucharist. What we have, then, in our Bavli narrative is a devastating and quite malicious polemic against the Gospels' message of Jesus' claim that whoever follows him and, literally, eats him becomes a member of the new covenant which superseded the old covenant with the Jews.[9] The initiator of this bizarre heresy, it claims, is appropriately punished by sitting in what his followers, the Christians, excrete, after allegedly having eaten him: excrement.

I am aware that the latter interpretation in particular is not only bold but highly speculative—and it goes without saying that this has been duly noticed by my critics. But I insist that this is the only possible explanation that makes sense of the obscene claim that Jesus is punished by sitting in excrement. True, it is speculative, but since the Talmud doesn't bother to give us any hint at its motivations, we have no choice but to speculate—unless we want to throw up our hands and admit that we don't have access any more to the mind-set of the Talmudic author or to conclude that the Talmudic story is pure fantasy and nonsense. I for one still prefer the speculative option.

Looking at the distribution of the available rabbinic sources between Palestine and Babylonia, I come to the very clear and unambiguous conclusion that all the aggressively nasty stories about Jesus do not appear in Palestinian sources but are reserved to the Babylonian Talmud. This, I believe, is one of the most important results of my book. The two Jewish communities in Palestine and Babylonia lived under very different political and social circumstances: the former under Roman rule with the growing influence of the Christian religion that would more and more dominate and even suffocate Jewish life in Palestine, and the latter under Persian (Sasanian) rule with the *Christian* community increasingly seen as the fifth column of the Byzantine Empire

and exposed to a series of persecutions by the Sasanian authorities. These remarkably dissimilar conditions of life of the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews have a direct bearing on their attitudes towards their Christian sister religion. The Babylonian Jews, because of the peculiar and precarious situation of the Christians in the Sasanian Empire, could afford a highly adversary and confrontational stance—and, this is my main argument, took advantage of it. Whereas the Palestinian Jews witnessed Christianity *in statu nascendi*, that is, during its birth process, their Babylonian brethren were confronted with a more or less defined Christian *religion*. Hence, it should not come as a surprise that we find the most graphic polemic against Jesus in the Babylonian Talmud and not in Palestinian sources. There, in the Bavli, a conflict emerges which isn't a conflict any more between Jews and Jewish-Christians/Christian-Jews (i.e., Christianity in the making), but between Jews and Christians in the very process of defining themselves (i.e., the Christian Church). The polemic that the Bavli shares with us is scanty and has moreover been tampered with by Christian censors, but it nevertheless allows us a glimpse of a very vivid and fierce conflict between two competing "religions" under the suspicious eye of the Sasanian authorities.

Now a few more words about my critics. If you go to Amazon.com at the Internet, you will find many blogs about my book (and the number is still growing). Clearly, the book has found quite a lot of readers among the so-called lay audience. I don't want to go into any details here —blogs don't deserve a serious answer—but I believe they nevertheless reveal an interesting tendency. The range of the negative and sometimes rather spiteful blogs fluctuates between the two poles of either claiming that I am a Christian anti-Semite or suspecting, quite to the contrary, that I am a Jew who indulges himself in triumphalist anti-Christian sentiments. I must confess that I feel quite safe between these two mutually exclusive accusations. Still, one serious reviewer in a scholarly journal finds fault with my use of the term "malicious" when I characterize Jewish answers to the Christian claim of the new covenant (hence, presumably hints at the possibility of my anti-Semitic inclinations).[10] Obviously, this reviewer did not understand (or did not want to understand) that in using such terms I do not express my personal judgment about the Jewish viewpoint in some timeless Jewish-Christian debate but the *Christian* view as the historical Christian opponent of the historical Jew. Hence, when I say that the Babylonian Talmud offers a "malicious distortion of the birth narrative" or a "malicious polemic" against Jesus and his followers, it should be clear that I do not render here my own indignant moral judgment about the Bavli but speak from the perspective of the attacked Christianity.

The underlying tendency of this critique—unspoken or even unconscious anti-Semitic sentiments on my part—has been reinforced in a long review article by Daniel Boyarin titled "Nostalgia for Christianity: Getting Medieval Again" that he circulated in various versions among scholars before publication and that was finally published in 2010.[11] In its larger part the article is a detailed examination of my analyses and interpretations of the sources, but the frame in which this examination is put is highly troubling. I have no problem with his argument that I fail to make my case on all counts (he seems to be particularly offended by my claim that it is not just heretical teaching but also sexual depravity of which Jesus and his students are accused by the rabbis)—this can be discussed in all necessary detail—but I do have a problem when he suddenly veers into very different territory: "I suddenly realized," he writes, "that my conversation with Schäfer *felt to me* like a type of a nearly ritual form of contention between Christians and Jews, appearing most prominently in the long Middle Ages, in which the Talmud is 'exposed' by a Christian scholar for its slanderous attacks on Christians and then 'defended' by a Jewish scholar." He hastens to add, "Of course, this was only a phantasm on my part. The social context is entirely different, of course, and Schäfer is anything but an anti-semite"[12]—but this does not prevent him from adding in a footnote that Amazon.com recommends my book together with books such as *The Talmud Unmasked: The Secret Rabbinical Teachings Concerning Christians*, somehow insinuating that I am responsible for this unfortunate coupling. In other words, he reads my book as a replay of the medieval Christian-Jewish debates with their foregone conclusion—forced upon the Jews by the Christian Church—and fantasizes himself into the weak position of the Jew and me into the oppressive position of the Christian.

I must confess that this context in which Boyarin puts my book and me personally leaves me quite speechless (even more so when he, later on in the article, claims that we are friends). Let me therefore reiterate: I wrote this book as a historian, and the book claims to make historical arguments. I do maintain, indeed, that some of the rabbinic discourses about Jesus and his family, in particular in the Bavli, anticipate what in the Middle Ages would become the (in)famous Christian-Jewish debates with the prearranged Christian victory. And I point out, indeed, that the Bavli proudly pronounces the *Jewish* victory over the Christian claim of the new covenant. But I make it very clear that I see this as a onetime event in Jewish history, under the very peculiar circumstances under which Jews and Christians lived in the Persian-Sasanian Empire —with the Christians and not the Jews as the persecuted minority. So by implication I do say that some Jews,[13] when they were given the historical opportunity, spoke out publicly and even aggressively against the Christians. This is a historical statement that can be discussed and

evaluated. But by no means do I say or even imply, as Boyarin in fact insinuates, that this anti-Christian Jewish attack (with little political impact) may be compared to, let alone justifies, the brutal anti-Jewish Christian attacks in the Middle Ages (with their only too well known horrible results) or, even worse, modern anti-Semitic attacks. But ultimately I do agree with Boyarin's very last sentence: "In the end, then, it is philology on which the case shall have to rest.

Notes

1) Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007); German translation *Jesus im Talmud* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); second edition (with a new afterword), 2010; Japanese translation by Shizuka Uemura and Nozomi Miura, (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2010).
2) Although, within the Talmud, there are obvious clusters in the tractate that deals with capital punishment, the tractate Sanhedrin.
3) The first fruit of this project is the conference volume *Toledot Yeshu ("The Life Story of Jesus") Revisited: A Princeton Conference*, (eds.) Peter Schäfer, Michael Meerson, Yaacov Deutsch (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011). The next step will be an edition of all the major versions with English translation and commentary.
4) Following the reading in Zuckermandel's Tosefta edition.
5) Tosefta Hullin 2:24.
6) Following the reading in the only available Tosefta manuscript, Ms. Vienna.
7) Mt. 15:1-20; Mk. 7:1-23; Lk. 11:37-41.
8) Num. 31:16.
9) John 6: 48-58.
10) Jonathan Klawans, *AJS Review* 32 (2008), p. 426.
11) Daniel Boyarin, "Nostalgia for Christianity: Getting Medieval Again," *Religion and Literature* 42,1-2 (2010), pp. 49-76.
12) Ibid., p. 50.
13) And not "*the* Rabbis" (my emphasis), as Boyarin, ibid., p. 69, imposes on me.

Comment

Hiroshi Ichikawa

It is my great honor to make a comment to Professor Schäfer. I first noticed his name when I ordered the book on "Gershom Scholem's Major Trends - Fifty Years After". He was the co-editor with Prof. Rachel Elior. At the time I thought he was a scholar of Jewish Mysticism. Then when I became acquainted with Prof. Elior about fifteen years ago and invited her to the University of Tokyo as a visiting professor, she spoke highly of him. Ever since then I have been looking forward to meeting him. So I am very delighted to see him at this conference. My expectations were enhanced even further when a friend sent me a copy of the Japanese translation of his book on the Jewish view of Christianity. It is truly fortunate for us Japanese to be able to read his book in Japanese. And this conference is a timely occasion to invite him and to talk about this topic. So I greatly appreciate the initiative of the CISMOR Institute of Doshisha University. As he has already introduced his book in today's paper, I would like to mention several interesting points from the ideas found in this book in my comments. I cannot enter into some problems of modern sentiments between Jews and Christians.

My principal points are four.

1. The reason for the harsh criticism of the sages toward the Christians

Professor Schäfer has demonstrated clearly that the Rabbis of the Babylonian Talmud were well acquainted with the contents of the Four Gospels, especially the Gospel of John and responded to the Christian ideas of Jesus being the messiah and the son of God with deliberate, sophisticated and self-confident counter messages that parodied and ridiculed the New Testament narratives. He describes how fervently the sages contended the seemingly inconceivable and irrational descriptions of the Gospels from the Jewish standpoint. They ferociously ridiculed Jesus as a Mamzer born of a Jewish mother having had intercourse with a Roman soldier. Why did the sages criticize Christianity so freely? Professor Schäfer assumes that having settled in the unique historical setting of Persian Babylonia, whose rulers, the Sasanians, were opposed to Christian Rome, the Jews there enjoyed relative freedom and safety in expressing their thoughts freely about Christian theology.

Given that the sages could frankly criticize some basic Christian theological doctrines, it is obvious that Christian theology made no sense to the conventional Jewish thought. Such was the Jewish polemic against Christian doctrine that it could be understood as an act of self-confidence and pride in the superiority of Judaism over Christianity. However, it seems to me that Christians could have anticipated such harsh criticism from the Jewish standpoint, given that Christian doctrines as immaculate conception and virgin birth, as well as human incarnation of the Godhead, seemed a non-sense to ordinary common sense. Therefore we can assume that it did not matter to Gentile Christians whether Christianity was attractive to Jews; what mattered to them was how to persuade the Gentile world. If this is so, Jewish criticism might have been no more than self-satisfaction or complacency of Jews.

So it is important to understand why the sages criticized the Christians so harshly. We know there were rivalries in ancient Jewish society between the sages and their forerunners, the Pharisees on the one hand, and other groups of sects such as Sadducees, presumably the priestly class and supporters of Bar-Koziba as a messiah on the other, contending in fierce polemics with each other to assert each group's legitimacy, and which we know ended in the sages triumphantly claiming their legitimacy. There are many other controversies in the history of Judaism since the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. The sages fought with the Kabbalists, the Sabbatians, the Hassidim, the Modernists, the Secularists, the Zionists and so on. Can the Christians be considered one of such primary antagonists, and was their way of debate similar in some respects? And if we say there are some typical traits of exceeding harshness in Christian polemics, was it because Christianity was still a powerful adversary within the Jewish environment, attracting many followers from the Gentile world and therefore its existence could not be ignored by the sages?

2. The possibility of a goodwill dialogue between Jews and Christians

The first point is related to the second one. Debate (Massa u-mattan) and dispute (Machaloket) were admitted among Jewish sages and even recommended in order to establish a *halakhic* principle according to the will of Heaven. On the other hand, certain kinds of dispute were abhorred; a typical example was the dispute of Korach and his party against Moses and Aaron. We have a teaching in the Mishnah Avot:

> Avot 5:17 *Any dispute which is for the sake of heaven will in the end yield results, and any which is not for the sake of heaven will in the end not yield results. What is a dispute, which is for the*

sake of Heaven? This is the sort of dispute between Hillel and Shammai. And what is one which is not for the sake of Heaven? It is the dispute of Korach and all his party.

If there had been such a dispute for the sake of Heaven between Jewish sages and Christian leaders in the Talmudic era, what kind of Jewish response could have been meaningful and more than self-satisfactory, and for the sake of Heaven for both of them?

The activities of Jesus of Nazareth, which are depicted in the Gospels, were most likely to reflect the situation in which the debate and dispute were made for the sake of Heaven. In this respect, it seems to me that the attitude of Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus towards the teaching of Jesus, which led to his arrest by the Roman authorities in the famous Talmudic Aggadah, may reflect a rare case of such a goodwill dialogue.

This well-known story of Rabbi Eliezer's arrest by the Roman authorities is found in the Aggadic tradition in the Talmud; although Rabbi Eliezer did not know exactly why he had been arrested, he was reminded by his disciple Rabbi Aqiva that he had admitted or agreed with some of the ideas of a Christian named Jacob and this had led to his arrest. I prefer to interpret this as an example of a goodwill dialogue between them.

3. What was Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrcanus like?

Concerning this matter, Professor Schäfer presented a counter thesis based on a manuscript wherein Rabbi Eliezer was arrested for two reasons: fornication and sexual orgies on the one hand and the exercise of magical powers on the other. I prefer to perceive R. Eliezer as a more rational person rather than a miracle-working man who resorted to the use of supernatural powers at his disposal, and to perceive him more as a man of virtue rather than a man of fornication. However the picture painted based on the manuscript apparently presents the latter aspect of his images. But is this picture compatible with other traditional images of R. Eliezer? Which documents or what evidence support your conclusion? And did the Roman authorities specifically accuse Christians of abuse by magical power and what kind of magic were they supposed to exert? In posing these questions, I am more concerned with the historical facts of this sage's personality. However you might say that these are exemplary images of the sages' attitude towards heretics in general which had nothing to do with the historical truth.

4. On the heretics or Minim

Do you have new insights concerning who the sages assumed to be heretics or Minim, compared with previous scholarly views?—Professor Schäfer already responded to this question when commenting on the thesis of Daniel Boyarin.

The 5th CISMOR Conference on Jewish Studies

"Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages"

Part II

Jews in the Scriptures – Close Readings

Partings of the Ways in the Apostolic Fathers[1]

Atsuhiro Asano

1. Introduction

This paper surveys the selected body of Christian literature from the second century C.E. with reference to the issue of the separation of Christianity from Judaism, which itself is part of the larger discussion of religious / cultural anabolism and catabolism. The space only allows us to deal with works in the Apostolic Fathers, namely *the Epistle of Barnabas* and *the Epistles of Ignatius*. I have elsewhere discussed the matter in exegesis of Paul's letter to the Galatians,[2] one of the earliest works of Christian literature in the first century. My discussion of separation continued, but I shifted focus to the other letters of Paul, particularly Romans.[3] In these previous works, I pointed out that Paul's polemical expressions against the Torah, or the Jewish religion in general, should be understood as an effort to construct a positive identity for the fledgling communities of faith in various local areas, mainly for the purpose of their survival. I also noted that in such an effort one finds that the roles of community-identity change, from a mere effort of survival to the politics of control, depending on what social status a faith community possesses. The aim of this paper is to observe in the aforementioned works how Christians began to separate themselves from Judaism.

Works that are relevant to the subject matter span both the geographical and chronological ranges of the second-century Mediterranean world. Therefore, one needs to be very cautious about hastily deducing a general pattern from the phenomena of separation. In this paper, therefore, each work is treated separately to best identify expressions of separation, and various historical and sociological explanations of separation are sought. It is not the aim of this article to draw a conclusion as to when and on what occasion separation took place. It suffices here to join the discussion by J.D.G. Dunn in resolve that we are not to speak of a single period or occasion for the separation of Christianity from Judaism[4]. This article consciously avoids the connection between polemical expressions found in the literature and the historical and current use and abuse thereof as propaganda of control. Such an analysis is of some value.[5] However, it is beyond the scope of this article, and unless extremely carefully done, it may prevent us from embracing our own responsibility of attaining understanding of and harmony between people of different faiths.

2. Literature Analysis

2.1. The Epistle of Barnabas

The Epistle of Barnabas was written by an anonymous author with the intention of imparting perfect knowledge to readers who already shared the author's same faith (*Barn*. 1.5). This 'perfect knowledge' concerns answering questions that are central to the identity of the emergent faith community. These questions can be summarized; (1) how should Christians interpret the Hebrew Bible, and (2) what is the nature of relationship between Christianity and Judaism.[6] Such being the central issues of the epistle, it is certainly one of the key documents for understanding the subject of separation in the second century.

The author's use of allegorical interpretation may suggest Alexandria as the provenance of *Barnabas*[7]. The fact that *Barnabas* contains the earliest reference to the epistle by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 2.6.13, 2.7.37), and that its author uses literary devices akin to those found in the catechism of Alexandrian synagogues[8] support the view that Alexandria was the provenance of *Barnabas*.[9] Based upon these evidences, Barnard suggests that the author of *Barnabas* is an Alexandrian Jew, who was a convert to Christianity.[10] If the author is a Jewish Christian, one has to explain why the polemical stance against his own people is so pronounced. The author, for example, compares becoming 'proselytes to the law' to 'shipwreck' (*Barn*. 3.6)[11] and Jewish pride in the physical Temple to the paganism among Gentiles (16.2). He also teaches that the rite of circumcision is from the evil angel (9.4). Barnard speculates that the author's polemic against Judaism is due to his bitter experience of forced exclusion from the mother community,[12] somewhat akin to the experience of *aposunagôgê* and the resultant expressions found in the Fourth Gospel (John 8.44, 9.22, 12.37-40, 16.2). However, the polemical expressions may suggest Gentile authorship of the epistle,[13] and the author's warning in *Barn*. 3.6; 'in order that we might not shipwreck' certainly seems to support this latter view (see also Barn. 4.6, in which the author refers to himself as; *heis ex humôn ôn*). The choice of the first-person plural pronoun is better explained by a Gentile author writing to a largely Gentile audience. Moreover, as noted in the following section, scholars have suggested that the interpretive strategy of *Barnabas* is quite different from that of its Jewish contemporaries.[14]

Historians report that during the Jewish revolt under the reign of Trajan (114-16 C.E.), Jews slaughtered both Romans and Greeks in Cyrene under the leadership of Andreas, and similar tragedies occurred in Egypt and Cyprus. This resulted in Jews being expelled and banned from those regions (Eusebius' *Church History* 4.2), though the extent of these expulsions is not clearly

attested. However, if the epistle was written in Alexandria and dated after the reign of Trajan, perhaps during the 120s C.E. under Hadrian's reign,[15] the churches in Alexandria may have been mostly occupied by Gentile converts. In light of social unrest in association with the Jewish community, Alexandrian Christians may have had a strong motivation to distinguish themselves from the Jews and their synagogues. It is, therefore, suggested that the author of *Barnabas* is a Gentile, whose knowledge of Judaism suggests that he was a God-fearer before converting to Christianity.[16]

2.1.1. Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible

In understanding the mode of interpreting the Hebrew Bible, Chandler compares the exegeses of 'the red heifer' (Numbers 19) by *Barnabas* and *Mishnah Parah*.[17] The former takes liberty in selecting details of the scriptural account that are congenial to its typological interpretive stance (e.g. *Barn*. 8.1-2), while the latter, instead of allegorizing selected details from the account, inserts elements that do not have Scriptural origin. Therefore in *Mishnah*, uprooting non-red hair makes the heifer perfectly presentable before God (*m. Parah* 2). The primary interpretive concern of *Barnabas* with regard to the Hebrew Bible is the way in which it proves Jesus' messiahship (a christocentric interpretation), while *Mishnah* is concerned with one's practical observation of the Torah (a hallakhic interpretation). *Barnabas* justifies its christocentric interpretation by reasoning that the allegorical mode of interpretation is standard, common practice. We know, however, that Philo's allegorical interpretation of the Torah, for example, is quite different from that of *Barnabas*. While the former employs allegorical exposition to substantiate the importance of literal observance of the Torah, the latter undermines literal Torah observance by way of the same methodology (e.g. *Migr*. 92).[18] Furthermore, according to the epistle, the destruction of the Temple proves=that the attempt to interpret Scripture as cultic instruction is no longer appropriate (*Barn*. 2.9-10, 3.6, 8.7, 9.4, 10.9, 12, 16.1). On the other hand, *Mishnah* discusses the issue on the assumption that purification rites performed outside of the Temple offer a possibility of purity, even without the physical Temple. The comparison shows that in each of these authors of literature is found 'a system of meaning which could address the current, historically rooted needs of each author's community'.[19]

There is nothing new in the christocentric interpretation. Paul defines the role of the Torah on the basis of his revelation experience (Gal. 1-3). However, it is in the *Epistle of Barnabas* one finds that the Jewish (hallakhic) mode of interpreting the Hebrew Bible is refuted on the basis of the historical event of the Temple's destruction. *Barnabas* further emphasizes the authenticity of

a Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible by positing that the Jews' ignorance of the Torah is due to their resistance to the 'Lord's voice' (*Barn*. 8.7).

2.1.2. Covenant

The fourth chapter of the epistle deals largely with the issue of covenant. On this issue, there is a significant textual variation between the Latin text and the *Codex Hierosolymitanus*. The full text represents the former, and the text without the bracketed portion represents the latter.

> …and do not be like certain people; that is, do not continue to pile up your sins while claiming, 'Our covenant remains valid'. In fact (illorum est nostrum est; nostrum est autem = *ekeinôn kai hêmôn menei. hêmôn men* / the covenant is both theirs and ours. Ours it is, but) those people lost it completely in the following way, when Moses had just received it (*Barn*. 4.6).

Wilson, in favour of the Latin text, concludes that the idea of shared covenant portrayed therein is a persuasion either on the part of Jewish Christians or Gentile Judaizers, against which the author of the epistle attacks later in the same chapter.[20] Supporting the *Codex Hierosolymitanus*, Kraft emends the text as *hêmôn hêmin menei. hêmôn men* and argues that the focus of the statement is simply Jewish spiritual pride.[21] In either case, the author's aim is to emphasize that the covenant remains with the churches and not with the synagogues.

The epistle explains how Moses received the covenant from God at Mt. Sinai, but immediately, 'by turning to the idols, they (the Israelites) lost it'. The explicit statement of their losing the covenant is followed by its christological significance. The focus shifts here from the Mosaic covenant to the covenant of Jesus.

> And Moses understood and hurled the two tablets from his hands, and their covenant was broken in pieces, in order that *the covenant of the beloved Jesus might be sealed in our heart*, in hope inspired by faith in him (*Barn*. 4.8).

The same theme is revisited in the thirteenth chapter. There the author presents an allegorical interpretation of Rebecca's two sons to suggest that one people dominates the other (*Barn*. 13.2). He also emphasizes that Abraham was reckoned righteous prior to circumcision and was made Father of the Gentiles (13.6-7). If the Latin text in *Barn*. 4.6 is understood as authentic, here the idea of shared covenant is clearly refuted by the author. When it comes to the covenant, 'Jews were not worthy to receive it because of their sins' (*Barn*. 14.1), but 'the Lord himself gave (it) to us (Gentiles)' (14.4). The christocentric interpretation of the Hebrew Bible leads to the transfer of the covenant from Judaism to Christianity, refusing the possibility of shared covenant between the two.

2.1.3. The Torah

The author's view of the Torah is clearly seen in the interpretations of the sacrifice of the red heifer (*Barn*. 8), the rite of circumcision (9), and the dietary rules (10). In these interpretations, one finds christolizing, demonizing and moralizing of the Torah.[22] Since the old covenant was 'broken into pieces' (4.8), the Torah finds its significance only in a christological interpretation. Thus, the heifer is said to be Christ, who is to be slaughtered for the cleansing of humans from their sins (8.2).

The rite of circumcision is not a matter of the flesh, but of the heart (*Barn*. 9.4-5). In fact, the Jewish emphasis on the physical aspect of circumcision without appropriate attention to the spiritual aspect of it is due to the 'deceptive reasoning' of an evil angel (9.4). According to the epistle, Abraham instituted the rite of circumcision with the expectation of the coming of Jesus (9.7). The idea that the rite is the seal of covenant is refuted because the same (or similar) rites are practiced among the pagans (9.6). It is notable that, while Philo refutes Gentile ridicule against the Jewish custom of circumcision by arguing that the rite is practiced also by other nations (*Spec. Leg*. 1.2), Barnabas here refutes the significance of the rite's physical meaning by pointing to the fact that pagans also practice it. The christocentric interpretation is also seen in treatment of the number 318 (*Barn*. 9.8-9). The number 318 is the number of people circumcised in Abraham's household (cf. Gen. 14.14), and the author allegorizes it to lend significance to the passion of Jesus: I and H as in IHSOUS represent respectively 10 and 8 in Greek, and T as the shape of the cross (T) represents 300 in Greek, and altogether they add up to 318.

The dietary regulations are allegorized into a series of moral exhortation (*Barn*. 10.1-12). Therefore, the avoidance of swine for food means to disassociate with men who are like swine, which are forgetful of their owner when the stomach is full (10.3). Again, the avoidance of birds of prey is a warning against those who do not labour for their own food (10.4). Through these moralizing allegories, the author emphasizes the appropriateness of their spiritual interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. With the emergence of the new covenant, the typological understanding of the Torah is made significant. Persistent adherence to the literal meaning of the Torah, therefore, is refuted as spiritual folly (8.7) and disobedience (9.4).

2.1.4. Jerusalem Temple

In the same emphasis of spiritual interpretation, Jewish longing for the physical Temple is denounced as pride in material things (*Barn*. 16.1-2). The Temple cult is compared to the practice of pagans, attempting to consecrate gods by means of handmade buildings (16.2). Here is

Barnabas' argument: if the Christian approach to Gentile proselytism is accused by the Jews of paganizing the faith, then Jews paganize their faith through the very practice of the Temple cult. Therefore, the pagan-like Temple cult is consequently abolished, while the spiritual sacrifice, which is obedience to 'the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ', is established (2.6, cf. 16.6-10).

Apart from being consistent in spiritual interpretation of the Jewish inheritance, the author may have had a pressing need to denounce the significance of the physical Temple cult. The epistle warns the readers against 'error to creep in among us, thereby hurling us away from our life' (*Barn*. 2.10). This apprehension may be related to an actual expectation of reconstructing the Temple (16.3-5).[23] The epistle reports that the reconstruction was 'happening' and 'now' (16.4). In the background of the writing of the epistle, there may have been a hope of Temple reconstruction between the fall of Jerusalem and the construction of the temple of Zeus by Hadrian (cf. *Dio. Cass*. 96.12.1-14.3). Therefore, the threat of Judaism being revived with the expectation of the new Temple was felt by the author of the epistle. It may have necessitated him to warn Christians to prepare themselves theologically for certain 'error' that may challenge their christocentric self-definition. The believers were reminded that God is the one who is building the Temple, not 'the very servants of their enemies' (16.4), and that the Temple is the heart of each believer (16.8). Despite the rising expectation of Temple reconstruction, the author of the epistle assures the readers that 'their (Jews') hope was in vain' (16.2).

Christian communities behind *the Epistle of Barnabas* were in need of distancing and distinguishing from the Jewish communities, at a time in Gentile society where Jews were associated with social unrest. Their peculiar christocentric interpretation of the Hebrew Bible does not simply reflect the Christians' strong conviction for the significance of the Christ-event, but their effort of refuting the Jews' literal interpretation of the Hebrew Bible, thus disauthenticating Jewish religious practices. The idea of shared covenant may have existed among the communities, held particularly by Jewish Christians and Gentile Judaizers, but was also denied on the basis of the stubbornness of the Jews against God's will. The destruction of the Temple is also seen as proof of the implausibility of the literal interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. Even at the expectation of Temple reconstruction, the Temple cult is refuted as vain for its perceived kinship to pagan practices, and the true Temple of God is spiritually understood to be the enlightened hearts of the believers themselves. Through the peculiar christocentric and spiritual interpretation, the author redefined the meanings of the Hebrew Bible, covenant, and the Temple so as to show the distinct identity of the Christian community over against Judaism, which continues its ineffectual approach to God.

2.2. The Epistles of Ignatius

Much attention is given to Ignatius' epistles to the Philadelphians and to the Magnesians out of the seven authentic epistles collected by Polycarp (*Ign. Phld*. 13.2). The authenticity of the epistles is widely recognized, partly due to the testimonies of Irenaeus and of Eusebius (*H.E*. 3.36), especially the latter in their traditional order.[24] Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch in Syria, on the way to be martyred in Rome, wrote these epistles in Smyrna, where he was visited by Christians from Asia Minor. That Ignatius was martyred during the reign of Trajan (97-117 C.E.) is widely accepted. Lightfoot, therefore, suggests the date of writing to be *ca.* 110 C.E.[25]

It is often argued that the problems dealt with by Ignatius in the epistles are the projection of the problems in his home church in Antioch, while scholars differ in their opinion as to what extent the Antiochean situation is reflected. Therefore, while Sanders only sees a glimpse of the Antiochean problems in the epistles,[26] for Donahue the epistles inform more of the Antiochean situation than that of the churches in Asia Minor.[27] Ignatius did have first-hand knowledge at least of the churches in Smyrna and Philadelphia, as he visited these locations. Although Ignatius clarifies that schismatic problems have not yet been detected among the churches, they still significantly concerned him as potential problems (*Ign. Magn*. 11, *Ign. Phld*. 3.1, 7.2, *Ign. Smyrn*. 4.1). Indeed, *Ign. Smyrn*. 6.2a seems to suggest that schisms had already been recognized among the church. He warns the Smyrnaeans; 'Beware of those who are of heretical views about the grace of Jesus Christ which came to'. Being the bishop of Antioch, Ignatius may have been able to relate to the needs of the churches in Asia Minor quite well as he wrote to them. However, what the epistles reflect seem to be more than mere projection of the author's past experience, oblivious to Asian circumstance. The study of the epistles, therefore, helps one to better understand the problems in Asia Minor around the turn of the century and soon after, particularly divisiveness stemming from docetic and Jewish influences. This view does not deny that the epistles contain some information as to what the old opponents of Ignatius in Antioch were like.[28] The purpose of the epistles can be summarized, therefore, as to warn and protect the churches from the 'false teachings' of the Judaizers and docetists,[29] the identity of whom may contribute to our subject of the separation of Christianity from Judaism.

2.2.1. Identification of the Opponents

Ignatius denounces the teaching(s) of heterodoxy (*Ign. Magn*. 8.1, cf. *Ign. Smyrn*. 6.2). The identification of these opponents to Christian orthodoxy is debated. Lightfoot and Barnard both suggest a single heterodoxy of Gnosticism with a Jewish flavour (Judeo-Gnosticism).[30] The reasons for this decision can be listed as follows.

(a) *Ign. Magn.* 8-11 refers both to Judaism and Gnosticism closely in the same context.
(b) The heterodoxy of *Ign. Magn*. 8 bears a resemblance to heresy in the pastoral epistles (1 Tim. 1.4, 4.7, 2 Tim. 4.4, Titus 1.14).
(c) The same phrases are used to describe both Judaism and Gnosticism (*Ign. Trall*. 11.1, *Ign. Phld*. 3.1, 8.1, *Ign. Magn*. 8.1, *Ign. Smyrn*. 6.2, 9.1).

Donahue argues that Gnosticism and Judaism are treated as separate heterodoxies. The link with the pastoral epistles (b) may suggest that the heresy in the pastoral epistles is of a Jewish nature[31]. The parallel phraseologies assigned to them (c) only show that they are both heresies, but not that they are identical in their persuasions. Therefore, Donahue concludes that the opponents include both Gnostics and teachers with a Jewish flavour.[32]

A full discussion on the question may require a separate treatment, yet it may well be that the supposed anti-docetic statements are against general docetic tendencies within churches when interpreting the Hebrew Bible and the gospel.[33] Then this inclination could be shared both by those who had the Jewish flavour in their teaching and by those who did not. This seems to be the background that explains the difficulty in deciphering the exact objects of Ignatius' accusations. Then what is pertinent to our discussion is the Jewishness of the opponents that endangers the unity of the community. The insistence on Torah observance may result in separate worship meetings, one on the Sabbath and another on the Lord's day (*Ign. Magn*. 9.1). Adherence to the purity regulations may mean different modes of Eucharist (*Ign. Eph*. 20.3, *Ign. Phld*. 4). Cultic divisions based upon ethnic sentiments stand in the way of constructing a distinct community identity.

2.2.2. Identification of Judaizers and Jewish Christians

One of the key passages in all of the epistles by Ignatius that discuss the issue of separation is found in *the Epistle to the Philadelphians*, which reads;

> But if anyone expounds Judaism to you, do not listen to him. *For it is better to hear about Christianity from a man who is circumcised than about Judaism from one who is uncircumcised. But if either of them fail to speak about Jesus Christ*, I look on them as tombstones and graves of the dead, upon which only names of men are inscribed (*Ign. Phld*. 6.1).

The passage tells that Christians may be exposed to a teaching by a circumcised person on Christianity and another teaching by an uncircumcised person on Judaism. It would help us to further understand the issue of separation if the teachings and teachers are somehow clarified.

The most natural reading of 'circumcision' and 'uncircumcision' is to identify one's ethnicity. This leads to a possibility of Gentile Judaizers teaching Judaism to the community members.[34]

The epistle seems to warn against the divisive problem coming from within. This does not eliminate the possibility that communication between churches and synagogues may have been taking place, as we observe in the work of Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho*)[35]. They may well be former God-fearing Gentiles who are sympathetic to Judaism and have transferred themselves from synagogues to churches. As they did so, they may have brought with them the predilections of their former way of life.[36] Even those who had been significantly assimilated to Judaism may not have been required to undergo the rite of circumcision. The process of Gentile assimilation to Judaism was like going through a continuum of commitment to the religious belief system, starting from mere curiosity to gradual incorporation of customs.[37] It is one's decision whether he finally goes through the rite of circumcision for 'becoming a Jew' (*Ant*. 20.38-39) or 'entering the house of Israel' (*Jdt*. 14.10).[38] The segregation of worship (*Ign. Magn*. 9.1) and Eucharist (*Ign. Phld*. 4.1) may be preferred by the Judaizers, since we are aware that there is precedence of it in the case of segregatory pressure by 'certain people from James' (Gal. 2.12). In his early attempts at Gentile mission, Paul insisted on the inter-ethnic mode of Eucharist, which faced opposition from the Jewish churches in Judaea, particularly from leaders in the Jerusalem church (Gal. 2.1-14). Recognizing the sensibility of Jew-Gentile cohabitation in the course of his mission, Paul became at least open to a separate mode of Eucharist (cf. 1 Cor. 8.4-13, Rom. 14.1-3). For Ignatius, the problem lies in the divisiveness that such a segregating style of worship would bring, and he suggests removal of apparent Jewishness within the communities in order to attain unity, which is the shared identity of the communities.

It should be noted that in *Ign. Phld*. 6.1, the comparison between the two teachings of the two persons is highly rhetorical. The point is not that the Jewish Christian message is better than that of the Gentile Judaizers. The former is better when they speak about Jesus Christ than the latter when they do not. Unity should be wrought in the community by the teachings of and about Jesus Christ. The chief danger that resides in both groups is that they may blur the distinctive identity of Christians by their literal attachment to Judaism.

2.2.3. Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible

Ign. Phld. 8.2 speaks about the relationship between two archives;

> For I heard some people say, '*If I do not find it in the archives, I do not believe it in the gospel*. And when I say to them, 'It is written', they answered me, 'that is precisely the question'. *But for me, archives are Jesus Christ*, the inviolable archives are his cross and death and his resurrection and the faith which comes through him.

The opponents' argument is that the trustworthiness of the gospel is measured by 'the archives'. The term is generally understood as pointing to the Hebrew Bible.[39] The opponents insist that the gospel should be measured by its coherence to the Hebrew Bible, while Ignatius counter-argues that life, death and resurrection, i.e. the content of the gospel itself, is the foundation of faith. He further argues that in the gospel are revealed things hidden even from good priests and prophets (*Ign. Phld*. 9.1-2). Ignatius repeatedly states that the prophets believed in and testified to Jesus Christ in 'the archives' (*Ign. Magn*. 8.2, 9.2). The christocentric interpretation presupposes self-authentification of the gospel, which is based upon the decisive Christ-event.[40] This christocentrism has precedence in Paul's approach to the Scripture, as he argues in 2 Cor. 3.16 that one turns to the Lord and the veil is removed.

A tendency to put Jesus Christ under subjection to the Hebrew Bible is refuted, since such a tendency would obscure the identity of the community that believes in Jesus Christ.[41] Thus, Ignatius reminds the reader that 'Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity' (*Ign. Magn*. 10.3), and that the application of it is that those who adhere to the gospel should not subject themselves under the 'archives'. Rather, the archives are to be interpreted christologically. Ignatius feared that among the Jewish Christians and Gentile Judaizers resides such a danger to obscure the distinctiveness of the Christian community. Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible, rather than Jewish interpretation of the gospel, affirms the distinctiveness of community.

One of the primary concerns of Ignatius in Asia Minor is the influence of Jewish Christians and Judaizers, which he feared would hinder the unity of the Christian community. The identity-marking line must be drawn between the Christian community and Judaism, otherwise a dividing line might be drawn within the Christian community itself. For this purpose, Ignatius sought to establish a distinct identity of Christian community through refuting the Jewish tendency of literal adherence to the Torah and insisting on the primacy of 'archives' of Jesus Christ over that of the Hebrew Bible. Thus, he authenticated Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible and refused Jewish interpretation of the Christian gospel.

3. Conclusion

We have focused on the Epistle of Barnabas and the Epistle of Ignatius in order to observe the phenomena of partings of the ways in the early part of the second century C.E. In this paper, I did not deal with the historical consideration for example on how the Bar Kokhba Revolt or

the institution of *fiscus Judaicus* may have affected the tendency of the partings, but remained focused on the rhetoric of the authors of the epistles. The common theme observed among the epistles is the interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. For the churches, which were deeply rooted in the mother religion of Judaism, they way they dealt with the Jewish Scripture greatly influenced their fledgling community-identity. In the Epistle of Barnabas was taught that the literal reading of the Hebrew Bible was not proper on the basis of the fact that the Jerusalem Temple had been destroyed. Instead, the christocentric allegorical interpretation was a characteristic feature of the epistle, and it emphasized 'the Lord's voice' as an important measure of authentic interpretation. Ignatius, who understood 'the archives' (the Hebrew Bible) was for the sake of the gospel, justified the typological interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. These emphases should be understood as 'monopoly of truth' often practiced among any community in order to construct a positive identity. Therefore, for Justin Martyr, for example, the Jewish Scripture belongs exclusively to Christians, because they were the ones who understood the true meaning of what the Scripture says (*Trypho* 29).

We can easily imagine how the rhetoric of partings became sharper after the two historical events mentioned above, and we find the tendency, for example, in Melito of Sardis who accused Jews as 'deicide' in his preaching in the latter part of the second century (*Peri Pascha* 96). However, in order to fully observe the tendency, we are to take into consideration the Christian literature, not only of the second century, but also of the following centuries.

Notes

1) This article appeared first as 'Faith to Faiths: On Parting of Ways in Second-Century Christian Literature', *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review* 13 (2008), pp. 1-28.
2) Atsuhiro Asano, *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological and Socio-Historical Studies*, (JSNTSup 285; London & New York: T. & T. Clark Continuum, 2005), especially Ch. 7.
3) A. Asano, 'Changing Faces of Identity in Pauline Letters with Reference to Jewett's Commentary on Romans', in R. Jewett & K.K. Yeo (eds.) *From Rome to Beijin: Symposia on Robert Jewett's Romans Hermeneia Commentary,* (Philadelphia: Fortress, anticipated in 2012).
4) James D.G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity,* (London: SCM / Philadelphia: Trinity, 1991), particularly pp. 230-59. The terms, 'Christianity' and 'Judaism', are used here rather generally, not particularly implying two completely separate religious entities. Justification for the use of the terms is perhaps drawn from Paul's example of describing himself apart from his former life in Judaism already in ca. 50 C.E (Gal. 1.13). According to the testimonies of Suetonius (*Nero*

16.2) and Pliny (*Epistles* 10.96-97), the Romans began to see Judaism and Christianity as two separate religions.

5) For example, one should read, but very carefully and critically, these analyses of Christian polemic against Judaism. Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley & London: University of California Press, 1994); Clark M. Williamson, 'The "*Adversus Judaeos*" Tradition in Christian Theology', *Encounter* 39 (1978), pp. 273, 293.
6) J.B. Lightfoot & R.R. Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Text and English Translations of Their Writings* (rev. M.W. Holmes; Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), p. 271.
7) Lightfoot & Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 272.
8) L.W. Barnard, 'The "Epistle of Barnabas" and its Contemporary Setting', in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* (vol. 27.1; Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1993), p. 169. While seeing the influence of both the west and the east, which fits the pattern of Christian preachers and teachers crisscrossing the Mediterranean world, Robert Kraft still supports the suggestion by Lightfoot. Robert A. Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary on Barnabas and the Didache* vol. 3 (Toronto / New York / London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1966), pp. 54-56.
9) *The Epistle of Barnabas* uses the epistolary format, yet its content is rather a theological essay. Therefore, one me consider the possibility that the author had more general audience in mind.
10) Barnard, 'Contemporary Setting' in *ANRW*, pp. 169-70. See also, Birger A. Pearson, 'Christians and Jews in First-Century Alexandria', in George W.E. Nickelsburg & George W. MacRae (eds.), *Christians among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), p. 212. He sees in the epistle the exegetical and homiletical tradition of the Alexandrian synagogues (e.g. *Barn*. 7.1-11 on the Day of Atonement and 8.1-2 on the sacrifice of the red heifer) and draws the same conclusion.
11) The term *prosrêssô* means 'to break into pieces / shatter', from which Lightfoot & Harmer drew out the vivid image of 'shipwreck'. However, if one prefers a reading; *prosrêssômetha tô ekeinô*, the image is of waves breaking against the rocks.
12) Barnard, 'Contemporary Setting', *ANRW*, p. 171. For Barnard, the much-debated Jewish practice of *Birkat ha-Minim* plays a significant role at the occasion of the author's separation from the synagogue. This issue will be discussed extensively in a later section.
13) Stephen G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70-170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), p. 128.
14) Karen Chandler, 'The Rite of the Red Heifer in *The Epistle of Barnabas* Eight and *Mishnah Parah*', in William Scott Green (ed.), *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Studies in Judaism and its Greco-Roman Context* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 99-114.
15) Ferdinand R. Prostmeier, 'The Epistle of Barnabas', in Wilhelm Pratscher (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction* (trans. E.G. Wolfe; Waco: Balor Univ. Press, 2010), pp. 32-33. Cf. L.W. Barnard, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967), p. 46.
16) James Carleton Paget, 'The Epistle of Barnabas', in Paul Foster (ed.), *The Writings of the*

Apostolic Fathers (London & New York: T. & T. Clark Continuum, 2007), pp. 73-75.

17) Chandler, 'The Rite of the Red Heifer', p. 106.
18) Cf. Philo, *On the Special Laws, Book 1* (Loeb vol. 7, trans. F.H. Cole; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), § 1.
19) Chandler, 'The Rite of the Red Heifer', p. 107.
20) Wilson, *Related Stranger*, pp. 136-37. The issue here may be to clarify for the wider audience the boundary between the churches and the synagogues. This article follows the pattern of other scholars in using the term= 'Judaizer', although it is recognized that the term may cause confusion at times on the identity of such a person. Here, 'Judaizer' or 'Gentile Judaizer' means a Gentile who adopted some aspects of Jewish life-style and perhaps their religious belief, but later converted to Christian faith. Therefore, such a person may as well have some Jewish flavour in his approach to religious practices.
21) Kraft, *The Apostolic Fathers*, vol. 3, p. 92
22) Wilson, *Related Stranger*, p. 130.
23) Wilson, *Related Stranger*, p. 133. Cf. Lightfoot & Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 272.
24) Johannes Quasten, *Patrology: The Beginnings of Patristic Literature* (vol. 1; Westminster: The Newman Press, 1946), p. 73.
25) Lightfoot and Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 132.
26) Jack T. Sanders, *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One Hundred Years of Jewish Christian Relations* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1993), p. 159.
27) Paul Donahue, 'Jewish Christianity in the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch', *Vigiliae Christianae* 32 (1978), p. 81.
28) Stephen G. Wilson, 'Gentile Judaizers', *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992), p. 607; Thomas A. Robinson, Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Christian Relations (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009).
29) Edgar J. Goodspeed, *A History of Early Christian Literature* (rev. & enlarg. Robert M. Grant; Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1966), p. 15; Lightfoot & Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 130.
30) J.B. Lightfoot (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Revised Texts with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations and Translations* (1 of 2 vols; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), pp. 273-75; L.W. Barnard, 'Background of St. Ignatius of Antioch', *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963), pp. 198-99.
31) J.N.D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles* (BNTC; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1960), pp. 44-45; G.W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Episltes* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), pp. 73-74.
32) Donahue, 'Jewish Christianity', pp. 83-85.
33) C.K. Barrett, 'Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius', in Robert Hamerton-Kelly & Robin Scroggs (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity, Essays in Honor of W.D. Davies* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), p. 226.
34) Wilson, 'Gentile Judaizers', p. 608.
35) Awareness is noted that historisity of the dialogue is sometimes denied. Adolf Harnack,

Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mith Trypho, in Adolf Harnack u. Carl Schmidt (hrsg.), *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literature* 3 Bde (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1913), p. 54.

36) Wilson, 'Gentile Judaizers', p. 608.

37) A. Asano, *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians*, pp. 104-13; Alan F. Segal, 'The Costs of Proselytism and Conversion', in David J. Lull (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), p. 367.

38) Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), pp. 155, 157.

39) William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), p. 208. Since Josephus (Apion 1.29) compares 'archives' of nations with the Hebrew Bible, Schoedel concludes that this expression implies the Hebrew Bible. Lightfoot and Harmer, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 181, n. 89. Cf. *The Apostolic Fathers* (trans. Kirsopp Lake; Loeb, 1 of 2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912), p. 247, n. 1.

40) Robert M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary, Ignatius of Antioch* (vol. 4; London *et al*.: Thomas Nelson, 1966), p. 233.

41) To borrow Donahue's expression, 'it is senseless to subordinate the greater to the lesser, the gospel to the message pointing to Christ'. Donahue, 'Jewish Christianity', p. 87.

Comment: Considerations on the Relationship between the Self-definition of Early Christians and Judaism

Moriyoshi Murayama

1. Introduction

In his presentation, professor Asano discussed the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Epistles of Ignatius*, selected from among early Christian literature, with focus placed on the descriptions that refer to the relationship between Christianity and Judaism. Carefully and meticulously, he explored the meanings of the original texts of these epistles and their historical backgrounds, and discussed the views of Judaism held by the authors and the nature of their Christian faith, by examining the original texts while referring to major past research achievements.

Professor Asano convincingly argued how the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* interpreted, in a Christological manner, the Hebrew Bible accounts of the covenant of Moses, dietary rules, the rite of circumcision and the sacrifice of the red heifer, as well as the Jerusalem Temple. The author refuted Judaism based on the Christological, allegorical interpretation of the Bible. This epistle is considered to have been written in Alexandria in the early part of the second century C.E. Interestingly, a Jewish philosopher Philo (c.20 B.C.E–c.50 C.E.), who was active in Alexandria some decades earlier, commended Judaism to the Hellenistic world by means of an allegorical interpretation of the Bible. This fact indicates that, through an allegorical interpretation, the same text (the Bible) can have entirely different meanings, which eloquently illustrates the broadness of this style of interpretation. In this sense, allegorical interpretation can be a convenient means to defend any religious teachings or positions. At the same time, however, its validity as a standard for interpretation of the Bible is questionable, as allegorical interpretation is thoroughly subjective and leaves little room for historical and objective considerations. In this light, the legitimacy and relevance of the interpretation that is largely dependent on a subjective view has to be questioned. In fact, the allegorical interpretation of the Bible in the *Epistle of Barnabas* is so arbitrary that a researcher likened the author to a magician producing rabbit from a hat.[1)]

In analyzing the *Epistles of Ignatius*, Professor Asano identified the opponents in the epistles as the people with Jewishness that endangered the unity of the Christian community. Probably, these people were identical to those who feared God (the Gentiles). He also argued that Ignatius

drew a clear line between the teachings of the opponents and those of Christianity, and like the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, presented Christological interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in order to prevent the Christian community from being disunited. While the opponents placed value on the Hebrew Bible as the "archives," Ignatius insisted that the "archives" were Jesus Christ, his cross, death, the resurrection and the Christian faith that came through him. According to Professor Asano, the interpretation of the Bible based on this recognition helped to prevent the crisis that Ignatius had feared—the loss of the identity of the Christian community.

In his presentation, Professor Asano shed light on the attempt of the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* and Ignatius to make clear the distinction between Christianity and Judaism in order to help Christians establish a distinctive identity. According to these authors there was no connection between the Christian faith and Judaism: Judaism was a false religion; the Jewish interpretation of their Bible was not proper and the Christian interpretation of the Bible was the only authentic one. In this way, they denied Judaism and insisted on the legitimacy of the Christian faith. I think this attempt is an important part of the process of building a Christian community, and in principle, I agree with the view of Professor Asano in this regard. With this in mind, I would like to pose some questions for further consideration.

2. Separation or incomplete separation of Christianity from Judaism

I am interested in knowing to which degree the descriptions of the *Epistle of Barnabas* reflect the realities of Alexandria. The general opinion among researchers is that the descriptions of the epistle indicate the independence of Christianity from Judaism, and Professor Asano is basically of the same opinion. However, it seems possible to me that because there was no clear distinction between the Jewish and Christian communities in those days, the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* had to explicitly insist on the separation of Christianity from Judaism by means of the allegorical interpretation of the Bible.

Whenever we examine Christian epistles, we are always faced with the question of to what extent the epistles reflect historical facts. It is at least certain that the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* was clearly aware that Judaism and Christianity had to be distinguished from each other, but what were the realities of Judaism and Christianity in Alexandria? This question is also relevant to the *Epistles of Paul*.

For example, let me quote verse 3.6 of the Epistle of Barnabas: "*hina mē prosrēssōmetha hōs prosēlytoi tō ekeinōn nomō*," which means "in order that we might not shipwreck ourselves as proselytes to their law."[2)]

How can we interpret this verse? I think the verse can be interpreted to mean that the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* is worried lest Christians should be deceitfully led to believe in Judaism.[3)] If I am correct in this interpretation, then we may infer that the separation of Judaism and Christianity was not complete in those days.

Let me raise the same question for the *Epistles of Ignatius*, as well. Some researchers maintain that in those days, Judaism and the Christian community were hardly distinguishable from each other, especially in Syria, and that the border between them was obscure.[4)] The Gospel of Matthew and the Didache originated in Syria in the 80s C.E. and from the end of the first century to the early second century, respectively. Against this backdrop, is it not possible that the *Epistles of Ignatius* were written with a view to making a clear distinction between Judaism and the Christian community? In other words, can one of the purposes of the author be to draw a dividing line between Judaism and the group of Christians that were insufficiently separated? If this were the case, we may say that what is written in the epistles cannot be a direct reflection of the realities of Antioch and other parts of Syria.

For example, how can we interpret the following verse? In the epistle to the Christians at Magnesia (10.3), Ignatius writes that "*atopon estin Iēsūn Christon lalein kai iūdaizein ho gar Christianismos ūk eis Iūdaismon episteysen all' Iūdaismos eis Christianismon*" ("It is utterly absurd to profess Jesus Christ and to practice Judaism. For Christianity did not believe in Judaism, but Judaism in Christianity.")[5)]

This verse is a typical illustration of how Ignatius tried to draw a sharp line between Judaism and the Christian faith (Christians). At the same time, this passage can be interpreted to mean that some Christians practiced Judaism, and if this were the case, it may be inferable that the separation of Christianity from Judaism was still incomplete in those days. In connection with these points, allow me to raise another question.

3. Comparison with the Qumran Community

In this paper, Professor Asano concludes "Through the peculiar Christocentric and spiritual interpretation, the author redefined the meanings of the Hebrew Bible, covenant, and the Temple so as to show the distinct identity of the Christian community against over Judaism, which continues its ineffectual approach to God" (p.6). I agree with the view that the peculiar and spiritual interpretation of the Bible shown in the *Epistle of Barnabas* contributed to building a new Christian community, but I still think that further discussion is required to determine whether

the new community was built inside or outside the Jewish community. Here, I would like to draw attention to the reference of a new Christian community in the *Epistles of Paul*, in which Paul shows his own allegorical interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. For example, he uses the allegory of Sarah and Hagar (Galatians 4) and that of the spiritual drink and spiritual rock, which symbolize Christ (1 Corinthians 10:4). Personally, I think that the Christian community remained within the Jewish community on the grounds that Paul expresses his wish for the salvation of his fellow Jews (Romans 11:26). This viewpoint is not found in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and this fact can be reasonable grounds for the inference that the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* aimed at separating the Christian community from Judaism. However, if Judaism and Christians were still closely connected to each other and if their separation was incomplete as mentioned earlier, it may be possible that the *Epistle of Barnabas* was written within the Jewish community.

For example, is it not possible to consider the interpretation of the Bible shown in the *Epistle of Barnabas* as part of the Jewish interpretation of the Bible? To answer this question, it is worth referring to the interpretation of the Bible by the Qumran Community and their sharp criticism toward the Jewish leaders.

In the early Christian era, Judaism was by no means a normative unity. Due to the diversity in the theological thought and interpretation of the Bible, various groups were formed and acted independently, and they sometimes fiercely collided with each other. It seems, however, that none of these groups denied Judaism but were, however, devoted to developing a true understanding of the will of the only God, while defending their own religious beliefs. Perhaps, for the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, the Christian faith was the revelation of God and also the revelation of the Torah. In other words, to live a religious life was to follow the way revealed in God's Commandments. The author gives ethical advice concerning the two ways (Barnabas 18-20). Similar ethical advice is also found in the Didache 1-6 and the Community Rule (1QS) of the Qumran Community. According to the *Epistle of Barnabas*, Christians are people who are given "the knowledge of the way of righteousness" (*hos echōn hodū dikaiosynēs*) and they are distinguished from those who head "into the way of Darkness" (*eis hodon skotūs*) (Barnabas 5:4). Unlike the teaching of the Two Ways of the Didache, the *Epistle of Barnabas* is characterized by its apocalyptic (cosmological) dualism, and in this sense, it bears closer similarity to the Qumran Community. The ethical advice in the *Epistle of Barnabas* holds that each of the two ways is ruled by unearthly (spiritual) forces that are mutually antagonistic and that the supreme authority that governs the "way of death" is the "ruler of the present era of lawlessness" (= Satan) (Barnabas 18:2). It is known that the Qumran Community harshly condemned the

temple system in Jerusalem and had a firm belief that they were the only true interpreters of the law and that the members of their Community were "the people of God." Probably, the Qumran Community considered that the temple rituals of Jerusalem were completely wrong, and that these rituals were idolatry and blasphemous against God, for they were controlled by the "Angel of Darkness." Likewise, the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* argued that Judaism misunderstood the will of God, and that the Jewish law communicated the words of God incorrectly because "an evil angel enlightened them" (*hoti angelos ponēros esophizen autūs*) (Barnabas 9:4). The *Epistle of Barnabas* repeatedly emphasizes the evilness of this world that is constantly fraught with enemies (devils), using such terms as: "evil one" (= devil) (*ho ponēros*) (Barnabas 2:10); "black one" (= devil) (*ho melas*) (Barnabas 4:9); "evil ruler" (= devil) (*ho ponēros archōn*) (Barnabas 4:13); "evil angel" (*angelos ponēros*) (Barnabas 9:4); and "angels of Satan" (*angeloi tū satana*) (Barnabas 18:1). It seems that the author was convinced that Judaism was in the hands of these evil forces.

Though the Qumran Community sharply criticized the temple system in Jerusalem and the Jewish leaders, they did not deny Judaism itself. Therefore, I am interested in knowing whether or not this is also the case for the author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* who criticized Judaism and the Jewish understanding of the law based on his apocalyptic (cosmological) dualism.

Notes

1) Simon Tugwell, *The Apostolic Fathers,* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989), p. 22.
2) M. W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, third ed. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2007), p. 387. All translations of the Apostolic texts rely on this book.
3) Tugwell, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 23.
4) Scholars who support this view include Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), p. 11.
5) Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, p. 209.

Descriptions of the Jews in the Gospels: Are They Historical Facts or Fictions?

Yutaka Maekawa

1. Introduction

1-1) Problem setting

Many Jews appear in the existing four canonical gospels. They admire and follow Jesus in the early stage of the story of Jesus, but they demand the crucifixion of Jesus in the narrative of the Passion. Do these gospel descriptions represent historical facts, or are they simply fictitious?

1-2) Scope of this paper

What kind of people are the Jews in the gospels? Of course, we may identify Jesus as a Jew if we follow the religious definition of Jews as "individuals who believe in the Jewish faith" or the ethnic definition of them as "individuals who were born in the land of Judea." The disciples of Jesus were Jews as well. In this light, most of the characters in the gospels are Jews, excluding those explicitly described as "the Gentiles."

In the gospels, several different terms are used to indicate Jews. In the Gospel of John, Jews are very often referred to by the term *Ioudaioi*, which is not however the case in the Synoptic Gospels.[1)] This reflects the individual preference of each gospel writer in the selection of words. For this reason, we can be misguided if we place too much focus on the terms used to refer to Jews in each gospel. While the religious leaders of Judaism and the Pharisees are generally depicted as opponents of Jesus in the gospel narratives, it should be also noted that they are not the only Jews who appear in the gospels. Therefore, a broader perspective is necessary in discussing the subject of this paper.

In this paper, I use the term "Jews" to indicate the people who lived in the land of Judea, excluding Jesus, the disciples of Jesus who can be deemed to stand in the same position as Jesus and the people identified as "the Gentiles."

1-3) Research History

In the past, many researchers conducted studies on Jews based on the descriptions in the

gospels. Numerous papers have been written on *Ioudaioi* in particular, by researchers specialized in the Gospel of John.[2] In recent years, an increasing amount of research has been conducted on the gospels using the methodology of narrative criticism, which will be discussed later.[3] However, very few attempts have been made to compare the gospel descriptions of a certain topic using the approach of narrative criticism, and, to the best of my knowledge, this paper is the first to analyze the descriptions of the Jews in the gospels in a comparative manner.

1-4) Methodology

In this paper, the methodology of narrative criticism is used for the purpose of analysis. In this methodology, focus is placed on the information given by the texts themselves, while putting aside the historical facts behind the texts for the time being. Historical approaches, such as tradition criticism and redaction criticism, have helped researchers greatly in exploring the backgrounds of historical texts and the thoughts of the writers who wrote them. In fact, many research attempts have been made using these approaches, to shed light on the realities of the Jews in the time of Jesus based on the descriptions in the gospels. In these approaches, the gospel texts serve so to speak as windows that allow us to discover what lies beyond. On the other hand, literary approaches, including narrative criticism, focus on the content of the texts themselves. In other words, the primary aim of the literary approaches is not to clarify the intentions of writers, but to explore what the text tells us. However, this does not mean that there is no need to pay heed to the intentions of the writers. Given that the gospels are not purely fictitious inventions, but are deemed to be based on some historical facts, it is preferable to put the information revealed by the analysis of the texts into a historical perspective and re-examine it. In this light, the methodology of literary criticism is not incompatible with the historical approaches, but can work in a complementary manner to help us discover messages hidden in the texts.[4]

In analyzing the gospel narratives, I focus on six elements: structure/form, rhetoric, setting, characters, point of view, and plot. These are considered standard elements in the analysis of the narratives.[5]

2. Texts and analysis

For the analysis, I used the Nestle-Aland 27th edition,[6] which is currently recognized as the latest standard edition of the New Testament. Here, let me be clear in advance that my analysis is centered on “character”, the element most relevant to the theme of this research.

2-1) The Gospel of Mark

Jews who appear in the Gospel of Mark are referred to as: "scribes," "the scribes of the Pharisees," "the Pharisees," "chief priests," "the Sadducees," "high priests," "elders," and "multitude" and "crowd" (of people).

Structure/Form

In the scenes where Jews appear, they are almost always in dialogue with Jesus. This is true not only for the Gospel of Mark but also for all the other gospels. In the first half of the story, Jesus does or says something, to which Jews react by offering comments or blaming him, and then Jesus responds to their reactions. In the latter half, on the other hand, there are cases where Jews first fling questions at Jesus and Jesus answers them. This style is effective in building up a sense of tension and highlighting the difference in views between the Jews and Jesus.

Rhetoric

Generally, the Jews on the side of the establishment have a negative attitude toward Jesus, although there is an exceptional case where a Jew responds agreeably to him (12:28). The repetition of similar actions can be seen as a kind of "sequence of actions," which is effective in emphasizing the persistency of the Jews and reinforcing the stereotypical image of Jews in the minds of readers.

Settings

Dialogues between the Jews and Jesus take place in a wide range of settings. In the early part of the story, dialogues are initiated by scribes who happen to witness Jesus performing miracles (2:6, 2:16, and 2:24), while in the latter part, they come to meet Jesus (e.g., 7:1) and attempt to argue with him (8:11), instead of listening to him.

Characters[7)]

Jews who appear in the gospel narrative are not always portrayed as homogeneous. In many cases, those who are referred to as a "multitude" or "crowd" marvel at what Jesus does or says and feel sympathetic toward him. When Jesus refers to "Jews" in his remarks, he means "scribes," "chief priests," or "elders"[8)] who are deemed to have played a leading role in society at the time of Jesus. The narrative tells us almost nothing about their personalities. As they begin to plot on how to kill Jesus already in 3:6, their sinister image is imprinted in the minds of readers at an

early stage in the narrative. In addition, the narrative reveals the malicious intent of these Jews by saying "… catch him (Jesus) in his words" (12:13).

On the other hand, the term "multitude" can be understood to indicate "many others" who are not in the position of leaders. There is no material difference between the terms "multitude" and "crowd." However, considering that Jesus is active in Galilee up until Chapter 8 of the Gospel of Mark, further consideration may be necessary to determine whether the people referred to as a "multitude" in this and the preceding chapters can be taken to mean "the Jews" or not. Yet, in light of the description that "a great multitude followed from Judea and Jerusalem" (3:7-8), it is possible that the writer used the term "multitude" to collectively refer to the crowd of people, without regard to whether they were from Judea or Galilee, from the beginning of the narrative. The multitude marvels and wonders at the behaviors of Jesus, and cheers Jesus when he rides into Jerusalem. In the end, however, spurred on by the chief priests (15:11) they demand that Jesus be crucified. These people, though basically sympathetic to Jesus, are portrayed as being led to demand the crucifixion of Jesus by the chief priests.

As mentioned earlier, most of the interactions between Jesus and the Jews take place in the form of dialogue. However, Mark's narrative does not tell us how the Jews react to the remarks of Jesus in most cases. This supposes that the Jews remain unaffected by Jesus and play a fixed role as his opponents. In this way, the Jews are portrayed as flat characters.

Jews in the position of leaders who interact with Jesus in Galilee and during his journey to Jerusalem are the scribes and the Pharisees; chief priests make their appearance on the scene when Jesus arrives in Jerusalem. The chief priests assume a central role in the Passion narrative, and because of their high official position, their presence is effective in emphasizing the antagonism between Jesus and the leaders of Jerusalem. It is also worth noting that Jesus refers to chief priests when predicting his Passion during his journey to Jerusalem, and this serves as a prelude to the appearance of the chief priests in Jerusalem.

As an exception to these Jewish leaders, the narrative makes mention of a scribe who "answers wisely" in a dialogue with Jesus (12:34). However, as the narrative continues "… and from then on no one dared ask him any more questions," no argumentative dialogue takes place between Jesus and the Jews after that. While the wise answer indicates a change in the mind of the said scribe, the Gospel of Mark simply puts an end to the dialogue, which may be interpreted to imply that the writer did not allow the Jews to change their attitude toward Jesus.

The terms used to indicate the Jews who appear in Mark are as mentioned above. Basically, the Jews are portrayed as opponents of Jesus excluding those who are referred to as "multitude"

or "crowd." This view of the Jews held by the writer is automatically implanted in the minds of readers and affects them in their understanding of the Jews, especially if they know little about Jesus.

On the other hand, the writer portrays the "multitude" in a manner that contrasts with the Jewish leaders. The narrative which describes the Jewish leaders' fear of the multitude (12:12, 14:2) clearly indicates that the multitude is sympathetic to Jesus.

Point of View

Seen from an ideological point of view, it is apparent that the arguments between the Jews and Jesus are mainly concerned with the doctrines and principles of Judaism, such as the forgiving of sins (2:7), eating with sinners (2:16), and the Sabbath (2:24). The narrative compares the behaviors of Jesus with the teachings of Judaism to highlight the differences between them.

Speaking from a spatial and temporal points of view, the narrative starts from Galilee and moves to Jerusalem through a journey. The Jews are already beginning to plot on how to kill Jesus in Galilee while the narrative is still in its early stages (3:6), which indicates that the Jews remain consistently hostile towards Jesus whenever and wherever they are.

Psychologically, the Jews begin to show their hostility to Jesus relatively early in the narrative, which makes readers feel negatively towards them at an already early stage. Jesus makes critical remarks about the Jews mostly in his predictions of the Passion (Chapters 8 to 10), and it is only on very limited occasions that Jesus initiates a debate with them.

Plot

In the narrative, the Jews who are hostile to Jesus appear soon after Jesus begins his public ministry. The first Jews to appear on the scene are "scribes" (2:6), followed by "the scribes of the Pharisees" (2:16), and then by "the Pharisees" (2:18 and after). They begin plotting on how to kill Jesus already in the early part of the narrative (3:6), which sets up its basic premise. The antagonism between the Jews and Jesus is made evident by the attempt of the Jews "to test him (Jesus)" (8:11) and the remark of Jesus that "the Son of Man must …… be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and scribes" (8:31).

The "multitude" also appears from the beginning of the narrative. The early part of Mark in particular contains many stories about the miracles performed by Jesus, in which the multitude is depicted as eye-witnesses of the miracles who marvel at them. Such a reaction of the multitude represents a response of the general public to Jesus.

2-2) The Gospel of Matthew

The terms used to refer to the Jews in the Gospel of Matthew include: "scribes," "the Pharisees," the "Sadducees," "elders," "chief priests," "the Council," and "Jews," as well as "multitude" and "crowd."

Structure/Form

As in Mark, the Jews engage in dialogue with Jesus in most of the scenes where they appear in the Gospel of Matthew. Many of the dialogue scenes are the same as those in Mark, although the descriptions are generally simpler. In addition, the Jews in Matthew initiate contact with Jesus rather than criticize his behavior, which is mainly because Matthew contains fewer stories of miracles performed by Jesus.

Rhetoric

Matthew uses a rhetorical technique similar to that of Mark. Many of its descriptions are a little shorter than those of Mark, giving a streamlined impression to readers.

Settings

In Matthew, the Jews appear in both the Galilee and Jerusalem settings. While Matthew's description of the journey to Jerusalem is very short, we can still see the references to the Jews in Jesus' predictions of the Passion during his journey. The descriptions of these predictions are thought to be based on those of Mark. Therefore, not much originality is found in the setting of Matthew.

Characters

In Matthew, the Jews are first referred to in the remark of Jesus that "… unless your righteousness surpasses that of the Pharisees and the scribes…" (5:20). Clearly, this remark is not meant to denounce the Jews. In Chapter 6, however, Jesus speaks negatively of the Jews by using the term "hypocrites," which can be interpreted to indicate the Jews, while the 7:29 says "… he taught them … not as their scribes," which also seems not meant to humiliate the Jews. In Matthew, the Jews do not appear in person until Chapter 8 in which they engage in dialogue with Jesus. In and after Chapter 9, the term "the Pharisees" is used frequently to indicate the Jews, who confront Jesus at the forefront, and this is also the case in Mark. In Matthew, the Jews are only mentioned in the remarks of Jesus at first, and only appear in person in the later part.

This style has the effect of shaping the image of the Jews in the minds of readers (through the viewpoint of Jesus) gradually from the beginning of the narrative.

The Jews in the position of leaders who first appear in Matthew are "scribes" and "the Pharisees" (5:20). They are mentioned in the remarks of Jesus with no direct reference to their personalities. They also appear on the scene in the same manner as in Mark in the part of the text written based on Mark. Basically, the Jews do not change their attitude and remain hostile to Jesus. In this way, they are portrayed as flat characters in Matthew, in the same way as they are in Mark.

Characteristically in Matthew, Jesus in some cases positively appraises the Jewish leaders. For example, there is mention of a scribe who tells Jesus that he will follow him (8:19), although the narrative tells us nothing of what Jesus eventually thinks of the scribe. On the other hand, the scribe who "answers wisely" in the dialogue with Jesus (Mark 12:34) does not appear in Matthew.[9)] In this light, it is likely that the positive appraisals of the Jews by Jesus are only incidental.

Matthew is also characterized by the disclosure of the realities of the Jews by Jesus. This is especially the case in Chapter 23, where Jesus accuses the scribes and the Pharisees.

Upon Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem, the chief priests appear on the scene as opponents of Jesus. As is the case in Mark, Jesus mentions the chief priests in his predictions of the Passion (16:21).

Characteristic of Matthew is that a debate over whether the son of David can be the Messiah or not precedes the passage "… from that day on no one dared to ask him any more questions." Here, the reason for no more questions is the inability of the Jews to reply to Jesus. This makes a striking contrast with the corresponding verse in Mark, which says that a scribe answers wisely in the dialogue with Jesus and after that no one dares to ask more questions.

Point of View

In Matthew as in Mark, the ideological difference between the Jews and Jesus is mainly concerned with the doctrines and principles of Judaism. The description of this difference is mainly based on Mark. However, Matthew is different from Mark in that Jesus encourages the crowd to surpass the righteousness of the Jews (5:20) at an early stage of the narrative. This remark is made at the opening of the Sermon on the Mount, and, together with the verse "he taught them … not as their scribes" (7:28) which concludes the sermon, emphasizes the superiority of the teachings of Jesus to those of the Jews.

In spatial and temporal perspectives, the ministry of Jesus takes place mainly in Galilee up until Chapter 19, and by that time, the Jews have enough hostility toward him. From the

Synoptic Gospels, we can surmise that the public ministry of Jesus lasted one year. Jesus taught extensively on faith during this very short period of time, and this fueled the hostility of the Jews towards him.

Psychologically, the writer of Matthew instills a fixed image of the Jews into the minds of readers by portraying them from the viewpoint of Jesus. Because of this image, readers are led to have a negative view of the Jews in the debates between Jesus and the Jews which follow. Probably, this is an intentional strategy of the writer.

Plot

As discussed earlier, the writer of Matthew portrays Jesus as having a favorable regard for the Jews at the beginning. The writer then depicts the scene of a debate between Jesus and the Jews (Chapters 8 and 9) based on the story of Mark, which reveals the intent of the Jews to kill Jesus in 12:14.

One of the characteristics of Matthew is its narrative structure in which the Jews appear in a concentrated way in certain chapters. While Jews are referred to in the remarks of Jesus in Chapters 5 to 7, their appearance is almost limited to Chapters 8, 9, 12, 15, 16, and 19 to 22. Basically, they express questions about the legal righteousness of the behavior of Jesus in these chapters, while they begin to plot to kill him in 12:14, try to test him in 16:1 and 19:3, and plan how to trap him through his words in 22:15. In this way, their hostility toward Jesus increases as the story advances, and finally, they plot to arrest Jesus in some underhand way and kill him in 26:4. This plot allows readers to follow how the hostility of the Jews increases and eventually leads them to the decision to crucify Jesus.

2-3) The Gospel of Luke

The terms used to refer to Jews in the Gospel of Luke are “the Pharisees,” “scribes,” “a ruler of the synagogue,” “elders,” and “an expert in the law.” The terms “multitude” and “crowd” are also used, as in other gospels.

Structure/Form

The Gospel of Luke, the third of the Synoptic Gospels, also contains scenes of dialogue between Jesus and the Jews, which were written based on Mark. However, the writer of Luke made some alterations to Mark’s version as did the writer of Matthew. In the case of Luke, some stories are made longer than the corresponding stories in other gospels. (For example, Matthew

9:1-8 corresponds to Mark 2:1-12 and to Luke 5:17-26.) In addition, the Jews often initiate contact with Jesus, which is also the case in Matthew.

Rhetoric

In the Gospel of Luke, the Jews first appear in 4:14-30. In these verses, they are referred to simply as "all" and "people," but considering that they are in a synagogue on the Sabbath day, it is evident that these terms mean "Jews" in a broad sense. Here, the people first speak well of Jesus (4:22), but become furious instantly after hearing the sermon of Jesus (4:28). Their next appearance is in 5:17. The episode beginning from this verse was written by altering and adding to the corresponding episode in Mark. In Luke, there are many episodes in which the Jews are present from beginning to end (e.g., 5:17-26, 6:6-11, 11:37-54). Readers are told that the Jews witness the whole process of each of these incidents, and they are convinced that the involvement of the Jews in these incidents triggers their hostile reactions toward Jesus.

Like Mark, Luke also shows how the repeated debates between the Jews and Jesus contribute to the gradual escalation of hostility toward Jesus.

Settings

In the Gospel of Luke, as well as the rest of the Synoptic Gospels, the Jews appear in scenes in three settings, first in Galilee, then during Jesus' journey to Jerusalem and finally in Jerusalem. In Luke, the scenes where the Jews appear are distributed relatively evenly across the gospel. Furthermore, the Jews are portrayed as always being near Jesus, which distinguishes Luke from Matthew.

Characters

In the Gospel of Luke, the first Jewish leaders who appear on the scene are the "Pharisees" and "teachers of the law" (scribes) (5:17). According to Luke, they come from Galilee, Judea and Jerusalem, which means from all over the land of the Jews. Although this description is obviously an exaggeration, it implies that the Pharisees and scribes as well as people from all over the land of the Jews paid considerable attention to Jesus from the early stages of his public ministry. In the corresponding episode in Mark, only scribes are present on the scene, and their presence is mentioned only after Jesus performs a miracle. In this light, it is evident that the episode in Luke is an adaptation of its counterpart in Mark.

Luke also makes mention of the emotional reactions of the Jews to Jesus. For example, the Jews were "furious" at Jesus' words (6:11), all his opponents were "humiliated" (13:17), and they "muttered" to see Jesus eating with sinners (15:2, which corresponds to 9:11 in Matthew). In this way, Luke adds to the descriptions in Matthew and Mark, and emphasizes the negative attitudes of the Jewish leaders toward Jesus.

While the Jews show their anger at Jesus relatively early in the narrative (6:11), this anger does not instantly lead to an intent to kill him, unlike in Matthew and Mark. The verse 10:29 in Luke says that an expert in law wanted to "justify himself," and the Jews do not express hostility to Jesus until 11:53. In 13:31, the Pharisees benevolently warn Jesus that Herod plans to kill him, but at this stage, the Jewish leaders show no intent to kill him explicitly. It is not until 19:47 that the Jews "began planning how to kill him." This pattern of events is unique to Luke. The flow of the narrative of a series of disputes eventually leading the Jews to kill Jesus makes the story of Luke more natural and convincing to readers than the accounts of Matthew and Mark, in which the Jews directly express their intent to kill him at an early stage.

The character of the "multitude" in Luke is basically the same as in the other gospels, but Luke additionally makes mention of the emotional feelings of the multitude toward Jesus, as it does for the opponents. In Luke, the multitude (*pās*) first appears in Chapter 4, which says "everyone praised him" (4:15) and "all spoke well of him" (4:22). These descriptions indicate that the multitude thinks highly of Jesus and emphasize the contrast with the negative attitude of the Jewish leaders.

Point of View

Ideologically, the doctrines and principles of Judaism are the major cause of the disputes between the Jews and Jesus, which is also the case in Mark and Matthew. In Luke, opponents of Jesus make their first appearance in 4:16-30, in which the scroll of the prophet Isaiah is handed to Jesus and he says this scripture is fulfilled. The writer of Luke in particular often uses the term "*nomikoi* (expert in the law)." Considering that this term places greater emphasis on "the law" than the term "*grammateus* (scribe)," it can be inferred that the writer of Luke attaches special weight to the law.

In spatial and temporal perspectives, the descriptions of the Jews are evenly seen throughout the period of the ministry of Jesus, which implying that disputes between the Jews and Jesus are constantly occurring throughout this period.

Psychologically, Luke depicts a dispute arising between the Jews and Jesus in their dialogue in Chapter 4, indicating that the hostility of the Jews toward Jesus is already present at an early stage. In this sense, Chapter 4 gives hints of the future development of the story. Interestingly, Luke is different from the other gospels in that the multitude, as well as religious leaders of Judaism, are portrayed as opponents of Jesus at an early stage, making readers aware that many people, besides the Jewish leaders, are antagonistic towards Jesus.

Plot

In Luke, Jesus makes his first public appearance after beginning his ministry in Chapter 4. At first, he taught in synagogues and everyone praised him (4:15). In the synagogue of Nazareth, all spoke well of Jesus (4:22) in the beginning, but they become furious soon after they heard his words. They even took Jesus to the hill, attempting to throw him down the cliff (4:28-29). In this way, the fate of Jesus is implied already in the early part of the story, although the Jewish leaders make clear their intent to kill Jesus at a later stage (19:47) than they do in the other gospels. In Luke, scenes of debates between Jesus and the Jews are seen throughout the story. They are constantly engaged in a debate, and the hostility of the Jews escalates in each scene (refer to the section of "Character" above). The plot of Luke is well organized and designed to build tension gradually mounting towards the climax.

2-4) The Gospel of John

In the Gospel of John, the following terms are used to refer to the Jews: "the Pharisees," "Jews," "chief priests," and "a member of the Jewish ruling council," as well as "multitude" and "crowd." In John, there seems to be two types of "Jews": Jews in general and certain Jewish groups. For this reason, I call the former "the Jews" and latter "the *Ioudaioi*" in this section.

Structure/Form

Likewise in the Gospel of John, interactions between Jesus and the Jews take place mainly through dialogue, although John uses a different source than the Synoptic Gospels. The dialogues themselves are longer than those in the Synoptic Gospels, in which both Jesus and the Jews make more remarks. The pattern of the dialogues is a typically dialogic one, in which Jesus speaks first, the Jews respond to his words, Jesus answers their response, and then the Jews respond further.

Rhetoric

Many of the dialogue scenes consist of conversations only, with virtually no explanation of situations. This indicates that the writer of John places great importance on each dialogue itself; this style is similar to that of a drama.

The technique of repetition is used in these dialogues, which is effective in building tension within each dialogue and in portraying the anger of the Jews which intensifies with each repeated exchange of words.

Settings

In the Gospel of John, Jesus enters Jerusalem three times, and his dialogues with the *Ioudaioi* take place mostly in Jerusalem. Chapter 11 is about an episode in Bethany, which is also located near Jerusalem. This means that the *Ioudaioi* is portrayed as being active in Jerusalem, and Jesus visits them to engage in a dialogue. This contrasts with the settings of the Synoptic Gospels in which the Jews travel to Galilee to listen to Jesus.

Characters

In many cases, the *Ioudaioi* in the Gospel of John are portrayed as hostile to Jesus, as shown in the narrative in 5:16 where the Jews persecute Jesus and in 5:18 and 7:1 where they seek to kill him. People with such malicious intentions are referred to as the *Ioudaioi*.

At the same time, however, not all the Jews appearing in John are like the *Ioudaioi*. Those referred to as the "multitude" are often described as followers of Jesus (although Jesus does not trust them). In this light, the Jews in John cannot be regarded as people with the same character. In fact, individual Jews other than the *Ioudaioi* are often depicted as sympathetic to Jesus, and this portrayal is probably meant to emphasize the difference between them and the *Ioudaioi*.

Point of View

Ideologically, the doctrines of Judaism are the issue of controversy between the Jews and Jesus, as in the Gospel of John. Characteristically, however, John emphasizes the superiority of Jesus over Judaism, or more specifically, his superiority over Moses and even Abraham. This point of view is unique to John, and distinguishes John from Matthew, who places emphasis on the fulfillment of the law.

In terms of space and time, the *Ioudaioi* is active mainly in Jerusalem, and Jesus meets them there. The antagonism between them gradually grows through Jesus' three visits to Jerusalem.

Psychologically, in John, the Jews make their first explicit appearance in the episode of Jesus' cleansing of the Temple (2:13-22).[10] While the outcome of the cleansing of the Temple is told differently from gospel to gospel,[11] John does not give any specific account of the direct effect of this incident on the Jews nor their emotional reactions to it. This in turn gives special importance to the descriptive text of 2:21-22.

Attention should also be paid to the collective term "the *Ioudaioi*," as when using this term, the writer of John must have had a specific group of people in mind. The term "the Pharisees" is also used in many parts of John, and this indicates that this term was familiar to the writer. On the other hand, the Gospel of John has much fewer references to "scribes" than the Synoptic Gospels. It is also known that the term "*polloi*" (multitude) is often used in combination with "*pisteuō*" (believe) in John,[12] which implies that the writer took special care in the use of these terms.

Plot

In John, the term "*Ioudaioi*" is first used in the scene of the cleansing of the Temple. At this stage, however, the *Ioudaioi* do not show any explicit hostility toward Jesus. The narrative says that many people in Jerusalem believed in Jesus but Jesus didn't trust them (2:23-25). The description that Jesus has a negative attitude toward the multitude from the beginning is unique to John. The *Ioudaioi* begin to persecute Jesus in 5:16, as Jesus performed the miracle of healing on the Sabbath, and their intention to kill Jesus becomes more apparent in 5:18. In this way, John reveals the intent of the Jews to kill Jesus at an early stage, which is also the case for Matthew and Mark. The antagonism between Jesus and the *Ioudaioi* grows throughout their repeated debates, which leads the *Ioudaioi* to try to arrest him (7:30, 7:44, 10.39, 11:57), stone him (8:59, 10:31-33), and eventually crucify him.

3. Discussion

3-1) "Jews" as a designation

As discussed in the introduction, the term "*Ioudaioi*" is rarely used in the Synoptic Gospels. In Matthew and Luke, this term is used only five times each, and three times it is used to refer to "the king of the Jews," a description derived from Mark.[13] In other parts, the term is used in the following phrases: "the king of the Jews" (Matthew 2:2), "… widely circulated among the Jews" (Matthew 28:15), "elders of the Jews" (Luke 7:3), and "the Judean town of Arimathea" (Luke 23:51). As shown in these cases, the term "*Ioudaioi*" has no greater significance than a

mere modifying word. On the other hand, the terms "*grammateus*" (scribe),[14] "*archiereus*" (chief priest),[15] and "*Pharisaioi*" (Pharisees)[16] appear very often in the Synoptic Gospels. In the Gospel of John, to the contrary, "*Ioudaioi*" is seen quite frequently, while other terms are seldom used to refer to the Jews.

Accordingly, we may infer that each gospel writer selected the term (terms) that seemed to be most effective in communicating the image of the Jews to readers. To be specific, the writers of the Synoptic Gospels thought that the term "*grammateus*" (scribe) would be sufficiently understandable for readers, while the writer of the Gospel of John thought the term "*Ioudaioi*" would best serve the purpose. In this light, we will have to consider the meaning of the term "Jews" itself from the perspective of not only the Gospel of John, but also early Christian literature in general, including the Synoptic Gospels.

3-2) Intent of the Jewish leaders

In most cases, it is the Jewish leaders who engage a debate with Jesus. Unlike the multitude, they are portrayed as reacting negatively to Jesus (e.g., Matthew 21:46, Mark 12:12, Luke 19:47-48, and John 12:19), and their hostility toward Jesus and their intent to kill him are mentioned in the descriptive texts (e.g., Matthew 12:14, Mark 3:6, Luke 19:47, John 5:18). These descriptive texts can be understood to reflect the notion of the gospel writers that the Jewish leaders were responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus.

The timing at which the intent of the Jewish leaders to kill Jesus is told differs from gospel to gospel, which indicates that these descriptions are mostly fictitious inventions of the gospel writers. Probably, the accounts of the Jewish leaders are not based on fixed sources, but were created by the writers in a manner to suit their respective purposes.

3-3) Role of chief priests

Chief priests are among the Jewish leaders and play an important role in the Passion narrative in each of the gospels. For example, in the Synoptic Gospels, they are behind the arrest and trial of Jesus (e.g., Mark 15:10). In John, chief priests are mostly replaced by the *Ioudaioi*, although the term "chief priests" appears in some verses of the gospel (e.g., 18:3, 19:5 and 19:21). This indicates that the Passion narrative was written based on some relatively established source. Prior to the Passion narrative, chief priests appear on the scene of debate with Jesus over the issue of authority, which is commonly seen in the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew 12:23, Mark 11:27, Luke 20:1). Therefore, this scene, too, is presumed to be based on some established source.

Unlike the descriptions of chief priests, which are evidently based on some source, the descriptions of the Jewish leaders obviously vary from gospel to gospel, as discussed in 3-2 above.

3-4) Role of the multitude

Ordinary people not in the position of leaders, called the "multitude" or "crowd," appear in all the gospels. They marvel at and praise Jesus at first and follow him, but they reverse their attitude, urged by Jewish leaders, and demand that Jesus be crucified in the Passion narrative. It is difficult to shed light on the realities of these people by the approach of historical study. The descriptions of the gospels tell us little about their real lives, and it is reasonable to assume that they reflect the intentions of the respective writers to a large extent.

If so, then, what role does the multitude play? In the early stage, they are portrayed as believing and following Jesus regardless of the hostility of the Jewish leaders. The gospels repeatedly tell us how Jesus is admired by these people, and these descriptions are highly effective in placing the positive image of Jesus into the minds of readers and also in contrasting their attitude toward Jesus with that of the Jewish leaders.

In the Passion narrative, however, the multitude takes sides with the Jewish leaders and accuses Jesus. According to Mark and Matthew, the chief priests persuade and incite them to do so, while in the accounts of Luke and John, they demand the crucifixion of Jesus at their own will. This discrepancy is reasonably attributable to the difference in viewpoint among the gospel writers.

Although Matthew 27:25 is regarded as one of the causes that gave rise to anti-Semitism, it is wrong to determine that some historical fact is behind this verse. Given that the multitude is portrayed in a manner that suits the purpose of each writer, this verse, too, should be understood as reflecting the view of the gospel writer, not a historical fact.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed the descriptions of the Jews in the four gospels using the methodology of literary criticism and reached a conclusion that these descriptions vary from gospel to gospel and that many of them are fictitious inventions that reflect the intention of each writer (or community). Of course, it cannot be denied that certain historical facts are behind some of the descriptions, and some are presumed to be based on certain sources. However, one should

exercise particular care when attempting to explore historical facts behind the gospels through the texts that survive today.

In light of the above presentation, this is my answer to my initial question "Are the descriptions of the Jews in the gospels historical facts or fictions?"—Most of them are fictitious, although some are based on historical facts.

Notes

1) The term "*Ioudaioi"* appears five times in Matthew, seven times in Mark, and five times in Luke, as compared to 70 times in John.
2) Recently published papers on this issue include: Raimo Hakola, *Identity Matters. John, the Jews and Jewishness* (Suppl to NT 118, Leiden: Brill, 2005); and Lars Kierrspel, *The Jews and the World in the Fourth Gospel. Parallelism, Function, and Context* (WUNT II 220, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
3) For example, David E. Aune (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testamen*t (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010) gives an overview of this issue.
4) Basically, I chose this methodology out of my quest to find answers to the questions, "What significance does it have for us to read the Bible texts today?" and "What can we learn from the Bible today?" In other words, my question is "What can the biblical texts communicate to readers who have never read the Bible before or who have only limited historical knowledge about the Bible?"
5) J. L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005) specifies five elements of narrative analysis: Rhetoric, setting, character, point of view, and plot, which are considered to be basic elements of narrative criticism. Here, Resseguie deals with structure/form as part of rhetoric, but I opted to discuss them separately to make my point clearer.
6) Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993).
7) For consideration of the characters in Mark, refer to David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1982), pp. 101-136. To be specific, refer to pp. 117–122 for the Jewish leaders and pp. 134–135 for the multitude.
8) Mark 8:31, 10:33, 12:35, 12:38
9) The significance of this description varies depending on which is faithful to the source tradition: the shorter version (Matthew) or the longer version (Mark). We may infer the intent of each writer if we can make clear whether this description was deleted from the source by the writer of Matthew or added to the source by the writer of Mark. However, the historical consideration of their source is beyond the scope of this paper.
10) It is possible that the Jews were present at the marriage at Cana (2:1-11), but I opted to set aside

this episode due to the lack of an explicit reference to them.

11) Matthew does not give any specific account of the outcome of the cleansing of the Temple (21:12-13), while Mark says this incident directly triggers the hostility of the Jewish leaders toward Jesus (11:15-18). According to Luke, the behavior of Jesus including the cleansing of the Temple, cause the Jewish leaders to develop an intent to kill him (19:45-48).
12) 2:23, 4:39, 4:41, 7:31, 8:30, 10:42, 12:42.
13) This usage is seen in Chapter 27 of Matthew, Chapter 15 of Mark, and Chapter 23 of Luke.
14) This term is used 22 times in Matthew, 21 times in Mark, 14 times in Luke, and once in John.
15) This term is used 25 times in Matthew, 22 times in Mark, 15 times in Luke, and 21 times in John.
16) This term is used 29 times in Matthew, 12 times in Mark, 27 times in Luke, and 20 times in John.

Comment: Is the Methodology of Narrative Criticism Effective in Addressing Historical Questions?

Ritsu Ishikawa

In his presentation, the problem set by Yutaka Maekawa is: "Do the descriptions of the Jews in the four canonical gospels represent historical facts, or are they simply fictitious?" He analyzes the descriptions of each of the gospels using the methodology of narrative criticism and discusses how the Jews are portrayed in each gospel in light of six elements: structure/form, rhetoric, setting, character, point of view, and plot, which are considered standard elements in the analysis of narratives. Based on this analysis, he argues that the descriptions of the Jews vary from gospel to gospel, and that they reflect to a considerable extent the intentions of the respective writers (or the respective communities behind the gospels). As a result and as an answer to the above-mentioned question, he concludes that most of the descriptions are fictitious, although some are based on historical facts.

One must be well versed in the gospels to be able to review all the four gospels focusing on the descriptions of the Jews based on the above-mentioned six elements for analysis. I am sure that the results of the analysis discussed in the presentation, will be very helpful if we are to examine the descriptions of the Jews in the gospels using the methodology of narrative criticism.

While I would like to thank Yutaka Maekawa for his contribution in this regard, allow me to discuss frankly some questions concerning his presentation.

1. About the methodology:

In his presentation, Yutaka Maekawa first set the problem, then implied he would employ the methodology of narrative criticism to solve it.

The problem: "Do the descriptions of the Jews in the four canonical gospels represent historical facts or are they simply fictitious?" is a question of a historical nature. I say this because this question requires us to explore whether historical facts are behind the gospel descriptions or not, rather than to simply examine the structure, rhetoric, and plot of each gospel narrative. To answer this question, we have to compare the descriptions of the four gospels, which were written somewhere between 70 C.E. and 100 C.E., with historical facts regarding the

Jews during the same period or during the days of Jesus, and then we must explore to what extent the gospel descriptions reflect the realities of the Jews in those days. In this light, the above problem is definitely a historical question.

Due to its historical nature, I think that this problem cannot be solved by means of narrative criticism alone.

By adopting the methodology of narrative criticism for the analysis of the four gospels, Yutaka Maekawa virtually accepted the premise that these gospels are "narratives." If they are narratives, it is a matter of course that they are fictitious to one degree or another. While he concluded that most of them are fictitious although some are based on historical facts, this conclusion was already self-evident at the time he adopted the methodology of narrative criticism.

I am not saying that there is something wrong with the methodology of narrative criticism itself. On the contrary, I have no doubt as to the high effectiveness of this methodology in the interpretation of the Bible. However, I think narrative criticism alone can never lead us to any in-depth conclusion or insight when we deal with historical questions.

Of course, we can rely on narrative criticism to analyze the four gospels, but at the same time, we should examine historical facts for the purpose of comparison. To be more specific, I think it is necessary to identify relevant historical facts so that we can compare the descriptions of the Jews in the four gospels with the realities of the Jews and explore how the Jews reacted to early Christianity historically. Unless we do this, we cannot determine which of the descriptions are true and which are fictitious, and we cannot shed light on how the Jews actually felt about early Christianity either.

2. About problem setting:

While the analysis in the presentation leads to the rough conclusion that most of the narratives of the four gospels are fictitious although some are based on historical facts or events, I think this is a natural consequence of depending solely on the methodology of narrative criticism to deal with a historical question.

However, what we want to know is something more specific: We want to know to what extent the narratives are fictitious and to what extent they are based on historical facts or events.

In addition, we want to know more about the background; namely, why the writers made up such fictitious accounts. I think it is especially necessary to first shed light on how the Jews responded to early Christianity in reality, and make clear the difference between the factual

accounts and the fictitious descriptions in the gospel narratives, and then discuss why the gospel writers portrayed the Jews in the manner that we know today.

In narrative criticism, focus is placed on the effects of particular descriptions on readers, with no consideration given to the intentions of writers. For this reason, this methodology, if used alone, can hardly serve the purpose of examining historical questions.

It seems to me that, by adopting the methodology of narrative criticism, Yutaka Maekawa has placed some restrictions on the exploration of the problem he set: "Do the descriptions of the Jews in the four canonical gospels represent historical facts, or are they simply fictitious?"

3. About the time when the historical events took place:

While Yutaka Maekawa concludes that most of the descriptions are fictitious although some are based on historical facts or events, I am wondering when these "historical events" took place.

Basically, they could have taken place either during the days of Jesus or the days when the gospels were edited. Therefore, are the descriptions of the Jews in the gospels based on sources dating to the days of Jesus, or do these descriptions represent the view of the Jews prevailing in the days of the gospel writers?

The remark that "some are based on historical facts or events" is too vague. I think it is necessary to clarify the time when the particular historical events took place.

4. About the discussion of the Gospel of Luke:

The Gospel of Luke is followed by the Acts of the Apostles which as everyone knows, gives accounts of the ministries of the apostles, including Peter and Paul, in the early days of Christianity in the form of a narrative. In this light, I think any consideration of the Gospel of Luke is incomplete if it lacks reference to the Acts of the Apostles.

While this presentation focuses exclusively on the four gospels, I still think that it should include reference to the Acts of the Apostles, given that the discussion extends to the Gospel of Luke in its entirety.

5. About the Gentiles:

When considering early Christianity, the issue of the Jews can be viewed as the issue of the

Gentiles. Probably, Jewish understanding of salvation had been most problematic ever since the days of the prophets, and this remained true even during the days of the New Testament. This means that the belief that salvation is only for the Jews was the biggest problem for early Christianity, and for this reason, the notion that the Gentiles are also eligible for salvation, or that the Gentiles, among others, should be eligible for salvation is expressed consistently throughout the New Testament.

Therefore, I think any consideration of the Jews without reference to the Gentiles is incomplete.

I have raised five questions concerning the presentation. I welcome comments and further discussion on these points.

The 5th CISMOR Conference on Jewish Studies

"Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages"

Part III

Christian-Jewish Polemics - A Historical Perspective

Jews and Christians: Dialogue, Debate, Discord

Ora Limor

1. Dialogue: The Church and the Synagogue

A twelfth century Christian text describes two figures standing at the gates of heaven. A blind old lady named Synagoga, the synagogue, and a young lady—Ecclesia, the church. Ecclesia turns to Synagoga and says:

> Listen old, miserable mother
> A dry, sterile fig-tree…
> I am not led astray by arid magic,
> Nor have I learned false doctrines,
> But only the wisdom of Jesus Christ, my bridegroom,
> That shines for every human being who asks for it.
> Why won't you remember how God…
> In Jacob, son of Isaac, blessed you and enriched you,
> And like Esau, condemned you?
> Are you not Judea, denied every blessing and gift?[1)]

The text is a religious debate, set as a theatrical play, a drama. Two female characters take part in it, each representing a collective entity. Ecclesia represents Christianity. She is young, confident and full of herself. She is the triumphant church. Synagoga represents Judaism. She is old, blind, and infertile like a dead tree, defeated. The young Church reproaches the old Synagogue for her short-sightedness. She alone is to be blamed for her miserable situation. Why can't she see the course of history?

Clearly, the two figures are rivals. And yet, while rivals, they are also family. The family language is apparent right from the beginning, when the young Ecclesia turns to the old Synagoga, calling her "mother". True, an "old, miserable mother", but still, mother. Her mother. Ecclesia understands herself to be the daughter of Synagoga. She takes pity on her mother, but she is also angry with her.

These two figures—Ecclesia and Synagoga—are common images in Christian art.[2)] We find them in all art media—sculptures, frescoes, painted glass, manuscript illuminations. Sometimes

they are shown as two queens—Synagoga's crown is falling off her head, her scepter is broken, the tables of the Covenant droop from her hands and her eyes are covered with a veil. She is a tragic figure, a queen who has lost her kingdom. Ecclesia, on the other hand, is the ruling queen. Her eyes are wide open, her crown is set on her head, and she holds high a scepter with a cross on top.

The image of the twin figures of Ecclesia and Synagoga, the Church and the Synagogue, was a common way to represent Judaism and Christianity, but not the only way. In Christian literature, Judaism and Christianity were often presented as biblical pairs: two brothers—Jacob and Esau, or Cain and Abel; two sisters—Lea and Rachel; or two rivals—David and Saul, Sara and Hagar. In Christian imagery, Judaism was Cain, Hagar, Ishmael, Esau, Lea, while Christianity was Rachel, Jacob, Abel—the younger brother or sister, the daughter or the son. Christianity thus acknowledged the ancestry of Judaism, as a parent or an elder brother or sister, but this did not diminish the resentment or soften the conflict between them. They were indeed members of the same family, but we all know how difficult families can be. We all also know that no conflict is more bitter than a family conflict, and conflicts over the family inheritance are the worst. The Jewish-Christian encounter along two millennia of co-existence is marked by hostility but also by family resemblance. In a way, both speak the same language, the biblical language, and one may even say that the closer the language and the imagery, the harsher the emotional enmity.

Judaism and Christianity were both text-centered societies. Their religious and cultural life, moreover, their very entity, was centered on a text, the same text—the Bible. Christianity, while sanctifying the Jewish Bible, added a second story to it—the New Testament, but looked to the Old Testament, the Jewish Bible, for self-justification. No wonder then that both groups expressed their self-identity through the same biblical imagery and by using the same biblical language.

Most common in the imagery of both groups is the image of the twins—of Jacob and Esau, the biblical twin brothers, sons of Isaac, mentioned also in the dialogue which I just cited.[3)] In the book of Genesis, we read that Rivka, wife of Isaac, gave birth to twin boys. Esau came out first, so he was the firstborn and entitled to Isaac's blessing. Esau was a cunning hunter, while Jacob was a simple man. With Rivka's help, Jacob obtained Isaac's blessing, which included the verse: "Let people serve thee... be lord over thy brethren…" (Genesis 27:29).

Both Judaism and Christianity used the image of Jacob and Esau to express their relationship as, simultaneously, brothers and enemies. In both religions, "we" are Jacob, "they" are Esau. Jacob is self, while Esau is the "Other"—an enemy, a sinner, a persecutor. Jews called Christianity "Edom," Esau's other name, while Christians turned the imagery upside down,

identifying themselves as Jacob, the younger brother, the chosen. According to them, at first the Jews were the chosen people, but after rejecting Jesus, they lost their special status in the eyes of God to the Christians. As we all know, Jacob's other name was Israel, and this became the name of the ethnic, religious and cultural entity of the Jews. But according to Christianity, the Jews are Israel only in the flesh (*Israel iuxta carnem*), that is, genetically, while the Christians are the new Israel, Israel in the spirit (*Israel iuxta spiritum*). And as the spirit is superior to the flesh, Christianity is superior to Judaism. Christianity is the True Israel, *Verus Israel*. The seniority went from the Jews to the Christians, as it did from Esau to Jacob. The rivalry as to who was Jacob and who can be identified as Israel is primeval, and its roots can be found in the New Testament, in Paul's epistles:

> For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel;
> Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children;
> But, in Isaac, shall thy seed be called.
> That is, they which are the children of the flesh,
> these are not the children of God;
> But the children of the promise are counted for the seed… (Romans, 9:6-8)

The concept of *Verus Israel*—the True Israel—became a cornerstone of Christian theology and its attitude towards the Jews.[4] God's words to the pregnant Rivka were read as a prophecy that foretold the relationships between Christianity and Judaism for generations to come: "Two nations are in thy womb… and the elder shall serve the younger" (Genesis 25:23). God's words foretold the future relations between the victorious Christian majority (the younger son) and the oppressed Jewish minority (the elder one) and also justified them. The destruction of the Jewish temple by the Romans and the captivity and exile of the Jews were taken as decisive proof of the rejection of the Jews and the choosing of the Christians. The Jews were defeated and banished from their land as punishment for their blindness and stubbornness, for not being able and not being willing to recognize Jesus as the Messiah; moreover, for causing his cruel death by the Romans. All Jews, those who lived in Jesus' times and those who lived in later generations, were guilty of his crucifixion. According to the Gospels, they willingly took this guilt upon themselves, saying to Pilate, the Roman ruler "his blood be on us and on our children" (Matthew 27:25). Indeed, in Christian eyes, the Jews bore the guilt for hundreds of years. Although the Jews were needed to advance the history of salvation and to carry out Jesus' mission as an innocent sacrifice who atoned for human sins, they still bear the guilt.[5] It was only in 1965, in the edict of the Vatican II church council, when the horrors of the holocaust still haunted Europe, that the church

withdrew from this concept of collective, eternal guilt. But in Late Antiquity and during the Middle Ages, all Jews bore the guilt of Judas Iscarioth, who betrayed Jesus and caused his death.

"Why are you in exile for hundreds and hundreds of years?" the Christians would ask the Jews time and again. "What grave sin have you committed for which God punished you so severely? And when will this exile come to an end? Probably never, unless you change your heart and start to believe." Indeed, in Christian polemical literature, the Jewish exile stands out as the most difficult argument, one that Jews found hard to answer or refute. It was also a cause of the despair that led many Jews to the baptismal font.[6)]

The Jewish Witness Doctrine

From the Christian point of view, one may ask: if prophecy and history proved the Christians to be right and the Jews to be wrong, why should the Christians let the Jews live in their midst? Why should they maintain them? Why are they still here, unlike the Pagans, who were either converted or killed? The answer to this question was given by Augustine, the great Church Father, at the end of the fourth—beginning of the fifth century. Jews must exist in the Christian world because their role is not yet over. This role is defined by Augustine in his *opus magnum*, *The City of God*, as follows:

> Yet the Jews who slew him and chose not to believe in him…, having been vanquished rather pathetically by the Romans, completely deprived of their kingdom (where foreigners were already ruling over them), and scattered throughout the world (so that they are not lacking anywhere), are testimony for us through their own scriptures that we have not contrived the prophecies concerning Christ…
>
> Hence, when they do not believe our scriptures, their own, which they read blindly, are thus fulfilled in them…
>
> For we realize that on account of this testimony, which they unwillingly provide for us by having and by preserving these books, they are scattered among all the nations, wherever the church of Christ extends itself.[7)]

The Jews, says Augustine, chose not to believe. They are blind and they read the Bible blindly. For their error, they were punished by God: they lost their kingdom and are now dispersed among all nations. Like the murderer Cain, they wander from place to place, not finding a resting place. And they are slaves. However, their very survival and the terms of this survival are part of God's plan: they are living proof of the veracity of Christianity. They carry the Bible with them (their Bible which they do not understand), thus proving its ancestry. If someone were to say that

the Christians invented the biblical testimonies and prophecies, the Jews could testify to their antiquity and originality. Moreover, their dispersion among the nations and their enslavement in Christian territories are proof of their error and of the truth of Christianity.

"Slay them not, lest at any time they forget your law; scatter them in your might." Augustine cited Psalms 59:11 (according to the Old Latin version that he used). "Slay them not": Augustine's doctrine of the Jewish witness laid the foundation for the Christian attitude towards the Jews in both its aspects. On one hand, the Jews are allotted a place within Christian society. They are not to be killed lest they won't be able to provide testimony on behalf of the Christians. But they must also be scattered, exiled and humiliated. Christians must ensure their survival as well as their dispersion, thus demonstrating their error and the punishment for it.[8)]

In Augustine's time, it would seem, Christians despaired of the hope that all Jews would soon be convinced by the Christian message and convert. His "Jewish witness" doctrine should be understood as a theological explanation of a historical situation, that is, the Christian failure to convert the Jews. Indeed, by Augustine's time, the ways were parted and the Jews remained unbelievers, but this was God's plan, says Augustine, and it had a reason. Augustine's doctrine shaped the Jew as a hermeneutical entity (Jeremy Cohen's definition), whose very *raison d'ètre* was to fulfill Christian needs. Historically, however, this doctrine allotted the Jews a place in Christian society and secured some kind of tolerance towards them. Although a suppressed minority, they were also treated (not always, unfortunately) with some respect, due to their ancientness, their books, and their arcane knowledge. Jerome, a doctor of the church and the greatest biblical scholar of Late Antiquity (a contemporary of Augustine), taught the Christians that the Hebrew version of the Bible was superior to the translated versions, and that in order to understand it properly, the Christians need the help of the Jews. This is the famous *Hebraica Veritas* (Hebrew truth) concept.[9)] Although the Jews belong to the past, the Christian relied on their authority with regard to the Hebrew language, to the meaning of the Biblical verses, and to geographical knowledge of the Holy land. In Christian eyes, the Jews were still their father, or their elder brother, and their ancestry was much needed, if not always appreciated.[10)]

Jewish existence and survival in the Christian world depended on a delicate equilibrium formulated by Augustine and the theologians and popes who followed him, in which the Jews were both sinners and sages, punished for their sins but tolerated for their knowledge and ancestry. This sophisticated formula served as a kind of explanatory frame for Jewish-Christian relations, at least until the 12th century.

We must remember however, that here we are trying to draw a big picture, a picture that is clear and understandable. But history is also (and perhaps mainly) an accumulation of events and processes, of many details that do not always fit into this big picture. What prevails—tolerance or suppression—is not only a theological question. The answer to the question can be found also, or even mainly, in political, economical and sociological factors. We must also remember that a unified Christian society existed only in history books, that there were always several *Christianities*, and that even within Catholic Christianity, there was always a gap between underlying theological concepts formulated by popes and theologians, and ideas disseminated by local priests and preachers in towns and villages. These local priests expressed the sentiments of their flock and also influenced them. No wonder that they were much more hostile to the Jews than the theologians. Thus, for example, when in 1096, during the First Crusade, the flourishing Jewish communities of the Rhine Valley were persecuted by the crusaders and confronted with the choice between baptism and death, it was the bishops who tried to defend them. According to Christian teaching, conversion should be made out of sincere conviction and not out of coercion. The Roman popes, for their part, were quite persistent in defending the traditional tolerant stance, basing themselves on the Augustinian formula. Many of them issued edicts defending the Jews and condemning persecutions and pogroms.[11] Yet, as we shall soon see, the picture was gradually changing, and not for the better.

2. Debate: A Polemical Existence

What then was the debate between Jews and Christians? What did they agree on and what did they disagree about? And in what ways did they express this? For two thousand years, Jews and Christians devoted time, energy and creativity to convincing the other party of their truth. Polemics with "the other" infiltrated every mode of expression: theological compositions, biblical interpretations, homiletic literature, philosophy, and the visual arts. One can even say that the very existence of Jews and Christian in the Middle Ages was a polemical one. Christianity also expressed its polemical argument in a special genre, the *Adversus Iudaeos*, or *Contra Judaeos* genre—"Against the Jews." Hundreds of works, long and short, were written within this framework over the centuries. The Jews answered with a genre of their own termed the 'Victory (or Wrangling) Literature', but anti-Christian arguments can also be found in other forms of expression—liturgy, poetry, biblical commentaries, and more. Many of the polemical works were written as a dialogue between a Jew and a Christian. In the Christian literature, the Jew asks and

the Christian answers; in the Jewish literature, the Christian asks and the Jew answers. In both, the questions are short and the answers are long, and in many, the debate closes with a "happy ending"—the "surrender" of the opponent and his conversion.[12)]

We can briefly and schematically summarize the main topics of the debate as follows:

(a) The Deity: Both Judaism and Christianity define themselves as monotheistic religions, believing in one God who created heaven and earth, but Christianity adds to this belief the mysteries of the trinity and the incarnation. God has three persons – the father, the son and the Holy Spirit; the son was incarnated, that is, he came down to earth in the flesh, as a human being, to suffer and die for the atonement of humanity.

Is God one or is he three, is he divine or human, the gap between the two alternatives could not and cannot be bridged.

(b) The Messiah: Both religions believe that a Messiah will come to redeem human beings (or at least the believers), but while the Jews believe that the Messiah is yet to come, the Christians believe that Jesus was that Messiah, that he came down to earth and ascended back to heaven, and that he will come again at the end of times to redeem humanity.

(c) Jewish Exile: We have already touched on this very painful issue for the Jews. Both Jews and Christians agreed that the Jewish exile was a punishment for sins. The disagreement was about "for what sin?" The Christians claimed that the Jews were punished because they caused Jesus' crucifixion and for their stubborn disbelief in him; the Jews agreed that they were punished, but it was for not observing God's tenets. They indeed sinned, but not "that sin."

(d) The biblical commandments: While both religions are based on a sacred text, the same sacred text, that is, the Bible, they read it differently. The Jews believe that the biblical commandments (for example circumcision and the dietary laws) are binding forever and ever and cannot be changed. The Christians, on the other hand, asserted that the commandments were valid and important in their time, but after the coming of Jesus, they became superfluous, and observing them is even a sign of disbelief. Jesus' grace (*gratia*) replaced the law (*lex*) and made it null and void.

The Christians also read the commandments as allegories. This reading was in keeping with an overall system that called forth a spiritual understanding of the sacred text, instead of a verbal or historical one. Believers should not circumcise their bodies but their hearts; that is, repent of their sins, said Christian authorities. The stories of the Bible (the Old Testament) are all allegories, parables and mysteries that should be decoded and deciphered.[13)]

Two examples will clarify this systematic way of reading: In the book of Genesis, we are told of Abraham, who was ordered by God to offer up his son Isaac as a sacrifice. Abraham took the wood of the offering and laid it upon Isaac. For three days, they walked to the place that God had told Abraham of. There, Abraham built an altar and tied Isaac to it, but at the last moment, an angel came down from heaven and stopped him. A ram was offered up instead. For the Christian reader, this heart-breaking story was an allegory, a prefiguration, the anticipation of another story, that of Jesus' crucifixion. Like Isaac, Jesus too was offered to God. Like him, Jesus carried the wood of the cross on his back to the designated site. Abraham and Isaac went for three days to the site; Jesus was in his tomb for three days until his resurrection. The ram, or the lamb, is also Jesus, who indeed was offered to God, unlike Isaac who was eventually saved. Every Christian child who read the story of the binding of Isaac understood it as actually the story of Jesus. Isaac prefigured Jesus just as Cain prefigured the Jews. Cain slew his brother Abel, the Jews slew their brother Jesus. Cain was cursed by God to be a vagabond on earth just as the Jews are now vagabonds, roaming from place to place everywhere on earth.[14)]

Biblical stories and biblical prophecies hint and foretell the truth to be revealed in its fullness in the New Testament. As every Christian knew, Isaiah's prophecy, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel…" (Isaiah 7:14), was fulfilled in Jesus, while his vision of the angels who cried to one another and said "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord" (Isaiah 6:3) is proof of the trinity.

And thus, while the Jews read the stories and prophecies historically, as recounting their history, Christians read them allegorically, claiming that the spiritual reading is superior to the historical, or carnal, one, just as the spirit is superior to the flesh and just as Israel in the spirit (the Christians) is superior to Israel in the flesh (the Jews).

3. Discord: The High Middle Ages

Historians working on Christian-Jewish relations in the Middle Ages would generally agree

that the twelfth and/or the thirteenth century were kind of a watershed in the encounter between the two religions. While the former period was marked by relative tolerance toward the Jews (with sporadic outbreaks of violence here and there), from the 12th and, even more so, from the 13th century, the attitude changed for the worse, a change that was salient in all spheres of life. As Robert I. Moore put it, western Christianity became a persecuting society.[15] The persecuting attitude was not directed only toward Jews. It affected all "others"—Moslems, heretics of all kinds, and lepers, as well as the "other" par excellence, the Jews.

For the sake of clarity, let us focus on the year 1215. In that year, Pope Innocent the third, the most impressive and influential pope of the High Middle Ages, convened in his palace, the Lateran palace, in Rome, a church council, known as Lateran IV. Some 1,300 people took part—bishops, archbishops, prelates, abbots, and prominent representatives of the secular world.

Several pressing problems were at stake: theological, political and military problems that endangered the power and the unity of the Church. The pope was determined to defend the church and consolidate it against all these dangers. His overarching aim was to draw a clear border between those who are "with us" and those who are not, and to secure the homogeneity of Christian society. The Jewish problem was a minor one on the agenda of the council, yet it found its place in the overall scheme. Four of the council's seventy resolutions dealt with the Jews—only four—but these four resolutions had grave consequences. They are also a clear expression of the new winds that were blowing in the Christian world.

The second of the four resolutions is the most famous: it decrees that both Jews and Moslems who live under Christian rule wear distinguishing signs on their clothing, so as to draw a clear distinction between them and the Christians and to prevent the possibility that Christians mistake Jews or Moslems for Christians and have (sexual) relations with them. Other clauses forbid Jews from holding public office; forbid Jews who were baptized of their own free will to observe their old rites, that is, Jewish customs (like eating kosher food); and state that Jews should be compelled to give up usury, lest they be denied commercial relations with Christians.

The council did not try to interfere in Jewish internal affairs. Jews became a Christian problem only when they came into contact with Christians, economically or socially, or when they stopped being Jews and became Christians. Conversely, this legislation hints at the situation which existed before, when it was hard to tell a Jew from a Christian, Jews did hold official posts, and many Christians depended on them economically. If before, Christians and Jews had been part of the same community, the only difference between them being their religion, now the Church wanted them to become two completely separate groups, with well defined markers and

borders. From this point of view, the council can be considered a chronological divide. It opens a new age.

This new harsher relationship toward the Jew is connected with other phenomena of the period: the Crusades, the 12th century Renaissance and the rational thinking it fostered, a new religious zeal, which, among other things, gave birth to new religious orders—the Mendicants (Franciscans and Dominicans), whose aim was to revive the original Christian ideals and to deepen the belief of the laity.[16] New dogmas were formulated, taught and preached, first and foremost, the dogma of the Eucharist—the actual changing of the Eucharistic elements—the bread and the wine—into the flesh and blood of Jesus during Mass.[17]

A new chapter now also opened in Christian anti-Jewish polemics. So far, religious disputations of both sides were based mainly on the Bible and on biblical authorities. The Bible was sacred to both religions and formed a platform for debate acceptable to both. For Christianity, the Jews living amongst them were the descendants of the biblical Jews, identical to them in belief and customs. Christianity agreed to tolerate them within it, as they took them to be identical to the biblical Jews, those who refused to change when Christianity showed them the better way, and had not changed since.

But in the 12th century, Christian scholars (most of them, converts from Judaism) started to claim that Judaism had changed and therefore should not be tolerated. The Jews, they claimed, did not live according to biblical tenets, but according to the Talmud; that is, the Jewish Law (*Halacha*) as formulated in the oral tradition. Unlike the Bible, which was translated into Latin and into other languages, the Talmud was written in Hebrew and Aramaic and not translated into any other language. Thus, it was sealed off to the Christians, and aroused their suspicion and enmity. Christians also learned from Jewish converts that the Talmud contains insults of Jesus, his mother Mary, and Christianity in general. Their target was mainly Talmudic legends (*Aggadah*), which contain anthropomorphic descriptions of God (that is ascribe human properties to God), which Christians considered blasphemy and an offense to God.

Christian scholars, especially Dominicans and Franciscan friars, took up these claims and made them part of an overall attack on the Jewish religion. Inflamed by an ardent missionary zeal, they set out to educate and deepen the belief of Christians, to fight heretics and to convert Jews and Moslems. Their aim was to convert the world, thus preparing the way for the second coming. Their weapon was preaching. Within a short time, they became the leaders of anti-Jewish activity, formulating a militant anti-Jewish ideology aimed at bringing an end to Jewish existence within the Christian universe through conversion or expulsion.[18]

One of the novelties of the 13th century in the polemical sphere was the public disputation. We can take it for granted that Jews and Christians, living in the same neighborhoods and doing business with one another, sometimes argued about their beliefs, just as people of different parties today would argue about political issues. These were private disputes, and the Church opposed them vehemently, out of fear that the Jews, who were usually more learned, would have the upper hand. Only those who were trained for it should enter into a debate over matters of belief, said the Church.[19)]

But in the 13th century, a new form of disputation came into being, a public event, in which learned representatives of the two groups were called forth to defend their religion, in front of a distinguished public and under the auspices of the political ruler. These disputations were orchestrated by the mendicant orders as a trial, in which the Jews had to answer questions put to them by the Christian protagonists, but could not interrogate the Christians or attack Christian beliefs.[20)]

The first public disputation, or should we say the first trial, took place in Paris in 1240. A Jewish convert to Christianity, Nicholas Donin, wrote a letter to the Pope, accusing the Jewish Talmud of unspeakable insults against God, the Christian religion and Christians. As a result, all volumes of the Talmud were confiscated and prominent rabbis were invited to the king's palace to defend it. The king's mother presided over the event and the master general of the Dominican order, as well as prominent prelates, acted as a jury. They found the Talmud guilty of the charges against it and condemned it to be burned at the stake. In a day and a half, 12,000 volumes of the Talmud were burned.[21)]

The second public disputation was held in Barcelona two decades after the Paris event, in 1263. The Barcelona disputation was a polemical event of major cultural and political significance, which cast a shadow over the life of Spanish Jewry in the second half of the 13th century. It was also one of the most famous religious dramas of the Middle Ages.[22)] As in any great drama, it involved some fascinating characters and a stormy and tension-filled plot. The details of the plot are as follows: For four days, in July 1263, in the Royal Palace and Cloister at Barcelona, Nahmanides (Rabbi Moses Ben Nachman, the leader of Aragonese Jewry) and Paulus Christiani (Pau Cristià) argued the question of the true faith. Paulus Christiani was a converted Jew who had become a Dominican friar, well known in the second half of the 13th century for his missionizing and polemical activities, which began before the Barcelona event and continued long after it. At his side stood learned scholars of the Dominican order. The disputation took place under the aegis of King Jaume I of Aragon (1213–1276), who hosted the encounter and was

involved in the entire scenario.

The Barcelona disputation opened a new epoch in Christian anti-Jewish debate, hence its importance. The Christian disputants developed and refined a new strategy of religious disputation. The basic idea was an attempt to prove the truth of Christianity on the basis of post-biblical Jewish literature. While in Paris the Christians had tried to condemn the Talmud, in Barcelona they tried to use it to their benefit. On the Jewish side, Nahmanides' responses to the new Christian assault became classics of the polemical genre, a kind of inventory from which later Jewish polemicists could pick suitable answers. This famous event ended with no verdict and no immediate consequences, unlike the third famous disputation, at Tortosa in Spain in 1413–1414, which had fatal consequences for Spanish Jewry. This disputation was held in an atmosphere of terror and coercion that drove many Jews to the baptismal font. Its consequences testify to the deterioration in the situation of Spanish Jewry, and it was considered as one step towards their complete expulsion from Spain in 1492.[23)]

Even without analyzing every polemical event in detail, the point is clear: The public disputation should be considered a step towards the isolation of the Jews and their condemnation. Its setting clearly reflected the balance of power between the majority and the minority. While in the former period, the Church had refrained from interfering in Jewish internal affairs and from scrutinizing Jewish beliefs, now it started to look at both through a magnifying glass. In the 13th century, a great rabbi like Nahmanides, by virtue of his personality, his erudition and his original argumentation, was still able to block the Christian victory. By the 15th century, nobody could save the Jews.

The deterioration of Jewish status in Western Europe that started, as we have seen, in the 12th century, had varied manifestations, like, for example, the obligatory wearing of distinctive clothing, or living in separate quarters. The rise of the town, and the new flourishing of regional and international commerce, brought forth a new commercial stratum that replaced the Jews as merchants and pushed them to money lending. While Christianity condemns usury, the increasing need for cash money in a growing economy was answered by Jewish monetary activity. Jewish money lending became indispensable and abominable to the same degree.

In the religious sphere, new devotional expressions that became dominant in the Late Middle Ages had serious, and even frightening, consequences for Medieval European Jews. This new form of devotion put an emphasis on the suffering of Christ as a human being, and the compassionate grief of Mary, his mother. Consequently, it deepened anti-Jewish feelings, as Jews were held responsible for Christ's passion and Mary's grief. The old myth of the Jews as Christ-

killers now received weight and importance and had an impact that it never had before. This was a potent myth, replete with hundreds of dramatic pictorial representations, religious dramas, scholarly tractates and all kinds of literary expressions. And it gave birth to fantasies about Jewish evil, awful fantasies that cast their dark shadow on Jewish life and became a mortal threat to their very existence.[24)]

The most famous of these fantasies was the blood libel, with its multi-faced expressions: Ritual murder (Jews kill Christians, mainly young Christian boys, for ritual purposes); Blood libel (Jews kill Christians in order to use their blood for liturgical purposes or for sorcery); Desecration of the Host (Jews steal the sacred Eucharist wafers, and stab or otherwise desecrate them, in order to insult Jesus and Christianity). All these libels fall back on the Christ-killers myth that holds the Jews responsible for Jesus' cruel death on the cross.[25)] The murder of Christian children, the use of their blood and the desecration of the Host time and again reenact the original crime of the crucifixion. The Christ-killers myth gave force to these libels and gained force from them. Other libels followed, like the poisoning of wells that caused the Black Death, or the belief in a Jewish treachery, a universal Jewish bond, plotting to ruin Christianity. To the three Ds of this paper—Dialogue, Debate, Discord, we can now add a fourth—Demonization.[26)]

Once these libels struck root in Christian imagination, it was almost impossible to uproot them and their repercussions exist to this day. The hope that with the enlightenment and secularization, the black shadows of past myths and superstitions would completely disappear proved wrong.

Not all Christians believed in such myths. Popes, kings and scholars tried to defend the Jews, showing the absurdity of the libels and calling to maintain the old order, but with little success. Gradually, Jews were pushed to the edges of society, losing any kind of legitimacy. They were prey to pogroms and harsh legislation, confined to small neighborhoods and to certain professions, objects of violent preaching and victims of forced conversion. In most countries, the process terminated with expulsion. The Jews were expelled from England in 1290, from France in 1306 and again in 1394-5, from Spain in 1492, and, in Portugal in 1496, they were forced to convert to Christianity. The reasons for expulsion differed from place to place, but they all reflect the most extreme aspect of Jewish life as a minority in Western Europe. By the end of the 15th century, Jews were still living in only several cities in Germany and in the papal state in Italy. Significantly, Augustinian tolerance remained valid and could protect the Jews only there. From then on, the center of European Judaism moved eastward, to Poland, Russia and other Eastern countries, but these developments are outside the scope of this paper, as is the relationship of the reform movement (Protestantism) toward the Jews.

Happily, this is not the last chapter of our story, and I can end my paper with a more optimistic view. In 1962, Pope John XXIII convened a council in his palace at the Vatican, known as the second Vatican council or Vatican II. It was time, the pope said, "to open the windows of the Church to let in some fresh air." One of the declarations of the council, known as *Nostra Aetate* (In our Age), deals with the relations of the Church with non-Christian religions, among them, the Jews. This declaration was promulgated in 1965, some twenty years after the end of Second World War, when its horrors, especially with regard to European Jewry had become evident. Here are some excerpts from the Declaration:

> The Church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revelation of the Old Testament through the people with whom God in His inexpressible mercy concluded the Ancient Covenant. Nor can she forget that she draws sustenance from the root of that well-cultivated olive tree onto which have been grafted the wild shoots, the Gentiles. Indeed, the Church believes that by His cross Christ, Our Peace, reconciled Jews and Gentiles. making both one in Himself.—
> True, the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ; still, what happened in His passion cannot be charged against all the Jews, without distinction, then alive, nor against the Jews of today. Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures—
> Furthermore, in her rejection of every persecution against any man, the Church, mindful of the patrimony she shares with the Jews and moved not by political reasons but by the Gospel's spiritual love, decries hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.

Let's hope that this call is answered by all.

Notes

1) *Disputatio Ecclesiae et Synagogae*, in: Edmund Martène and Ursin Durand (eds.), *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, 5 (Paris 1717, repr. New York 1968), pp. 1500-1501.
2) Nina Rowe, *The Jew, the Cathedral and the Medieval City: Synagoga and Ecclesia in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
3) Gershon D. Cohen, "Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought", in: Alexander Altmann (ed.), *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 19-48; Israel J. Yuval, *Two Nations in your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. by Barbara Harshav and Jonathan Chipman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
4) Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire 135-425*, trans. by H. McKeating (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

5) Jeremy Cohen, *Christ Killers: The Jews and the Passion from the Bible to the Big-Screen* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
6) Ora Limor, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*, in: *Jews and Christian in Western Europe: Encounter between Cultures in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, vol. 3 (Tel Aviv: The Open University, 1993), pp. 87-90 [in Hebrew].
7) Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 18, 46, ed. by Bernardus Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb, CCSL 47-48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), p. 644. English translation by Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the law* (below, note 8), p. 32.
8) Jeremy Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 1999), pp. 27-44.
9) J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writing, and Controversie*s (London: Duckworth, 1975); H.I. Newman, *Jerome and the Jews*, PhD thesis, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1997.
10) Ora Limor, "Christian Sacred Space and the Jew", in: Jeremy Cohen (ed.), *From Witness to Witchcraft. Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter-Studien 11 (Wiesbaden, 1996), pp. 55-77.
11) Solomon Grayzel, "The Papal Bull *Sicut Iudaeis*", in: Meir Ben-Horin, B.D. Weinryb and S. Zeitlin (eds.), *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman* (Leiden: Brill, 1962), pp. 243-280.
12) David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical edition of the Nizzahon Vetus, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979); A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-eye View of Christian Apologiae until the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935); Ora Limor, *The Jewish-Christian Debate.*
13) Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture*, 4 vols. (Paris: Aubier, 1959-1964).
14) Ruth Mellinkoff, *The Mark of Cain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).
15) Robert I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950-1250* (2nd edition, Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).
16) Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: The Evolution of Medieval Anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, 1982).
17) Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
18) Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*; Robert Chazan*, Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
19) Ora Limor, "Missionary Merchants: Three Medieval Anti-Jewish Works from Genoa" *The Journal of Medieval History*, *17* (1991), pp. 35-51.
20) Hyam Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial: Jewish-Christian Disputations in the Middle Ages* (London: Associated University Presses, 1982).
21) Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial*, pp. 19-38.

22) *Vikkuah ha-Ramban* in *Kitvei Rabbenu Moshe ben Nahman*, ed. Chaim Chavel, 2 vols. (Jerusalem: Mosad ha-Rav Kuk, 1971), vol. 1, pp. 302-320; Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial,* pp. 39-75, 102-146; Robert Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond: The Disputation of 1263 and its Aftermath* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
23) Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial*, pp. 82-94.
24) Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven: Yale University press, 1999).
25) Cohen, *Christ Killers* (above, note 5).
26) Ruth Mellinkoff, *Outcasts: Signs of Otherness in Northern European Art of the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

Mary and the Jews:
The Virgin in the Christian-Jewish Debate

Ora Limor

A thirteenth-century text, written in French, describes a fictional disputation between a Jew and a Christian. The text begins with the Christian citing a Latin hymn about the Virgin:

> The nation of all believers
> Rejoices,
> Our redemption,
> A child is born,
> He puts on flesh
> In a virgin's womb,
> And is clothed with flesh,
> Glory of the God-head.

The Jew says he does not understand, and the Christian explains:

> I speak of the son of God who was born here on earth; —
> He was born of the virgin like a rose on its thorn bush.
> He emerged from her womb through its closed door:
> He entered and emerged from the belly of the woman,
> In such a way that the lady never lost her virginity,
> Nor was defiled before or after.
> During conception, during the birth, and afterward she remained whole.
> In the same way the sun can pass through glass
> Without damaging or shattering it,
> In similar way, but even more adeptly,
> God entered into the virgin and afterward came out again.[1)]

The Jew says he is no fool. How could a virgin give birth? How could God, so great that the whole world cannot contain him, be enclosed in the belly of a woman? The Christian interprets the prophecy of Isaiah for the Jew: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding" (Isaiah 11:1-2). The branch, says the Christian, is the virgin, and the flower is He who came down for us in the virgin. This biblical exegesis finally convinces the Jew and he decides to get baptized and become a Christian, a typical ending to Christian texts of this sort.

I deliberately chose a poem as my starting point, so as to show the variety of ways the inter-religious debate expresses itself. Besides the famous disputations—treatises that were written to refute another religion's claims and to strengthen one's own—we find other cultural expressions, both literary and visual, some of which will be demonstrated in this paper. The text also demonstrates the centrality of the dogma of the Virgin birth and of Marian beliefs in general within Christian theology, as well as their centrality to the debate between the two religions.[2)]

The Gospels are rather laconic in relation to Mary. The story of the Annunciation, so prominent in Christian piety and imagination, is told only in Luke (1:26-38). Matthew mentions, very briefly, that Mary was betrothed to Joseph, but "before they came together she was found to be with child of the Holy Spirit" (1:18). Mark and John entirely ignore the subject. The Nativity stories are told in detail in Matthew (chapters 1 and 2) and Luke (chapters 1 and 2), but are not mentioned by Mark and John. In addition to the stories of the Annunciation and Nativity, John refers briefly to Mary in two further scenes, once in the wedding at Cana (2:3–5; 12) and again during the Crucifixion (19:25–27). She also figures in the account of the origins of the early church in Acts (1:14). It is important to note that Paul makes no mention of Mary at all.

The evangelists left in dark Mary's childhood and youth, her life after her son's crucifixion, and other details concerning her. Yet, quite early in the history of Christianity, perhaps as early as the second century, Mary began to loom bright in Christian faith and ritual, and stories about her life circulated among Christians. These apocryphal stories centered on Mary's life before the birth of Jesus and after his death. Mary's birth, childhood and youth were recounted in the texts known as *The Protevangelium of James*, and her death (Dormition), burial and Assumption were described in works entitled *Transitus Mariae*.[3)] These traditions spread rapidly through the Christian world in a variety of languages and versions. They were gradually accepted by Christian orthodoxy and formed the basis for Marian theology. Marian doctrine and ritual were considerably encouraged by the Council of Ephesus (431), which officially bestowed upon her the title of *Theotokos* ("Mother of God" or "bearer of God"). Mary's rise to prominence in Christian theology was expressed in liturgy, with several festivals dedicated to her, and in geography, as more and more holy places related to her were marked on the map of the Holy Land, in Nazareth, Sephoris, Bethlehem, and in and around Jerusalem.[4)]

According to all sources, canonical and apocryphal, Mary lived and died as a good Jewess. The Jews, however, resented her and her theology. It would even seem that they choose to fight Jesus through his mother. In *Nizzahon Vetus*, a Jewish anti-Christian book written in Germany around the year 1300, we read:

> Consequently, how could this man be God, for he entered a woman with a stomach full of feces who frequently sat him down in the privy during the nine months, and when he was born he came out dirty and filthy, wrapped in a placenta and defiled by the blood of childbirth and impure issue. The Torah, on the other hand, warns against approaching a menstruate woman, a woman who has had an impure issue, and one who has just given birth, as it is written, "…she shall touch no hallowed thing… until the day of her purification be fulfilled" (Lev. 12:4). Hence he was not worthy of association with anything sacred.[5)]

Not all Jewish anti-Christian polemical works resorted to such picturesque language, but in fact the author of that work simply summarized in vulgar terms what Jews had been saying for hundreds of years. The references to Mary reflect misogynous discourse, primarily the outrage felt by Jewish men at the idea of physical contact between a woman and the deity, that is contact between impurity and sanctity. The very idea of virgin birth was for the Jews unbearable, as well as illogical, and side by side with the Trinity and the resurrection from the dead, proof of the impossible nature of Christianity as a whole. One way to challenge the very possibility of virgin birth was to suggest explanations for the fact that Mary gave birth to a child that was not her husband's. The Talmud and the Midrash already offer derogatory remarks about Mary's dubious personality,[6)] and there is a caustic narrative summary of the Jewish perception of Mary in *Sefer Toledot Yeshu* ("The History of Jesus"), a kind of Jewish biography of Jesus, whose composition date is debated.[7)] Amos Funkenstein has termed this book "counter history," which he aptly defines as a genre of historiography with polemical aims, which systematically exploits the other party's most reliable sources, contrary to their intention and spirit. "The aim of counter history," writes Funkenstein, "is to distort the other's self-image and identity by destroying his collective memory."[8)] This is precisely what *Sefer Toledot Yeshu* tries to do. It takes the tales of the Gospels and distorts their entire content, thus producing an alternative biography of Jesus, portraying him in caricature.

Sefer Toledot Yeshu is not concerned with Mary's biography as a whole, since its main subject is her son's life. Nevertheless, she does star in the work and the story of her pregnancy is treated at particular length. According to this book, Mary was a young Jewess, the daughter of a widow living in Bethlehem, who was betrothed to a humble, god-fearing youth named Johanan. One Saturday evening, her neighbor Joseph Pandera, an evil, disreputable man and a war hero, of the tribe of Judah, raped her in her home during her menstrual period, doing so twice that night. On both occasions, Mary thought that the rapist was her fiancé Johanan, and she complained to him and warned him, but to no avail. Upon hearing that Mary had become pregnant, Johanan, fearing that he would be held responsible, fled to Babylonia. Mary in time gave birth to a son, whom she

named Joshua (Jesus). When the circumstances of Jesus' birth came to light, he was proclaimed a "*mamzer* (bastard) son of a menstruating woman," and he therefore fled to Galilee, living there for a few years until he returned to Jerusalem.

The figure of Mary as portrayed in this Jewish history of Jesus shifts from the tragic to the comical: an unfortunate naïve girl, victim of sexual abuse, who was raped and gave birth. The story indeed stresses that Mary objected to Joseph's advances, and that he forced himself upon her. At the same time, while she is an unwilling and innocent victim, it is difficult not to hold her in contempt and to ridicule her as a woman who could not tell the difference in the dark between her humble fiancé Johanan and her coarse, adulterous neighbor Joseph Pandera; a woman who sat in her doorway so that her vile neighbor could see her and have his way with her. Perhaps Mary was not to blame for her fate, but she is surely contemptible.

The Jews' attitude toward Mary did not go unnoticed by the Christians. Their contempt for her and the stories about her were surely known and caused Christians no little distress. Their concern was particularly acute because the Jewish criticism touched a raw nerve—fragile points of Christian theology, which were controversial and not readily explainable in a logical manner. These related to two basic tenets of Christian dogma that incensed the Jews: the idea that the divine messiah had been born to a mortal woman, and the doctrine of the virgin birth. Here, as in other contexts, what Christians quoted as having been said by Jews could also represent suppressed Christian disapproval, or a guilty conscience for heretical thoughts and doubts.

* * *

How did Christians react to the Jewish criticism of Mary and their contempt for her?[9)] What role did they assign the Jews in the emergence of Marian theology? I shall try to answer these questions through several early Christian stories about Mary and the Jews. These ancient tales place the Jews at a sensitive juncture, a meeting place between the evolving theology of Mary, the veneration of her relics and also the beginnings of icon worship. When listening to these tales we should be aware of the two underlying facts that I have already mentioned: (1) The Jews resented the Christian beliefs connected with Mary; (2) This resentment worried the Christians, especially because of their own doubts and questions relating to her. The stories depict in bright colors the ways Christians mobilized Jewish criticism and hostility to reinforce Christian beliefs. What happens in the stories is that precisely because of their awareness of Jewish criticism, Christians assigned to the Jews the role of confirming Mary's sanctity. These are then apologetic

stories. They reflect the perception of the Jew in Christian thought and even the complex web of relationships between Jews and Christians in general.

Mary's robe

I shall begin with a pleasant story about Mary's robe, a story that takes place in the Galilee, where Mary lived. Its origins are probably in the fifth century. At that time, the Galilee was an important Jewish center, and most of the population was Jewish, but Christian communities were gradually being established, and the Christian identity of the Galilee began to take shape, mainly in places mentioned in the Gospels in connection with Jesus. In Nazareth, Capernaum, Sephoris and elsewhere, churches were built, commemorating biblical scenes. An anonymous traveler from Italy, who journeyed to the Holy Land in the second half of 6th century, writes:

> We traveled on to the city of Nazareth, where many miracles take place…. The house of Saint Mary is now a basilica, and her clothes are the cause of frequent miracles.
> The Hebrew women of that city are better-looking than any other Hebrew women in the whole country. They declare that this is Saint Mary's gift to them, for they also say that she was a relation of theirs. Though there is no love lost between Hebrews and Christians these women are full of kindness…[10)]

As can be seen from this short description, many of the traditions of the Christian Galilee revolve around Mary. Only naturally, they were feminine traditions. According to our pilgrim's story, Jewish women (whom he calls *Hebraeas*—Hebrew women) were proud of their lineage and their familial relationship with Mary—a Galilean Jewess like themselves—and of their unique qualities due to that relationship.[11)] It was because of Mary that they were particularly good-looking and kind—beautiful in a corporeal and a spiritual sense. The pilgrim notes that Galilean Jews were not generally sympathetic to Christians, and for that reason he marvels at the behavior of the Jewish women. His account may hint at some local Marian rituals observed around sites and objects associated with Mary, with the participation of both Christian and Jewish women.[12)] In other periods and places, there were ecumenical rituals devoted to veneration of saints, rituals that cut across religious barriers, among them, rituals associated with Mary.[13)] Several Christian holy places connected with Mary were also frequented by Muslims, and in rare cases, we also have evidence of Jewish participation in such rituals.[14)] While our pilgrim does not refer to Jewish women actually worshiping Mary, his account alludes to their veneration for her, and an admission that she was the source of their beauty and good qualities. He also refers to miracles

performed in Nazareth by virtue of the relics kept there—Mary's clothing: "her clothes are the cause of frequent miracles," he writes.

Indeed, the most important holy relic in Byzantine Constantinople, documented as early as the seventh century, was Mary's robe. It was credited with many miracles, some associated with the defense of the city. There were various versions of the origins of the robe, one of which placed its origin in Galilee. This version survived in the hagiographical literature of the Greek Church and goes back to the fifth century.[15)]

Two noble brothers, Galbius and Candidus, resident in Constantinople at the time of the emperor Leo the Great (457–474), decided to go on a pilgrimage to the holy places. They made their way to Jerusalem through the Galilee, in order to visit the holy places there. As night overtook them, they found lodging in the home of an old Jewess who offered them her hospitality. Upon entering the house, the brothers saw a room full of invalids—men, women and children, which astonished them. Curious to learn the reason, they invited the woman to dine with them. At first she refused, saying that as a Jewess, she could not dine with Christians. However, she agreed to their suggestion that she bring along her own food. During the meal, the brothers plied her with wine, and then asked her why so many invalids were crowded in the inner room. Whether because of the wine or by Divine Providence, the woman told them her secret: In a chest in the next room, the woman said, she kept Mary's sacred robe. Mary had entrusted it to a female acquaintance, a member of the old lady's family. That woman had enjoined her family to guard the robe well and respect it, and the robe had thus been handed down from one generation to the next, from one virgin of that family to another. The chest was now in the inner room, and it was the robe within it that was working the miracles.

The brothers thanked the woman and begged her permission to sleep in the room containing the robe. During the night, they measured the chest precisely. In the morning, they set off for Jerusalem. Arriving there they found a carpenter, from whom they ordered an exact replica of the chest, made of the very same wood. On their way home, they again passed through the woman's village, dined with her, and asked to sleep in the room with the robe. At night, after assuring that all the sick people sleeping in the room were indeed asleep, the brothers prayed to Mary, asking her agreement, and then switched the boxes. In the morning, they took their leave of the old Jewess and went on their way, taking the sacred treasure with them. They brought the original chest and the robe to their city, Constantinople, where an imperial church was erected in honor of the Holy Virgin and her robe was placed there in a gold and silver chest in the church. As for the old woman, when she discovered the theft, she died of grief.

The Virgin's robe became one of Constantinople's most important relics. An annual festival of the robe was celebrated in Constantinople on June 2. The robe was credited with having Galilean origins, in fact, Jewish-Galilean origins. Mary herself entrusted it to a woman known to her, and it was passed down from one generation to the next, until the old Galilean woman disclosed the secret to the two brothers. This is then a story of *furta sacra*- "sacred theft,"[16] as well as a story of *translatio*—transfer of the sacred robe from the Galilee, the Virgin's homeland, to Constantinople, but even more important, from Jews to Christians. If any person had doubts as to the authenticity of the robe kept in the church at Constantinople and its miracle-working qualities, the Jewish woman from Galilee was recruited to bear witness to them and through them, to the eternal virginity of Mary.[17]

On an allegorical level, one might read the story as a homily, a sermon on Jewish-Christian relations: Judaism is likened to an old woman, preserving an inherited ancient truth that she herself does not fully comprehend. She is the *Synagoga*, the Synagogue. When the time comes, she passes this truth on to the young, victorious, Christianity, the open-eyed heir to the truth, the *Ecclesia*, the Church.

Mary's funeral

We now turn to other stories, much less favorable towards the Jews. An early story, probably of Syro-Palestinian or Egyptian origin, tells of Mary's Dormition (*dormitio*—falling asleep). It is traditionally attributed to the evangelist John. This story is also known in different versions beginning in the fifth and sixth centuries, but is presumably even older.

The story relates how an angel (in some versions, Jesus himself) informed Mary that she would be taken up into heaven (the Assumption). Miraculously, all the apostles gather from their countries of mission, to bid her farewell and accompany her on her final journey. When the funeral procession makes its way from Mount Zion, where Mary lived after the Crucifixion and where she sank into sleep, to Gethsemane, where she was to be buried, it attracts the attention of the leaders of the Jews in Jerusalem, who plot to seize the body and burn it, lest the site of her tomb cause miracles to occur like that of Jesus her son. This implies that the Jews are aware of Mary's marvelous power, but they deny it. As they prepare to leave the city gate to seize the body, the Jews are struck blind, with one exception, a Jew named Zephaniah, who runs to Mary's bier and catches hold of it, intending to damage it. Thereupon, an angel appears, a fiery sword in his hand, and cuts off Zephaniah's hands, leaving him writhing in agony while his hands

remain stuck to the bier. When Zephaniah begs the apostles to save him, they answer that only the Virgin can help him and advise him to pray to her. After doing so he is healed and converts to Christianity. The apostles then send him back to the city to heal the other Jews of their blindness. Many of them become Christians, and recover their sight.[18)]

This episode presents the Jews' hostility toward Mary and their criticism of the beliefs associated with her in a literary garment. They wish to harm the body, in order to defile and ultimately burn it, thus refuting the Christian belief that Mary's body is sacred, as it never sinned. According to Christian belief, every human being is bound to die because of the original sin imprinted in his flesh. But because Mary's body was immaculate, she was physically taken into heaven, entirely untouched by death. The Jews' designs to prevent this are brutally frustrated, and what happens is the very opposite of their original intention: the Jew is unable to defile the pure body; on the contrary, it is his own sinful body that suffers injury. Only through prayer to Mary is he healed. After Mary has miraculously cured him, he becomes a Christian and converts other Jews, after which their sight is restored. The Jews' blindness is theological in nature—it is their characteristic quality, as stated by Paul in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: "the God of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the likeness of God." (2 Cor. 4:4). Their blindness is at one and the same time the crime and the punishment: unwillingness and inability to perceive the Christian truth. Only admission of the Christian truth can remove this blindness. Thus, contrary to his original design, the Jew bears the ultimate testimony to Mary's sanctity and, though he wanted to cause her terrible injury, she forgives him and heals him. This is the beginning of Mary's long career as a healer. Throughout history, places connected with her and objects associated with her caused innumerable miracles to occur, east and west.

Mary's physical assumption into heaven indicates her special relationship with Jesus through her body.[19)] Not only did she carry him in her womb and suckle him at her breast, she also shares his immaculate nature, his freedom from any taint of sin. Her Assumption, a triumph over body and bodily death, was also a triumph over the physical, corporeal and verbal perception of Judaism and a sign of hope for all believers who will also be resurrected at the end of time.

The funeral story was known throughout the Christian world. Christian preachers used it in their sermons, and it was also disseminated and perpetuated through the medium of art.[20)] In addition, pilgrims to Jerusalem were shown the place, just outside the Old City walls, where the Jews tried to seize Mary's body. They could thus see the place with their own eyes and imagine the event that it was supposed to commemorate.[21)]

Mary's Icon

Jews were frequently described in Christian literature as plotting to damage Christian holy objects. An early example is the story of Mary's icon, as told by Adomnán of Iona, a famous Irish abbot, who heard it from a pilgrim who traveled to the East in the 670s. After visiting Jerusalem and other holy places, he ended his journey in the city of Constantinople, from where he brought the following story:

> [—] On a wall of a house in the metropolitan city… a picture of the blessed Mary used to hang, painted on a short wooden tablet. A stupid and hardhearted man asked whose picture it was, and was told by someone that it was a likeness of the holy Mary ever virgin. When he heard this that Jewish unbeliever became very angry and, at the instigation of the devil, seized the picture from the wall and ran to a building nearby, where it is customary to dispose of the soil from the human bodies by means of openings in long planks whereon people sit. There, in order to dishonor Christ, who was born of Mary, he cast the picture of His mother through the opening on the human excrements lying beneath. Then in his stupid folly he sat above himself and evacuated through the opening, pouring the excrements of his own person on the icon of the holy Mary… After the scoundrel had gone, one of the Christian communities came upon the scene, a fortunate man, zealous for the things of the Lord. Knowing what had happened, he searched for the picture of the holy Mary, found it hidden in the refuse and took it up. He wiped it carefully and cleaned it by washing it in the clearest water, and then set it up in honor by him in his house. Wonderful to relate, there is always an issue of genuine oil from the tablet with the picture of the blessed Mary…This wondrous oil proclaims the honor of Mary, the mother of the Lord Jesus of whom the Father says: "With my oil I have anointed him" (Ps. 88:21)…[22)]

The story attests to the flourishing cult of Mary in Constantinople and also to the development of icon worship in the Christian world. It is also an example of the role Christians assigned to the Jew as a confirmed opponent of that worship. Christians knew that the Jews objected to any kind of icon worship, following the second commandment: "You shall not make for yourself any graven image, or any likeness…" (Exodus 20:4). But opposition to icon worship is found not only among the Jews. The iconoclastic controversy (the famous Christian controversy concerning the worship of images) broke out only in the eighth century, but criticism of the increasingly popular cult of images was already common before then, among Muslims and Jews, but also among Christians.[23)] The advocates of icon worship, who were aware of the Jewish views, labeled any criticism of icons as Jewish. Christian imagination shortened the distance between verbal violence—name-calling and offensive references (as in the passage quoted above from *Nizzahon Vetus*) and violent actions, such as throwing Mary's image into refuse and filth.

The story of the icon is an early example of a powerful and dangerous image of the Jew as the enemy of Mary and of Christian icons, who defiles Christian holy objects by throwing them into the sewage, an unsurpassable act of contempt and degradation.[24] This image of the Jew was common in the Middle Ages. For example, the story of the Lincoln blood libel (1255) reports that the Jews killed a Christian child and threw his body in a cesspool.[25] The "Prioress's Tale" in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, relates a story about a seven year old boy, who used to go to school through the Jewish neighborhood, and while walking he constantly sang a hymn to Mary. The Jews, who couldn't bear to hear it, hunted the boy, cut his throat and threw him into the pit "where the Jews purged their entrails."[26] But the boy went on singing loudly through his cut throat, and thus the Jews' crime was discovered. In such stories, the most sublime sanctity is defiled in the most sordid, disgusting place. But that is never the end of the tale. As a result of the Jews' crime, miracles occur: The dead child sings, the icon exudes pure oil. Thus, the very act by which the Jews thought to debase Mary turned against them and instead of insulting her bore witness to her glory.

* * *

It is important to stress again, that the Jewish attitude to Mary, as depicted in all these stories, reflects the Christian world, not the Jewish one. These stories were told for Christian needs, and their Jewish protagonists were enlisted in the service of Christian goals—confirmation of beliefs, relics and icons related to Mary. They formulate a complex, powerful, narrative answer to troubling questions, attesting to the intensity of Marian beliefs, which had become binding dogmas—Immaculate Conception; virgin birth; the body untouched by sin and by death; and the power of images. The Jewish voice in these stories is the voice of criticism—the Jew expresses doubt, and his persuasion or eradication is intended to remove this doubt or feelings of guilt and to provide a liberating catharsis.

The Jewish stories brought here propose several possible solutions to the Jewish question: A Jew who is saved by converting to Christianity, as in the funeral story; A Jewess who does not even have to convert because in her innermost being she is already a Christian, as in the story of the robe; and a Jew who disappears, leaving no trace, as in the story of the icon. The last, the disappearing Jew, who neither converts to Christianity nor is punished, but continues to live somewhere, wandering, and is likely to reappear at any moment—that is the most dangerous Jew.[27] This was the Jew who reappeared in Christian imagination throughout the Middle Ages,

portrayed time and again as the Jewish arch-criminal, constantly plotting to harm Christianity. He would despoil icons and crosses, desecrate the Host and kill Christian children, and poison wells, all in the name of a Jewish world conspiracy to destroy Christianity. While the story of the Galilean woman, who willingly bears positive witness, was not known at all in the Christian West, the story of the funeral was well known, as was that of the icon.

Finally, the three stories also raise questions of gender. Mary's worst enemy in Christian imagination is the male Jew who profanes her innocence in words and touch. Jewish women are sometimes seen as possible allies. They are sometimes virgins like Mary (as in the Galilean tale), and sometimes mothers like her, as in another famous story, that of "The Jewish Boy," in which a Jewish woman converts to Christianity together with her son, who witnessed a miracle wrought by Mary, while the stiff-necked, cruel father is thrown into a fiery furnace.[28] Another interesting story tells of a Jewish woman in the pangs of labor, already expecting to die, who hears a voice telling her to call upon Mary. She does so and proceeds to give birth painlessly.[29] Through the Jewish mother, this story, too, corroborates the Christian belief that Mary gave birth without labor pangs, for she was untouched by sin and therefore also by punishment for sin.

I should also mention the fact that research in recent decades shows another kind of Jewish reaction towards Mary—either latent imitations of Marian beliefs and concepts (as, for example, the influence of the figure of Mary on the concept of the Shechina, the divine presence of God, grammatically feminine in the Hebrew language, or beliefs in the power of Miriam, the sister of Moses, who shares Mary's name). This is a very positive direction of research that might somewhat balance the negative, dark picture that emerges from most of our sources.[30]

We began with a poem from the thirteenth century and went back in time, to look for the roots of the complex relationship between the Jews and Mary. Let us now turn again to the thirteenth century, to an episode from the Life of Saint Louis (Louis IX, King of France 1226-1270), told by his biographer, Joinville. It tells of a disputation held by clergymen and Jews:

> King Louis also spoke to me of a great assembly of clergy and Jews which had taken place in the monastery of Cluny. There was a poor knight there at the time to whom the abbot had often given bread for the love of God. The knight … rose to his feet, and leaning on his crutch, asked to have the most important and most learned rabbi among the Jews brought before him. As soon as the Jew had come, the knight asked him a question. "May I know, sir," he said, "if you believe that the Virgin Mary, who bore our Lord in her body… was a virgin at the time of His birth, and is in truth the Mother of God?" The Jew replied that he had no belief in any of those things. Thereupon the knight told the Jew that he had acted like a fool when—neither believing in the Virgin, nor loving her—he had set foot in that monastery which was her house. "And by heaven,"

exclaimed the knight, "I'll make you pay for it!" So he lifted his crutch and struck the Jew such a blow with it near the ear that he knocked him down. Then all the Jews took to flight, and carried their sorely wounded rabbi away with them. Thus the conference ended.[31)]

By the thirteenth century, and even before, Mary the mother, who in Christian tradition was a symbol of love, charity and grace, had become a strong opponent of the Jews, taking vengeance on them for their attitude toward her. Mary and the Jews were now enemies.

Notes

1) Hiram Peri, "Poems of religious disputations in the Middle Ages (with a hitherto unknown text in Old French)" *Tarbiz* 2/4 (1931), pp. 443-76 (in Hebrew). See Kirsten A. Fudeman, *Vernacular Voices: Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 2010), pp. 17-20. The English translation is Fudeman's. This paper is based on two former articles of mine: "Mary and the Jews: Three Witness Stories" *Alpayim* 28 (2005), pp. 129-151 (in Hebrew); and "Mary and the Jews: Story, Controversy and Testimony" *Historein* 6 (2006), pp. 55-71.
2) Miri Rubin, *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary* (London: Allen Lane, 2009, especially pp. 169-173).
3) *The Protoevangelium of James*, in: Wilhelm Schneemelcher (ed.) *New Testament Apocrypha*, I, English translation by R. McL. Wilson (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1991), pp. 421-438; Stephen J. Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2002).
4) Ora Limor, "Mary in Jerusalem: An Imaginary Map" (forthcoming).
5) David Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Nizzahon Vetus, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979), chap. 6, p. 44. See also Berger's appendix, "God in the Womb and the Problem of the Incarnation", *ibid.*, pp. 350-354.
6) Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in The Talmud* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Jacob Z. Lauterbach, "Jesus in the Talmud", in: *Rabbinic Essays* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1951), pp. 473-570; William Horbury, "A Critical Examination of the Toledoth Jeshu", Ph.D. Thesis, Cambridge, 1971.
7) Johann Christoph Wagenseil, *Tela Ignea Satanae* (Altdorf, 1681); Samuel Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen* (Berlin: S. Calvary, 1902); Peter Schäfer, Michael Meerson and Yaacov Deutsch (eds.), *Toledot Yeshu (The Life-Story of Jesus) Revisited* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011); Ora Limor, "The Opposed Image", *Jews and Christian in Western Europe: Encounter between Cultures in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, vol. 4, unit 8 (Tel Aviv: The Open University, 1997), [in Hebrew].
8) Amos Funkenstein, "History, Counter history and Narrative" *Alpayim* 4 (1991), p. 210 [in Hebrew].

9) See Limor, "Mary and the Jews: Three Witness Stories" *Alpayim* 28 (2005), pp. 129-151 [in Hebrew]; id., "Mary and the Jews: Story, Controversy and Testimony" *Historein* 6 (2006), pp. 55-71.
10) Antoninus, *Itinerarium*, 5, ed. by P. Geyer, CCSL 175, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1965), pp. 130-131; English translation by John Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades* (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 2002[2]), p. 132 (with changes).
11) Simon Mimouni argued that these Hebrew women belonged to a community of Jewish-Christians that still lived in Galilee: Simon Mimouni, "Pour une définition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme ancien" *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992), pp. 171-182.
12) For another interpretations see Andrew S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 124-131.
13) Benjamin Z. Kedar, "Convergences of Oriental Christian, Muslim, and Frankish Worshippers: The Case of Saydnaya", in: Yitzhak Hen (ed.), *De Sion exibit lex et verbum domini de Hierusalem. Essays on Medieval Law, Liturgy and Literature in Honour of Amnon Linder* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), pp. 59-69; Ora Limor, "Sharing Sacred Space: Holy Places in Jerusalem between Judaism, Christianity and Islam", in: Iris Shagrir, Ronnie Ellenblum, Jonathan Reilly-Smith (eds.), *In Laudem Hierosolymitani*: Studies in Crusades and Medieval Culture in Honour of Benjamin Z. Kedar (Ashgate: Aldershot 2007), pp. 119-131.
14) Amikam Elad, *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic Worship: Holy Places, Ceremonies, Pilgrimage* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 138-141.
15) Antoine Wenger, *L'Assomption de la Vierge dans la tradition Byzantine du Ve au Xe siècle. Études et documents* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1955), pp. 110–139, 293–311; Norman Baynes, "The Finding of the Virgin's Robe", *Annuaire de l'Institute de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slave*s 9 (Mélanges Henry Grégoire, 1949), pp. 87-95.
16) Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra: Theft of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 1978.
17) Ora Limor, "Christian Sacred Space and the Jew", in: Jeremy Cohen (ed.), *From Witness to Witchcraft. Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought*, Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter-Studien, 11, (Wiesbaden, 1996), pp. 55-77.
18) Summary based on Shoemaker, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption* (Oxford University Press 2006), pp. 789-790.
19) Denise L. Despres, "Immaculate Flesh and the Social Body: Mary and the Jews", *Jewish History* 12 (1998), pp. 47-69 (56-57).
20) Ludmila Wratislaw-Mitrovic and N. Okunev, "La Dormition de la Sainte Vierge dans la peinture medieval orthodoxe" *Byzantinoslavica* 3 (1931), pp. 134-180; Peter Schäfer, *Mirror of His Beauty: Feminine Images of God From the Bible to the Early Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 179-191.
21) For example in the itinerary of Willibald of Eichsttät: *Vitae Willibaldi et Wynnebaldi auctore sanctimoniali Heidenheimensis*, ed. by O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS, 15,1 (Hannover, 1887), pp.

97-98.

22) *Adamnan's De Locis Sanctis*, 3,5, ed. by Denis Meehan, Scriptores Latini Hiberniae, 3 (Dublin, 1958), pp. 118-119.

23) Ernst Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8 (1954), pp. 83-150; Peter Brown, "A Dark Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy", *English Historical Review* 88 (1973), pp. 1-34; Norman H. Baynes, "The Icons before Iconoclasm", *Harvard Theological Review*, 44 (1951), pp. 93-106.

24) Recall that the Talmud relates that Jesus was condemned to be tortured in hell in boiling feces (Bab. Talmud, Gittin 57a). See Israel J. Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb: Perceptions of Jews and Christians* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2000), p. 210 (in Hebrew); The Christians were also familiar with the Jews' attitude to Mary. Jewish literature referred to Mary, "Maria" in Latin, by distorting her name to *ḥaria*, meaning "feces. E.g., in *Nizzahon Vetus*, Chap. 88 (Berger, *The Jewish-Christian Debate*).

25) Gavin I. Langmuir, "The Knight's Tale of Young Hugh of Lincoln" *Speculum* 47 (1972), pp. 459-482.

26) Geoffrey Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, A. Kent Hieatt and Constance Hieatt (eds.), (New York: Bantam Books, 1964), p. 377.

27) The legend of the wandering Jew is later than the period discussed here but nevertheless worth mentioning in this context: Galit Hasan-Rokem and Alan Dundes (eds.), *The Wandering Jew: Essays in the Interpretation of a Christian Legend* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1986).

28) Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven: Yale University press, 1999), pp. 7-39.

29) Michele Tarayre, *La vierge et le miracle. Le Speculum historiale de Vincent de Beauvais* (Paris: H. Champion, 1999), pp. 91-94; Johannes Herlot, *Miracles of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, trans. by C. C. Swinton Bland, (London: Routledge, 1928), pp. 35-6; Despres, "Immaculate Flesh", p. 58.

30) Schäfer, *Mirror of His Beauty*.

31) Joinville, *The Life of Saint Louis*, in Joinville and Villehardouin, *Chronicles of the Crusades*, trans. by M.R.B. Shaw, (Baltimore: Penguin Press, 1963), p. 175

Comment

Akira Echigoya

I have three questions to ask.

First of all you showed the Jews' attitude to Mary in two Jewish books, *Nizzahon Vetus* and *Sefer Toledot Yeshu*, and then you raised two questions. The first question was: "How did the Christians react to Jewish criticism of Mary and Jewish contempt for her?" The second question was: "What role did the Christians assign to the Jews in the emergence of Marian theology?"

You tried to answer these questions by referring to several early Christian stories about Mary and the Jews. The first question is difficult to answer because these Christian stories were not told primarily as a reaction to the Jewish criticism of Mary; this is very clear in the story of Mary's robe in Galilee. However with regard to the second question, it is much easier to see the role assigned to the Jew in each story.

We can say that the audience of each story was Christian, not Jewish. Each story was directed at Christians, not Jews. Therefore what was the purpose of these stories? Why were they told?

You have already answered this last question, by saying that "These stories were told for Christian needs….". Can you expand on these Christian needs? You added, "The Jewish voice in these stories is the voice of criticism—namely, that of Jewish criticism and also that of the Christian opposition…." The voice of the Christian opposition was not heard in these stories; however it might have been represented by the voice of Jewish criticism. The voice of the Christian opposition might have overlapped the voice of Jewish criticism. Would you tell us about this Christian opposition in more detail? This is my first question.

As for my second question: In one of the Christian stories, the story of Mary's robe in Galilee, which explains why the robe is in Constantinople, you showed that many people gathered around the chest in which Mary's robe was kept. Mary's robe was venerated and admired in Galilee too. You also introduced the same kind of story with an account by an anonymous traveler from Italy in the 6th century. You said, "His account may hint at some local Marian rituals observed around sites and objects associated with Mary, with the participation of both Christian and Jewish women." This is very interesting. It may be possible to suppose that the worship of Mary first

came out of Galilee, or Nazareth. Are there any other texts or archaeological finds which show the worship of Mary by Jewish women?

As for my third and final question: In the Christian stories you introduced, the Jews were described in different ways. The impressions which we receive from each story are rather different. In the story of Mary's robe, there is an old Jewish woman who is deceived by two men from Constantinople. She is a victim of her own generosity. On the other hand, in the story of the portrait of Mary, a Jew appears as an opponent to the worship of Mary. You also introduced the story of the Lincoln blood libel (1225) and Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, in which the powerful and dangerous image of the Jew is emphasized. The change in the way Jews are described is thought to reflect to some extent the change in the relationship between the Jews and the Christians. You talked about "the unfavorable turn taken by Christian-Jewish relations in Byzantium from the sixth century on, and the subsequent decline of the Jews' position there". Would you explain this "unfavorable turn" in more detail please.

The 5th CISMOR Conference on Jewish Studies
In collaboration with the School of Theology

Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity and Early Middle Ages

October 29-30 (Saturday-Sunday), 2011

Special workshops for students on Oct. 28, and Nov. 1 (Fri., Tues.)

Doshisha University, Faculty of Theology

10/28

15:00 – 16:30 Prof. Ora Limor, (Open University, Israel)
Workshop with students
"Central Themes in Christian-Jewish Polemics"

Session A

Christian-Jewish Polemics – A historical perspective

10/29

13:00 – 15:00 Prof. Ora Limor - Public Lecture (Leader: Prof. Murayama)
"Jews and Christians – Dialogue, Debate, Discord"

16:00 – 18:00 Prof. Ora Limor - closed workshop (Leader: Prof. Cohen)
"Mary and the Jews – The Virgin Mary in the Christian-Jewish Debate"
Commentator: Prof. Akira Echigoya (Doshisha University)

18:15 – Party dinner for all participants

Session B

Jews in the Scriptures – close readings

10/30

9:00 – 12:00 Closed Workshop in Japanese (Leader: Prof. Kohara)
Prof. Asano Atsuhiro (Kwansei Gakuin University)
"Partings of the Ways in the Apostolic Fathers"
Commentator: Prof. Moriyoshi Murayama (Doshisha University)

Lecturer Yutaka Maekawa (Doshisha University)

"Jews in the Gospels – a history or a narrative?"

Commentator: Prof. Ritsu Ishikawa (Doshisha University)

Session C

The reactions of Jews to early Christianity and Jesus

13:00 – 15:00 Prof. Peter Schäfer - Public Lecture (Princeton University)

(Leader: Prof. Kohara)

"Jewish Responses to the Emergence of Christianity"

15:30 – 17:30 Prof. Peter Schäfer - closed workshop (Leader: Prof. Cohen)

"Jesus in the Talmud"

Commentator: Ichikawa Hiroshi (Tokyo University)

11/1

15:00 – 16:40 Prof. Peter Schäfer's workshop with students

"Jewish Responses"

同志社大学一神教学際研究センター（CISMOR）・神学部神学研究科
第 5 回 CISMOR ユダヤ学会議

「古代・中世初期のユダヤ教とキリスト教」

2011年10月29日（土）– 30日（日）
学生向けワークショップ10月28日（金）・11月 1 日（火）
同志社大学神学部

10/28

15:00 – 16:30　オーラ・リモール教授（プティファ大学・イスラエル）
ワークショップ
「キリスト教とユダヤ教の間における論争の中心テーマ」

セッション A

キリスト教とユダヤ教の論争：歴史的見地から

10/29

13:00 – 15:00　オーラ・リモール教授　公開講演
「ユダヤ教徒とキリスト教徒―対話・論争・不和」
（司会：村山　盛葦准教授）

16:00 – 18:00　オーラ・リモール教授　非公開研究会
「マリアとユダヤ教徒―ユダヤ・キリスト教の論争における処女マリア」
コメンテーター：越後屋　朗（同志社大学教授）
（司会：アダ・タガー・コヘン教授）

18:15 –　懇親会

セッション B

聖典中のユダヤ教徒：文献精読

10/30

9:00 – 12:00　日本語での研究会（ 2 発表とコメンテーター)
浅野　淳博　教授（関西学院大学）
「『使徒教父文書』に見るユダヤ教からの教会分離：プロレゴメノン」

コメンテーター：村山　盛葦教授（同志社大学）
前川　裕　嘱託講師（同志社大学）
「福音書のユダヤ人―歴史か物語か」
コメンテーター：石川　立教授（同志社大学）
（司会：小原　克博教授）

セッション C

初期キリスト教とイエスに対するユダヤ教徒の反応とユダヤ人

13:00 – 15:00　ピーター・シェーファー教授（プリンストン大学、USA）
公開講演
「キリスト教出現に対するユダヤ人の反応」
（司会：小原　克博教授）

15:30 – 17:30　ピーター・シェーファー教授　非公開研究会
「タルムードのイエス」
コメンテーター：市川　裕　教授（東京大学）
（司会：アダ・タガー・コヘン教授）

11/1

15:00 – 16:30　ピーター・シェーファー教授　ワークショップ
「キリスト教出現に対するユダヤ人の反応―テキスト分析」

出席者一覧　List of Participants（According to Japanese alphabet order）

＊研究者 Scholars＊

浅　野　淳　博
Atsuhiro ASANO
関西学院大学・神学部神学研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Theology, Kwansei Gakuin University

アダ・タガー＝コヘン
Ada TAGGAR-COHEN
同志社大学・神学部神学研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

石　川　　立
Ritsu ISHIKAWA
同志社大学・神学部神学研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

石　田　訓　夫
Kunio ISHIDA
外務省大臣官房外交史料館
Diplomatic Archives, Minister's Secretariat, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

市　川　　裕
Hiroshi ICHIKAWA
東京大学・大学院人文社会系研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, The University of Tokyo

越後屋　　朗
Akira ECHIGOYA
同志社大学・神学部神学研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

小　野　文　生
Fumio ONO
京都大学・教育学研究科特定助教
Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education, Kyoto University

オーラ・リモール
Ora LIMOR
ハウニベルスィタ・ハプトゥハー大学・歴史 / 哲学 / ユダヤ学学部教授
Professor, Department of History, Philosophy and Judaic Studies, The Open University of Israel

勝　又　悦　子
Etsuko KATSUMATA
同志社大学・神学部助教
Assistant Professor, School of Theology, Doshisha University

小　原　克　博
Katsuhiro KOHARA
同志社大学・神学部神学研究科教授、CISMOR センター長
Professor, Director of CISMOR, Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

四　戸　潤　弥
Junya SHINOHE
同志社大学・神学部神学研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

高　尾　千津子
Chizuko TAKAO
立教大学・文学部教授
Professor, College of Arts, Rikkyo University

高　木　久　夫
Hisao TAKAGI
明治学院大学・教養教育センター准教授
Associate Professor, The Center for Liberal Arts, Meiji Gakuin University

武　井　彩　佳
Ayaka TAKEI
学習院女子大学・国際文化交流学部准教授
Associate Professor, Department of Intercultural Communication, Gakushuin Women's College

竹　内　　裕
Yuu TAKEUCHI
熊本大学・文学部准教授
Associate Professor, Department of Literature, Kumamoto University

辻　　学
Manabu TSUJI
広島大学・総合科学研究科教授
Professor, Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University

ドロン・B・コヘン Doron B. COHEN	同志社大学・国際教育インステイテュート嘱託講師 Part-time Lecturer, The Institute for the Liberal Arts, Doshisha University
中　野　泰　治 Yasuharu NAKANO	佛教大学非常勤講師 Part-time Instructor, Bukkyo University
ペーター・シェーファー Peter SCHÄFER	プリンストン大学・宗教学部教授 Professor, Director, Program in Judaic Studies, Department of Religion, Princeton University, USA
前　川　　裕 Yutaka MAEKAWA	同志社大学・神学部嘱託講師 Part-time Lecturer, School of Theology, Doshisha University
水　谷　　誠 Makoto MIZUTANI	同志社大学・神学部神学研究科教授・学部長 Professor, Dean of the School of Theology, Doshisha University
宮　澤　正　典 Masanori MIYAZAWA	同志社大学・人文科学研究所嘱託研究員 Research Fellow, Institute for the Study of Humanities and Social Sciences, Doshisha University
村　上　み　か Mika MURAKAMI	東北学院大学・文学部教授 Professor, Faculty of Letters, Tohoku Gakuin University
村　山　盛　葦 Moriyoshi MURAYAMA	同志社大学・神学部神学研究科准教授 Associate Professor, School of Theology, Doshisha University

＊学生 Students＊

浅　尾　雅　俊 Masatoshi ASAO	同志社大学・神学部 Undergraduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
天　野　　優 Yuu AMANO	同志社大学・神学部 Undergraduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
飯　田　健一郎 Ken’ichiro IIDA	同志社大学・大学院神学研究科 Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
上　岡　好　子 Yoshiko UEOKA	同志社大学・大学院神学研究科 Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
宇　野　かをる Kaoru UNO	同志社大学・大学院神学研究科 Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
大岩根　安　里 Anri OIWANE	同志社大学・大学院神学研究科 Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
大　澤　耕　史 Koji OSAWA	京都大学・人間・環境学研究科 Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies, Kyoto University
大　澤　　香 Kaori OHZAWA	同志社大学・大学院神学研究科 Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
神　田　愛　子 Aiko KANDA	同志社大学・大学院神学研究科 Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

北　村　　徹
Tetsu KITAMURA
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

久保田　昌　弘
Masahiro KUBOTA
同志社大学神学部卒業生
Graduate of the School of Theology, Doshisha University

倉　地　久　嗣
Hisashi KURACHI
同志社大学・神学部
Undergraduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

酒　井　玲　希
Tamaki SAKAI
同志社大学・神学部
Undergraduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

櫻　井　　丈
Jyo SAKURAI
東京大学・人文社会系研究科
Graduate School of Humanities and Sociology, The University of Tokyo

武　次　悠　希
Yuki TAKETSUGU
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

堤　　悦　子
Etsuko TSUTSUMI
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

馬　場　建　次
Kenji BABA
同志社大学・神学部
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

早　藤　史　恵
Fumie HAYAFUJI
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

平　岡　光太郎
Kotaro HIRAOKA
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

平　野　敦　世
Atsuyo HIRANO
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

藤　原　佐和子
Sawako FUJIWARA
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

本　間　優　太
Yuta HONMA
同志社大学・神学部
Undergraduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

前　原　倫　子
Rinko MAEHARA
日本ユダヤ学会会員
Member of The Japan Society for Jewish Studies

水　口　隆　司
Takashi MIZUGUCHI
同志社大学・大学院神学研究科
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

安　中　佳　代
Kayo YASUNAKA
同志社大学・神学部
Undergraduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

編集後記・Editorial Comment

キリスト教とラビ・ユダヤ教が、それぞれ自身の宗教的アイデンティティーを絶えず他者との関係の中で形成しながら発展していく過程で、キリスト教はこの関係を図像として描いた。古代末期には、教会とシナゴーグの人格的な表象が盛んになった。そして１２世紀以降、それは二人の女性像―キリスト教会を象徴するエクレシアと、ユダヤ教のシナゴーグを象徴するシナゴーガとして登場する。二人は二つの宗教を人格化した図像表現である。●本巻の表紙に配したのは、ストラスブールの大聖堂の著名なエクレシアとシナゴーガである。オーラ・リモールが本会議中に議論したように、エクレシアは、王冠を戴き、若く、魅力的な女性として描かれ、十字架を頭に配した勺を携え、もう片方の手にはカップを持っている。他方、シナゴーガは弱々しく、目は覆われていて、槍は折れ、トーラーの巻物は手から落ちて、打ち負かされたユダヤ教を示唆している。ストラスブール大聖堂の壁面に施されていたエクレシアとシナゴーガは現在、ルーブル・ノートルダム美術館（ストラブール）に置かれている。●本会議で扱った内容は、決して綺麗ごとの話ばかりではない。しかし、二つの宗教の過去に向き合い、理解し合いながら、未来に向けて、両者の新しい関係を構築する手立てになることを希望している。

As Christianity and Rabbinical Judaism were developing, constantly shaping their own religious identity in relation to the other, Christianity depicted these relations in iconography. During late antiquity figurative personification of the Church and the Synagogue started to develop, and from the 12th century on they will appear as the two female figures titled Ecclesia —representing the Christian Church, and Synagoga—representing the Jewish Synagogue, embodying the iconographic personification of the two religions. ●The well-known figures of Ecclesia and Synagoga from Strasbourg Cathedral are depicted on the cover of this issue, as they were discussed by Prof. Ora Limor during the conference. Ecclesia, shown as a crowned, young, attractive woman, is holding a cross-topped staff, and a goblet in the other hand to catch the blood gushing from the side of Christ, while Synagoga is a weak figure blindfolded, with a broken lance and the Torah scrolls dropping from her hand, indicating defeated Judaism. The relics of Ecclesia and Synagoga from Strasbourg Cathedral which used to adorn the walls of the cathedral are today kept at the Musée de l'Oeuvre Notre-Dame. ●The content of the stories treated at this conference is by no means always pretty. However, while we confront the past of the two religions in an attempt to understand it, we simultaneously face the future with the hope that this could turn into the means for constructing new relations between them.

CISMOR ユダヤ学会議　第 5 号（2011年）

発行日　2012年10月 4 日
Date　October 4, 2012

編集　アダ・タガー・コヘン　&　勝又悦子
Editors　Ada Taggar Cohen & Etsuko Katsumata

校正　北村　徹
Proofreading　Tetsu Kitamura

発行所　同志社大学一神教学際研究センター（CISMOR）
Issuing place　Center for Interdisciplinary Study of Monotheistic Religion, Doshisha University

〒602-8580 京都市上京区今出川通烏丸東入
Karasuma Higashi-iru, Imadegawa-dori, Kamigyo-ku, Kyoto 602-8580, Japan

Tel: 075-251-3972　Fax: 075-251-3092
E-mail: info@cismor.jp　URL: htt://www.csimor.jp

表紙デザイン　高田　太
Cover design　Tai Takata

印刷所　中西印刷株式会社
Publisher　Nakanishi Printing Co. Ltd.

本誌は「文部科学省私立大学戦略的研究基盤形成支援事業（平成20年～24年）」の一環として出版されたものである。

The publication of this volume was facilitated by a grant from "MEXT-supported program for the Strategic Research Foundation At Private Universities (2008-2012)"