

AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN  
JEWS AND CHRISTIANS DURING THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

By

Samuel W. Chomsky.

A thesis submitted as partial requirement  
for the rabbinical degree.

Hebrew Union College

1934.

*Naic. 6/78*

## Preface.

A preface usually contains the reasons for the writing of the particular work it introduces. Very often it is an apology. In the latter vein I must introduce the following pages. To do justice to the title of the thesis requires far greater erudition than I at present possess; I have been forced to adhere to a narrow method of presentation. I hope at some future date to make a more thorough study of the subject. Such a procedure would involve a study of the New Testament, of the literature and theology of the Church, of Gnosticism, and a fuller examination of the German commentators. It is to be understood that a knowledge of Jewish and Christian history has been assumed throughout. Lastly, to avoid dealing with the problems concerning the life of Jesus, the narrative is begun rather abruptly with the events immediately following his death.

## CONTENTS

Chapter.	Page.
Preface.	
I. <sup>U. S.</sup> From the Death of Jesus to 70 <del>A. D.</del> .....	1
II. <del>A. D.</del> 70 - 138.....	11
III. <del>A. D.</del> 138 - 220.....	22
IV. <del>A. D.</del> 220 - 325.....	33
V. Summary and Conclusion.....	42
Notes.....	46
Bibliography.....	63

## CHAPTER I.

### FROM THE DEATH OF JESUS TO 70 A. D.

*Paul* The principle, and practically the only, source for this early period is the Acts of the Apostles. This work, apparently written as a historical account, presents many difficulties. It is thoroughly partisan, revealing in its composition a definite purpose. The author, Luke, writing to a convert from the Gentiles with the express desire of winning him to the Christian faith, has an anti-Jewish bias. The primary object of Acts seems to be a presentation of the transition from the Jewish to the Gentile mission, with the consequent rejection of Judaism.<sup>1</sup> The first half of the book deals with the relations between the early Christians and the Jews in Judea and its immediate surroundings. The cumulative effects of the friction between the small group of Jewish Christians and orthodox Jewry resulted in the gradual but sure break between the two factions, and in the decision of some of the apostles, especially Paul, to spread their gospel among the Gentiles. In the latter half of the work the mission to the Gentiles is described and the stage is set at the end of the apostolic period for a complete separation, at least in theory, from Judaism.

The narrative account in Acts is begun with the assembling of the apostles, and their small following, in Jerusalem after the death of Jesus (c. 30 C. E.). The first followers of Jesus comprised a small group differing from their fellow Jews in what was at first unimportant matters. They lived a strictly Jewish life, keeping the law and frequenting the temple.<sup>2</sup> In the matter of belief they differed only by holding the messiah had already appeared. This view, or delusion as no doubt their

neighbors styled it, probably aroused no opposition in a period when the rise of sects was common and when messianic speculation was rife. In external form, likewise, the community of apostles probably resembled the usual organization in Jerusalem.<sup>3</sup> No doubt they grouped together, belonging perhaps to a common synagogue, to one of the great number then prevalent in Jerusalem. Or it is possible that they had a synagogue of their own, perhaps a Galilean one, as there were many similar organizations of foreigners, non-Palestinians, in Jerusalem.<sup>4</sup> It seems that at the beginning they had some sort of communistic organization for the equal distribution of their worldly possessions,<sup>5</sup> but undoubtedly this arrangement did not last long.<sup>6</sup> Had this small group of believers been content to live peaceably and to await the return of Jesus, all might have been well, but the evangelistic fervor of Christianity was manifest at its very inception. The missionary efforts of the apostles soon brought them into conflict with the religious and civil authorities.

The gift of the Holy Spirit, granted the believers of Jesus, through the Apostles, was expressed in ecstatic prophecy and in the power of healing.<sup>7</sup> The apostles made use of the latter gift to win converts to their belief in the messiahship of Jesus.<sup>8</sup> The first record of this practice is the healing of the Beggar at the Beautiful Gate, in the temple environs, by Peter and John.<sup>9</sup> Peter utilized the occasion to address an awe-stricken crowd in an attempt to convert them to a belief in the risen Jesus. The ensuing disturbance caused the arrest of Peter <sup>and John</sup> by the temple authorities.<sup>10</sup> <sup>and John were</sup> Peter was forced to stand trial before the Sanhedrin on the charge of exorcism, of unlawful magic, as he testified that the healing was done in the name of Jesus.<sup>11</sup> ~~Peter was dismissed~~

They were

? Your reference does not bear this out.

with a warning not to mention the name of Jesus again nor to teach in his name.<sup>12</sup> This first arrest of Peter, his resumption of faith healing, the spread of propaganda, and the subsequent second arrest and trial, reveal clearly the causes for the increased friction between the growing group of Jesus' followers and the Jews.<sup>13</sup> First of all, the Christians' consciousness of special pneumatic endowment, with the accompanying ecstatic element in their life, must have aroused attention, no matter how small their number might have been.<sup>14</sup> This pneumatic endowment found concrete expression in the powers of healing which led to the arrest of the disciples on the charge of performing miracles by unlawful means.<sup>15</sup> Secondly, the disciples' pronounced reverence for Jesus, and their exaltation of him as a divinity, was a denial of the unity of God.<sup>16</sup> A new note was sounded at the trial of Stephen, namely the Christian interpretation of the history of the Jews with regard to the observance of the Law.

Stephen was presumably the leader of the seven administrators of charity chosen by the twelve disciples and their followers. The real work of these Seven and their relation to the twelve disciples is hard to ascertain because Acts is the only source which mentions them.<sup>17</sup> Another question which cannot be answered is the one arising from the reference to the Hellenists.<sup>18</sup> It has been suggested that the Seven were really the leaders of the Hellenistic Christians in Jerusalem, while the Twelve were the leaders of the "Hebrews".<sup>19</sup> However, it is certain that the account of the Seven serves as a connecting link between the Twelve in Jerusalem and the Christian mission outside the city. After Stephen, the way is prepared for the taking of the gospel from Jerusalem, the centre of Jewish life, to Caesarea, and this is largely the work of Philip, one of the Seven, and of Peter, the

My  
references  
lead into  
resurrection  
of Jesus.

The Seven  
works  
parallel  
to  
26 3

leader of the Twelve. Stephen evidently did not confine his activities to the administering of charity, but, displaying the gift of the spirit, preached and won converts to his movement.<sup>20</sup> His activity led to his arrest by the Sanhedrin on the charge that he stated; "Jesus, the Nazarene, will destroy this place and change the customs which Moses handed down to us".<sup>21</sup> At the trial Stephen made no attempt to answer the charge brought against him but used the opportunity for the voicing of propaganda.<sup>22</sup> The content of his speech<sup>23</sup> is what an early Christian, not of the Paulinian school, would have said.<sup>24</sup> The speech is an ardent attack on the conduct of the Jews from the time of Joseph down to that of the speaker, and on the importance which the Jews attached to the temple cult. It is interesting to note that there was as yet no opposition to the Law of Moses; on the contrary, it was regarded as the word of God. The fault of the Jews lay in the nonobservance of the Law. This attitude of Stephen reveals that the Christians were beginning to differ from the Jews in the interpretation of tradition. The view that the Jews were untrue to the ancient faith called forth vigorous opposition against the Christians.<sup>25</sup> In turn, the charge was laid against the Christians that they were lax toward the temple duties and toward the religious customs of Moses. However, the important point in Stephen's speech was the attempt to trace in history the general tendency of Israel to rebel against its divinely appointed leaders and guides. Then the parallelism was drawn between the Jews' treatment of Jesus and their ancestors' treatment of Joseph, Moses, and the prophets. In other words, the Jews were condemned for rejecting Jesus' messiahship. This last statement becomes the keynote of the remainder of Acts and justifies the turning of the disciples to the Gentiles and subsequent spread of Christianity among the heathen.<sup>26</sup> For his rash words

Stephen met a martyr's death (34 A. D.), either at the instigation of the Sanhedrin or, what is more likely, from the account given, as the victim of mob fury.<sup>27</sup>

A persecution of the Christian community in Jerusalem, immediately after Stephen's death, resulted in the scattering of the group, except for the apostles,<sup>28</sup> throughout the countryside of Judea and Samaria.<sup>29</sup> This meant the beginning of the intentional carrying of the gospel to the Gentiles, largely through the efforts of the Seven, especially Philip,<sup>30</sup> and the consequent evangelization of Judea and Samaria.<sup>31</sup> There can be no doubt that at the time of this missionary effort among the Gentiles there was no insistence upon the literal observance of the law.<sup>32</sup> And, what is more, the apostolic community in Jerusalem sent Peter and John to confirm the results of the missionaries in Samaria.<sup>33</sup> At this same time (c. 34 A. D.) Paul (Saul of Tarsus), the arch-persecutor of the Christians,<sup>34</sup> was converted to the belief in Jesus.<sup>35</sup> A man of intense feeling, he proceeded to devote his great energies in behalf of, instead of against, the Christian movement.<sup>36</sup> His influence was so great that his interpretation of Christianity became the dogmatic basis of the later Church. How historical the account of the events immediately following his conversion, narrated in Acts 9:20 f. may be, is hard to say. The story is in direct conflict with Paul's own version in II Corinthians.<sup>37</sup> *where?*

In the interval between the death of Stephen and the accession of Agrippa I, during the years 34-41 A. D.,<sup>38</sup> the Christians must have carried on extensive missionary work. Unquestionably the Christians aroused opposition in Jewish circles. Agrippa I (41-44 A. D.), consummate politician that he was, merely reflected the desire of his people in his persecution of the Christians. According to the account in Acts he beheaded James



the brother of John, and arrested Peter for trial before the Sanhedrin.<sup>39</sup> Peter was imprisoned but managed to escape to Caesarea. As a result of the persecution, the apostolic community in Jerusalem was disrupted temporarily. But the untimely demise of Agrippa I, and the return to Roman rule, very quickly removed the restrictions which had been imposed upon the activities of the apostles.

Acts next records the spread of Christianity in three centres - Caesarea, Antioch, and Cyprus, during the years 41-46 A. D.; the ensuing apostolic council in Jerusalem (46 A. D.); and the very significant results of that meeting. Peter's journey through the land to Caesarea and his missionary work are given in Chapters 10-11:18. An important problem is raised concerning the social relations between the Jewish Christians and the Gentiles. Acts 11:19-30 tells of the spread of Christianity in Cyprus and Phoenicia, but especially of the evangelization of Antioch, including the Gentile population. At the same time the accession of Paul and Barnabas to their work is narrated. It is interesting to note the purpose of the author of Acts in telling the two accounts.<sup>40</sup> The story of the spread of Christianity in Antioch has the same form as the one telling about the spread in Caesarea. Both lead up to the fact that Christianity was preached to the Gentiles and that, on consideration, the Church at Jerusalem accepted the situation.<sup>41</sup> The missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas to Cyprus is related in Chapters 13:1-14:28. They made a rather thorough canvass of the island. Not only did they preach to the Gentiles but, what is more, they used the established Jewish synagogues as means of making contacts with the Gentiles - this was a common practice in the early period of Christianity.<sup>42</sup> The tale is studded with descriptions of Paul's persecutions by the Jews, who no doubt were soon aware of his heretical views.

Upon the return from their successful trip, Paul and Barnabas were summoned to Jerusalem to discuss the problems incurred by the conversion of the Gentiles, problems involving the Law and the Gentile Church in Antioch.<sup>43</sup>

There are two accounts of the apostolic council in Jerusalem, Acts 15 and Gal. 2. Each of these sources is very unsatisfactory, and it is hardly possible to harmonize the two.<sup>44</sup> It is clearly intimated that Peter, John, and James acknowledged the work of Paul among the heathen and made no effort to direct his missionary labors.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, it was still possible at that time to unite the Jewish and Gentile Christians in the recognition, at least, of the principle of fellowship, if not upon actual fellowship itself.<sup>46</sup> Within the ranks of the Jewish Christians themselves, however, a division took place. One group, as hinted at in Acts 15:5, remained "zealots for the law" and aided the true Jews in the persecution of Paul and his group.<sup>47</sup> The other group, including Peter and probably others of the primitive apostles, compromised with Paul in the matter of the Law and the Gentiles.<sup>48</sup> They insisted, however, on the condition that the Gentile Christians were to abstain from flesh offered to idols, from tasting blood and things strangled, and from fornication. Henceforth this group of Jewish Christians could unite in real fellowship with the Gentile Christians outside of Palestine.<sup>49</sup> Peter,<sup>50</sup> and probably those apostles in accord with him, took part in the Gentile mission, while James headed the Jewish Christian group which refused to modify the Law. The importance of the decisions of this council can hardly be overestimated. Had the strict opinion of the Jewish Christians prevailed, the Christian religion might have remained merely a Jewish sect. But as it was,

the council confirmed in theory the practice of the missionaries

15, 13-24)

agreeing with Peter! And James is the one suggesting the above compromise (15, 20)

our reasoning is not cogent at all! The ~~anecdotal~~ decision  
to the Gentiles and permitted the latter to enter the Church  
without accepting the Law. A definite break with the Synagogue  
was only a matter of time and circumstance. The compromise  
(that the Jewish Christians should keep the Law and that the Gen-  
tiles should not, except for the above mentioned conditions)  
between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile ones was an un-  
natural one and was inevitably sure to be dissolved at the first  
sign of conflict. It could endure only as long as the Temple  
stood and as long as the first few generations of Jewish Christ-  
ians were psychologically unable to break away from the Jewish  
customs. Paul himself probably lived his life more or less in  
accordance with the Law even though the logic of his theoretic  
stand led him to expound, in his epistles, a complete break with  
the Law. In Acts Paul makes no explicit statement with reference  
to his view of the Law, but in the epistles to the Romans and to  
the Galatians he shows that he held the Law to be abrogated.<sup>51</sup> He  
argued that since the Messiah, in the person of Jesus, had come,  
the Law was no longer valid, and that circumcision was therefore  
unnecessary for converts - it was an institution of the past.  
Paul was the first to pronounce the view that the Law had been  
given because of the transgressions of the Jews and, since the ad-  
vent of Jesus, was abrogated. This conception of the Law, as will  
be shown below, was seized upon and elaborated by later Christian  
apologists.

The latter half of Acts is largely a narrative account  
of the missionary labors of Paul in Asia Minor,<sup>52</sup> Macedonia,  
Thessalonica,<sup>53</sup> Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, and Troas, and his return  
to Jerusalem.<sup>54</sup> Paul carried on his propaganda through the agencies  
of the synagogues in these various cities.<sup>55</sup> He preached his doc-  
trine to the Jews but he was especially interested in the Gentile

fringe which was associated with the synagogue either as proselytes or as potential proselytes. In almost every instance Paul and his associates met with spirited resistance from the Jews as soon as the latter realized their subversive intentions. Upon his return to Jerusalem, Paul, denounced by Asiatic Jews who probably knew the nature of his activities among the Gentiles, was arrested and eventually sent to Rome.<sup>56</sup> The conclusion of Acts which finds Paul in Rome (c. 56 or 57 A. D.) is most unsatisfactory both from the literary and from the historical point of view.<sup>57</sup> His contact with the Jews in Rome is practically unknown. Acts 28:17 casually records that Paul met the Jews in Rome and sought to win converts to Christianity. Probably his method was the same as the one used in the more fully recorded missionary activities.

It is impossible to obtain an accurate knowledge of the relations between the Christians and the Jews in the decade before the destruction of the second temple. In subsequent Christian literature the Jews were blamed for instigating the Neronian persecutions of the Christians.<sup>58</sup> But that this tradition is untrustworthy, and even maliciously invented, is shown by M. Joel.<sup>59</sup> Again, the general historians, following Eusebius, depict the withdrawal of the Christian community from Jerusalem to Pella at the outset of the revolt in 66 A. D. That the cleavage between the Jewish Christians and their fellow Jews was so sharp is very doubtful.<sup>60</sup> Even Paul, the great missionary to the Gentiles, retained a deep love for his fellow Jews. Late in his career he expressed his longing for the conversion of the Jews.<sup>61</sup> Moreover, M. Joel shows that the removal to Pella was antedated by Eusebius, as he says, to point out "how Jerusalem was devoid of holy men in whose behalf God might have saved the city".<sup>62</sup> Joel states further that the four chief letters of Paul and especially the Apocalypse of John reveal that

the relations between the Jewish Christians and the Jews around the year 69 was still very close.<sup>63</sup> The strong spirit of nationalism pervading all groups of Jewry at that time could not have left the Jewish Christians unaffected. Even the heathen born Christians were in sympathy with the Jewish rebellion.<sup>64</sup> Likewise, the Samaritans, otherwise bitter foes of the Jews, assisted them in the desperate struggle. It was not the war itself that hastened the eventual separation between the Christians and the Jews; it was the terrible results of the war, the destruction of the temple and the ensuing reorganization of Jewish religious life. The Talmudic evidence of the Jabneh period, however fragmentary, confirms this truth.

## CHAPTER II.

A. D. 70 - 138.

The destruction of the temple in the year 70 A. D. was not only of vast significance for Judaism but was also a momentous event for Christianity. It provided the opportunity for the latter, already divergent from Judaism in theory, to separate from Judaism in actuality. The loss of the temple destroyed with one blow the greater part of the Jewish Law which had been bound up with that institution.<sup>1</sup> It seemed to vindicate the method of the Gentile mission of the Christians which permitted the pagan converts to Christianity to obey only part of the Mosaic law. Moreover, through the operation of the tax, the Fiscus Judaicus, imposed by Vespasian, a premium was placed upon the uncircumcised in contradistinction to the Jews.<sup>2</sup> And in the time of Hadrian, the propaganda for the circumcision of the Gentiles was abruptly and temporarily, at least, stopped because the emperor had forbidden this act even among the Jews. These events were extremely important for the Gentile Church but their significance for the circumcised, tradition-loving, Jewish Christians is hard to estimate.

The "Epistle to the Hebrews", written in this period,<sup>3</sup> indicates that the Jewish Christians were not prepared to withdraw from the Orthodox Jewish fold. This letter, presumably addressed to the Jewish Christians,<sup>4</sup> merely intimates that it was time to give up the hope of converting the Jews.<sup>5</sup> Its view of the Law is Paulinian, namely, that God has made a new covenant through Jesus, antiquating the old.<sup>6</sup> The greater part of the epistle is exhortatory, pleading that the Jewish Christians remain firm in their faith in Jesus. The last chapter contains a very significant

passage<sup>7</sup>. Therein is stated that the bodies of the animals whose blood was sprinkled in the Holy of Holies were burned outside the camp. "So Jesus also suffered outside the gate, in order to sanctify the people by his own blood. Let us go to him outside the camp, then, bearing his obloquy (for we have no lasting city here below, we seek the city to come)." This is evidently an appeal to the Jewish Christians to separate from the Jewish community in order to remain true to the belief in Jesus.<sup>8</sup>

A similar attitude is displayed in the writings of the Church Fathers of this period. Ignatius wrote, "it is absurd to profess Christ Jesus, and to Judaize".<sup>9</sup> Judaism, he holds, is not at an end - it has merged into Christianity. In the same letter he continues, "do not accept strange doctrines or old fables". Still to live by the Jewish law was to deny the gift of grace. The prophets lived like Jesus, that is without the Law, and hence they were persecuted. Twice again in two other epistles he warns against Judaizing and especially implores his correspondents to avoid Judaizing teachers.<sup>10</sup> This same strong anti-Jewish sentiment is found in two other writers of this early period. The "Epistle (of Mathetes) to Diognetus" ridicules the sacrificial cult of the Jews by saying that their offerings to the God of all things is as foolish as the worship of heathen idols.<sup>11</sup> Mathetes also pokes fun at the Jewish scrupulosity concerning the dietary laws. He scoffs at the superstitions connected with the observance of the Sabbath, at circumcision (as a sign of the elect of God), and at the various fasts and new moons. Mincius Felix held that the history of the Jews reveals how they in their wickedness forsook God before He forsook them.<sup>12</sup> This is one of the stock arguments used by the Christian leaders from the time of Stephen.<sup>13</sup> It remained for the more philosophically minded Barnabas to formulate the

Christian attitude toward the despised Law. But at the same time he concurred in Mincius Felix's interpretation of the history of the Jews. He states that the Jews are not the heirs of the covenant.<sup>14</sup> The Christians are the true heirs for they are the heirs of the covenant of Jesus.<sup>15</sup> In order to accept the Old Testament as inspired scripture without observing the Law, Barnabas applied the method of allegorical interpretation (one form of the aggadic method) to the Law, so that, for instance, the command not to eat pork meant to avoid the society of swine-like men.<sup>16</sup> He carried his theory so far as to maintain that the literal interpretation of the Old Testament was the invention of the devil.<sup>17</sup>

The other aspect of the situation, the attitude of the Jews to the Christians, is furnished by the Talmudic sources, and is largely expressed in the deeds and thoughts of the leaders of a hard-pressed Jewry. These leaders were the Rabbis who faced the task of readjusting Jewish life and religion to the sadly changed conditions. They grappled with their problems bravely and wisely, magnifying the place of the synagogue in Jewish life, and developing hermeneutic rules to adjust the traditional law to the new circumstances. Their attempts to unify the teachings of Judaism and to solidify the shattered national life brought them into sharp conflict with the various sects then prevalent, and especially resulted in a struggle with the Jewish Christians. These latter remained in the Jewish fold and attended the synagogue while at the same time secretly professing the messiahship of Jesus. The extant rabbinic sources for this period deal almost entirely with the Jewish Christians. These sources are extremely obscure and fragmentary in character.

Rabban Gamliel II, who became Patriarch about the year 80 A. D., as the representative of the Jewish group, must have had



2 frequent encounters with the Christians. The Talmud records a few such incidents.<sup>18</sup> The most famous story tells of a plot devised by R. Gamliel and Imma Shalom, his sister, to expose the venality of a Jewish Christian judge.<sup>19</sup> The purpose of the plot, it seems, was to show that even a Christian judge, as probably such characters were considered saints, could be bribed. In another encounter with a Christian (probably a Gentile, as a Jewish Christian would feel the defeat of 70 too keenly and probably would not use the expression "your prophets")<sup>20</sup> R. Gamliel dealt with a question which loomed up prominently in later Christian polemics, namely, the question of the Jews' relation to God after the destruction of the temple.<sup>21</sup> The Christian cited Hosea 5:6 to prove that God had rejected Israel. R. Gamliel refuted him by replying that he had mistranslated the word *לִפְנֵי* in the context as the preposition *in* not *before* was used. This dispute is an excellent example of the exegesis employed by the Christians to find a justification of their attitude toward Jewry reflected in the Old Testament.

Akiba, one of the great leaders of the time, seems to have taken a strong stand against all sects, especially the Jewish Christians.<sup>22</sup> In discussing those who are excluded from the future world, he mentions, "he who reads in external books, also he who whispers over a wound, and says, none of the diseases which I sent in Egypt, will I lay upon you, I the Lord am your healer."<sup>23</sup> The reference to "external books" no doubt includes Christian writings and the latter half of the passage may refer to the faith-healing practiced by Christians. Akiba's fear of the influence of Minim, including Christians, is expressed in the advice he offers concerning polemics, "do not give occasion to the Minim to humble you."<sup>24</sup> A strange anachronism in the Talmud, placing Jesus in the time of Akiba, may furnish a clue to Akiba's attitude toward Christ-

this  
refers  
to Sadducees

ianity. The trial and execution of Jesus are supposed to have taken place in Lud, the city where Akiba lived.<sup>25</sup> H. Laible explains this by advancing the following theory.<sup>26</sup> Since Akiba was the persecutor of the Christians during the Bar Cochba Revolt, and was most active against them in Lud, hence a later tradition arose that Jesus was a contemporary of Akiba and had been executed in Lud. There seems to be a great deal of truth in this ingenious theory.

One of the most definite Talmudic accounts dealing with Christianity is the story of Eleazer ben Domah.<sup>27</sup> Eleazer was bitten by a snake and Jacob of Chephor Sama (Sechanja) came to cure him in the name of Jeshua ben Pandira (Jesus Christ).<sup>28</sup> R. Ishmael, his uncle, did not permit the cure to be performed and Eleazer died. Thereupon R. Ishmael gave vent to his bitterness against heresy by remarking that it was better that Ben Domah die thus rather than be tainted with heresy (Christianity). Then R. Ishmael continued with the significant statement that it was better for him to die than to have acted counter to the words of his colleagues. This latter remark hints at a law or custom instituted against social contact with Minim.

Another clear reference to Christianity is found in the stories about Eliezer ben Hyrcanus. It is significant that there are many passages linking him with statements about Jesus and Christianity.<sup>29</sup> It is rather certain that Eliezer ben Hyrcanus was interested in Christianity. And, as a matter of fact, the Talmud records his arrest by the Roman government on the charge of Minuth, that is, on the charge of being affiliated with an illegal religion.<sup>30</sup> The account seems to be historical.<sup>31</sup> Eliezer avoided sentence by flattery and evasion, rather than by flat denial. Moreover, his refusal to be comforted after his acquittal was probably prompted

R. Akiba lived in Bnei

Barak  
I then

how  
dels  
he

some  
in all  
here?

whole theory  
based on nothing

222  
village

2

2

by the accusation of being tainted with Minuth, rather than the humiliation of the trial. That the Minuth mentioned in this story is Christianity is deduced from the consolation offered Eliezer by R. Akiba: "Akiba came to him and said, 'Rabbi, shall I say to thee why thou art perhaps grieving?' He said to him, 'Speak'. Akiba said, 'Perhaps one of the Minim has said to thee a word of Minuth and it has pleased thee'. He said, 'By Heaven, thou hast reminded me ! Once I was walking along the street of Sepphoris, and I met Jacob of Chephor Sichnin,<sup>32</sup> and he said to me a word of Minuth in the name of Jeshu ben Pantiri, and it pleased me'."

This experience of R. Eliezer is illuminating. It reveals the danger, even for the leaders of Jewry, lurking in the daily contact with Jewish Christians.

A legend dealing with R. Hananjah, the nephew of R. Jehoshua ben Hananjah, contains an unmistakable reference to Christianity.<sup>33</sup> R. Hananjah came to Chephar Nahum, Capernaum, where the Minim cast a spell upon him and set him to riding an ass on the Sabbath. R. Jehoshua broke the spell but because of this experience Hananjah had to leave Palestine and go to Babylon. This latter statement, that he went to Babylon, is historical, but the reason here given for his removal may not be correct. And yet it may even be true that he was tainted with heresy. In Koheleth r. 7:26, Hananjah is mentioned by R. Isi (4th century in Caesarea) as having had contact with the Minim in Chephar Nahum.

R. Jehoshua's ability to break the spell cast upon his nephew is in full accord with tradition's record of his miracle-working ability.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, as a leader in Jewry, he was one of the opponents of Christianity. There is an interesting illustration of this in b. Hag. 5 b. In one of the conversations between R. Jehoshua and a Roman emperor (Hadrian), a Min, presumably a

Christian, by pantomime indicated that God had turned away his face from Israel (Deut. 31:18).<sup>35</sup> Jehoshua answered in like manner proving that God's hand was still stretched out over Israel.<sup>36</sup> The latter part of this same passage indicates that Jehoshua was a staunch defender of Judaism against the Minim. When he lay on his death bed, the Rabbis asked, "What will become of us at the hands of the Minim?" He said to them,<sup>37</sup> "Counsel hath perished from the children, their wisdom is corrupted", when counsel hath perished from the children (of Israel) the wisdom of the peoples of the world is corrupted". "Their wisdom" seems to refer to "the wisdom of the Gentiles".<sup>38</sup> Evidently the interpretation of his cryptic words is that the power of the Gentiles to molest ceases with the power of the Jews to defend. In other words the Jewish religion will never want a defender as long as it is attacked.

R. Ishmael ben Elisha who revealed his vigorous attitude against the Christian heresy at the time of the death of his nephew E. ben Domah, as related above, displayed this same sentiment in discussing the appropriate treatment of the books of the Minim, which no doubt included Christian writings.<sup>39</sup> Ishmael is emphatic in stating that the books of the Minim, even though they contain the name of God, are to be destroyed.<sup>40</sup>

Another leader of this period who was even more outspoken about the burning of the books of the Minim was R. Tarphon.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, he states that if he were pursued he would rather enter a house of idolatry than seek refuge in a house of the Minim. For, as he says, the idolators do not acknowledge God, whereas the Minim do acknowledge God but speak falsely concerning Him.

The recognition by the Rabbis of the dangers of Minuth (including Christianity) and their hostility toward it is mani-

Very  
much  
in  
mind  
here  
  
Again  
in the  
same  
line  
ment  
Nol

fested in a statement recorded in the Tosephta.<sup>42</sup> The ordinary Gentile (  $\gamma/\rho$  ) is distinguished from the Min. The former did not keep the dietary laws because of ignorance, whereas the latter intentionally violated the laws. It says, "slaughtering by a Min is idolatry, their bread is Samaritan bread, their wine is wine offered (to idols), their fruits are not tithed, their books are books of witch-craft, and their sons are bastards. One does not sell to them, or ~~receive~~ <sup>buy</sup> from them, or take from them, or give to them, one does not teach their sons trades, and one does not obtain healing from them, either healing of property or healing of life".<sup>43</sup> That the opinion of the Tosephta was not binding as a law might be deduced from the contacts of the Rabbis with Christians, as described above, but it was no doubt well known and approved as is evidenced from the remark of Ishmael about Ben Domah in the same passage. R. Ishmael said, "Happy art thou, Ben Domah, for thou hast departed in peace, and hast not broken through the ordinances of the wise".<sup>44</sup> Had he received healing from Jacob he would have transgressed against the words of the Rabbis. However, there is no way of ascertaining just how effectively this rule was enforced and just what were the social relations between the common people and the various sectaries. Without doubt the tendency to withdraw behind the rising wall of the Law was already well developed. Also the tendency to refrain from disputations, whenever possible, with the Minim, who employed the Hebrew scriptures and method of exegesis for their own purposes,<sup>45</sup> was likewise developing.

Further evidence of fuller appreciation, by the leaders, of the menace that the various sects offered a disorganized and distraught Jewry, is seen in the liturgical changes of this time. An important innovation was the insertion of the  $\text{קִרְבַּן בְּאֵינֵינוּ}$  (the 12th benediction) in the Shemoneh Esreh. The problems con-

cerning the date and the original form of the benediction are numerous and complex.<sup>46</sup> Suffice it to say here that not only was the formula a malediction, but, as Graetz says,<sup>47</sup> it was also a kind of test-formula for the purpose of detecting those who might be secretly inclined to heresy. It can be safely stated that the benediction was composed in the time of R. Gamliel II, probably shortly after the year 80 A. D. It represents an official fear and condemnation of the spurious Judaism which had been developing in the synagogue. Another change in liturgy, the deletion of the "Ten Words" from the daily service, also presents many problems. The passages in j. Ber. 3c and b. Ber. 12a are very obscure.<sup>48</sup> As stated in j. Ber. 3c, the recital of the "Ten Words" was discontinued because of the misrepresentation of the Minim, who would say, "These alone were given to Moses on Sinai."<sup>49</sup> It is highly improbable that this sentiment could refer to the Jewish Christians, but it might represent the Gentile Christians' denial of the Mosaic Law.<sup>50</sup>

But more than a change in liturgy was needed to guard Judaism against the growing influence of Christianity. The daughter religion had based its new teachings upon the Hebrew Bible and threatened to usurp that book in its Greek, and perhaps even in its Aramaic, version. The Septuagint was being used by the Christians for their own purposes and they did not hesitate to corrupt verses to strengthen the so-called Christological passages.<sup>51</sup> An opportunity for the acquisition of a new Greek version of the Bible came when the famed Aquila was converted to Judaism. His careful, word for word, translation became the official Greek version of the synagogue. A similar need was felt for a fixed Aramaic Targum. Too many individuals prepared their own versions allowing for many textual variances.<sup>52</sup> Despite the legendary accounts given in the Rabbinic sources,<sup>53</sup> it can be inferred that during this

period official Targumim were fixed for both the Torah and the prophetic literature, as this latter was extensively revised and used by the Christians for polemical purposes.<sup>54</sup>

The changes in liturgy and the standardization of the Targumim serve as indices to the nature of the relations between the Jews and the Christians in the period immediately following the destruction of the temple. Suffering from the shock of that loss, Jewry, busy with the problems involved in the preservation of Judaism, began to grow more and more exclusive. The wall of the Law was in the process of encircling the people. Against heresy in every form, and especially Christianity, a weakened Jewry had to take a defensive rather than an offensive stand. This trend of affairs assumed a sharper aspect after the Bar Cochba revolt and is portrayed in the increased number and in the sharp tone of the Christian polemics. But, before that fateful war, Jewry made a valiant attempt to stamp out the Jewish Christian heresy. Concealed in the exaggerated accounts of the Christian persecutions, preserved by the Church Fathers, lies a kernel of truth. The leaders of Jewry, in its last desperate attempt to throw off the yoke of Rome, could not risk the danger of lukewarm advocates or possible traitors within the camp. Furthermore, the Christians had only themselves to blame for any persecution at the hands of the Jews. The Christian apologists had begun to address themselves to the Roman emperors in order to make known the distinctiveness of Christianity and its separation from Judaism.<sup>55</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that the followers of Bar Cochba persecuted the Jewish Christians who refused to rally under their banner.<sup>56</sup> The tragic failure of the revolt and the subsequent reorganization of Judaism resulted in the complete separation of the Jewish Christians from the body of orthodox Jewry. The independence of Christ-

ianity was manifested in the election of a Gentile bishop, Marcus, to the seat of Jerusalem, which had become a pagan city forbidden to the Jews. The ensuing relations between the Jews and the Christians were destined to become more and more bitter. The aggressive attitude of Christianity is reflected in its polemical literature, while Jewry was content to assume a defensive attitude protected within the wall of the Law.



### CHAPTER III.

A. D. 138 - 220.

*Talmud  
new  
historical  
book*

The severe effects of the unfortunate Bar Cochba Revolt and the ensuing Hadrianic persecution is nowhere better illustrated than in the paucity of Talmudic material dealing with Christianity in the latter half of the second century. Busied with the problems of internal organization, the development and codification of the Law, and partially freed from association with the Jewish Christians, the Rabbis, if one may argue from silence, did little more than defend themselves against the verbal assaults of an aggressive Gentile Christianity. Forced for the time being to desist from missionary efforts, Judaism could offer Christianity little competition in the conversion of the heathen. On the other hand the Christian Church enjoyed fairly peaceable times during the second century, except during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 161-180). Filled with missionary fervor, the Church gained many converts throughout the Roman Empire. Beginning with Justin Martyr, the first great apologist, the Church resorted more and more to the pen to win members among the educated pagans. As this apologetic literature grew, it developed an increasingly hostile attitude to Judaism, deprecating its peculiar institutions while at the same time taking for itself the best of Jewish thought and ritual. The temper of the second century Christian literature is best exemplified by the fourth gospel<sup>1</sup>. This otherwise fine work presents the Jews as desirous, from the very beginning, of killing Jesus and, eventually, consummating their wish. This gospel was influenced by the bitter hate which the Bar Cochba rebellion left, in its wake, in Christian circles. Many writings of the second century reveal similar influence.

Even Justin, either through ignorance or wilful misrepresentation of the facts, blamed the Jews for the death of Jesus. As M. Joel states well in many places,<sup>2</sup> Christianity, after its definite separation from Judaism, adopted every available means to discredit Judaism and to curry favor with the Romans. It desired to beautify its origin in the eyes of the Romans and the pagans, and to blacken Judaism. The later Church Fathers utilized every opportunity to exonerate Rome from the blame for Jesus' death and for the persecution of the Christians.<sup>3</sup> The Jews were made responsible for everything, including the spread of calumnies about the Christians among the heathen.<sup>4</sup> That this latter charge against the Jews was of malicious origin is shown by M. Joel.<sup>5</sup> Tertullian and Eusebius both knew and even stated that many atrocious charges levelled against the Christians were from heathen sources. But the great numerical power of the Christians enabled these polemicists to adopt an aggressive and even an arrogant tone, as will be shown below, while an apparently crushed and humiliated Jewry worked quietly to insure its religious preservation.

"The Dialogue of Justin, Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, A Jew", the work of Justin, the first Christian apologist, offers a mine of information for the relations between the Jews and the Christians immediately following the Bar Cochba Revolt.<sup>6</sup> The Dialogue, despite the fact that it is long, rambling, and repetitious, has a certain coherent and definite argument. The problem raised by Trypho is twofold - how the Christians could profess to serve God and yet (1) break God's given law, and (2) believe in a human saviour?<sup>7</sup> Justin's answer may be divided roughly into three parts.<sup>8</sup> Chapters 11-47 constitute a refutation of the Jewish conception of the binding character of the Mosaic law. Chapters 48-108 deal with the divinity of Jesus, his pre-existence, incarnation,

passion, resurrection, and ascension. Chapter 109 may be considered the climax of the argument as it contains the logical conclusion to be drawn from the enunciation of the above two principles, namely, that the conversion of the Gentiles is a necessity, and so is the abandonment of the Old Israel, the Jews, unless they will accept the new covenant. This sentiment represents the pure Gentile viewpoint which held that the Law ended with the coming of Jesus who removed all sin (ch. 43).<sup>9</sup> Justin's entire argument is based on the Old Testament and upon the interpretation of prophecy.<sup>10</sup> And, as a matter of fact, Justin started his dialogue<sup>11</sup> by admitting that he believed absolutely in the God of Israel.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, he realized that Trypho, or any true Jew, would not have listened to his argument unless it were based on the Bible.<sup>13</sup>

In discussing the Law, Justin presents the claim, which was taken literally by the Church, that the Old Testament, the source of the Law, belongs to the Christians who alone interpret it correctly.<sup>14</sup> He concludes that the entire Law (Sabbath, circumcision, festivals, and sacrifices) was instituted because of the Jews' transgressions and hardness of heart.<sup>15</sup> As a stubborn and wayward people the Jews could not live a moral life without the protection of stringent laws. In ch. 20, Justin states that the Jews were ordered to abstain from certain foods in order that they might keep God before their eyes while they ate and drank, as they were very prone to depart from His knowledge. Moreover, he attacks the literal meaning of the Law.<sup>16</sup> He proves by fanciful allegories that the Mosaic laws were figures of things which pertain to Christ. For instance, he maintains that the oblation of fine flour was a figure of the Eucharist. "And the offering of fine flour... which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucha-

rist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering which He endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from all iniquity."<sup>17</sup>

In more general terms, the burden of Justin's argument was that the universality and eternality of God precludes that He confine His relations to man within the limits of a Law addressed to a single people, and for a limited period of time.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, Justin distinguishes between two elements in the Law, the eternal and the temporal. This distinction plays a large role in the writings of later apologists. As proof that the Law was not to be taken literally but symbolically (ch. 20), Justin offers interpretations such as these: that meat is a symbol of Christ, and, likewise, the Paschal lamb and the scape-goat are symbols of Jesus.<sup>19</sup>

As stated above, once Justin has refuted the Jewish conception of the binding character of the Law he proceeds to prove the divinity of Jesus.<sup>20</sup> The climax of the discussion is presented in the last third of the dialogue. The coming of Jesus, the Messiah, as foretold in the Bible, meant the abrogation of the Law.<sup>21</sup> For Jesus, through his vicarious atonement, removed all sin. And, says Justin, if the Jews persist in rejecting Jesus they in turn will be abandoned. The new covenant will be given to the Gentiles, and the Christians will become the true Israel, the Holy People promised to Abraham.<sup>22</sup> The rapid spread of Christianity ever more convinced the Christian leaders of the truth of this assertion.

In addition to his main discussions about the Law and the divinity of Jesus, Justin takes up other points of contention between the Jewish and Christian groups. A familiar argument is that the gift of prophecy had been transferred from the Jews to the Christians.<sup>23</sup> Jesus was the last great prophet and was, more-

over, the fulfillment of the spirit imparted to the previous prophets.<sup>24</sup> Another cause of friction, one fraught with terrible consequences for the Jews, was the charge that the Jews cursed the Christians in the synagogues.<sup>25</sup> This no doubt refers vaguely to the benediction against the Minim. Justin, however, takes a rather gentle attitude and exhorts the Jews to desist from this practice and to be converted to Christianity: "Pour no ridicule on the Son of God, obey not the Pharasaic teachers, and scoff not at the King of Israel, as the rulers of your synagogues teach you to do after your prayers".<sup>26</sup> But this charge, however vague, was repeated by the Fathers of the first four centuries and used during the Middle Ages to justify the persecution of the Jews.<sup>27</sup> In another aside from the principle argument, Justin intimates that the Christians of his day still clung to and practiced many Jewish customs.<sup>28</sup> When Trypho inquires about the salvation of those who keep the Mosaic law, the Jewish Christians, and at the same time acknowledge the messiahship of Jesus, Justin admits that such persons merit salvation.<sup>29</sup> But at the same time he states emphatically that the Gentile converts to Christianity have no need of the Mosaic law which had been given because of the stubbornness of the Jewish people and which contributes nothing to the performance of righteousness and of piety. Moreover, he speaks strongly against those who insist that the Gentile converts practice the Mosaic law.<sup>30</sup> But the gentle Justin states further that he is even willing to communicate and to stay in touch with the Jewish Christians. It is apparent from the discussion of Justin that the Jewish Christians, even though few in number, on the threat of social ostracism and on the question of salvation, insisted that the Gentile converts adopt the Mosaic law and keep it in its entirety. Justin could not approve of this.

Throughout the major portion of this dialogue, the tenor

of Justin's remarks reveals deliberate reasoning and philosophic calm. But as the relations between the Jews and the Christians grew more strained, and as the number of disputants increased on both sides, the philosophic tone of this first great apologist of the Church was lost. Even Justin at times reveals impatience with the Jews and ridicules the tactics of the Jewish controversialists, who in a well-balanced argument seek to discover and to attack a minor and neglected point. He says, "one may speak 10,000 words well yet if there happens to be one little word displeasing to you, because not sufficiently intelligible or accurate, you make no account of the many good words, but lay hold of the little word, and are very zealous in settling it up as something impious and guilty"<sup>31</sup> This weak refutation on the part of Jewish controversialists indicates that these disputations were a source of danger to Judaism.<sup>32</sup> Christian dialecticians would overwhelm Jews who were less versed in the fine art of debating. The Rabbis, however, were not unaware of this menace. As seen above,<sup>33</sup> they added to the exclusiveness engendered by the general law, a specific prohibition against social intercourse with the Christians. And Justin testifies that ordinary Jews, not especially skilled in controversy, were strictly enjoined to avoid polemics with Christians.<sup>34</sup> And even Trypho, who presented so bold a front to his opponent, regretted his breach of this rule.<sup>35</sup>

Another great Christian apologist of this period, Tertullian, a contemporary of Jehudah Ha-Nasi, adopted a more contemptuous attitude toward Judaism. In the "Apology" he interprets the history of the Jews as a witness of Jesus Christ.<sup>36</sup> Because the Jews did not live up to the precepts of their prophets, Jesus came to "renovate and illuminate man's nature" as foretold by God in the Scriptures. Viewing their current misfortune under

no clear  
take  
Justin's  
statements  
is only  
no  
doubt.

Rome he declared this to be a proof that the Jews were no longer the chosen people. They had sinned against the revealed word of God and had rejected Jesus. Consequently, they were now being punished through the agency of Rome. Tertullian reveals his attitude toward Judaism most fully in his "An Answer to the Jews".<sup>37</sup> The occasion for the composition of this essay is interesting. Tertullian's purpose was to elucidate important points obscured during a debate between a Christian and a proselyte to Judaism. He takes up in detail the all important question of the Law. He speaks of a law anterior in time to Moses, of a natural law.<sup>38</sup> The Law of Moses, including the Sabbath, circumcision, etc., is unnecessary as it was not observed by the righteous men who lived before Moses.<sup>39</sup> Then Tertullian goes on to draw a distinction between the carnal and the spiritual law, between the temporal and eternal law. In greater detail he depicts that the circumcision of the flesh is unnecessary for salvation. It was given to Israel merely for a "sign" to set them apart from other peoples; that Israel might be singled out later for punishment. The old Law of carnal circumcision is superceded by the new one involving spiritual circumcision, circumcision of the heart as demanded by Christianity. Likewise, the Sabbath was also a temporary measure instituted by Moses, but it was not observed by the righteous men before him. In turn he proves that the sacrifices were only temporal and carnal. For according to Leviticus the laws of sacrifices were to be observed only in Palestine. Moreover, the prophets spoke of a spiritual sacrifice, a contrite and humble heart, and of a sacrifice of praise. These latter types of sacrifice were intended for all peoples, that is for the Christians. Accordingly he concludes that the old law was now abolished,<sup>40</sup> and he further proves this from the nature and divinity of Jesus, using the same arguments

as did Justin Martyr. In addition to the question of the Law, Tertullian argues from the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of Judea that God has abandoned the Jews, and hence he is able to justify the calling of the Gentiles.<sup>41</sup> In the conclusion of this polemic Tertullian rather naively proposes a clue to the error of the Jews, that is their refusal to accept Jesus. The Jews, he contends, do not properly understand the problem of the two advents of the Messiah. They see only the ignominy of the first advent. But, Tertullian assures the Jews, in his second coming Jesus will be resplendent with glory and honor.

Despite the seemingly temperate attitude displayed by Tertullian in his work addressed directly to the Jews, he betrays his bitterness and hostility in many instances; he shares with Eusebius the dubious honor of blaming the Jews for the heathen persecution of the Christians. In telling of a public disputation he once wrote, "The crowd believed the Jew. In what other set of people lies the seedplot of calumny against us?"<sup>42</sup> On another occasion he called the synagogues "fontes persecutionum".

While both Tertullian and Justin concur in speaking of the frequency of public disputations with Jews, and while both testify that the Jews slandered Christianity, the Jewish sources of this period, unfortunately, are extremely scanty and unilluminating. Not until the third century is there direct evidence of a sustained Jewish defense against Christian polemics. During the crucial period of the Hadrianic persecutions, and immediately thereafter, the Jewish leaders must have prohibited, as much as possible, social intercourse with the various sectaries. And as Justin testified,<sup>43</sup> they warned their people against public disputations with Christian dialecticians. Moreover, there is one rabbinic source which clearly reveals the hatred borne by the Jews



toward the Christians who were steadily increasing in numbers during the latter half of the second century. In b. Ber. 10a a passage reads as follows: "a certain Min said to Beruria, 'It is written, sing, O barren that didst not bear.' Sing, <sup>because</sup> Because thou didst not bear, <sup>she</sup> She said to him, 'Fool, look at the end of the verse, for it is written, 'For more are the children of the desolate, than the children of the married woman, saith the Lord'. What is meant by, 'O, barren that didst not bear, sing'? The congregation of Israel, which is like a woman who hath not borne children for Gehenna, like you'." The verse from Is. 44:1, quoted very appropriately by the Min, who was probably a Gentile Christian,<sup>44</sup> refers to Zion as the representative of defeated and decimated Jewry. Beruria, one of the famous women of the Talmud, the wife of Rabbi Meir, first answers by telling him to consult the latter part of the verse, where it is stated that the children of the barren are more numerous than the children of the married woman. Then, accepting the Christian's interpretation of the verse, she turns it against him, "you say that Israel is like a barren woman, and ask why then should she rejoice? Because she does not bear children for Hell, such as you".

The only clear reference to Christianity connected with Rabbi Meir, the husband of Beruria, and the greatest scholar of his generation, is his witticism reported in b. Shab. 116a.<sup>45</sup> His remark is added to a discussion about the disposal of the heretical books of the Bē Abidān. R. Meir made a pun on the "Evangelium", which probably refers in a general way to the Gospels, calling it *ḥayyot*, "a worthless thing of a book", or since *ḥayyot* in the Bible generally has some reference to idolatry, "a book of idolatry".<sup>46</sup>

Equally hard to understand is the absence of material

*Handwritten notes:*  
 hardly mentioned in literature as such  
 history of 1st century. Only a few points mentioned.

with reference to Jehudah Ha-Nasi and his inevitable encounters, as a leader of the Jewish group, with the Christian movement. In the midst of a halachic discussion in b. Hullin 87a is a difficult and obscure passage telling of a disputation between R. Jehudah and a Min over the question of God's unity. Discussing Amos 4:13 "a certain Min said to Rabbi, 'He who formed the mountains did not create the wind. And he who created the wind did not form the mountains, as it is written, 'For, lo, he that formeth the mountains and he that createth the wind''!<sup>47</sup> Rabbi said to him, 'Fool, look at the end of the verse, 'The Lord of Hosts is his name''!." The Min, either a Gentile or a gnostic,<sup>48</sup> asked for three days time in which to consider the problem. Unable to refute the argument of Rabbi, he committed suicide. Another Min, presumably a Jew,<sup>49</sup> came and informed Rabbi of this glad event. It is very tempting to infer from this casual account that Rabbi had many similar experiences. Without doubt he must have been challenged at various times to answer not only the broadsides of individual opponents, but also to attack Christianity in defense of Judaism, whose leader he was.

To summarize briefly - it is possible to deduce from the attitude of the Christian apologists, as revealed in their writings, that the Gentile Church was becoming consistently more hostile to Judaism and Jewry. It hated the Jews for their rejection of Jesus, and at the same time the Church attempted to justify, by deprecating Judaism, its misappropriation of the Old Testament and numerous Jewish customs. Its path was made smooth by the almost inherent antipathy of the Greeks and Romans to the Jews.<sup>50</sup> Christian converts from these people were prone to become rabid foes of Jewry. And although there is a paucity of source material with reference to the activities of the leading person-

alities in defense of Judaism, their resentment against the misappropriation of the Bible by the Church is voiced in a mid-rash.<sup>51</sup> Moses, it holds, was not permitted by God to write down the oral law for He foresaw that other peoples would take over the written Bible and would misinterpret it. The oral law, passed down by tradition, and unshared by other, would serve the Jews for the correct interpretation of the Bible. At least one law, the oral law, would be safe from the insatiable Church.

## CHAPTER IV.

A. D. 220 - 325.

During the greater part of the third century, Christianity, except for sporadic but violent persecutions, thrived at the expense of a disorganized Roman Empire. As a consequence, the leaders of the Church became more and more militant in their missionary endeavors and in their polemics against Judaism and Heathendom. In turn, Jewry, a generation or more removed from the Hadrianic persecutions, and well entrenched behind the wall of the Law, found many able combatants against Christianity and the various sects. The ablest exponent of Christianity in the third century was Origen. He may have had a Jewish mother and hence obtained some knowledge of Hebrew from her<sup>1</sup>. As bishop of Caesarea he came into frequent contacts with learned Jews, and with their aid completed his Hebrew education<sup>2</sup>; he mentions his "magister Hebraeus"<sup>3</sup>. He also associated with the Patriarch's family and with other Jewish notables<sup>4</sup>. Dealing with such opponents, Origen, for the most part, carefully avoided offensive expressions in his polemics, forming in this respect a noble exception to the usual polemicist. Origen attacked principles, not their exponents<sup>5</sup>. His chief labors were to refute the scriptural exposition of Jewish teachers, and to replace them with his own exegesis. Origen not only had private interviews with Jewish teachers, but also engaged in public disputations in the presence of large audiences, which included among their ranks competent controversialists<sup>6</sup>.

Origen's works show that he was addicted to the usual Christian method of interpreting Jewish history in an allegorical fashion<sup>7</sup>. He concluded that the Jews had once been the chosen people but had forfeited this honor in favor of the Christians

since the advent of Jesus.<sup>8</sup> Jesus himself had known that he would be rejected by the Jews and that this unbelief would be a means to the calling of the Gentiles.<sup>9</sup> For their refusal to accept Jesus, the Jews had been abandoned by God;<sup>10</sup> they no longer had prophets nor miracles as did the Christians.<sup>11</sup> The punishment of the Jews had been severe; their nation had been overthrown within a single generation after Jesus.<sup>12</sup> In this manner, Origen, as the other Church Fathers, disparaged the Jews and justified the conquest of the heathens by a Christianity based largely on Jewish teachings.

In writing of disputations, Origen mentions the principal topics discussed at these meetings. He found it hard to bear the mocking charge of the Jews that the Christians possessed corrupted Biblical texts. He in turn charged that the Jews falsified Scriptures;<sup>13</sup> especially did he think this true of later copies of the Jewish Bible.<sup>14</sup> But in other works he unconsciously contradicted himself, for he often admitted that the Jews had the genuine and the Christians the corrupt text of the Bible.<sup>15</sup> As a matter of fact, the desire to free the Church from the just reproaches of the Jews on this score led him to that great enterprise, the Hexapla.<sup>16</sup> Another point of contention between the Christian and Jewish debaters was the mysterious birth of Jesus.<sup>17</sup> In his commentary on John XX:14, Origen wrote that the Jews spoke of Jesus' illegitimate birth.<sup>18</sup> Origen's attitude toward the abrogation of the Mosaic Law is the same as that of the other Church Fathers. His writings reveal an interesting sidelight on the question of the Law. It seems that the Paulinian doctrine, that the advent of Jesus superseded the Law of Moses, met with spirited opposition down to the third century.<sup>19</sup> The contradiction between the traditional view of Jesus, that not an iota of the Law should be given up, and his

followers' disregard of the most essential Jewish observances, was too glaring not to be noticed. Even the impartial heathens attacked the Christians on this score. They said that the Christians were not justified in their neglect of the ceremonial laws; for there were Jews who also conceived their laws spiritually and yet carefully practised all of them.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, Origen severely condemns the Jews who keep the Law "after the flesh";<sup>21</sup> he scorns all observance of the Law in a "carnal" sense. Bitterly he records that the heathen were still greatly attracted to Judaism.<sup>22</sup> There were many "Judaizers"<sup>23</sup> among the Christians also; many, especially women, kept the Sabbath on the same day of the week as the Jews, and washed and adorned themselves in honor of the day.<sup>24</sup> Passover was also observed according to Jewish rites by numerous Christians who prepared unleavened bread.<sup>25</sup> Apparently the Church was far from free of Jewish customs in the third century, and even in the fourth century, as Jerome complains in a similar vein. Origen, in defense, asserts that this sympathy with Judaism was not spontaneous, but was the artificial work of missionaries, who carried on a zealous propaganda on behalf of the ancient faith and persuaded Christians to practice its rites.<sup>26</sup> He could never understand the attractiveness of Judaism and constantly maintained that the unbelief of the Jews was unreasonable.<sup>27</sup> For the character of Jesus as the suffering Messiah, and his advent, had been predicted, according to Christian Biblical exegesis; and, also, Jesus in his lifetime, through the performance of miracles, had given evidence of his messiahship. But, despite his great erudition and literary gift, Origen probably made few converts among his learned Jewish opponents.

Another distinguished Church Father of this period, Cyprian, a younger contemporary of Origen, drew up a systematic

indictment of the Jews.<sup>28</sup> Many quotations from both the Old and the New Testament, as in the usual style, are used to bolster his conclusions. He writes that the Jews incurred the wrath of God because they forsook Him and worshipped idols, and because they did not hearken to the prophets but put them to death. It was foretold by the prophets that the Jews would neither know Jesus nor understand him, nor receive him. As a consequence, it was predicted that they would lose Jerusalem, their land, and the "Light of the Lord". The Jews, emphasizes Cyprian, had never understood the Old Testament correctly, and still did not interpret it properly because they refused to believe in Jesus. In treating the question of the abrogation of the Old Law, Cyprian was rather thorough. He declares the first circumcision, the one of flesh, to be void and advocates the second one, the one of spirit, as promised. In general, the former Law given by Moses was at an end, and a New Law, a new covenant, was in force. This New Testament was given by Jesus who was a prophet equal to Moses. The old baptism of holy water was replaced by the new baptism, with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Jesus was the new house and temple of God. The old priesthood was superseded by the new and everlasting priest, Jesus. In Genesis 25:23, the prophecy telling of two peoples, a younger and an elder, is made to apply to the Jews and the Christians; the elder people, the Jews, were destined to serve the younger, the Christians. And the Church which had before been barren would in the future have more members from among the Gentiles than the synagogue had had before.<sup>29</sup> The Gentiles rather than the Jews would attain the kingdom of heaven.<sup>30</sup> Cyprian concludes his deprecation of the Jews, and his justification of the Gentile mission, by admonishing the Jews to accept Jesus as saviour.<sup>31</sup> Only in this manner could the Jews receive pardon for their sins.

The "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles" repeats the well established arguments of the Church. The prophets are cited to prove that the rejection of Israel, "falsely so named", was predicted long ago.<sup>32</sup> The current plight of the Jews, who were under tribute to Rome, is the expected consequence of their impiety toward Jesus.<sup>33</sup> The Law - including the ceremonial and dietary laws, and the laws of ritual cleanliness - was given to the Jews to restrain them from further straying from God, as in the incident of the golden calf.<sup>34</sup> The Christians, sharing in the Grace of Jesus, were released from the bonds of the Law.<sup>35</sup> Jesus, the son of God, by his coming, confirmed and completed the Law and abolished the most grievous laws, although not the entire Law.<sup>36</sup>

The writings of these chief representatives of the Church during the third century reveal that the Church, rich in numbers and defended by men of great ability, had grown confident of itself. It had taken whatever it desired of the Jewish doctrine and teachings, had justified its actions by passages from Scripture, and had, at the same time, declared the right of Judaism's existence to be at an end. The verbal disapproval of these fathers of "Judaizers" was later, when Christianity obtained political power, to take expression in persecutions.

In turning to the Talmudic sources, it is surprising to find again, a paucity of material despite the abundant evidence afforded by the Church Fathers that contacts between the two groups, especially in the form of disputations, were common. Enough information, however, has been preserved to give some indication of the trouble the Rabbis encountered from Christian Biblical exegesis. The Church Fathers must have pounced upon every verse in the Bible which gave them the slightest opportunity to refute Judaism and to confirm their own views. One of the most famous

*see previous Mar  
final note*



Biblical verses utilized by the Christians, and other religious groups, for polemical purposes, is Genesis 1:26, containing the plural verb *אמר*.<sup>37</sup> Justin Martyr, writing soon after the Bar Cochba Revolt, had made use of this verse as a reference to Jesus.<sup>38</sup> The replies of the Rabbis to the problem raised by the plural verb, that of the unity of God, are instructive. R. Jonathan said,<sup>39</sup> "When Moses was writing the Torah, he wrote the deeds of each day. When he came to this verse, as it is written, 'And God said, let us make man in our image, according to our likeness', he said, 'Lord of the world, how Thou art giving a chance to the Minim! I am astonished!' He said to him, 'Write, and he who will err, let him err!'" Then, to this rather grim rejoinder, is added the usual rabbinic explanation that God conferred with the angels.<sup>40</sup> R. Simlai<sup>41</sup> gave the Minim, the Christians, the best general answer when he said, "In every passage where the Minim go wrong, the answer to them is close by". In commenting on this particular passage, Gen. 1:26, R. Simlai pointed out that in the very next verse *אמר* and *אני* are in the singular number. R. Simlai seems to have had a number of disputes with Christians over the proper interpretation of Biblical passages.<sup>42</sup> On the whole he answered the Minim well. b. Sanh. 38 b contains a number of the texts appealed to by Minim, and also has the answer usually resorted to by the Rabbis, namely, that the angels were meant.<sup>43</sup>

The Christians evidently used the contradictions and vague references in the Bible to prove the existence of the trinity and to confuse the Jews. This practice must have been very common, and a source of irritation to the Rabbis - even Trypho complains of Justin's attitude on this score.<sup>44</sup> In b. Ber. 7 a, it is stated that a Min, a neighbor of R. Joshua b. Levi, was a pest in this respect. The Rabbis, as a last resort, sought to nullify the baneful

influence of this Christian exegesis by preaching against it in the synagogue.<sup>45</sup>

Another source of dispute between the Rabbis and Church Fathers was the problem of the divinity of Jesus. R. Abbahu, a well known opponent of Christianity, who had frequent contacts with Minim,<sup>46</sup> many of them friendly encounters, expressed the opinion of the Rabbis when he stated: "If a man says to you 'I am God', he is a liar; if he says, 'I am the son of man', in the end people will laugh at him; if he says, 'I will go up to heaven', he saith, but shall not perform it".<sup>47</sup> This passage is in the Gemara in the discussion on Num. 23:19. It is without doubt a sarcastic allusion to Jesus. Similar views are expressed by other Rabbis.<sup>48</sup> A disparagement of Jesus, as the representative of Christianity, is found in b. Ber. 17 a. b and b. Sanh. 103 a. Commenting on Ps. 91:10, "there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy tent", one explanation is "that thou mayst not have a son or a disciple who burns his food in public like Jeshu the Nazarene". This figurative expression probably refers to one who spoils good doctrines. It may be a reference either to the individual Jesus or to the Church which had misappropriated and reinterpreted many Jewish customs and teachings.

There are two incidents with regard to the contacts made by rabbis with Christians which are important for the light they throw upon the social relations between the Jewish and Christian groups. According to the story in j. Shab. 14 d,<sup>49</sup> the grandson of R. Joshua b. Levi was cured in the name of Jesus. "The grandson had a choking attack. A man came and whispered something to him in the name of Jeshu Pandera, and he recovered. When he (the Christian physician) came out, he (R. Joshua) asked him, 'What did you whisper to him?' He replied, 'A certain word'. Then

Joshua said to him, 'It had been better for him that he had died rather than thus'. And it happened thus to him, 'as it were an error that proceedeth from the ruler' (Ecc. 10:5)." This story resembles in main outline the account about R. Ishmael and Ben Domah, as discussed above, except that in this tale the cure is carried through. And as the verse from Ecclesiastes indicates, the evil was irretrievable. The same strong objection voiced by R. Ishmael to the Christian faith-healing is reflected by R.

Joshua. Another passage which must be discussed in connection with this one deals with R. Abbahu.<sup>50</sup> R. Abbahu was treated by a Christian physician,<sup>51</sup> but his drug was removed from the leg of R. Abbahu by two colleagues, who shared the antipathy displayed by R. Ishmael and R. Joshua toward Christian cures. This case of R. Abbahu is given in a discussion on the question of the hire of non-Jewish doctors. R. Johanan laid down the rule that these doctors might be called in for cases of slight illness, but were not to be used in cases of severe illness lest they be present at the bedside of the dying and impart some heretical taint to the patient. The attitude of R. Johanan is more sensible and more lenient than the one adopted by R. Joshua and the friends of R. Abbahu. But their view is indicative of the danger to Judaism that lay in the close social contacts with Christians and sectaries.

Evidently the old law, or custom, instituted early in the second century, exhorting Jewry to keep the Law and to refrain from social intercourse with the Minim, was still in force. Just how well this custom was kept, especially in the Diaspora where Christianity was growing rapidly, it is impossible to say. The reproach of the Church Fathers against "Judaizers" gives evidence that the relations between the Jews and the Christians may have been very close. The scarcity of source material, however, both

Christian and Jewish, does not allow for even a reasonable conjecture. It is noteworthy that the material furnished by the rabbinic literature and the writings of the Church Fathers does not overlap. It can be argued that this is a proof that the contacts and relations between the two groups was much closer than the extant sources would seem to indicate. The most difficult thing to understand is the paucity of material in the later rabbinic literature dealing with Christianity. Christianity by 300 A. D. was a growing and extensive movement and yet the Talmud, it might be said, almost ignores it. Perhaps this may be explained psychologically as a deliberate avoidance of a great evil. Of course, the Talmud is anything but a historical work.

The eventual adoption of Christianity by Rome and the claim of the Church to be the true Israel must have been very galling to the Jews and yet the Talmud affords only one brief allusion to this momentous event. It is recorded in the name of R. Aha who lived in Lydda in the first half of the fourth century and who probably lived to see Christianity become the official religion of the Roman Empire.<sup>52</sup> j. Nedar. 38a has, "R. Aha said in the name of Huna: Esau the wicked will put on his tallith and sit with the righteous in Paradise in the time to come; and the Holy One, blessed be He, will drag him and cast him forth from thence", etc. "Esau the wicked", that is, Rome, donning a tallith, refers to the fact that the Roman Empire, now become Christian, pretended to be the true Israel.<sup>53</sup> The sentiment of the Jews is clear - God will be the judge of the true Israel.

## CHAPTER V.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

An attempt has been made in the preceding chapters to reconstruct from source material a connected and coherent narrative of the relations between the Jews and the Christians prior to the Nicene Council. Strictly limited to a historical viewpoint, the account deals with the activities and personalities of both groups, and only incidentally traces the evolution of Jewish thought in the Christian Church. This later problem requires a different approach and method, and would involve a presentation of Christian theology. However, this aspect of the relations between the Church and the Synagogue will be briefly treated in this concluding section. Another aspect of the relations between the Church and the Synagogue, which can only be briefly alluded to in this summary, is the delineation of the Jewish sources of the Christian liturgy.

In reviewing the nature of the Christian literature of the ante Nicene period, from the Acts of the Apostles to Eusebius, a certain definite characteristic can be discerned. The greater part of this vast literature is apologetic in tone. Aware of their complete dependence upon Judaism, the Church Fathers, including the author of Acts, attempted to justify their particular interpretation of Jewish tradition, and especially their mission to the Gentiles. It is constantly pointed out that every attempt was made to convert the Jews to a belief in the messiahship of Jesus. Only when Judaism definitely, and even forcibly rejected Christianity, did the early apostles reluctantly turn to the heathen for converts. Even then, one faction of the early Church, the Jewish Christians, remained loyal to the entire tradition of Judaism.

For their compromise they suffered the usual fate - they were persecuted by both the Gentile Christians and the Jews. Definitely separated from the Synagogue by A. D. 138, the Church began a long battle, with tongue and pen, against both Judaism and Heathendom. But even while attacking Judaism, the Church gradually developed an organization, dogmas, and a ritual closely modelled after the Jewish pattern. Handicapped by political struggles with Rome, Jewry fought back against this strange and invidious foe, which shamelessly took the teachings of Judaism with one hand while with the other hand it sought to crush its exponents. Forced to take a defensive stand, Judaism withdrew more and more behind the shelter of the Law, and resorted to polemics whenever a chance was had to thrust back at Christianity. Official Jewish opinion of Christianity and its Founder can be gleaned from the vague but uncomplimentary references to Jesus and to Christianity found scattered throughout rabbinic literature.<sup>1</sup> But, unfortunately, an exact knowledge of Judaism's measures against Christianity cannot be ascertained. The rabbinic literature, while it is voluminous, scarcely mentions Christianity, and, when it does, it often treats it contemptuously as one of the many sects formed around the periphery of Judaism. Against these sects Judaism was guarded by the injunctions of the Law. Only occasionally does the Talmudic literature grant one a glimpse of the polemics and the dangers called forth by Christianity. One can only repeat again the old wish - if only the Rabbis had displayed greater interest in historical matters !

The Church Fathers were more kind in this respect. Occupied with the founding of a new religion, their apologetics and polemics contain a wealth of historical material. Almost every page of their literature reveals the utter reliance of the Church

upon the Synagogue. Little more can be done here than to mention the debt owed Judaism by Christianity. The Church took from Judaism its God idea, its code of ethics, the Bible, the aggadic method of interpretation, and its liturgy. In other words, early Christianity was largely another version of Judaism. The Jewish God idea developed into the trinitarian concept of the Church Fathers. The purely ethical aspects of the Biblical law were adopted by the Church and identified with natural law. The Bible, as a whole, was taken over by the Church and was made the basis of its canonical literature. Even the Jewish method of Biblical interpretation was retained; the formula "it is written" was just as binding upon the Christians as upon the Jews<sup>2</sup>. And not only did Jewish Christianity attempt to remain in the Synagogue, but also Gentile Christianity adopted the main elements of the synagogal ritual. It transferred these rites to the services held on the first day of the week, i. e. Sunday<sup>3</sup>.

Even the objection of the Church to the Mosaic Law was not an objection to a Law as such. Expediency formed the basis for the rejection of this particular Law. It was felt that the Gentile world would not accept the apparently antiquated code. Circumcision, especially, was a semitic custom repugnant to the Greek or Roman mind. The Church merely proceeded to declare the Mosaic Law abrogated in theory. It appropriated whatever laws it could use and constructed a legal system of its own, which later assumed the proportions and binding character of the Jewish Law. In reality, the Jewish laws and customs retained their popularity among the Christian masses for centuries. It has been stated above that, from the earliest Church Father, Ignatius, down through the centuries, there was constant opposition to the "Judaizers" among the Christians. Origen, especially, could neither understand nor

stomach this attraction to Jewish customs. And Jerome, writing in the fourth century, complained that many Christians still adhered to Jewish customs.<sup>4</sup> It is almost unnecessary to state that the baptized Jews retained their customs, and were by no means a source of gratification to the Church. "Take any Jew you please who has been converted to Christianity", Jerome wrote to St. Augustine, "and you will see that he practices the rite of circumcision on his newborn son, keeps the Sabbath, abstains from forbidden food, and brings a lamb as an offering on the 14th of Nisan".<sup>5</sup> Not only Jewish converts to Christianity, but also Gentile Christians were attracted to Jewish customs. Christian women ascribed indefinite but great magical power to the phylacteries. The exact rites of the Synagogue were imitated and were often considered holier than those of the Church. At death, mourners rent their garments after the Jewish custom. Jewish birth was considered a great factor in the selection of Church Heads. As Jerome pointed out,<sup>6</sup> the lower classes could not give up the Jewish Law, the enactments of which appeared more rational and wise than those of the Christian codes. The dependence of the Church on the Synagogue is best described by Ruffinus, who sarcastically observed that, if a few Jews were to institute new rites, the Church would have to follow suit and immediately adopt them.<sup>7</sup>

*E. H.* The relations between Christianity and Judaism, after A. D. 325, were destined to become more and more bitter. Bound to Judaism by so many ties and yet unable to influence its parent, it was inevitable that the Church, once it gained political power, would attempt to crush Judaism. Having shorn Judaism of the best of its fruits, it could not endure Judaism's continuance and development. The daughter religion, grown to maturity on sustenance drawn from the parent religion, malignantly denied its benefactress.



## NOTES

### Chapter I.

1. Harnack, A. The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. 2 vols. Vol. I, p. 54, n. 2.
2. Acts 2:46. *2*
3. See the ambiguous statements in Acts 2:44 f.
4. Acts 6:9; Foakes Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. Vol. IV, p. 66 n.
5. Acts 2:44 f. *4:32*
6. *ibid.* 6:1 f.
7. *ibid.* ch. 2.
8. See Peter's speech, *ibid.* 3:12 f.
9. *ibid.* 3:1 - 4:31.
10. Cf. Case, S. J. The Evolution of Early Christianity. p. 163 n. The Sadducees may have had political interests in the dispersing of a mob.
11. Acts 4:<sup>3</sup>7, 4:9-12. Peter's act was a violation of the Biblical injunction, Deut. 18:9 f. This type of incident must have been an irritating and common feature during this period due to the influx of foreign influences and deities. *2*
12. Acts 4:18.
13. See Case, p. 144 f.
14. Acts ch. 2.
15. *ibid.* 3:6, 12-16; 4:7 f; 5:16-18, 40.
16. *ibid.* 4:33, 5:28 f, 7:4-48, cf. 1:2<sup>3</sup> and 4:1-3.
17. See Jackson and Lake, vol. IV, p. 63 n. The author of Acts clearly intended to indicate why the communistic venture failed.
18. Acts 6:1.

*It is not so obvious that  
communistic venture failed.  
Only instead of 7000  
were appointed.*

19. See Jackson and Lake, vol. V, Additional Note XII. This issue and many other problems reveal that the historicity of Acts, at least of the narrative, especially in the first half of the work, is very doubtful. One can only draw inferences from the intent of the author.

20. Acts 6:7 f.

21. *ibid.* 6:9 f.

22. This action was characteristic of these early Christians. Of course the speeches are probably the compositions of the author of Acts, but the situations portrayed are psychologically correct - reformers grasp every opportunity to broadcast their views.

23. Acts 7:2 f.

24. Cf. Jackson and Lake, vol. IV, p. 69.

25. See Case, p. 144.

26. Acts 8:1, 9:22 f, 13:46, 22:19-21, 28:25-28.

27. The execution of Stephen raises almost the identical problems involved in the death of Jesus. For discussion of this and of the date of Stephen's death, see Jackson and Lake, vol. IV, p. 86 n. For the doubtful historicity of this event, see Joel, M. Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte, 2 vols., vol. II, pp. 75-6.

28. "Evidently the Christians at this period were persecuted with certain exceptions; none were disturbed whose devotion to the temple and the law was unimpeachable, and these still included Peter and the rest of the apostles." Harnack, vol. I, p. 57 n.

29. Acts 8:2.

30. *ibid.* 8:2-13.

31. *ibid.* 10:31, etc.

32. Cf. Jackson and Lake, vol. I, p. 308.

33. Acts 8:14-25.
34. Cf. Acts 8:1, etc.; this fact is confirmed in Gal. 1:13, 22 f, I Cor. 15:9, Philipp 3:6, I Tim. 1:13.
35. Acts 9:3 f.
36. The account in Acts 9:2 f, telling of the warrants issued by the Sanhedrin for the arrest of Christians in Damascus, is of extremely doubtful historicity. See Joel, vol. II, p. 76.
37. The account in Acts may show the tendency of the author to give a Jewish basis to all hostility to Paul. Cf. Jackson and Lake, vol. V, p. 194. Also Joel, vol. II, p. 124. <sup>2</sup>
38. For this and subsequent chronology, see Jackson and Lake, vol. V, Additional Note XXXIV.
39. Acts 12:4, cf. 17:5. <sup>2</sup>
40. See Jackson and Lake, vol. IV, p. 127 n.
41. Cf. Acts 10:24 f and 11:22 f.
42. See Harnack, vol. I, for how the wide spread of Judaism in the Diaspora; how the appeal of the great central principles of Judaism, viz. God and the moral law, to the pagan world; and how the graded scale of proselytes set the stage for the spread of Christianity. Christianity took the most attractive features of Judaism, discarded the Law and granted full conversion to the Gentiles, and hence outstripped Judaism as a missionary religion.
43. Acts 14:27 f.
44. See Harnack, vol. I, p. 68 f, for an interpretation of the council.
45. Acts 15:12.
46. Harnack, vol. I, p. 69.
47. *ibid.*
48. Acts 15:20 f. See also Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. III, p. 433 f,



mention the migration.

63. *ibid.* p. 82.

64. *ibid.* p. 85.

## Chapter II.

1. Joel, vol. II, p. 86 f.

2. *ibid.*

3. Harnack, A. *Chronologie*, p. 479 dates the epistle in the period A. D. 65 - 95. Taken from Herford, R. T. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, pp. 384-5.

4. See Graetz, vol. II, p. 372 f.

5. Ep. to the Hebrews, ch. 6:4 f.

6. *ibid.* 8:6 f.

7. *ibid.* 13:11 f.

8. Cf. Graetz, vol. II, p. 373; see also Joel, vol. II, Additional Note VI to vol. I. *(what does this reference tell on this point?)*

9. Ep. of Ign. to the Magnesians, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. I, p. 63.

10. Ep. of Ign. to the Trullians, *ibid.* vol. I, p. 71; Ep. of Ign. to the Philadelphians, *ibid.* vol. I, p. 83. See also Foakes Jackson, *History*, p. 58. Ignatius vehemently denounced the Jews before Trajan.

11. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. I, p. 26.

12. *ibid.* vol. IV, p. 193, The Octavius of M. F.

13. Acts of the Apostles, 7:2 f.

14. The Jews forfeited this right, cf. Ex. 32:7 and Deut. 9:12.

15. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. I, pp. 138-9, Ep. of Barnabas.

16. Cf. Jackson and Lake, vol. V, p. 218.

17. Cf. Harnack, *Expansion*, vol. I, p. 78, 79 n.

18. See Joel, vol. II, note III, p. 172 f. The attack of the

Minim, especially Christians, against the Mosaic Law may be the basis of the following rabbinic passages. In Ex. r. 30:9 is the well known story of the visit of R. Gamliel, Jehoshua, E. b. Azariah and Akiba to Rome. There they encountered a Min who asked why God did not observe the Sabbath. The answer of the Rabbis implies that in their minds the Law was conceived of as a kind of cosmic or natural law. Likewise, an answer to the antinomians may be traced in the curious passage about God putting on Tiffilin (b. Ber. 6 a), and, again, in the sentence about Abraham having obeyed all the subsequent laws (b. Joma 28 b).

19. b. Shab. 116 a.b. For the "ass has come and trodden out the lamp", see Herford, p. 152.
20. Cf. Büchler, A. Über die Minim von Sepphoris und Tiberias im zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert, p. 280.
21. b. Jeb. 102 b.
22. Cf. b. Baba Mezia 62 a.
23. Mish. Sanh. 10:2.
24. Tos. Par. 3:3; Tos. Joma 3:2 (cf. b. Joma 40 b). Shimon ben Azai expressed himself similarly, b. Menah. 110 a, Siphri ~~IP~~ 143.
25. Tos. Sanh. 10:11, j. Sanh. 7:16, b. Sanh. 67 a.
26. J. Christ. im Talmud. Taken from Herford, p. 85.
27. Tos. Hullin 2:22, 23; j. Shab. 14:4; j. Aboda Zara 2:2; b. Aboda Zara 27 b; Midr. Koh. r. 1:8.
28. Cf. Acts 3:6, 9:34.
29. b. Shab. 104 b (cf. b. Sanh. 67 a), b. Joma 66 b, b. Kallah 51 a, Tos. Shab. 11:15.
30. Tos. Hullin 2:24, b. Aboda Zara 16 b. 17 a, Midr. Koh. r. 1:8.
31. For a conjectural but doubtful date of the trial, see Herford, pp. 141-2. It probably occurred about 100 A. D. - before his

excommunication.

32. For full account see the version in b. Aboda Zara 16 b. 17 a.
33. Koh. r. 1:8.
34. Cf. j. Sanh. 25 d.
35. See b. Jeb. 102 b for a similar taunt thrown at R. Gamliel II by a Min. It was a familiar sentiment of the later Church Fathers.
36. In the same passage R. Joseph, a Babylonian of the second half of the third and first quarter of the fourth century, quoted Is. 51:16.
37. Cf. Jer. 49:7.
38. See Herford, p. 222 f.
39. Tos. Shab. 13:5, j. Shab. 15 c, b. Shab. 116 a.
40. Herford, p. 338 f, cites an interesting passage from b. Nedar. 32 b which deprecates Melchizedek, who was the subject of speculation by a Gnostic sect and who in the "Epistle to the Hebrews" (ch. 8) is represented as a type of Christ. The passage is quoted in the name of R. Ishmael.
41. T. Shab. 13:5, cf. Mish. Sanh. 10:1, b. Git. 45 b lower and b. Menh. 42 b; b. Shab. 116 a, j. Shab. 15 c.
42. T. Hull. 2:20, 21; cf. b. Hull. 41 a. b, Mish. Hull. 2:9, j. Kil. 32 a. There are a number of obscure passages - Mish. Sotah 9:15, cf. b. Sanh. 97 b, Shir. r. on 2:13, Der. eretz zuta, c. X - which refer to "the kingdom turned to Minuth". It is very doubtful that these passages refer to the triumph of Christianity. Perhaps it can be inferred that Minuth in the second century was sufficiently known and dreaded, that it could serve as an illustration of the calamities which were to herald the coming of the Messiah.
43. The date of this anonymous Tosephta is unknown, but evidently the views here given were entertained at a very early date. In

But  
on N. d.  
can  
be  
made  
from

social intercourse with Christians or Gentiles, or any sectaries, the question of the dietary laws was important, cf. Acts 11:3.

44. Cf. Justin Martyr, Dialogue, ch. 38.

45. Joel, vol. II, p. 49.

46. Cf. Herford, p. 125 f; Krauss, S. in J. Q. R., 1893, p. 130-3; Schechter, S. in J. Q. R., 1897; for composition of the formula as restored from manuscripts, see Strack, H. Jesus, Die Häretiker und Die Christen, p. 31 and p. 64\*- the prayer contains the wish that the יְהוָה be destroyed quickly.

47. Graetz, vol. II, p. 379.

48. Cf. Herford, p. 308 f for discussion and for Graetz's view.

49. See "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles", Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, p. 458.

50. A third passage, b. Pesh. 56 a, dealing with the addition of the response

אָר, פֿאַר אַלע אַרבעטן און פֿאַר אַלע אַרבעטן

after the Shema, and with the proper use of pauses in reciting the Shema, offers still greater difficulties. The latter part seems to represent a defense of the unity of God and might be directed against the Jewish Christians who worshipped in the Synagogue.

51. Weiss, I. H. יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ vol. II, ch. 14, p. 121 f.

See also Justin, Dialogue, chs. 71, 72, 73.

52. Weiss, p. 124.

53. *ibid.* ch. 14.

54. No better example could be given than the "Dialogue" of Justin Martyr.

55. Cf. Foakes Jackson, History, p. 59 f.

56. *ibid.* Graetz, vol. II, p. 412 f; Justin Martyr, I Apol. ch. 31; see b. Sanh. 43 a - the death of the five so-called disciples



of Jesus may refer to the persecution of the Jewish Christians. This is a suggestion of Laible, H. J. Christ. im Talmud, p. 68 f, taken from Herford, p. 94.

### Chapter III.

1. Joel, vol. II, pp. 125-6.
2. ibid. p. 5, 16, 17, 42-4, 45, 51, etc.
3. ibid. p. 16, 17 and ch. III.
4. ibid.; Justin, Dialogue, chs. 17, 108, 117, 118, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. I, p. 253; Harnack, vol. I, p. 65 still states this charge as a historical fact.
5. Joel, vol. II, p. 18, 19. See the obscure passage in Koh. r. 1:8 - although probably of late origin, it tells of the experiences of R. Jonathan which intimate that the Christians were thought to live immoral lives.
6. For the question of whether or not the disputation was actually held, and for the attempted identification of Trypho, see Krauss, S. in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 124-6.
7. Dialogue, ch. 10.
8. See Smith, W. and Wace, H. A Dictionary of Christian Biography... vol. III, p. 571 f.
9. See Harnack, vol. I, on the completion of the Gentile mission by 140 A. D.
10. Justin was unacquainted with Hebrew and based all his arguments on the text of the Septuagint. Jewish Encycl., vol. VII, p. 395 f, art. Justin Martyr.
11. The first ten chapters are autobiographical.
12. chs. 11, 57, 68.
13. ch. 56.
14. ch. 29; see above Barnabas and the Law.
15. chs. 18-22.

16. chs. 40-43.
17. ch. 41.
18. Cf. ch. 19. God had viewed with favor the righteous men before Moses and the giving of the Law, etc.
19. chs. 40, 41.
20. chs. 48-108.
21. Jesus' coming was the fulfillment of the Law. See "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles", ch. XXIII, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, pp. 460, 461.
22. Cf. chs. 109, 110, 119, 123, 130, 135. See also ch. 80 - an argument Justin considers important is: Judaism has produced many heresies which it has not disowned, hence it is unfair to disown Christianity. He says that out of the various sects, Sadducees, Genistae, Galilaei, Helleniani, Pharisei, and Baptistae, it is hard to decide which one represents the real Judaism. See also Clement of Alexandria, Strom. 7:15, taken from Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 134-5.
23. Dialogue, ch. 82.
24. ch. 87.
25. ch. 96. See ch. 122 - Justin complains that the proselytes to Judaism denounce Jesus more than the Jews and wish to torture and to put the Christians to death. This is psychologically true.
26. ch. 137.
27. Cf. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 130 f. The Church Fathers were not clear about the exact nature of the curse against Jesus or against the Christians. Their views were: I. Malediction against Jesus - Justin, Dialogue, chs. 96, 103, 137; Origen, Hom. in Jerem. XVIII:12. II. Against Christianity and Christians - Justin, Dialogue, chs. 16, 93; Origen,

- Hom. in Jerem. XVIII:12. III. Against the Nazarenes - Epiphanius, Haeres. XXIX: 9; Jerome in Is. 2:18, etc.
28. *ibid.* p. 127; Dialogue ch. 24, Justin felt constrained to offer an excuse for the Christian transference of the Sabbath day to Sunday.
29. Dialogue, ch. 46.
30. ch. 47. See the attitude of the earliest Church Fathers against Judaizers, as depicted in ch. II.
31. ch. 115.
32. See Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 128.
33. See ch. II. Note saying of Rabbis to avoid giving the Minim an opportunity to humble the Jews in disputations.
34. Dialogue, ch. 112.
35. ch. 38.
36. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. III, pp. 34, 40.
37. *ibid.* p. 151-173.
38. In "The Chaplet, or De Corona", Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. III, p. 195, Tertullian remarks that Christian customs and practices are better than Jewish ones - they are more true to nature. See also *ibid.* vol. VII, p. 458, 460, "Constitution of the Holy Apostles".
39. See note 18 in ch. II - b. Joma 28 b, Abraham obeyed all subsequent laws. *Already authority B. of Jubilees makes point*
40. a. Marcion, a contemporary of Justin Martyr, an opponent of both the Church and the Synagogue, held a more radical view regarding the Law (see Marmorstein in H. U. C. Annual, vol. VI. Also *ibid.* vol. II, p. 129 f - Baeck, L. "Judaism in the Church".) Marcion held that the Law was to be entirely discarded as it was the work of the Demiurge, who was an inferior God, the God of the Jews. He claimed to be a true interpreter

of Paul and he was, in a literal sense.

b. Another view of the Law, the one which was ultimately adopted by the Church, is set forth in the "Didascalia" as incorporated in the "Apostolic Constitutions". It maintained that the Law is binding on Christians, but the Law consists only of that part of Exodus which precedes the worshipping of the golden calf in Ex. 32. All that followed was not law but "Deuterosis", "Secundatio", 'secondary matter' or Mishnah, which was inflicted on Jews and on Jews only in punishment for their sin in worshipping the golden calf. It was binding therefore only on the Jews. In this manner the ceremonial law of Leviticus was excluded, although if the generation of the "Didascalia" had been consistent it would have noted that circumcision was included. The truth, of course, is that this treatment of the subject is merely an artificial explanation devised in order to justify an established situation, rather than the intellectual conviction which produced that situation. (Cf. Cant. r. 1:6).

c. The Ebionites, a sect of the Jewish Christians, accepted the messiahship of Jesus but denied his divinity and supernatural origin. Moreover, these Christians observed all the Jewish rites. The origin and history of this sect is obscure. Kohler (Jew. Encycl. vol. V, p. 31) treats them as the Jewish Christians. This view, however, is inaccurate. See the "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles", Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, p. 452 where it speaks of "those who are newly risen amongst us, the Ebionites, who will have the Son of God to be a mere man, begotten by human pleasure, and the conjunction of Joseph and Mary".

41. In Apol. XXI Tertullian records the shame of the Jews, "scattered, wanderers, exiles from their own land and clime, they

roam through the world without a human or divine king, without so much as a stranger's right to set foot even on their native land". Taken from Harnack, vol. I, p. 78 n.

42. ad. Nat. I:XIV, cf. adv. Marc. 3:23; adv. Jud. XIII - taken from Harnack, vol. I, p. 66 n.
43. Dialogue, ch. 112.
44. See Büchler, p. 281. Justin Martyr in I Apol. ch. 53 says that "more are the children of the desolate" refers to the Gentiles, who, now in greater numbers than the Jews and the Samaritans, accept God's law. He cites Is. 54:1.
45. For rather far fetched comments on this entire passage, see Guedemann, M. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien, p. 70 f.
46. See Herford, p. 163; in the same passage, which is reported by R. Abbahu, R. Jochanan bar Napaha, third century in Palestine, calls the Evangelium "a book of iniquity".
47. For a similar dispute involving R. Gam. II see b. Sanh. 39 a and the discussion above in Chap. II.
48. Büchler, p. 289.
49. ibid. pp. 288-9.
50. Harnack, vol. I, p. 78. This view is a bit doubtful, it may have been true of certain classes.
51. Ex. r. Par. 43, on ch. 34:27.

#### Chapter IV.

1. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 139.
2. See ibid. p. 147 f. Origen was acquainted with a great deal of the Aggada - next to Jerome he was the greatest aggadist among the Church Fathers. See also b. Aboda Zara 4 a - the custom of Christians studying under Jewish teachers must have been common. R. Abbahu recommended the Babylonian scholar, R. Saphra,

2. praised him as a teacher among the Minim. *as a great teacher of the Jews*

3. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 147 f. Origen often acknowledges the greatness of the Jewish people, and the excellence of their knowledge and laws - a favorable reaction no doubt due to his intensive study of Hebrew and Judaism. "Origen against Celsus", Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, pp. 510-1, 562.
4. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 140.
5. *ibid.*
6. Vs. Celsum I 45, *ibid.* I 55, *ibid.* I 56. Taken from Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 140.
7. Ag. Celsus, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, p. 517, 518-21.
8. *ibid.* p. 565.
9. *ibid.* p. 463; the rejection of Jesus had been predicted - cf. II Sam. 22:44, 45.
10. See Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. V, p. 219, 221. Hippolytus, in the "Expository Treatise against the Jews", says that the Jews boasted of having killed Jesus, and that this may be the reason for their current plight. Cf. also *ibid.* vol. I, p. 194, Justin; vol. II, pp. 334-43, Clement; vol. III, p. 151, Tertullian; vol. IV, p. 402, etc., Origen; vol. V, Cyprian.
11. *ibid.* vol. V, p. 433; a refutation of this Christian view by R. Hanina bar Hama is found in b. Pesq. 87 b and Joma 56 b. *why?*
12. Ag. Celsus, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, p. 506. *yes, that's right*
13. See Justin above in Chap. II; Hom. in Jer. XVI:10 - taken from Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 145. *that's right*
14. From *ibid.* In Matt. Com. ser. IP 28. *that's right*
15. *ibid.* Hom. in Jer. XVI:10. *that's right*
16. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 141. *that's right*
17. Cf. Justin, Dialogue ch. 49, *that's right*

18. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 143; cf. Mish.

Jebam. 4:13 and Kalla 41 d.

*What do you mean by Kalla?*

19. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 145.

20. Vs. Celsus I IP 1 and IP 3. Taken from Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 145.

21. *ibid.* Com. in Matt. 11:12.

22. *ibid.* In Math. Comm. ser. IP 16.

23. Cf. Commodianus, "The Instruct. of C.", Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, p. 210.

24. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 146. Hom. in Jerm. XII:13.

25. *ibid.*

26. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. V, p. 147; in Math. Comm. ser. IP 16.

27. Ag. Celsus, Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. IV, p. 446; cf. *ibid.* vol. IV, p. 219., Commodianus, "the Instruct. of C."

28. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. V, p. 508 f, "The Treatises of Cyprian".

29. Cf. b. Ber. 10 a, the story of Beruria as discussed above, in ch. III.

30. Cf. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, p. 241-2, Lactantius, "The Epitome of the Divine Institutes".

31. Cf. *ibid.* vol. III, p. 94, "Recognitions of Clement".

32. Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. VII, p. 451-2.

33. *ibid.* p. 461.

34. *ibid.* p. 458.

35. *ibid.* pp. 459, 462.

36. *ibid.* p. 460.

37. Büchler, p. 282 f, thinks the following incidents refer to Gentile Christians.

38. Dialogue ch. 62, Justin seems to have been adept at this type of exegesis. See *ibid.* ch. 56, where commenting on Gen. 19:24, he tries to prove that the God of the patriarchs was not the same God as the creator of the world. See also *ibid.* ch. 60, the question of the God in the burning bush. For discussion, see Büchler, p. 284 f. Cf. also the saying of the gnostic, Simon Magus, in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies 16:11.
39. Gen. r. 8:8.
40. Cf. b. Sanh. 38 b; also Gen. r. 21:5, Cant. r. 1:9; Mechilta 14:18 - reference to angels in Gen. 3:22.
41. j. Ber. 12 d - 13 a.
42. See j. Ber. 12 d - 13 a, Gen. r. 8:9.
43. For a greater number of passages dealing with "Two Powers", referring either to Christianity or to Gnosticism, see Herford and also Büchler, p. 289 f.
44. Cf. Büchler, p. 289.
45. Büchler, p. 290; cf. Mish. Sanh. 4:5 and T. Sanh. 8:7.
46. See b. Suc. 48 b, Gen. r. 25:1, b. Ber. 10 a, b. Shab. 152 b.
47. j. Taanith 2:1.
48. See Jalq. Shim. P 766. The reference in this passage to the man, son of a woman, who sought to make himself God is later than R. Eleazer Hakappara to whom it is ascribed. Strack, p. 38\*; see also b. Sanh. 106 a; Ex. r. 29:5; Pesiq. r. 21.
49. See also j. Abodah Zara 2:2, Koheleth r. 10:5.
50. b. Abodah Zara 28 a.
51. Herford, p. 109 f.
52. See Herford, p. 210.
53. Cf. Gal. 3:7, also the various Church Fathers as discussed above.



## Chapter V.

1. See the references to Jesus as collected by Strack and Herford. Post-Talmudic generations collected the *1e' nia 8/11*.
2. For aggadah and aggadic method in the Church literature, see Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series vol. V and in the Jewish Encycl.
3. See Kohler, K. The Origins of Synagogue and Church. Also Oesterley, W. O. E. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy.
4. Krauss in J. Q. R. Old Series, vol. VI, p. 237 f.
5. *ibid*.
6. *ibid*. p. 238. Ep. CXXI ad Algasiam, 878.
7. *ibid*. Ruffini, *Invect.*, lib. I. c. v.; II, 589.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Sources.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. 10 vols. C.Scribner's Sons. N.Y.,1903.  
Bible.- New Testament.- The Acts of the Apostles and The Epistle  
to the Hebrews.

Herford, R. T. Christianity in Talmud and Midrash. Williams and  
Norgate. London,1903.

Strack, H. L. Jesus, Die Häretiker und Die Christen. J.C.Hin-  
richs. Leipzig,1910.

Note: The rabbinic passages cited or commented on are  
usually taken from Strack's corrected texts unless another source  
is indicated.

### II. Secondary Authorities.

Büchler, A. Über die Minim von Sepphoris und Tiberias im zweiten  
und dritten Jahrhundert, in Judaica: Festschrift zu Hermann  
Cohens siebzigstem Geburtstage. B.Cassirer. Berlin,1912.

Case, S. J. The Evolution of Early Christianity. University of  
Chicago Press. Chicago,1914.

Foakes Jackson, F. J. History of the Christian Church, from the  
Earliest Times to A. D. 461. G.H.Doran Co. N.Y.,1924.

Foakes Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K. The Beginnings of Christianity.  
Part I. The Acts of the Apostles. 5 vols. Macmillan and Co.  
London,1922-33.

Graetz, H. History of the Jews. 6 vols. Jewish Publication  
Society. Phila.,1893. Vol. II.

Guedemann, M. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien. O.Leimer.  
Leipzig,1876.

Harnack, A. The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. 2 vols. Williams. London, 1904-05.

Jewish Encyclopedia. Articles: Ebionites, Justin Martyr, Church Fathers, Didache, Didascalia.

Joel, M. Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts. 2 vols. S. Schottlaender. Breslau, 1880-83. Vol. II.

Kohler, K. The Origins of Synagogue and Church. Macmillan Co. N.Y., 1929.

Marmorstein, A. The Background of the Haggadah, in Hebrew Union College Annual. Vol. VI. Cincinnati, 1929.

Oesterley, W. O. E. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy. Oxford Press. 1925.

Smith, W. and Wace, H. A Dictionary of Christian Biography... 4 vols. J. Murray. London, 1882.

Weiss, I. H. 1-27/27 27/27 27/27 5 vols. Platt and Minkus. N.Y., 1924. Vol. II.

### III. Periodicals.

Krauss, S. Church Fathers: The Jews in the works of the Church Fathers, in The Jewish Quarterly Review. Old Series. Vol. V and Vol. VI.