JAMES CARLETON PAGET

Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
251

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

251

James Carleton Paget

Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity

Mohr Siebeck

James Carleton Paget: Born 1966; 1992 PhD at Cambridge University; currently Senior Lecturer in New Testament Studies at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow and Tutor of Peterhouse.

e-ISBN 978-3-16-151540-8
ISBN 978-3-16-150312-2
ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de.*

The book was typeset and printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

For my children, Emily, Hope and Harry, with thanks
for all that they are and will be

Preface

Collections of essays are often dubious things, and I reserve the right to a less-than-adequate defence of this one to some introductory remarks, which follow this preface.

I would like to thank the following for extending help, of various kinds, in the production of this work: the editor of the series in which the volume appears, Prof. Jörg Frey; the editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck, in particular Dr. Henning Ziebritzki; and Frau Ilse König; Di Hakala for outstanding editorial and computational assistance, carried out with great efficiency, intelligence, assiduity well beyond the call of duty and always with an enviable cheerfulness and patience, especially in the face of my lamentable technophobia; Dave Goode for his patient help with computational matters; Philip Alexander, Susanna Avery-Quash, Markus Bockmuehl, Nicholas de Lange, Judith Lieu and Annette Yoshiko Reed for reading one or more of the unpublished chapters and making helpful, and sometimes detailed, comments on their contents; William Horbury for reading almost everything in this volume, for giving so generously of his immense, yet lightly held, erudition, and for being such a stalwart and immensely encouraging friend (together with his wife, Kathy) over many years; Simon Gathercole for reading all the unpublished chapters, for helping in the reformatting of others, work well beyond the call of duty in a very busy schedule, and for his greatly valued and stimulating friendship; Andrew Chester, my colleague for many years, and with whom I have shared in much fruitful discussion; the late Graham Stanton for the encouragement he gave me to produce this collection, for his wonderful friendship, and for the remarkable example of courage and resilience he gave all who knew him over a considerable period of debilitating and painful illness; to the Master, Fellows and staff of Peterhouse, not least the bursar, Richard Grigson, for all the help and kindness they have afforded me over many years; and for the great friendship of Susanna Avery-Quash, John Bew, Petà Dunstan, Mari Jones, Magnus Ryan, Brendan Simms and Anita Bunyan, and Alexander Studholme; and, last but not least, my family.

I wish to dedicate this book, in spite of its many grave shortcomings, to my children. I hope that they will never have reason to make use of it for anything other than a door stop (surely the legitimate fate, and most useful

function, of many an academic book, and *certainly* of this one), but that they will see its dedication as a testimony to their father's love for them.

Cambridge, March 2010 James Carleton Paget

Table of Contents

Section 2

Jewish Christianity

Section 3

Judaism in the Second Century

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used throughout the book for both ancient texts, periodicals, reference works and serials are almost entirely according to those given in P. H. Alexander *et al.* (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style: for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). The few exceptions to these will be spelt out in the individual bibliographies.

Chapter 1

Introduction

The collection of essays brought together in this volume span a period of some nineteen years, and range from the shorter article on a quite specific subject to the longer, discursive piece. Nine have been previously published; three are published here for the first time. The published pieces have been minimally edited with some new bibliography added, and known mistakes eradicated. While the essays do not form a coherent collection in the sense that the sum of their parts constitutes a self-standing, interconnected argument, bringing them together under one roof seems justified on a number of grounds. The first is practical: most of these essays have appeared in journals or sometimes rather inaccessible collective volumes. To place them in a single volume serves the purpose of making them more easily available to the interested scholar. Such an assertion, however, merely begs the question whether it is worth making this particular set of essays more accessible. Whatever justification might exist for this lies partly in the claim that the collection focuses upon subjects, which have elicited intense and fruitful discussion in recent times. These are, in order, Jewish-Christian relations in antiquity, Jewish Christianity, and Judaism in the second century. Some central points in the debate about these matters will be noted below, and it will, I hope, become clear to the reader that the recent stimulus given to their investigation by a range of scholars is significant. In different ways each of the essays in this volume seeks to interact with elements of the debate about these three subjects, and to sharpen discussion of them.

Another partial justification lies in the argument that the three subjects upon which it focuses, as well as being important in their own right, are interconnected, and have become increasingly so in more recent debate. So, for instance, Daniel Boyarin contends that precisely because, according to him, one cannot talk about Jews and Christians as self-contained definable groups in the first three centuries C.E. (or possibly ever in the sense that there is an essence of being a Jew or a Christian somehow distinct from the perspective of the person doing the defining), the term ‘Jewish

Christian' or 'Jewish Christianity' has no meaning.[1] Whether Boyarin's radical thesis is right or not, it is true that one's understanding of the definition of Jew and Christian, and so the extent to which one can differentiate between them, will inevitably intrude upon one's understanding of the term 'Jewish Christian', a point which in a variety of ways has been accepted by scholars since the middle of the nineteenth century. After all, one needs to understand when the term is meaningful, and one can only do that if one has a view about when the categories, Jew and Christian, are distinguishable one from another.[2] It is also the case that if we adopt Boyarin's new paradigm of Jewish-Christian relations, alluded to above, our view of the importance of those designated 'Jewish Christian' will be significantly altered – rather than seeing them as a group of individuals whose significance wanes at a very early stage in Christian history, a victim of the so-called 'parting of the ways' between Judaism and Christianity, they become individuals who are less marginalised than at first appeared.[3]

The connection of these two subjects, however conceived, to the third, Judaism in the second century, is less obvious, and yet this subject is significant for both. First, it is the case that the earliest *adversus Judaeos* texts appear in the second century, that is, it can be argued that it is only from the second century onwards that some Christians sought in a conscious way to engage with the question of 'Judaism', or put differently, it was only in the second century, for whatever reason, that Christians began to seek to define the Jew as they sought in some senses to define themselves. Secondly, and related to the first point, it was only in the same period that some Christian writers began to pronounce heretical, a term which first comes into being in the second century, those Christians whom they thought too Jewish, and to give them names such as Ebionite. That is, it was in the second century that what scholarship has come to call 'Jewish Christianity' first came explicitly to be a subject of discussion amongst some and the cause of censure amongst others. Investigation of both of these points will necessarily involve discussion of Judaism in the second century, and in a variety of ways, may be said to impact upon discussion of that subject. Was there anything, for instance, about the development of Judaism in this period insofar as we can speak about such an entity, which led to the two developments we have outlined, namely the beginnings of

[1] See Boyarin 2009. He also believes it has no meaning because it is a category created by heresiologists. However, that is only the case by implication, for the word 'Jewish Christian' is a neologism dating from the sixteenth century. On this, see below.

[2] See Skarsaune and Hvalvik 2007, 748-50; and Reed 2003 and 2008, for scholars who have made much of the relevance of Boyarin's view of Jewish-Christian relations for the study of Jewish Christianity.

[3] See Reed 2003.

the *adversus Judaeos* tradition, and of the criticism of those called 'Jewish Christians'?

An initial claim, then, can be made for the interconnectedness of the subjects of this book, and by extension, the coherence, broadly conceived, of the medley of essays gathered in this volume.

Jewish-Christian relations in antiquity

Recent discussion of Jewish-Christian relations has in part been preoccupied with a critical examination of the paradigm of the so-called 'parting of the ways.'[4] In brief this view, associated in particular with James Parkes,[5] and given magisterial expression by Marcel Simon,[6] emphasised the Jewish origins of Christianity and argued that Christians remained initially within the Jewish fold, Judaism understood as a diverse and variegated entity in the first century. But as a result of the Jewish revolts of 66-70 and 132-5, the hostility of the emerging rabbinic movement to Christians, given partial expression in the so-called *Birkath ha-minim*, or Twelfth Benediction of the *Amidah*, which had the effect of excluding Christians from the synagogue, and the Christian commitment to a Gentile mission, the ways of the two religions parted, probably some time in the early second century, although a number of advocates of this view prefer to speak in terms of 'partings' rather than a single, particular 'parting'.[7] The popularity of this paradigm, consciously a response to scholarship of an earlier era on Judaism, which had tended to argue a supersessionist case in which Jesus emerged in a Judaism in decay, and Christians almost immediately became part of a separate movement, can be variously explained. Part of it has to do with its neatness; part to do with the fact that it is in most of its forms palatable to both Jews and Christians; and part to do with its ecumenical potential.[8]

Those who have criticised this model have done so from a variety of angles.[9] Some have questioned it from a factual perspective, drawing attention to evidence, literary and archaeological, which would contradict the

[4] See Jacobs 2008. His succinct and helpful review of the *status quaestionis* begins with attacks upon this approach to Jewish-Christian relations. For other critiques, see Lieu 2002; Becker and Reed 2003; Boyarin 2004; Fonrobert 2005.

[5] See Parkes 1934.

[6] See Simon 1986.

[7] Dunn 1991.

[8] For the historical context of Parkes' views and an explanation of the popularity of the 'parting' model, see Becker and Reed 2003, 7-16; and Lieu 2002.

[9] For significant critical engagement, see Boyarin 1999; 2003; 2004; Fonrobert 2001; Lieu 2003; Becker and Reed 2003; and Jacobs 2008.

idea of an early, and universal, parting.[10] Particularly criticised are the views of those who would attribute importance to the so-called *Birkath haminim* as a means of effecting separation, and who would accordingly assume a kind of monolithic Judaism under the hegemony of the rabbis.[11] Such a Judaism did not exist, nor did a monolithic Christianity.[12] Both, at least for some time, were varied entities with loose authority structures, an observation, which has obvious implications for the question of when, how and in what circumstances they 'parted'. This has led in turn to a call for less generalised and abstract talk of parting, and a stronger interest in limited, micro-geographical studies of the phenomenon.[13] Also criticised, and related to the points made above, is the assumption, implicit in the 'partings' model, that interaction between the Jews and Christians was limited and exceptional. Above all else critics of the 'partings' model want to emphasise 'meaningful convergence', convergences which often follow 'partings'; and see this as much more the norm than the exception.[14] These types of observation have emerged from a close attention to questions of identity. In this context scholars argue that it is wrong to think about self-contained, clearly definable *entities* called Judaism and Christianity, something which a 'partings' model can be said to assume. Yes, there were people at the time who thought one could speak of these two entities, but these so-called separatists, whose most important early representative is often taken to be Justin Martyr (although it is Ignatius who first uses the two terms 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' – interestingly, Justin does not use either term), on the one hand, and the evolving rabbinate, on the other, are seeking to create something which did not exist at the time they wrote.[15] In this view it is precisely the existence of the *adversus Judaeos* tradition, in some senses the embodiment of separatist tendencies, which is taken as proof of the existence of a more complex 'blurred' view of Christian/Jew-

[10] See Rutgers 1992; and Lieu 2002

[11] For a review of some important work on this vexed subject, see van der Horst 1994. For a detailed engagement with the subject, see Teppler 2007. For a recent defence of the earliness of the version of the *Birkat* and its relevance to questions of separation, see Marcus 2009.

[12] Becker and Reed in their introduction to Becker and Reed 2003.

[13] See Lieu 2002, 18: "The problem with the model of the 'partings of the ways' is that … it operates essentially with the abstract or universal conception of each religion, Judaism and Christianity, when what we know about is the local and specific. I would suggest that the abstract or universal is, certainly for our period, problematic. What we need is a more nuanced analysis of the local and specific before we seek to develop models which will set them within a more comprehensive overview."

[14] Becker and Reed 2003, 23.

[15] 'Separatists', of course, are taken to be responsible for the construction of 'master narratives' which scholars, unknowingly sometimes, have followed. On this, see Gager 2003, 368; and Reed 2008, here discussing Eusebius.

ish difference on the ground, the argument being that an emphasis on difference only occurs because enough people do not see such difference.[16] This kind of view also emerges from a suspicion of all forms of essentialism, which would assert that there is something which, almost metaphysically, makes a Christian a Christian or a Jew a Jew. So Daniel Boyarin, one of the most radical participants in the current debate, has written: "Even if we grant the statistical dominance ... of the separatists ... are there sets of features that absolutely define who is a Jew and who is a Christian in such wise that the two categories will not seriously overlap, irrespective of the numbers of members of the blurring sets? I think not."[17] For Boyarin, we should no longer think of Jews and Christians in the ancient period, at least up until the time of Constantine, but rather of various types of Jews occupying different positions along a Judaeo-Christian continuum, stretching at one end from Jews who had no belief in Jesus to Marcion, at the other end, who denied the validity of the Old Testament with the middle a kind of complex blur.[18] It was only when Christianity became the state religion, in the time of Constantine, that the vision of the separatists could be aligned to state power and become the norm,[19] a norm, which involved the creation of two religions, Christianity and its opposite, Judaism, or the separating out of 'religion' from other parts of life, which one might call civic, cultural and ethnic.[20] Of course, in response to part of this evolving alternative vision, some might argue that a Christian can be defined as someone who is a disciple of Christ, but to this Boyarin responds by noting that such a "feature hardly captures enough richness and depth to produce an interesting category, for in so many ways groups that follow Jesus and

[16] See Fonrobert 2005, 254: "It is perhaps this inability to control the borderland (between Judaism and Christianity) that finally accounts for the anti-Jewish rhetoric in early Christianity."

[17] Boyarin 2003, 78.

[18] Boyarin further elucidates what he is trying to convey by referring to the model of dialect study. He writes (Boyarin 2003, 76), "I am not claiming an undifferentiated 'Judaism' that formed itself into Judaism and Christianity through the borrowing of various religious traits but rather an assortment of religious dialects throughout the Jewish world that gradually developed structure as clusters through diffusion and were eventually organized as languages (religions) through processes very much analogous to those by which national languages, such as French and Italian, were also formed."

[19] See Boyarin 2009, 28: "I suggest … that there is no nontheological and nonanachronistic way at all to distinguish Christianity from Judaism until institutions are in place that make and enforce that distinction, and even then, we know precious little about what the nonelite and nonchattering classes were thinking and doing."

[20] Boyarin owes aspects of this thesis to the work of Seth Schwartz who in Schwartz 2001 had argued that the emergence of post-Constantinian Christianity had led to the creation, by imitation, of the Jewish religion.

groups that ignore him are similar to each other",[21] here developing observations about the shared culture of Jews and Christians. Boyarin's views are, as stated, at the radical, and more theoretical, end of those who would seek to criticise the 'partings' model, but he embodies, in striking ways, many of their assumptions and tendencies.

In all of this, then, the 'partings' paradigm appears at once historically and hermeneutically naive, and in need of a considerable overhaul.[22] That does not mean that a new paradigm has emerged, although some have sought to create one.[23] So the title of Becker and Reed's multi-authored volume, *The Ways that Never Parted*, contains a variety of approaches to the subject, as the authors themselves admit. The title of the volume is provocative, but is understood by the editors in a number of ways. First, as a challenge to the convention that no meaningful convergence between Jews and Christians occurred. Secondly, to suggest that Jews and Christians may have been engaged in the task of 'parting' throughout Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, *precisely because* the two never really parted during that period with the degree of decisiveness or finality needed to render either tradition irrelevant to the self-definition of the other, or to make participation in both unattractive or inconceivable (or as they state on the same page that they were meaningfully intertwined).[24] None of the above would appear to carry the radical implications that the title might be seen to have (although Boyarin's contribution comes closest to endorsing these, at least for the ancient period). What might be said to bind together scholars of this new tendency is a call to look at the relevant primary material again and ask: "What happens when we approach our evidence from a different perspective, treating the 'parting of the ways' as a principle that needs to be proved rather than presupposed?"[25]

In commenting on this development in recent study, we should note that much of what has been outlined above is to be welcomed in that it has sent us back to what we thought was established, and made it seem less so. Texts, for instance, that we once believed to be easy to define as Jewish or Christian, are shown to be less easily described in such a way;[26] and this

[21] Boyarin 2003, 80. Also Lieu 2004, 1-26.

[22] See Becker and Reed 2003, 2, who refer to "its methodological paucity, its inadequacy as an historical account, and its inability to explain much of our primary evidence."

[23] Note Boyarin's use of recent theories about dialects and the formation of language, as well as his own use of wave theory. See n. 18 above.

[24] Becker and Reed 2003, 22-3.

[25] Becker and Reed 2003, 22.

[26] On this, see Frankfurter 2003, who analyses a number of texts which are generally held to be of Jewish origin but then appropriated by Christians, and asks the question: "What happens in the discussion of these texts if one abandons the category 'Christian' –

has necessarily led to a sharpening of thinking. Divisions, which we took to be inevitable, appear less so. Texts which some held to describe a state of separation, such as the *adversus Judaeos* texts, are held to be trying to create one in the face of opposition both direct and indirect.

Skepticism about the 'partings' model has, I would contend, emerged from a combination of factors. One of these has been new discoveries, either of texts, such as Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hekhalot literature, or inscriptions and other archaeological evidence, reflection upon which has led a number of scholars to question monolithic views of Jewish identity, and to emphasise its diversity in the ancient period (sometimes by drawing attention to known texts like the Old Testament pseudepigrapha), and the relative lack of influence of the rabbis.[27] Similar emphases are reflected in the study of early Christianity,[28] though here perhaps less as a result of new discoveries. All of this has led to the adoption of generally less institutional views of both 'religions'.[29] However, it is also important, I would suggest, to see aspects of this new approach to Jewish-Christian relations as emerging from an ever-growing influence of aspects of post-modern thought upon early Christian studies and Judaism.[30] This is seen in the

---

as a distinct stage in these texts' composition and, implicitly, as a distinct religious mentality? What if we were to look at these texts, rather, as the work of continuous communities of halakically-observant Jewish groups … that incorporated Jesus into their cosmologies and liturgies, while retaining an essentially Jewish, or even priestly, self-definition?" (Frankfurter 2003, 134-5). Note also Davila 2005, who, taking up a suggestion of Robert Kraft, seeks to look again at the whole question of how we might seek to define a pseudepigraphon as Jewish or Christian. It should, of course, be noted that the issue of the Jewish or Christian provenance of a text had been openly discussed for many years in relation to works such as *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *The Lives of the Prophets*, and even Revelation. Followers of the more recent trend outlined above have simply extended the debate on this matter to encompass more and different texts.

[27] Although, see Horbury 1998, 3f., who, while asserting that "diversity rather than unity in the Jewish practice and belief of the Second Temple period has been repeatedly discerned and stressed in the last thirty years", goes on to show how the debate about a diverse or more uniform Judaism goes back as far as W. Bousset in the early twentieth century, and can be seen in the reaction to G. F. Moore's assertion about the existence of a common pattern within rabbinic and pre-rabbinic literature, found in his Judaism in the first centuries of the Christian era, the age of the Tannaim, published between 1927 and 30.

[28] Note especially the importance of Bauer's *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Bauer 1971; originally published in 1934), for the study of early Christianity.

[29] Lieu 2002, 26, talks about 'de-institutionalisation.' She writes: "Once we de-institutionalise our understanding of Jewish communities, once we remove the synagogue, understood much as some Christians speak of the church, from the centre of our perception of their essential identity, with what are we left?"

[30] For a discussion of the significance of aspects of post-modernity for the study of early church history, see Clarke 2008.

general suspicion of 'master narratives', the related interest in recovering lost voices or little noted witnesses, in taking seriously the constructed character of identity, particularly as this manifests itself in texts, in paying greater attention to local differences in the manifestations of Judaism and Christianity rather than in engaging in general stories with teleologies, and in a flight from what some have termed 'positivistic historicism'.[31]

Secondly, it is important to note that some of the observations out of which the criticism of the 'parting of the ways' paradigm emerged have always been a part of the discussion. So, for instance, many scholars have sought to emphasise the continuities between Judaism and Christianity, the shared culture of the two faiths, in particular as a result of Christian and Jewish commitment to what the former came to call the Old Testament. Here similarities between Jews and Christians are seen both in terms of shared methods of interpretation as well as common exegetical traditions. Some of these same scholars, who emphasise this shared culture, interestingly, are committed to a version of the 'parting of the ways' paradigm.[32] It need not be assumed, therefore, that a commitment to this apparently discredited paradigm excludes the idea of convergence. In this context it is interesting to note that what possibly divides these scholars from those who attack the paradigm of 'parting of the ways' as this relates to issues of convergence, is that the latter see such convergences as having implications for questions of identity, of having repercussions for the extent to which we can talk of Judaism or Christianity as self-contained entities, for our understanding of the meaning of 'separation'. The former generally do not, and indeed sometimes their views about 'convergence', however un-

[31] For some elements of this, see Boyarin 1999; 2004; Gager 2003; Lieu 2004; Jacobson 2008. Annette Reed, in correspondence with me, preferred the term 'post-structural' for what I have termed 'post-modern', in particular highlighting the indebtedness of this broadly new approach to Jewish-Christian relations to "Saussurian linguistics and its extension by Levi-Strauss, Foucault, Derrida et al.", although she goes on to note that they also reflect other streams of thinking about identity-construction in psychology, sociology, and historiography.

[32] An example, one amongst many, would be the Cambridge scholar, William Horbury. Almost more than any other British scholar he has sought to emphasise cultural continuities between Christianity and Judaism, both in terms of scriptural interpretation, and shared emphases (e.g. messianism). And yet he is keener than some to emphasise evidence for separation from a relatively early stage in Christian history. On all of this, see various essays in Horbury 1998. This point is implicitly made in Becker and Reed 2003 where a number of the contributors appear to assume a form of the 'parting' paradigm while playing up the significance of convergence.

derstood,[33] can appear to depend upon the idea that there were assured boundaries between Jews and Christians.

Thirdly, the unease that critics of the 'parting of the ways' paradigm feel at its apparent failure to take sufficient account of the complexity of issues of identity and of the fact of convergence between Jews and Christians, leads many of them, to varying degrees, to question the idea that we can, at least until Constantine, legitimately talk about Jews and Christians. This reaches its strongest expression in the work of Boyarin where legitimacy can only be attached to the designation 'Judaeo-Christianity', but it is there, in possibly less clear form, in a number of other writers. The question that arises in the face of this relates to the meaning of such assertions. Is this a point which has its origin in a suspicion of essentialism? Or is it something that emerges from the evidence? After all, while we might doubt that there was something called 'Judaism' and something called 'Christianity' in the period preceding Constantine, and indeed afterwards, if we are assuming the existence of such things in the abstract, there were people who called themselves Jews and people who called themselves Christians and these people did not regard themselves as a single group.[34] Some would say that it is only such self-identifying Christians or Jews to whom we can, in any meaningful way, apply the terms; and that even then, we are dealing with individual perspectives on the subject rather than clearly articulated general definitions.[35] It is interesting in this context to take note of the pagan evidence (questions relating to the Christian evidence will be dealt with below). The witnesses here are not thick on the ground, and they are often very limited in what they do say. They are, nevertheless, striking. Nero, we are told by Tacitus, was apparently able to differentiate between Jews and Christians as early as 64 C.E., at least in the city of Rome. Tacitus himself, writing some fifty years after this event, acknowledges the origins of the Christian movement in Judea but does not go on to associate it with the Jewish *ethnos*, stating that the movement began in Judea and then moved to Rome (*Annales* 15.44).[36] Strikingly also, given his negative opinions of the Christians, he never mentions their association with the Jews in what most take to be his strongly polemical account of the

[33] Convergence can be understood in a number of ways. So in relation to exegesis it could be taken to imply: (i) independent development of shared traditions; (ii) a shared culture of exegesis; (iii) direct influence of one exegete upon another.

[34] See Kalmin in Burrus, Kalmin, Lapin and Marcus 2006, 19.

[35] See Williams 2009, 41. On the question of perspective, see Goodman 2003.

[36] Some think that Tacitus, possibly writing in the wake of the Trajanic revolt of 115-117, deliberately associates Christians with Jews here so as to pour more opprobrium upon them. See Lieu 2002, 21. However, this, seems unlikely not only because Tacitus makes no attempt to exploit their 'Judean' association; but also because it makes little sense of the mention of their movement to Rome where Jews had been for some time.

latter in his *Histories* (*Hist.* 5.1-13). Suetonius, while possibly failing to differentiate Christians from Jews, understood as the followers of 'Chrestus', in his notoriously unclear notice about the expulsion from Rome of the Jews by Claudius in the *Life of Claudius* 25.4,[37] in his other notice about Christians (*Nero* 16.2), makes no reference to their Jewish associations. A similar observation can be made about Pliny the Younger's famous letter to Trajan (*Ep.* 10.96). The Christians, insofar as they are described in that precious epistolary token, are simply associated with worship of Christ and certain customs, but not with Jews or Judaism.[38] Celsus, writing somewhat later, can affirm that Christians are apostates from Judaism (*Cels.* 2.1), here at least giving unambiguous evidence of an association with Jews; and Tertullian refers to pagans who slander the Christians as "the third race" (*Nat.* 1.1), possibly taking up a Christian self-designation, which differentiated between themselves, Jews and pagans, but which was obviously accepted by a wider public.[39] *Prima facie*, then, such evidence would appear to show that to some outsiders, Christians had an identity separate from that associated with Jews, and precisely because this is the view of those looking in from outside, it should be taken seriously.[40] In response to such an observation, it could be argued that a figure like Celsus may be adopting the viewpoint of a Jewish separatist; and that by extension all of the utterances of the above inevitably reflect a particular perspective, or even ignorance. Added to that it should be noted that not all pagan witnesses reflect, so apparently unambiguously, the separatist position implicit or explicit, in the examples cited above. Galen, the well-known medical writer, speaks of the "school of Moses and Christ", and

[37] Judge 2008, 436.

[38] Benko 1985, tried to argue that the test given to recanting Christians bears some likeness to tests given to Jews (*B.J.* 7.50-1), and so, therefore, the passage should be read as implying an identification of the Christians with the Jews. For criticism of this view, see Lieu 2002, 22, who, following others, makes the point that the language is closer to that used to describe other non-Jewish groups. See also Judge 2008, 435-6.

[39] For references to Christians as a 'third race', either directly or by implication, see *inter alia Kerygma Petrou* Fragment 2, although the phrase here could refer to a third type of worship; *Diognetus* 1.1 where Christians are differentiated from Jews and Greeks, although there is no reference to them as a third race. The derogatory reference in Suetonius, *Nero* 16.2, to Christians as a *genus* might point to an originally negative use adapted by Christians.

[40] "The official position is clear, and remained so for the next two centuries. Incomprehensible as the activities of Christians were, they could be tolerated providing (as Romans) they did not abandon their national duty of sacrifice to the Roman gods. The Romans had always understood and accepted that this was impossible for Jews, for whom exemption was secured. Why did they not, see that Christians stood in the same tradition, and were often themselves Jews into the bargain? There is no hint that anyone ever tried to suggest such a solution" (Judge 2008, 436).

elsewhere of the "followers of Moses and Christ" (*de Puls. Diff.* 2.4 and 3.3 respectively); and Lucian, in describing the Christian group whom the religious quack, Peregrinus, succeeds in duping, presents them in a manner that some have construed as strongly Jewish (*Peregrinus* 11-13).[41] These counter examples are, however, not as telling as some suggest. Lucian is describing a group in Palestine, so aspects of his description are understandable in that context (and in any case he nowhere calls those Peregrinus dupes Jews – they are clearly Christians – and he did know of Jews); and one could argue that Galen does differentiate between the two groups, but simply without using the terms 'Jew' and 'Christian'. One might respond by noting that the singular 'school' implies something unified; but in this context we should note that Galen's reference to a 'school' is simply an acknowledgement of a shared culture; and that his retention of separate names (of Moses and of Christ) indicates a clear sense of their separateness at a social level.[42] Into this bag of evidence we may also want to place the reforms of the *fiscus judaicus* under Nerva, which may have had the effect of making plain who identified with the Jewish community (the absence of extant evidence for Christians paying the *fiscus* may be further proof of social separation, and indeed of a particular cause of such a phenomenon),[43] as well as the fact of persecution of Christians (and not Jews) by Romans, which could have served to encourage a sense of separateness on the part of some non-Christian Jews.

Scholars who object to the 'partings' paradigm would not necessarily find the points made above too problematic for their position. That there are people who designate themselves Jews and Christians is not so important to them, not least because such people may have understood their Jewishness and their Christianity differently, some attributing considerable importance to it, and others not, especially in relation to differences with

[41] It is a weakness of Judge's robust essay (Judge 2008) that he fails to address the relevant evidence from Lucian and Galen. Reference could also be made to the passage in Epictetus, cited by Arrian in *Epict. diss*. 1.22.4, where Epictetus argues that if one is not deemed simply to be playing the part of a Jew, one must be baptised. Because of the reference to baptism rather than circumcision, some have taken Epictetus to be referring to Christians but as Jews. For a variety of reasons such an interpretation seems unlikely, not only because of its erroneous view about the exclusive association of baptism with Christian, rather than Jewish, initiation, but also because on the one occasion where Epictetus appears to be referring to Christians, he calls them "Galileans". See Arrian, *Epict. diss*. 4.7.6, and the discussion of Stern 1980, 541 and 543-4.

[42] Note in this respect the comment in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* 8.5 to the effect that there is absolute convergence between the teachings of Moses and Christ. "For, there being one teaching by both (Moses and Jesus understood), God accepts him who has believed either of these." For two contrasting accounts of the pagan evidence as it relates to Jewish and Christian identity, see Lieu 2002, 21-4, and Judge 2008.

[43] See Goodman 1989.

other groups (that is, between themselves and pagans, heretics, Marcionites etc.). Furthermore, and related to this, some might want to differentiate between the terms 'Jew' and 'Christian', on the one hand, and 'Judaism' and 'Christianity', on the other. The former terms are clearly the kind of thing with which one can identify oneself; the latter are not, for when authors use these terms, they "are engaged in constructing conceptual frameworks, in which these categories and their relation to each other in turn serve to configure reality in new ways."[44] Ignatius, then, may early on refer to something he calls 'Ioudaismos' and something he calls 'Christianismos' (Ign. *Magn.* 10.1, 3; Ign. *Phld.* 6.1), but these are constructed concepts in which one term depends for its meaning upon the other, and which are constantly in a state of flux. To try to define their essence is to engage in an unrealistic exercise.

Fourthly, and related to the previous point, the view that "elite authors remained so preoccupied with, and so vehement about, the boundaries between 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' precisely because these boundaries were still being constructed, negotiated, contested and blurred 'on the ground' …", raises a number of questions.[45] For instance, how might we prove that such writers are seeking to create a reality (of separation) rather than, at least in part, giving expression to one? This is, of course, a complex task; and there may be as much pressure on those who would claim that such boundary-concerned works do reflect a reality, as upon those who would claim the opposite, to justify their view. Part of the approach of non-separatist scholars lies in emphasising evidence, minority evidence in this instance, which appears to contradict the kind of vision that the boundary-makers, like Justin, want to create;[46] and by asserting that there exist

[44] Williams 2009, 42. See also Lieu 2004, 306-7. After mentioning these terms (Judaism and Christianity), she writes, " ... although rooted in the language of (a very small minority of) our texts, the conceptual baggage these terms carry belongs rather more to our contemporary agenda. Far too frequently recent scholarly discussion has forgotten this, and slips ... from speaking of 'Jews' and 'Christians', to conceptualizing and fixing 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' as if these, at least, required no further definition."

[45] For he calls to read such texts "against the grain", see also Gager 2003, 369: "Thus we have no choice but to read against the grain." Note also Lieu's observation that "systemic 'othering' was ... a textual achievement." (Lieu 2004, 308).

[46] Note the strong words of Gager: "Once we look behind the historical and theological smoke screen released by these elites, what we find among what I will call 'ordinary Christians' is plenty of evidence to suggest that for them there was no such parting at all." But how much evidence is plenty of evidence? Gager refers his reader to his own book of some eighteen years earlier (Gager 1985) where he emphasises a number of sources which apparently support his position (John Chrysostom, *Adversus Judaeos*; some pertinent texts from Syria; Ignatius of Antioch; and Paul). In many ways the problem here lies in how we weight these texts, especially Chrysostom's work. For Gager Chrysostom appears to give voice to an ongoing and significant presence of non-

clear disjunctions between assertions that such authors as Justin make in texts and the reality which some authors experienced "on the ground".[47] So it would be wrong to argue that such a mistrust of early *adversus Judaeos* texts is simply the result of a type of mirror-reading, that is, a view that these 'separatist' texts only speak the way they do because they oppose a conflicting opinion of the way things are. But on occasion it may seem to some that elements of the case made are exaggerated. So, if Justin is the man who tries, for the first time to create Judaism and Christianity (although, interestingly, he does not, as previously noted, use these terms) and he does so by artificially emphasising their absolute difference, why should he have taken the apparently liberal position he did on the issue of Jews who continue to obey the Jewish Torah when they convert to Christianity (*Dial.* 47)? Interestingly, he contrasts his view on this matter with the apparent *opinio communis*, which seems to be in favour of harsher treatment of such individuals, implying, interestingly, that 'separatism' as an ideal precedes his own time. Such an observation implies questions about the extent to which Justin is the kind of innovative separatist some scholars, especially Boyarin, assume him to be, although for the latter Justin's distinctiveness partially lies in the way in which he seeks to define Judaism in the process of defining heresy.

This raises the important question of weighting; or expressed as a question, is it possible to affirm that separatists were from an early stage the most influential members of the Christian and Jewish communities? The answer is clearly 'yes' if we take seriously the texts which have come down to us, both within the New Testament, where, interestingly, on a number of occasions, separatism is a measure associated with Jews, and one which Christians resent,[48] and outside of it (*Barnabas*; Ignatius; Melito). But, as we have indicated, suspicion about the representative character of received texts is precisely the problem; and many of these texts could be said to 'protest too much'. What other courses lie open to us if we wish to answer this question? Recently, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra has argued that one way forward lies in analysing the contents of libraries and looking at the distribution of the remains of texts which might described as 'core' (the

separatists within the church whereas for others the best explanation for Chrysostom's outburst lies in the circumstances of the time when large number of new converts were entering the church, converts who were unaware of the separate nature of Judaism and Christianity. For further discussion of Chrysostom's work, see Kinzig 1991; and Fonrobert 2005, 237-43.

[47] See Lieu 2002, 25.

[48] See especially John 9:22. For this point, see Horbury 1998, 13, who notes that "(e)xternal impulses towards separation … impinged on Christians from the majority Jewish community long before the Christians themselves were ready to envisage such separate existence."