Mariusz Rosik

Church and Synagogue (30-313 AD) Parting of the Ways

European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski

PETER LANG

Church and Synagogue (30–313 AD)

EUROPEAN STUDIES IN THEOLOGY,
PHILOSOPHY AND HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski

VOL. 20

PETER LANG

Mariusz Rosik

Church and Synagogue (30–313 AD)

Parting of the Ways

PETER LANG

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available online at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

This publication was financially supported by the Pontifical Theological Faculty in Wrocław.

Printed by CPI books GmbH, Leck

ISSN 2192-1857
ISBN 978-3-631-76005-5 (Print)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-77542-4 (E-PDF)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-77543-1 (EPUB)
E-ISBN 978-3-631-77544-8 (MOBI)
DOI 10.3726/b14955

© Peter Lang GmbH
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
Berlin 2019
All rights reserved.

Peter Lang – Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Warszawa · Wien

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Preface

> Awareness of Jewish roots of Christianity allows to look closely into God's plan of salvation at the beginning of which there are the chosen people of God. Within the nation, God prepared the Incarnation of the Son of God.
>
> Common spiritual heritage of Christians and Jews - *the Letter of Polish Episcopate for the fiftieth anniversary of the declaration Nostra aetate.*

The Bamberg Cathedral, consecrated in 1012, is famous not only for the fact that the mortal remains of Clemens II, the only pope buried north of the Alps, were laid to rest there. The two statues of women carved in stone that decorate the portico seem to have even greater force of attraction. They present Church and Synagogue. The first woman, dressed grandly, is wearing the royal crown on her head. The second one, who is blindfolded, a symbol of spiritual blindness, is wearing clothes of an adulterous woman exposing her feminine shapes and, as attributes, she is holding a broken lance and the Tablets of the Decalogue. Similar representations of *Ecclesia and Synagogue* were placed in the entrance façade, in the southern part of the transept of Strasbourg Cathedral, in Reims Cathedral, and in the stained-glass window of the Paris Abbey Church of St. Denis. They are also known in Poland, e.g., in the church of St. George on the historic Lech Hill and at the Golden Gate in Malbork Castle. Sermons of this type "in stone and glass" are the result of, inter alia, such beliefs and theological interpretations which were demonstrated by St. Jerome when, in the *Commentary to the Book of Hosea,* he compares Synagogue to: "A prostitute […] and adulteress […]. Synagogue is both these things." Not less shocking effects are invoked by the scenes painted with pens of Jewish writers included in the medieval treatise *Toledot Jeshu* which is often called an anti-gospel or simply a libel. This time Mary, the mother of Jesus, is shown as an immoral woman who gives herself to a heavily drinking Roman soldier. The inspiration for such an unfavourable showing of Mary's image and Jesus himself were the records of the Talmud in which the founder of Christianity is described as an illegitimate son. These reflections of the relation between Church and Synagogue, usually originating in the Middle Ages and, let us add, in many cases not devoid of artistry, are rooted in centuries-old mutual relations between believers of both religions in ancient times.

*

In 2015 the Catholic Church celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of the Second Vatican Council *Nostra aetate* (October 28, 2015), which drew a new road map for the relations with Judaism. On this occasion, Pope Francis blessed

the sculpture standing on the campus of St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia and which was named "Synagogue and Ecclesia of our time." Its author is Joshua Koffman, a local artist, and the initiative itself was taken by the Jewish community. The sculpture represents two female figures sitting next to each other. One of them is holding in her hands the New Testament and the other woman – the Torah scroll. According to the initiators' plan, the sculpture represents what Francis called "Journey of Friendship" and commemorates the achievements of Christian-Jewish dialogue in the last half century. The dialogue which is also developing in an academic form and to which, hopefully, this publication may contribute.

*

It all began with an article. One afternoon, at the beginning of 2011, I received a call from professor Krzysztof Pilarczyk of the Jagiellonian University, who invited me to take part in the project aimed at showing the person of the Founder of Christianity and His first followers in the eyes of the authors of the Talmud. The subject of the article which was published a year later in the book *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa* (ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Krakow 2012; the work published as one of the issues of the magazine *Aesthetics and criticism*) was: *Zarzewie konfliktu między Kościołem a Synagogą (until 135)*. When I started working on this article, the caesura adopted (the year 135 AD) seemed in many ways justified to me. Many researchers had been already rejecting the thesis that separation of Church from Synagogue took place at the time of creation of Jabneh academy (approx. the year 90 AD) and pointed rather at the fall of the Bar Kokhba revolt, the year 135 AD.

The project involving an attempt to provide a synthetic presentation of the factors which resulted in the emergence of two separate religions from biblical Judaism in the course of one century (since the resurrection of Christ around the year 30 to the foundation by Hadrian of the city Aelia Capitolina on the ruins of Jerusalem), seemed to be laborious, but not impossible. Theological factors played undoubtedly the greatest role in the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue but historical, social, cultural, linguistic and even economic determinants were also relevant. However, an attempt to prepare a list and only brief descriptions of these factors and characteristics in an article numbering several dozen of pages resulted in a significant sense of insufficiency and left me with the impression of work only partly completed. In the course of the research, the caesura indicating the year 135 AD was also questioned. Therefore, I decided to continue searching, so as to analyse at least partially the dating as well as the factors and determinants that have affected the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity, taking into consideration more recent publications concerning the examined issues. That is how the book has been written.

Mariusz Rosik

Contents

Introduction 11

Sources 18

Literature Review 30

Methodology 43

Part I Church within Judaism (30–70 AD)

I To the Expulsion of Jews from Rome (30–49 AD) 47

Jerusalem – Judeo-Christian Community 52

Messianism of Judeo-Christians and Messianism of other Movements within Judaism 58

The Temple in the Eyes of Judeo-Christians and other Jews 68

Understanding the Role of the Law 75

The Beginning of Apostolic Activity of Paul of Tarsus 90

Excursus: The Greco-Hellenistic Mentality and the Jewish Mentality 100

Success of Mission among the Gentiles as a Separation Factor 103

Philo of Alexandria and Biblical Allegory in Christian Exegesis 107

Acceptance of Christianity by Samaritans (c. 37 AD) 110

Early Christianity among Ethiopian Jews (c. 38 AD) 120

Riots in Jabneh (c. 40 AD) 125

Ban on Bringing Judeo-Christians to Alexandria? (41 AD) 126

Claudius' Expulsion of Jews from Rome (c. 49 AD) 131

II Until the Fall of Jerusalem (50–70 AD) 139

So-Called Council of Jerusalem (51 AD) 139

Conflict with Jewish Community in Corinth (51 AD) 145

Intensified Persecution by Jews and Romans (Approx. 60 AD). The Role of James, Brother of the Lord 148

Divinity of Christ and Monotheism of Judaism 153

The Eucharist – Nourishment for Christians and Scandal for the Jews 170

Sabbath and the Lord's Day 173

Economic Factors 185

Status of Women in Judaism and in the Early Church 186

The Status of Slaves 194

Jesus and Judaism – Through the Eyes of Mark the Evangelist 197

Jews, Christians and Fire in the Eternal City (64 AD) 202

Judaism in Qumran and Palestinian Christianity 205

First Jewish Revolt Against the Roman Empire (66–70/74 AD) 212

The Letter to the Hebrews and Theology of Substitution 222

Part II Difficult Parting – The Beginnings (71–135 AD)

I Until the Foundation of Jabneh Academy (71–89 AD) 229

Increasing Openness of Church to Non-Jews 231

The Gospel According to Matthew and the Jewish Tradition 232

Fiscus Iudaicus 242

Dual Work of Luke 251

II Until the Outbreak of Bar Kokhba Revolt (90–131 AD) 257

Academy of Jabneh (c. 90 AD) 260

Are Christians Jewish? Rabbinic Perspective 267

Question of *Birkat ha-minim* and the Lord's Prayer 268

Greek Bible in the Hands of Jews and Christians 282

Excursus: Palestinian (Galilean) Aramaic and Targumic Aramaic as a Separation Factor? ... 291

The Issue of Is 7:14b ... 299

Anti-Judaism of Johannine Writings and Exclusion from Synagogue ... 310

Apocryphal Apocalypses as Witness to the Division between Church and Synagogue ... 326

Letters to Christian Communities of St Ignatius (c. 107 AD) ... 332

Around the Reference of Pliny the Younger to Christ and Christians (110 AD) ... 335

Jewish Uprisings in the Diaspora in the Years 115–117 ... 337

Ebionites and Nazarenes – Jews or Christians? ... 342

Aristides of Athens about the Jews (c. 125 AD) ... 346

III Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 AD) ... 349

Part III On Separate Ways (136–313 AD)

I Until the First Amoraim (136–220 AD) ... 361

The Epistle of Barnabas (c. 138 AD) ... 363

Excursus: On Ancient Invective ... 366

The Chosen Nation in the Works of Justin Martyr (c. 140 AD) ... 372

Martyrdom for the Faith in the Second Century: Jewish and Christian View ... 383

The Case of Marcion (c. 144 AD) and the *Gospel of Judas* ... 386

Jewish Involvement in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp of Smyrna* (c. 156 AD) ... 389

Melito of Sardis' Accusations Against the Jews? ... 393

The Epistle to Diognetus (c. 180 AD) about the Jews ... 399

Activity of Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi ... 402

The Oldest Latin Homily *Against the Jews* (c. 190 AD) ... 405

Calendar of the Jews and Christian Dispute over the Date of the Celebration of Easter 409

Septimius Severus Against the Jews and Christians (AD 202). Tertullian 411

The Beginnings of Talmudic Tradition about Jesus and Christians 415

II Until the Milanese Rescript (221–313 AD) 433

New Demography of Palestine in the Third Century 435

Sages of Israel in Confrontation with Christians 438

The Development of Rabbinic Literature 441

Didascalia Apostolorum and *Pseudo-Clementines* on Obeying the Jewish Law 444

Jewish Exegetical Methods in Origen 449

Christian and Jewish Catacombs in Rome in the Second Half of the Third Century 458

Jewish Question at the Synod of Elvira (c. 303) 460

The Epilogue: Towards the Milanese Rescript (313 AD) 461

Conclusion 463

Abbreviations 477

The Mishnah and the Talmud 480

Qumran Texts 480

Midrash, Judeo-Hellenic and Latin Writings 480

Apocryphal Literature 481

Ancient Christian Writers 481

Other Ancient Writers 482

Bibliography 485

Index 545

Introduction

> The humanly irreconcilable difference between Jews and Christians will not be settled [until God redeems the entire world as promised in Scripture].
>
> *A statement Dabru Emet*

The first centuries of the existence of Christianity and the development of the Church in the territory of Syro-Palestine and the Mediterranean Sea basin are marked by a growing conflict with Judaism which, at that time, was going through one of the largest and, in a way, most creative crises in its history. The climax of this crisis fell on the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and with it the Temple, the central institution of the Jewish cult. Parting of the ways of the young Church and – nominally speaking – Synagogue came at the time of the decline of biblical Judaism and the time of the birth of rabbinic Judaism. The latter did not tolerate Judeo-Christians in its bosom. For the first time, the term "Judaism" in the Greek form appeared in the Hellenic Jewish literature (2Mch 2:21; 8:1; 14:38; *EstRab* 7,11), and then in the writings of Christians (Ga 1:13-14) where it was used to describe Jewish form of religiosity that was shaped after their return from Babylonian exile. The Hebrew equivalent of this term occurs only in medieval literature.[1] However, this form of Jewish religiosity changed after the caesura which is marked by the fall of the Temple and the creation of the academy of Jabneh at the end of the first century.

When it comes to the relations between Judaism and Christianity, it seems clear today that the term "Christian" should be purified of the stereotyped understanding of our time, especially when we use it in relation to the followers of Christ in the first century. This term appears in the New Testament only three times (Ac 11:26; 26:28; 1P 4:16). In Antioch where disciples of the Master of Nazareth had been named for the first time "Christians," the term indicated belonging to Christ in contrast to the Gentiles who did not know Christ. Definitely, this term was not used to indicate the opposition to Judaism.[2]

---

1 K. Pilarczyk, *Rabinizacja judaizmu we wczesnym okresie pobiblijnym*, in: *Pan moim światłem. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Jerzego Chmiela w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, 286–287.

2 In the first ten years after the resurrection of Christ, his followers called themselves "brethren," which emphasized their mutual solidarity, or "saints" which, on the one hand, indicated those who adopted baptism "separating" them - in accordance with the Hebrew idea of holiness - from those who did not accept it; on the other hand, it constituted an appeal to the moral holiness. W. Chrostowski after D.H. Sternum believes that "Christians" means much the same as "people of Christ",

During the Princeton symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the origin of the Church, which was held in 1997, Donald H. Juel shared his experience on the works relating to the Gospel according to Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, which were carried out during the meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature. One of the experiments involved asking the participants of the discussion to avoid the term "Christian" with reference to the members of the Church in the first century, since the followers of Christ practically did not call themselves Christians at that time. It turned out that during the discussion, the scholars repeatedly uttered the word "Christian" to express the opposition against the "Jews," and then, realising the error," they smiled nervously and looked for proper substitutes. The most frequently used substitute was the term "Palestinian movement of Jesus" because there is no doubt that Christianity emerged from Judaism within which it originally constituted one group.[3]

In September 1989, Philip S. Alexander at the symposium organized by Durham University started his lecture entitled *"The Parting of the Ways"*[4] *from the perspective of Rabbinic Judaism* with the question: "When did Christianity and Judaism part and go their separate ways?"[5] The question "when?" determines historical perspective of searching for an answer, from the point of view of rabbinic Judaism. Struggling with the task, the investigator from University of Manchester created

---

i.e. the Messiah; W. Chrostowski, *Między Synagogą a Kościołem. Dzieje św. Pawła*, Kraków – Ząbki 2015, 85.

3 The author of these reflections states that the texts of the New Testament should rather be called "pre-Christian" or "proto-Christian"; D.H. Juel, *The Future of a Religious Past: Qumran and Palestinian Jesus Movement*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, III, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 65.

4 The term "parting of the ways" in relation to Church and Synagogue was used for the first time by James Parkes in his book *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (New York, 1934). Earlier this formula had generally been used by Catholics in regard to Protestants. However, the precursor of Parkes was F.J. Foakes Jackson, editor of a collection of articles published in London in 1912 entitled *The Parting of the Roads: Studies in the Development of Judaism and Early Christianity*. Further proofs of the usage of the wording *parting of the ways* with regard to Christian-Jewish relations in the first centuries are as follows: A. Cohen, *The Parting of the Ways: Judaism and the Rise of Christianity*, London 1954; R. Murray *The Parting of the Ways*, CJR 20 (1987) 42–44; R. Bauckham, *The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why*, OT 47 (1993) 135–151; and V. Martin, *A House Divided: The Parting of the Ways Between Synagogue and Church*, New York 1995.

5 "When did Christianity and Judaism part company and go their separate ways?" - the lecturer was saying, pointing concurrently out, that although the question was formulated in principle with the use of historical terminology, the answer may not remain at this level, but must reach the theological layer; P.S. Alexander, *"The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 1.

an interesting picture. In his opinion Christianity and Judaism constitute today two separate circles, but if one went back in the timeline, it would turn out that as late as in the fourth century both circles still had a significant common part and in the middle of the first century the Christian circle was completely contained in the circle of Judaism. This (maybe too geometric) comparison helps us realize that Christianity stemmed from biblical Judaism and at the beginning all the believers in Christ were Jewish.

Until recently, researchers have accepted a traditional image for the emergence of Christianity from Jewish religion, an image that can be summarized as follows: Jesus was a Jew and He addressed his message to his Jewish followers who created the "early Christianity" as one of the groups within Judaism, like Pharisees or Essenes. But when the Christian message reached the Gentiles who entered the Church, the believers of Christ were not confined within the strict framework of the Synagogue with its pressure on keeping the Sabbath, observance of dietary rules and circumcision. They were excluded from it and as a result a new religion developed. This simple scheme has been criticized by scholars of religion, historians of religion, theologians, exegetes and representatives of other branches of science and the criticism has led to the conclusion that the reality which was described in this vision by the simple word "Judaism" did not exist in its final shape at the time of Jesus. Judaism of Jesus was not the same Judaism which appeared after the year 90 because the biblical form of Jewish religiosity differs significantly from what was named "rabbinic Judaism" and was created in a mature form at least two or three generations after the appearance of Christianity.[6] Therefore, one cannot without running the risk of an error explicitly state that Judaism of rabbinic provenance is identical to the religion practised by Jews after returning from Babylonian exile because a lot of factors influenced the significant transformation of postexilic form of religiousness. Religious factors belong to the essential ones (at the top of them there are the establishment of the Church and the activities of the academy of Jabneh which constituted the answer to the developing Christian missions) and historical factors (such as the Jewish uprising which broke out in the year 66 and four years later led to the fall of the Temple).

Almost a century ago many researchers believed that the *parting of the ways* took place in the lifetime of Jesus who created a new religion.[7] However, such a view did not stand the test of time because it was commonly believed that the process of the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue came directly after the death of Jesus and the decisive factor would be the announcement of

---

6 R.A. Horsley, *Conquest and Social Conflict in Galilee*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 129; W. Chrostowski, *Kościół a Izrael*, CT 73 (2003) 1, 73–74.

7 Thus: J. Parkes, *Rome, Pagan and Christian*, in: *Judaism and Christianity*, ed. H. Loewe, New York 1937, 115–116.

his resurrection by the apostles. This path in research also occurred to be wrong. Resurrection cannot be a factor introducing a new religion since it was known in Judaism already in the second century BC (*Books of Enoch*), it was proclaimed by Essenes (*On Resurrection*, 4Q 521), precursors of Pharisees (*Psalms of Salomon*), and the Pharisees themselves.

The faith in the resurrection of the Messiah can also be proved by a stele discovered a few years ago. A stone tablet, coming out of Jordan, contains eighty-seven lines of a text written in Hebrew. It is highly probable that the inscription speaks of a suffering Messiah who will rise from the dead after three days. One of its lines reads: "In three days you will know that evil will be defeated by justice." Then words appear that are attributed to the Archangel Gabriel and are addressed to the Messiah: "In three days you shall live."[8] Moses Bar Asher, one of the greatest authorities of Hebrew Studies, the president of the Academy of the Hebrew Language in Jerusalem, concludes that the idea of the resurrection on the third day after death was working its way through the minds of the Jews shortly before the birth of Jesus. If the research results of the stele prove plausible, this will mean that Jesus took over the idea and then it was adopted by his believers. In a way, it is a reassuring thought as it means that Jesus with his views fits fully into one of the Judaic trends of the Messianic tradition.[9]

The late Jesuit, father Daniel J. Harrington (who died in February, 2014), the long-time Chair of the Biblical Studies Department at Boston College School of Theology and Ministry, confided that if he was to answer the question when the ways of Judaism and Christianity parted, he would react using the formula which has already become classic: "In different places, at different times." In his synthetic study entitled *L'emergere graduale della Chiesa e la "separazione ('the parting of the ways') tra ebraismo e cristianesimo*," he presented three stages on the way leading to the separation between Church and Synagogue: Christianity within Israel (as evidenced by the letters of Paul, especially the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians), rivalry between the two religious groups (what can be inferred from the reading of the Gospels according to Matthew and John), and crossing the border of historical Israel by Christians (which is reflected in the Epistle to the Colossians and the Epistle to the Ephesians). The researcher stipulates he does not advocate the thesis that separation of the Church from Synagogue took place in

8 The text of the inscription was read in this way in 2007 by the excellent Israeli linguist Israel Knohl, but two years later he admitted that the text can also be translated differently: "After three days – a sign"; T. Elgvin, *Eschatology and Messianism in the „Gabriel Inscription"*, JJMJS 1 (2014) 5–6.

9 I. Knohl, *The Apocalyptic and Messianic Dimensions of the Gabriel Revelation in Their Historical Context*, in: *Hazon Gabriel. New Readings of the Gabriel* Revelation, M. Henze, SBLMS 29, Atlanta 2011, 57–59.

times of the New Testament, but merely notes that traces of all three stages of this separation can be found in the New Testament.[10]

The attempt to explain the complex and many-sided process of parting of the ways between the two religious circles in the years 30–313 constitutes the main research subject of this publication.[11] Undoubtedly, it is the first century which is the richest in consequences as far as the process is concerned; later, the division which had already ensued in many regions only worsened and became more complicated in the sense that this process took place with varying intensity in different regions of the ancient world. Let us add right away that in most of the existing studies, only the Roman Empire was taken into consideration and the relations between Christians and Jews in the areas to the east of the ancient Palestine were almost ignored. However, it appears that the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue in the regions of old Mesopotamia and Persia was slower and was characterized by other determinants.

The first century AD is a significant period for Judaism as well as for Christianity emerging from it. For Judaism it is marked by the activities of apocalyptic, proselytizing and zealotic movements. It is also marked by the first Jewish war (66-73/4 AD), during which the Temple in Jerusalem was destroyed. It is marked by demise of biblical Judaism and the birth of rabbinic Judaism in Jabneh environment. Finally, it is marked by activities of the Jewish historian Josephus and a philosopher Philo of Alexandria. At the same time Christianity is on the rise. Some of the Jews believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah sent from the Father and they began a movement (or better "the Way"; cf. Ac 9:2) which led to the emergence of a new religion on the map of cults of the ancient world. The faith whose origin was deeply rooted in biblical Judaism, quickly reached the Gentiles (mainly thanks to Paul of Tarsus). The influx of the Gentiles to the Church and the emergence of new ecclesial communities in the Mediterranean Sea basin were very important factors in the process of strengthening Christian's position and at the same time separation from the official Judaism until the total break up. *Terminus ad quem* in our research is the year 313, the year of publishing by Constantine the rescript called

10 D.J. Harrington, *L'emergere graduale della Chiesa e la "separazione ('the parting of the ways') tra ebraismo e cristianesimo"*, w: *Gesù Cristo e il popolo ebraico: Inerrogativi per la teologia di oggi*, ed. P.A. Cunningham, J. Sievers, M.C. Boys, H.H. Henrix, J. Svartvik, Roma 2012, 149–150.

11 Sometimes the time span between the death and resurrection of Christ and the time of Constantine is called "early Christianity." Mark Humphries, author of the book entitled *Early Christianity*, in the following way designates the clear caesuras of the period under consideration: "It may be worth beginning with a definition of what is meant in this book by 'early Christianity'. Let me take 'early' first. I will be analysing Christianity between the life of Jesus Christ, in the early first century AD, and the conversion of the Roman emperor Constantine (306–37) to Christianity at the beginning of the fourth"; M. Humphries, *Early Christianity*, London – New York 2006, 9.

Milanese. Is the fourth century, as many researchers claim, in fact 'the first century of Judaism and Christianity'?[12]

This study is not as much focused on the question "When?", as it is on the attempt of bringing us closer to the answer to the question "How?" How did the separation of Church from Synagogue come about? What processes worked behind the separation of Christianity from Judaism? What factors affected the parting of these two currently separate religions? The research will not be confined to theological issues only, but it will be of a more comprehensive (although not exhaustive) nature, concerning social, historical and political areas as well. Already at the very beginning of this research, two issues should be emphasized which, in the light of hitherto research carried out by many biblical scholars, theologians and Church historians, are accepted as indisputable.

In the first place, the separation of Church from Synagogue (Christianity and Judaism) was not a one-time act, but a long-lasting, multi-layered, and diversified process.[13] Even if many researchers try to specify that moment in time (indicating the early nineties and the Jabneh environment[14] or the fall of the Bar Kokhba revolt), still the decision of the rabbis on the exclusion of Christians from Synagogue or the decision of the followers of Christ to break the ties with Synagogue had been germinating for years.[15] Those were not only the rabbis who decided to break the ties

12 J. Neusner, *The Three Stages in the Formation of Judaism*, Brown Judaic Studies, Chico 1985, 77; G. Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century*, Edinburgh 1999, 1. R.A. Kraft has no doubt that "it is quite obvious that the ways that led to classical Christianity and rabbinic Judaism did indeed part by the fourth century"; R.A. Kraft, *The Weighing of the Parts. Pivots and Pitfalls in the Study of Early Judaisms and their Early Christian Offspring*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 87 (it is worth paying attention to plural: *Judaisms*). These authors' theses have been questioned by D. Boyarin; *Semantic Differences; or, "Judaism"/"Christianity"*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 66.

13 W.A. Meeks after analysis of the texts of the New Testament, in view of relationship of Church and representatives of Judaism, jumps to a simple conclusion: "The path of separation, then, was not single or uniform"; W.A. Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians. Selected Essays*, New Haven – London 2001, 132.

14 M. Goodman, *Modelling the "Parting of the Ways"*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 122; W. Chrostowski, *Żydzi i religia żydowska a Maryja Matka Jezusa*, SM 2 (2000) 1, 219.

15 Advocates of such an approach often name religion of the Jews in the shape which it adopted in the 1st century AD, as "late Judaism" (Ger. *Spätjudentum*, English. *late Judaism*); A.S. Jacobs, *The Lion and the Lamb. Reconsidering Jewish-Christian Relations in Antiquity*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity*

with Christianity. Christians saw themselves as a natural continuation of biblical Judaism, at the same time rejecting the form of religiosity proposed by the rabbis.[16] It cannot be unequivocally stated that "the parting" occurred after the destruction of the Temple or after the fall of the Bar Kokhba revolt, or even a century later.[17] Secondly, Judeo-Christians played a significant (if not a decisive) role in this process. They were the ones who argued in favour of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah expected by the Jews and at the same time they opened the door of the new faith for the Hellenistic and Roman cultures, not linked to Judaism.

The parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue is based on two unquestionable facts: its evolutionary character and the role of Christians descended from Judaism. These two issues are the backbone of first the tension, then the conflict and finally even mutual disfavour and hostility which to a great extent was characteristic of the history of Church and Synagogue in the first three centuries. Tension, conflict and disfavour arose around the person of Christ and interpretation of his role in the history of salvation and around consequences (theological, liturgical and social) resulting from this reading.[18] Finally, the attempt to look at the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity must lead to a thoroughly fundamental question about the One who in the eyes of Saul of Tarsus is "to the Jews an obstacle they cannot get over, to the Gentiles foolishness, but to those who have

---

and the Early Middle Ages, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 98.

16 B. Chilton and J. Neusner remark: "the earliest Christians insisted that they formed 'Israel' and devoted rigorous thought to the demonstration that theirs was the Torah's sole valid meaning and their Founder its unique medium of fulfilment"; B. Chilton, J. Neusner, *Judaism in the New Testament. Practices and Beliefs*, London – New York 1995, 4.

17 Previous proposals according to which Judaism and Christianity started to function as separate religions already in Jesus' lifetime (1), just after His resurrection from the dead (2), from the beginning of the apostolic activity of Paul of Tarsus (3), since the martyr death of the Jerusalem bishop James in the year 62 (4) or after outbreak of the Jewish Uprising against the Romans (66 AD) and the fall of the Temple in 70 (5) have already been contested; M. Himmelfarb, *The Parting of the Ways Reconsidered: Diversity in Judaism and Jewish-Christian Relations in the Roman Empire. 'A Jewish Perspective'*, in: *Interwoven Destinies: Jews and Christians Through the Ages*, ed. E. Fisher, New York 1993, 47–61; J.G. Gager, *The Parting of the Ways; A View from the Perspective of Early Christianity: 'A Christian Perspective'*, in: *Interwoven Destinies: Jews and Christians Through the Ages*, ed. E. Fisher, New York 1993, 70–73; P. Fredriksen, *What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 34.

18 M.C. Boys, *Doing Justice to Judaism: The Challenge to Christianity*, JES 49 (2014) 1, 107–108.

been called, whether they are Jews or Greeks, a Christ who is both the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1Co 1:23-24).

Sources

The source *par excellence* of the research carried out in this work remains in the first place the New Testament and in it above all the so-called historical books (with ancient historiography properly understood), that is to say four canonical Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Acts, whose authorship is attributed to Luke, describe directly the events which led to the distancing of the Church from the *millieu* of Judaism within which the ecclesiastical community shaped. Deeper understanding of the approaching break-up can be found in Gospels which provide insight into the discrepancies of theological nature, rooted substantially in the teaching of Jesus.[19] Not without significance is also, especially when discussing detailed issues, the use of other books of the New Testament, in particular the Pauline letters, and this is for two reasons: firstly, these books are generally older than the Gospels, so they give insight into the very beginning of the differences between the community believing in Jesus' resurrection and other Jews who did not share the view; secondly, their authors were the Jews who, after the adoption of the message of Christ, in the overwhelming majority, turned away from certain habits and beliefs of their fathers and thus stood in opposition to the supporters of the existing form of Judaism which rejected the message of Jesus of Nazareth.[20]

Apart from the canonical books of Christian provenance, the oldest references to Jesus and Christians in the works of the Jewish and Roman writers should also be considered as sources. The first group must include the rabbinic scriptures to which the Mishnah, Tosefta, Gemara and two versions of the Talmud (Palestinian and Babylonian) belong.[21] The Mishnah is the primary source of information on early rabbinic Judaism. It was given its final form about 200 AD in Palestine, under the auspices of Judah I, known as Rabbi or Judah ha-Nasi (Jehuda ha-Nasi). The work that takes its name from the Hebrew verb that means "repeat' contains a record of the oral traditions. The rabbis – in the vast majority the descendants of the first Pharisees – believed that the traditions were transmitted by God to Moses at Mount Sinai.

---

19 U. Szwarc, *Jezus a judaizm*, in: *Mów, Panie, bo słucha sługa Twój. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Ryszarda Rubinkiewicza SDB w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, Warszawa 1999, 198–205.

20 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, Kraków 2009^{2}, 185.

21 The religious, social, historical and political background of rabbinic writings as well as their essential content are presented in the work *The Literature of Sages*, I, *Oral Torah, Halakha, Mishna and Tosefta, the Talmud, External Tractates*, ed. S. Safrai, CRJNT, Philadelphia 1987.

One can speak about the "first Mishnah" even before the destruction of the Temple and track down its origin in the activity of rabbi Akiba. It was formulated by his disciple, Rabbi Meir and the final version was prepared by Judah ha-Nasi. The researchers do not agree whether Akiba and Meir actually wrote down certain tractates or their fragments, or if they only transmitted them orally. The same refers to Judah ha-Nasi: it seems not to be possible for one man to edit the whole of Mishnah.[22] However, this is not an issue of primary importance. The most important fact is that the Mishnah shaped itself within rabbinic Judaism and its roots date back to biblical Judaism and then the time in which the first Christian community appeared. Thus, it cannot be excluded that in this work one may find echoes of anti-Christian polemics and this would prove particularly valuable for the research presented in this study.

A collection parallel to the Mishnah was the Tosefta, containing "additions" and a supplement to the latter. The Tosefta, just like the Mishnah, is divided into identical orders and tractates, with the exception of four of the latter. It cannot be determined with absolute certainty who the final editor of this work was. According to the Talmud, the Tosefta was redacted by rabbi Nehemiah (contemporary to Meir), while rabbi Sherira assigns it to rabbi Chijja bar Abba, what sets the date of its creation for c. 300 AD. Reading the Tosefta itself causes confusion because many sentences are not logically connected. Everything becomes obvious only when the work is read along with the Mishnah. However, it contains some parts which are not linked to the Mishnah. The compilers of the Tosefta arranged sentences it contains according to a specific structure: firstly, there are quotes from the Mishnah, then the sentences whose sense cannot be understood in isolation from the latter and finally at the end there are the Tosefta's own sentences not linked to the Mishnah.

The commentaries on the Mishnah which started to be written in the third century AD were recorded in the Gemara.[23] The Gemara was essentially created due to the fact that in the Mishnah contrary and mutually exclusive opinions had appeared. These contradictions had to be explained, so the Gemara recorded discussions of several generations of rabbis. Since these explanations were elaborated in two different centres, in Palestine and Mesopotamia, hence the Talmud, which is a combination of the Mishnah and the Gemara, exists in two versions. One is known as the Babylonian Talmud and the other is known as either the Palestinian or the Jerusalem Talmud. The Talmud is the most normative text of rabbinic Judaism.[24] Regarding the Palestinian Talmud, the Babylonian rabbis began

22 G. Stemberger, *Il Talmud. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, trans. D. Moretti, Bologna 1989, 46–57; cf. J.J. Schoeps, *Miszna*, in: *Nowy leksykon judaistyczny*, ed. J.H. Schoeps, trans. S. Lisiecka, Warszawa 2007, 556–558.

23 H. Freedman, *Talmud. Biografia*, trans. A. Czwojdrak, Kraków 2015, 9–10.

24 W. Chrostowski, *Rabiniczny wizerunek Jezusa i chrześcijaństwa w kontekście dialogu Kościoła z Żydami i judaizmem*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych.*

to use the term "the Talmud of the Land of Israel" or "the Western Talmud," but later the name – the Jerusalem Talmud (JT) was commonly adopted. Concurrently to the JT its Babylonian equivalent was created. According to the tractate *Bawa Metzia* (86a) the final editors of the Babylonian Talmud were Rabina and Rab Ashi. The latter probably died in 427. Therefore, the editing would fall on the first quarter of the fifth century. The activity of the first one, however, has given rise to certain difficulties, since it turns out that there were two teachers named Rabina. The first was contemporary with rabbi Ashi, the second died in 499. If he is mentioned by *Bawa metzia*, then the final edition of the work would fall on the end of the fifth century.[25]

When making use of rabbinic sources in the description of the mutual relations of Synagogue and Church in the first three centuries of the Christian era, two facts should be taken into account. The first is that the final edition of some of these writings was published several centuries after the final disunion between Church and Synagogue. It is true that rabbis referred with great care and attention to the accuracy of the teaching messages of their predecessors (including Pharisees), but it does not exclude the possibility of attribution to the teachers of the Torah some statements never uttered by them and created much later.[26] The second fact that

---

Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 345.

25 When it comes to dating the final edition of the Talmud, it seems extremely important to take into account the sources of the work. It is not enough to say that it is basically the Mishnah since it had different redactions. The text of the Mishnah adopted in BT is often very different from the one approved by JT. More considerable differences appear in interpretation of the Mishnah. Because it constituted a generally accepted and commonly approved model of religious life, no one could change it. However, both in Palestine and in Babylon, different religious traditions had formed. The effort of the authors of the Talmud often relied on harmonizing them with the text of the Mishnah. This harmonization perforce had to go in different directions in both centres. Until recently, there prevailed a view among researchers that editors of the BT made use of the JT as a source and in cases when both versions were different, they simply rejected the teaching of the JT. Today, many researchers have already turned down the thesis and the considerable similarities between the two versions of the Talmud are attributed to the fact that many Babylon rabbis studied at Jerusalem schools.

26 *Toledot Jeshu* is the late work of anti-Christian nature. It was well-known in the diaspora environment in Europe and in the Middle East in the 9th century. The text has been preserved in many versions. It may be an echo of anti-Christian polemics of the first centuries, but it should not be in any way considered as a reliable source for research on the history of the disunion between Church and Synagogue; A. Paciorek, *Jezus z Nazaretu. Czasy i wydarzenia*, Częstochowa 2015, 49. It ought to be added that it does not provide information about the initial Church, although the work itself, according to its creators, was to be a lampoon imitating the Gospel according to Matthew. It seems that among Christian writings contemporary to *Toledot Jeshu*, there is no counterpart of the work that in such a repulsive way would refer to

should be taken into account when using these sources is the awareness that the debate among scholars on which fragments actually relate to Christ or Christians, has not been finalized to this day.

Among other sources, the work *Antiquitates judaicae* by Josephus (born Yosef ben Matityahu) comes to the forefront. It contains so-called *testimonium Flavianum* (*Ant.* 18,3,3).[27] The author was of priestly descent.[28] He was born in Jerusalem in 37 AD and died in Rome in 94. The name of the noble Flavian line together with Roman citizenship were granted to him by Vespasian for his loyalty to Rome after bringing his own squad in Galilea into captivity during the uprising which broke out in the year 66. *Antiquitates* is a historiographic work, recounting in twenty volumes history from the creation of the world (i.e. *de facto* from the prehistoric period) to the outbreak of the first Jewish uprising in 66 AD. Although the events described by Josephus only marginally touch on the time of the arising Christianity (approx. thirty years), the author provides valuable background material showing the development of the emerging Church.

The same applies to the second great work by Josephus entitled *De bello judaico*. It was written in Aramaic shortly after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 (around the year 73), and then issued in seven books in Greek. Balanced judgement of data contained in *De bello judaico* by Josephus allows to shed some light on the question of the Jewish-Roman relations.[29] Two other works of the Jewish historian known by his Roman name may also be helpful here: *Vita* and *Contra Apionem*.[30] Against

---

some of the great characters of Judaism; W. Chrostowski, *Jezus a religijna żydowska tradycja*, CT 63 (1993) 2, 93.

27 On the importance of Titus Flavius Josephus' writings for the debate on relations between Church and Synagogue see: M. Hadas-Lebel, *Józef Flawiusz. Żyd rzymski*, Warszawa 1997, 9; J. Ciecieląg, *Palestyna w czasach Jezusa. Dzieje polityczne*, Prace Monograficzne 285, Kraków 2000, 17. cf. also: J.H. Charlesworth, *Jesus, Early Jewish Literature, and Archeology*, in: *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*, ed. by J.H. Charlesworth, New York 1991, 189–192.

28 A monumental work on Joseph Flavius collected works of such researchers as S.J.D. Cohen, L. Troiani, L.H. Feldman, F. Parente, M. Hadas-Lebel, J. Maier, C. Thoma, S. Mason, J. Sievers, L.I. Levine or M. Goodman. It is entitled *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period* (ed. F. Parente, J. Sievers, SPB 41, Leiden – New York – Köln 1994). See also: S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, Peabody 1993 (especially the chapter, "The Significance of Josephus for the New Testament Study"; ibid., 230–235).

29 M. Rosik, *Literatura żydowska okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, in: M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, Bibliotheca Biblica, Wrocław 2009, 105–107.

30 The works of Josephus should be approached with some mental restriction. The author, by many compatriots deemed traitor, describes the history of his people in such a way as not to misrepresent the Romans and especially the emperor, who accepted him at his court, in a bad light. On the understanding and presentation of

such background the relationship between Judaism and Christianity can be seen even more clearly.

The picture cannot be complete without the writings of Philo of Alexandria. They do not refer directly to the relationship between Church and Synagogue; however, they provide a broad background for Judaism, including Judaism of the diaspora, in which Christianity rooted itself in the first century.[31] Philo of Alexandria, writing in the first century AD, undoubtedly belonged to the intellectual Jewish elite in Egypt. He might have been of priestly descent and he had certainly received excellent Jewish as well as Hellenistic education. He knew the culture perfectly well, especially Greek philosophy. We can assume, however, that he did not know the Hebrew language. Philo's objective was to bring Judaism closer to his readers.[32] His most important works include: *De specialibus legibus*, *Hypothetica*, *Legatio ad Gaium*, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, *De praemiis et poenis*, *De vita Mosis*, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, *In Flaccum* (also known as *Adversus Flaccum* or *Contra Flaccum*). It seems that philosophical treatises on metaphysical, ethical and psychological issues were the first to be created. (*De aeternitate mundi*, *De providentia, Alexander sive de eo quod rationem habeant bruta animalia*).

Many of Philo's works were dedicated to explanation of the Torah (*Legum allegoriae, De gigantibus, De confusione linguarum, De somniis, Quaestiones in Genesim, Quaestiones in Exodus*). The systematic-theological treatises include: *De opificio mundi, De Abrahamo, De Iosepho, De Decalogo, De circumcisione, Monarchia*). In addition to the above mentioned *De vita Mosis* and *Contra Flaccum*, among the historical and apologetic treatises there were also *De vita contemplativa* and *De Sampsone* (considered to be inauthentic), *De Jon De mundo, Interpretatio Hebraicorum nominum* and *Liber antiuitatum biblicarum*.[33] It seems quite interesting that Philo's works have survived to our times mainly because they were cited in Christian writings.

---

history by Flavius see: *Making History. Josephus and Historical Method, SJSJ 110, ed. Z. Rodgers, Leiden – Boston 2007.*

31 J.J. Collins, *Natural Theology and Biblical Tradition: The Case of Hellenistic Judaism*, CBQ 60 (1998) 7.

32 Nevertheless, C.D. Moldenhawer, creating a catalogue of the royal library in Copenhagen, did not hesitate to place Philo's works in the first volume among *Patres Graeci*; he did so because of a similar understanding of the Old Testament in Philo and in Christianity; S. Giversen, *The Covenant - theirs or ours?*, in: *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody 1997, 15.

33 On the use of the works by Philo by early Christian writers see: D.T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, 3, *A Survey*, CRJNT, Minneapolis 1993. In the first place, the author discusses possible links of Philo's works with the New Testament and then he analyses how his writings were used by the early Christian writers such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Didymus, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ambrose and Augustine.

From among the works that had been written by Jewish authors, the writings by Justus of Tiberias and Thallus may be helpful. The first one coming from Galilea, though hated by Flavius Josephus, provides interesting information on the history of the Jews from the time of Moses to Agrippa. Thallus on the other hand – as some historians want it – probably mentions in his work the darkness that reportedly filled the world at the death of Christ. His work could have been written in the middle of the first century.

Furthermore, we should not ignore the mention of Jesus and Christians in a private letter written by a certain Syrian philosopher to his son. Mara bar Serapion, writing shortly after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem and having in perspective his forthcoming death, encourages his offspring to seek wisdom pointing at the outstanding figures of the wise men including Jesus. Serapion's mention of Christians is valuable not only because it is probably the oldest record on Jesus written by a Gentile, but it is also an example of a positive outlook on the teaching of Jesus of Nazareth.[34]

In this study, short passages from the works of non-Christian and non-Jewish writers of the Greco-Roman world have been used: Suetonius (Gaius Svetonius Tranquillus), Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus Maior), Pliny the Younger (Gaius Plinius Secundus Minor), Tacitus (Publius Cornelius Tacitus), Lucian of Samosata and Plutarch. Suetonius in the *Lives of the Caesars* writes about an edict of Claudius, expelling all Jews from Rome. The reason for the decision of the emperor were allegedly riots and anxieties initiated by Christians. The Latin title of the only surviving work by Suetonius is: *De vita duodecim Caesarum libri VIII*. It contains biographies of the following emperors: Julius Caesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellus, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian.[35] In the *Lives* non-essential information is mixed with one of crucial importance. For the most part, the author did not care to distinguish between insignificant facts and events of major importance, but the amount of collected material seems sufficient to reconstruct the history of the Imperial Rome.

Pliny the Elder is irreplaceable in portraying the history of Palestine. A valuable source, in this respect, is his *Historia naturalis*, a 37-volume work that was written by the author while providing assistance to the victims of eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in 79 AD. Pliny probably belonged to Titus' general staff who in 70 attacked Jerusalem, hence his descriptions of the siege of the city and the entire Jewish war appear to be those of an eye-witness. Some researchers have argued that Pliny, in his work *History naturalis,* mentioned Christians that were called by him "Nazarenes": "Nunc interiora dicantur. Coele habet Apameam Marysa amne divisam a Nazerinorum tetrarcha, Bambycen quae alio nomino Hierapolis vocatur, Syris vero Mabog" (V). In-depth linguistic research of the fragment which was

34 A. Paciorek, *Jezus z Nazaretu. Czasy i wydarzenia*, 52–53.

35 M. Cytowska, H. Szelest, *Literatura rzymska. Okres cesarstwa*, Warszawa 1992, 408–410.

written prior to 77 AD shows clearly that the author had in mind geographical identification rather than religious one.[36] Anyway, his works constitute for us an invaluable source of information on shaping of historical, political and social background of the time in which Christianity was developing.

Coming from Como (Northern Italy), Pliny the Younger testifies that Christians pray to Christ as to God.[37] He writes about it in a letter to emperor Trajan. Pliny the Younger's *Epistulae* are usually dated 97-109 AD. The sender in an excellent, comprehensible, albeit concise way describes the drastic persecution that affected Christians.

Among the works of Tacitus, member of a patrician family, *Historiae* and *Annales* deserve the most attention. The first one consisted of twelve books, but to this day only four books have survived in their entirety. The fifth book has survived only partially with one fragment in which Tacitus tells the story of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman legions under Titus, including in his description also Jewish history and religion.[38] Unfortunately, books VII-X, devoted to the time between the death of Tiberius (37 AD) and the middle of the reign of Claudius (approx. 47 AD) have not survived. Neither has most of book V, depicting the years 29-31. These materials could be of particular value for researchers of the original Church. The author boasted about describing events *sine ira et studio* ("without either bitterness or partiality"; *Historiae* 2,50), and added: "I have undertaken to collect fabulous tales and to delight my readers with fictitious stories; I cannot, however, dare to deny the truth of common tradition." (ibidem)

The second important work of this author, entitled *Annales* (the full title is: *Annales ab excessu divi Augusti*), was written under the rule of Trajan. In this case, six of fifteen books have been preserved in their entirety. The work covers the period between the death of Augustus Caesar in AD 14 and the year 69, that is the time the reign of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Tacitus in *Annales* tries to draw a background for the fire of the Eternal City at the time of Nero. The work provides us with valuable information on the history of Christianity in the Roman Empire and indirectly it also shows the relationship between Christians and Jews. As far as the method of description is concerned, Tacitus explains: "I have added no touch of the marvellous" *(Ann.* 11,27). Although he tries to be faithful to the principle of causality, combining events as resulting from each other, he does not avoid referring to metaphysical factors. Permeated with political passion, the historian does not deny the interference of deities in the history of the empire, which he describes

36 R.A. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity. From the End of the New Testament Period until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century*, Jerusalem 1988, 16–17.

37 Cursing Christ as a criminal convicted by Roman law was in accordance with the reason of state of the empire. The content of one of the letters by Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 10,96) allows to assume that the emperor knew well who Christ was; A. Paciorek, *Jesus of Nazareth. Czasy i wydarzenia*, 51.

38 M. Cytowska, H. Szelest, *Literatura rzymska. Okres cesarstwa*, 408–410.

relying mainly on the works of Pliny the Elder and such documents as *Acta Senatus or Acta diurna populi Romani*.

Born into a poor Syrian family from Samosata over the Euphrates, Lucian mentions Christians in several of his works. He does not attack them in a direct way (as in the case of other religious groups), but he does not refer to them favourably. He approves their mutual care, but regards Christian religion to be bizarre and its Founder to be a cheater. Three of his works should be taken into account here: *The Passing of Peregrinus, Alexander the False Prophet* and *The Lover of Lies*.

The analysis of Plutarch's writings may also prove valuable for our study. He was born into a prominent family in the town of Chaeronea. Plutarch is the author of an impressive number of biographical works, but not all of them have survived to our time. The most important ones include the biographies of Heracles and Hesiod of Ascra in Boeotia, Pindar of Thebes and Crates of Thebes, the biographies of the Roman Emperors Galba and Otho as well as a series of twenty three pairs of biographies of famous Greek and Roman characters, included in *Bioi paralleloi* (*Parallel Lives*). The author of the biographies sets himself a clear goal – he wishes to show the truth about man, disregarding neither the virtues nor the flaws in his character. He avoids idealization and apotheosis. The idea behind this concept of biography is to make it possible for the reader to look at his or her own life through the prism of lives of well-known people. Artistic assumptions are, therefore, subordinated to the objectives of teaching, but teaching does not mean resorting to fiction.[39] Plutarch arranges the biographies according to peripatetic pattern: birth (origin, upbringing, education) – acts (*prakseis*) – death (circumstances).[40] This type of literature also shows a context of the events which will be presented in this study.

With the appropriate methodological approach, the use of some apocryphal works and Qumran texts[41] may prove helpful in demonstrating the incentives for Christian-Jewish conflict. Apocrypha of Judaic provenance help to enrich the Judaic image of the coming of Messiah and the events associated with His arrival[42]

---

39 W. Tyszkowski, *Plutarchos*, in: *Słownik pisarzy antycznych*, ed. A. Świderkówna Warszawa 1982, 378.

40 K. Korus, *Plutarch z Cheronei*, in: *Literatura Grecji starożytnej*, II, *Proza historyczna, krasomówstwo, filozofia i nauka, literatura chrześcijańska*, ed. H. Podbielski, Źródła i monografie 255, Lublin 2005, 241–270.

41 D. Dimant, *Hebrew Pseudoepigrapha at Qumran*, in: *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. Tigchelaar, BETL CCLXX, Leuven – Paris – Walpole 2014, 89-–104.

42 Those texts, according to M. McNamara, also include Johannine Apocalypse; *I Targum e il Nuovo Testamento. Le parafrasi aramaiche della bibbia ebraica e il loro apporto per una migliore comprensione del nuovo testamento*, Bologna 1978, 7. See also J.H. Charlesworth, *Jesus, Early Jewish Literature, and Archeology*, 179–183; C. Dimier, *The Old Testament Apocrypha*, New York 1964, 20; M. de Jonge, *The so-called Pseudoepigrapha of the Old Testament and Early Christianity*, in: *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. by P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody

whereas the Dead Sea Scrolls enrich the image of Palestinian Judaism, showing its specific variation, whose picture may lead to interesting conclusions[43] when compared to Christian views. Reference to these sources allows us to understand better the relations between Church and Judaism. Moreover, some researchers even try to identify certain fragments of the 7-grotto manuscripts with texts from the gospel according to Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, the Letter to the Romans, the Letters of Peter, Timothy and James, which seems premature, although it could indicate direct relationships between the Qumran writings and the New Testament, which in turn refers to the Essene doctrine in such themes as faith, the end times, the struggle between good and evil in the world and in man as well as participation in the lives of the angels. In any case, today the impact of Essenism (as Judaism in general) on the emerging Christianity cannot be excluded, especially that the Essene communities existed in different places of Palestine. Their influence may be found in three areas: literary, institutional and doctrinal.[44]

To understand Jewish messianism, an idea of primary importance for grasping the origin of the conflict between Church and Synagogue, apocrypha of the Old (more specifically: Hebrew Bible) and the New Testament[45] are an invaluable source of information. Many of apocryphal writings created within Judaism were reformulated by Christians and in this way the Jewish tradition finally received Christian interpretation. To this day discussion has been held among researchers whether apocryphal books, such as the *Ascension of Isaiah*, two prophecies included in the *Second Book of Ezra* (now recognized as the *Fifth* and *Sixth Book of*

1997, 70; E. Tigchelaar, *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, in: *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. Tigchelaar, BETL CCLXX, Leuven – Paris – Walpole 2014, 1–18.

43 H. Stegemann, *Esseńczycy z Qumran, Jan Chrzciciel i Jezus*, trans. Z. Małecki, A. Tronina, Kraków-Mogilany 2002, 9.

44 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 173.

45 *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, II, *Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT, Philadelphia 1984, 14. This book was published under the auspices of the Foundation Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, established in Amsterdam which in 1964 (after the first meeting of the working committee) decided to publish a monumental series concerning the relationships between Judaism and Christianity. The first quarter-century of the activity of the foundation, along with works published by it have been discussed by W. Chrostowski in a comprehensive article *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, CT 62 (1992) 4, 147–176; cf. also: D. Frankfurter, *Beyond „Jewish Christianity". Continuing Religious Sub-Culture of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 133; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*, Minneapolis 2005, 43–53.270–444.

Ezra) and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are works created in the Jewish environment and then reworked by Christians, or if they are directly products of Christ's followers.[46] It can be believed that the oldest part of the *First Book of Enoch* or *1 Enoch,* also called the Ethiopian *Book of Enoch*, dates back to the sixth century BC, whereas the latest one dates back to the first century AD. The fact that it took so long to shape the final version of the book impelled some researchers to propose a thesis that some Aramaic fragments were recorded in the Hebrew body of the book. In the introduction, the author shows broad outline of end times.

The process of creation of the *Oracle of Sibyl* was equally long. It began in the first century BC and lasted for almost seven centuries.[47] The author of the apocrypha brings up the following subjects which can shed light on the relationship between Judaism and Christianity: criticism of idolatry, the announcement of coming of the kingdom of God, annihilation of Belial, God's judgement, history of the world that combines elements of Greek myths with biblical motifs, history of Israel with the stress put on Assyrian captivity and destruction of the Temple, threats against pagan powers, or criticism of polytheism. In some books of the apocrypha there are typically Christian interjections, which indicates that the original Jewish text was reworked by followers of Christ.

It will also be necessary to refer to the *Fourth Book of Ezra*. The work was first written in Semitic language (Hebrew rather than Aramaic), and then the translation into Greek was made. It is interesting since the time of creation of the book coincides with the birth of rabbinic Judaism and its author is most likely a Pharisee from Palestine. The book describes seven visions concerning fate of the contemporary world, the fate of Israel, the fate of those who have already passed away, the end of the world and the signs preceding it, as well as the end of the Roman Empire, punished by the Messiah.

About half a century later *The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* was created. It tells the story of the destruction of Jerusalem, the punishment of the Gentiles and the rebuilding of the Temple after the Messiah's coming. It is evident that the author of the apocrypha petrified in writing Jewish dreams of the reconstruction of the Temple, reduced to a heap of rubble almost a century before.

Amidst non-apocalyptic apocrypha of the Hebrew Bible, the *Psalms of Solomon* are noteworthy. The work is assumed to have been created in the first half of the first century AD in Palestine. Many arguments support the view that the author was a Pharisee. The faith in the resurrection is distinctly emphasized as well as the fact that the destruction of Jerusalem is seen by the author as God's punishment

---

46 J.H. Charlesworth, *Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings*, in: *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, II, *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*, ed. E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten, A. Mendelson, Philadelphia 1981, 27–28.

47 J.J. Collins, *Sibylline Discourse*, in: *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. Tigchelaar, BETL CCLXX, Leuven – Paris – Walpole 2014, 208–210.

for unfaithfulness of Israel to the Law. Messianism of *Psalms of Solomon* clearly has a political tone.

Similarly, it may be useful to refer to the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, a book which was probably created between 79 and 81 AD, as can be deduced from the plagues it describes. They seem to refer to the fall of the Temple and the explosion of Vesuvius in 79. The number of apocryphal scriptures of the Hebrew Bible reaches almost seventy.

The apocrypha mentioned above are leading titles for showing the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue, but other works of this kind may also be helpful.[48]

The New Testament apocrypha also cast light on the process of separation of Church from Synagogue. In 1945 in the library in Nag Hammadi, the *Gospel According to Thomas* was found. It is a collection of fourteen discourses that Jesus supposedly dictated to Thomas the Apostle ("Twin"). Jesus' words recounted in the book which was created in the second century are very similar to the logia of the synoptic Gospels. The *Gospel of the Hebrews* (linked to the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*) and the *Gospel of the Ebionites* belong to a group of Judeo-Christian writings. The problem of apocryphal Judeo-Christian Gospels seems to be very complex. None of these three writings has been preserved in its entirety, but some statements derived from them are included in other works, where they are cited tendentiously and sometimes in a highly selective manner.[49] It is not even known whether there were two *Gospels: According to the Hebrews and Ebionites*, or three (*the Gospel according to Nazarenes* is often combined with the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*). The *Gospel of the Hebrews* (and the *Nazarenes*) was used by Judeo-Christians of orthodox views, whereas the *Gospel of the Ebionites* was favoured by Judeo-Christians with strong gnostic inclinations. The first one was created at the end of the first century (possibly even before the year 70), probably in Pella (today's Jordan) where Christians supposedly escaped after the outbreak of the first Jewish insurrection in 66. The second gospel came into existence in Transjordan and is dated for the first half of the second century.

More or less from the same period comes another apocryphal scripture which is extremely valuable for hereof study. *The Solomon Odes* consists of forty-two

48 The fullest lists of ancient apocryphal books are included in: *Stichometry of Nicefor, Synopsis of the Holy Scripture of Pseudo-Athanasius, Elenchus 60 books, The Apostolic Constitutions and Decretum Gelasianum*; S. Mędala, *Wprowadzenie do literatury międzytestamentalnej*, Biblioteka zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 1, Kraków 1994, 116. See also: *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 1999, XIII-XIV; M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, 53–82; K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 130–161.

49 M. Starowieyski, *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, I/I, *Ewangelie apokryficzne*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, 98.

writings preserved in three languages: Syrian, Greek and Coptic. The *Odes* have liturgical character and they are loaded with symbols.[50]

At the beginning of our century the discovery of the *Gospel of Judas,* originating from the circle of the Cainites, proved to be quite sensational. The apocrypha is dated approx. 150 AD. In the first centuries, the *Gospel of Judas* seemed to be almost unknown. Even the early Christian writers who mention it (Irenaeus of Lyon, Theodoret of Cyrhus and Epiphanius of Salamis in Cyprus) do not seem to know the exact content of the Gospel. The work was written by members of the gnostic sect which put on a pedestal those who were strongly opposed to God of the Old Covenant.[51] They took their name from Cain, the killer of his own brother, but they also worshipped Esau who sold his primogeniture for food, or Corah who organized the rebellion against Moses and Aaron. The Cainites argued that God who created the world is *de facto* a demiurge and is completely different from the God proclaimed by Jesus. Christ himself, however, lived for a moment in the human body of Jesus, although he often appeared to his disciples in other shapes.

At the end of the list there is another apocryphal book which may turn out to be a valuable source for the study of the Jewish-Christian relationship in the first century. The work *Remaining Words of Jeremiah* is also known as the *2 Baruch*, the *3 Baruch* or even *4 Baruch*. Although it was initially an apocryphal book of the Old Testament written by a Jew of Judea (possibly from Jerusalem), it contains a lot of Christian interpolations.[52] References to the persecutions of Jeremiah, who proclaims the coming of Christ, perfectly reflect the tensions between Judaeo-Christians and the Jews who rejected the message of the Good News.

Works of early Christian writers also constitute invaluable source material not to be overlooked, particularly those written by the Church Fathers.[53] For presenting the separation between Judaism and Christianity the most prominent writings are, inter alia, the works of such authors as Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, Melton of Sardis, Irenaeus of Lyon, Eusebius of Caesarea or Epiphanius bishop of Salamis in Cyprus. Some works of the writers of the early centuries of Christianity remain anonymous; that is the case of *Didache*, the *Epistle to Diognetus* or Latin homilies *Against the Jews*. [54] At times, elements of polemics between Christians and Jewish believers also appeared in anti-heretical writings.

At the end of the presentation of the source material, it should be added that the results of research on artefacts extracted during archaeological excavations

---

50 *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, I/I, *Ewangelie apokryficzne*, 154.

51 F.L. Cross, E.A. Livingstone, *Encyklopedia Kościoła*, I, trans. T. Mieszkowski, Warszawa 2004, 782–784.

52 A. Paciorek, *Pozostałe słowa Jeremiasza*, in: *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 1999, 3–4.

53 M. Humphries, *Early Christianity*, 76.

54 D. Flusser, H. van de Sandt, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRJNT, Minneapolis 2002, 12.

cannot be omitted. Here, various inscriptions are also valuable: mural, sepulchral, inscriptions on ossuaries, tables, classical columns, memorials and other artefacts which are the evidence of interactions between the followers of Christ and the Jews.[55] Many of them are related to the places of Christian worship and synagogues whose network in the first three centuries was already highly developed.[56] The inscriptions are most often written in one of the four languages – Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek or Latin.[57] Moreover, when establishing chronology, coins discovered by archaeologists come to aid.[58] Images of rulers and monetary inscriptions (especially the dates) allow to date correctly particular stratigraphic layers, uncovered during excavations.

Literature Review

Before we move on to presentation of the findings of the study on the issue of the *parting of the ways,* it is worth remembering what Martin Goodman, professor of Oxford University, points out. He recognizes the importance of the perspective from which the whole issue is viewed. In his opinion, lack of agreement among researchers as to when, where, how, and above all whether actually the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue took place stems exactly from different perspectives. The issue is perceived differently by Christian authors, in a different way by Jewish ones and still differently by people who do not identify themselves with any of those religions. And it is not only the problem of our time. In ancient times, that is at the time when *parting* actually took place, there did not exist any clear and absolute criteria for determination of the identity of the Jewish community. Someone could be considered a Jew by some Fathers of the Church, but he did not identify himself with Judaism at all. The same person may or may not have been seen as a Jew by followers of pagan religions, inhabiting the Roman Empire. Certain phenomena could be regarded as related to Judaism by some, but not by others. One cannot expect to find clear distinctions in ancient sources.[59]

---

55 L.V. Rutgers, *Archeological Evidence for Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Antiquity*, AJA 96 (1992) 101–108.

56 J.F. Strange, *Archeology and the Ancient Synagogues up to 200 C.E.*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 37–38.

57 The inscriptions were collected and compiled in various sources: *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, I-II, ed. J.B. Frey, Rome - Paris 1936–1952; *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, I-IV, ed. A. Boeckhius, Berlin 1828–1877; V. Tcherikover, A. Fuks, M. Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, I-III, Cambridge 1957–1964; *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, ed. W. Dittenberger, Leipzig 1903–1905.

58 J. Ciecieląg, *Palestyna w czasach Jezusa. Dzieje polityczne*, 11–14.

59 "Much of the disagreement in modern scholarship about when, how, why, and indeed whether, the ways of Judaism and Christianity parted in antiquity derives

An interest in the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue has arisen largely thanks to the *third quest* in the search for historical Jesus.[60] Therefore, some monographs and editorial works concerning Jesus' approach to the religion of his ancestors should at least be mentioned here. One of the currents typical for the third stage of the research on the historicity of the Master of Nazareth – beside the sociological or charismatic mainstreams – is based on discovering the "Jewishness" of Jesus. Works of several excellent researchers fit into this current because they cast a beam of light on Jesus' attitude to the religion of his own nation.[61] The Jew, Shalom Ben-Chorin, in a book entitled *Bruder Jesus* (published for the first time in 1967)[62] expresses a view that the life of Jesus was determined by three stages of disappointment: non-fulfilment of the announcement concerning the coming of the kingdom of God, failure in preaching the kingdom of God and the failure of the cross.[63] David Flusser, Vienna-born professor of the Hebrew University, is of

---

from confusion about differences of perspective. The relationship of one group to another may be seen quite differently by members of the two groups, and differently again by the modern observer. Thus, for instance, someone considered Jewish by a Christian might not consider himself or herself Jewish, and might or might not be considered as a Jew by non-Christian Jews. It is unreasonable to expect ancient authors always to have made the clear distinctions which historians now seek to discover"; M. Goodman, *Judaism in the Roman World. Collected Essays*, AJEC 66, Leiden – Boston 2007, 175.

60 For the first time the problem of historicity of Jesus was raised by H. S. Reimarus (1694–1768). This first stage of the quest for historical Jesus was marked by liberal theology. At the beginning of the 20th century, a new question (*neue Frage*) about historical Jesus was asked. The search for an answer, in some way, is also depicted in the history of Wrocław (German: Breslau) where in the years 1916–1920 Rudolf Bultmann was an academic teacher. In his opinion attempts to reach historical Jesus are theologically irrelevant. This second stage of the quest for Jesus of history lasted until the early eighties of the last century and was crowned with a nearly full agreement among the exegetes that there is the continuation between Jesus of history and Christ of faith, and that there is a possibility - by means of appropriate criteria - to reach the *ipsissima verba et facta Jesu*. The third stage of research on the issue of the historicity of Jesus began at the end of the eighties. For the first time the term *third quest for the historical Jesus* was used by Wright in 1988; R. Bartnicki, *Ewangelie synoptyczne. Geneza i interpretacja*, Warszawa 2003, 419–484.

61 W. Chrostowski, *Żydzi a religia żydowska i Jezus Chrystus*, AK 136 (2001) 1, 9.

62 S. Ben-Chorin, *Bruder Jesus. Der Nazarener in juedischer Sicht*, Guetersloh 2005.

63 Ben-Chorin became fascinated with the person of Jesus through his personal experience. He writes that he grew up in Christian environment, in the catholic city of Munich. The first years of his childhood, he spent in the vicinity of the pilgrimage place Maria Erich and the image of the crucified one on a rusty cross was engraved in his memory and his child's mind. […] Attending a Christian religion class, his Jewish friends sat without involvement in the last rows, but he states that he himself with an open heart accepted facts that his colleagues had to learn against their own will; S. Ben-Chorin, *Jesus in Judentum*, Wuppertal 1970, VIII.

the opinion that Jesus[64] is a Jew faithful to the Law, preaching how to be guided in our lives by the commandment to love God and our neighbours. His book titled *Chrześcijaństwo religią żydowską* was published in Polish in 2003.

Geza Vermes (died in May 2013) was a Jewish scholar who wrote a lot of works on the topic of historical Jesus. The best known are *Jesus the Jew* (Polish translation was published in 2003) and *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (1981). Vermes shows Jesus as an itinerant charismatic similar to Hanina ben Dosa, well known in Jewish literature. His task was to preach conversion and the imminent coming of the kingdom of God.[65] One should also mention the book *The Changing Faces of Jesus* by this author, the book at the end of which the following significant words can be found: "At the end of the first century Christianity lost sight of real Jesus and the original meaning of his message."[66]

The above conclusion results from some methodological errors made by this Catholic priest, who later converted to Judaism.[67] Vermes blames researchers for following chronological order in demonstrating the evolution of the image of Jesus.[68] Consequently, he decides to travel the other way, from "divine Christ to step back and seek human Jesus[69] and he explains clearly what this opposite direction consists in: in descending from Everest of John's Gospel and high peaks of St. Paul in the direction of the synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. The trouble is that this perspective gives the reader a false impression that the thought about divinity of Christ was shaped in Christianity very late and supposedly synoptics had not known it yet because it was formulated thanks to the impact of Paul and John. Meanwhile, students of the first year of theology already realize that the letters of Paul are much earlier than the synoptic Gospels (especially Matthew and Luke) and it is from the letters where a picture of Christ as God emerges. This picture was only complemented by Johannine texts.[70]

---

64 He writes about his discovery of the person of Jesus - it was from the texts of the Gospels that he learned about Jesus who lived and prayed like a Jew and cited only Jewish texts, derived from the Old Testament. He acknowledged the Hebrew Bible without reservations; D. Flusser, *Chrześcijaństwo religią żydowską. Esseńczycy a chrześcijaństwo*, trans. M. Wodnar, Warszawa 2003, 158–160.

65 G. Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*, London 1993, 46–75.

66 G. Vermes, *Twarze Jezusa*, trans. J. Kołak, Kraków 2008, 329.

67 Similar methodological flaws or even errors the reader finds in the book *Autentyczna Ewangelia Jezusa* by the same author published in Polish translation in Krakow in 2009.

68 In his opinion such are the works by P. Fredriksen (*From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Image of Jesus*, Yale 1988) and M. Casey'a (*From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, published 1991 in Louisville).

69 G. Vermes, *Twarze Jezusa*, 14.

70 W. Chrostowski, *Żydzi a religia żydowska i Jezus Chrystus*, 16. Interestingly, Daniel Boyarin in one of his recent monographs has shown that Incarnation (and in consequence the recognition of the deity incarnated in human nature) is the idea quite

At the end of his life Vermes published one more volume which fits the research field of the division of Church and Synagogue, although it does not concern the topic directly. It is a book entitled *Christian Beginnings. From Nazareth to Nicea, AD 30-325* (2013).[71] This time the Jewish scholar goes even further in his anyway radical opinions: he recognizes Christianity as an unnecessary and false religion. The basic error of Christians is the recognition of Jesus as God (it is, according to Vermes, an affront to intelligence) and primarily Paul should be blamed for this state of affairs, as he pushed Christology in an absolutely wrong direction, as well as John who dared to write such a courageous prologue to his Gospel.

It seems that while examining the issue of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue one cannot overestimate works written by Ed Paul Sanders, of the Protestant provenance. His book *Jesus and Judaism* (1985) turned out to be a milestone in the study of historical Jesus. According to Sanders, thanks to extensive research on Jesus, we know about him objectively much more than about any other person of the first century. To sum up in a concise way the results of research of the Protestant theologian of Duke University, one can conclude that Jesus was an eschatological prophet preaching the need of conversion – not through severe penitential practices, but by discovering the love of God – and performing acts of healing.[72]

Harvey Falk, a rabbi belonging to an orthodox stream of Judaism, was also occupied with the Jewishness of Jesus. He is the author of a book entitled *Jesus the Pharisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus* (1985). The title itself suggests that the author sees in Jesus a Jew with Pharisaic views. His teaching should be placed between the views proposed by Shammai and Hillel.[73]

John P. Meier, an American biblical scholar, a Roman Catholic priest and the professor of theology at the Catholic University of Notre Dame, is the author of an extensive, three-volume work *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (since 1994). The convention of the book is very interesting because its content is contained within the framework of a fictional, but probable dispute between a catholic, a protestant, a Jew and an agnostic. The author claims that it was John the Baptist who had the greatest impact on Jesus. He was the "spark" that ignited in Jesus the dynamism of preaching the advent of God's kingdom. While John the Baptist spoke of the coming judgement, Jesus focused on drawing attention to the image of merciful God.[74]

---

possible to accept in the beliefs of the Second Temple Judaism; D Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ*, New York 2012, 213.

71 Full note is: G. Vermes, *Christian Beginnings. From Nazareth to Nicea, AD 30-325*, London 2013.

72 E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, Philadelphia 1985, 186–186.

73 H. Falk, *Jesus the Farisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus*, New York 1985, 16–17.

74 J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking a Historical Jesus*, II, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Auckland 1994, 176–177.

Another researcher, James Charlesworth of Princeton Theological Seminary, proves in his works that Jesus' way of thinking was formed by internal currents of Judaism and is anchored in them. According to this expert on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Jesus accepted almost all the implications resulting from his Jewish origin. He accepted the authority of the Temple, He took part in the pilgrimage feasts, He accepted the necessity of observing the sabbath and making offerings, He acknowledged the authority of the Scriptures, especially the Torah and the Prophets, He shared essential theological beliefs of the Jews, He respected their habits and He prayed.[75]

By contrast, the views of John Dominic Crossan, a retired professor at DePaul University in Chicago, included in the book *The Historical Jesus. The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Polish edition was published in 1996)[76] seem quite controversial. According to one of the founders of the Jesus Seminar, Jesus as a carpenter belonged to the lowest social stratum of villagers and craftsmen. Although He was illiterate, He adhered to oral tradition which passed down a lot of biblical wisdom. Remembering and using it, Jesus seems to have become someone resembling an itinerant Greek philosopher. In His opinions, He was close to cynics. Free healing and sharing meals acted as a magnet to crowds of His supporters.[77]

To a considerable degree, the interest in the issue of parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity arises out of Jesus' references to the religion of His own ancestors, as examined in the works listed above.[78] In a natural way,

---

75 J. Charlesworth, *Gesù nel giudaismo del suo tempo alla luce delle più recenti scoperte*, trans. D. Tomasetto, Torino 1998[2]. Also: idem, *Jesus, Early Jewish Literature, and Archeology*, in: *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, New York 1991, 177–198. W. Chrostowski has drawn similar conclusions in his research. He claims that Jesus sees in the Jews the nation of God's choice, that the plan of Jesus' life is typically Jewish (circumcision, pilgrimage to Jerusalem, observing Jewish customs, respecting the Torah, attendance at synagogue services) and that He was attached to the land of the Jews, and His message was addressed to the Jews; W. Chrostowski, *Żydowskość Jezusa*, CT 63 (1993) 2, 54–55.

76 J.D. Crossan, *Historyczny Jezus. Kim był i czego nauczał*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 1997.

77 In his works Crossan draws chiefly on non-canonical sources: *The Gospel of Thomas*, Egerton Papyrus, *The Gospel of the Hebrews* or hypothetical Q source. Many of these ideas were also contained in the book by Crossan, *Who Killed Jesus. Korzenie antysemityzmu w ewangelicznych relacjach o śmierci Jezusa*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 1998.

78 These works also include the fourth, slightly revised edition of the book by German researchers: G. Theissen, A. Merz, *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch*, Göttingen 2014[4]. A very interesting compendium of works concerning historical Jesus, published in recent decades, can be found in the article by E. D Schmidt, *Vom "historischen" Jesus, dem "erinnerten" Jesus und darüber hinaus. Zum aktuellen Stand der Jesusforschung* (JESCT 6 (2015) 1, 65-92). Valuable, in this respect, is also the book by J.H. Charlesworth, *The Historical Jesus. An Essential Guide* (Nashville 2008). On Jewish Jesus in the light of archaeological research, see by the same author: *Jesus Within*

the examination of Jesus' references to Palestinian Judaism turned into a study of mutual relations between Judaism and Christianity. Marcel Simon, the founder of the Centre for Research on History of Religion at the University of Strasbourg, paved the way for it by his doctoral dissertation published in Paris in 1948 and entitled *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire Romain (135-425)*. There have been many editions and translations of this monumental work. However, it refers only partially to the theme of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue because the author skips in his reflection the most crucial period of the process, namely the time between the death and resurrection of Christ and the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 AD. Further studies have filled the void in a significant way.

It has been twenty years since the publication of a book by James Dunn titled *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, re-released in 2006. The author, professor at the University of Durham, decided to show how Christianity refers to four pillars of Judaism of the Second Temple, i.e. to monotheism, the covenant, the Torah and the Temple institution. In his opinion the event of Christ revalued the look of Judeo-Christians (and finally the entire Christianity) on the constitutive elements of biblical Judaism and led to the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue. The conclusion adopted by the author, at the end of his reflections, is interesting but controversial. Namely, he claims that this split up occurred not so much between Christianity and Judaism, but rather between mainstream of Christianity (coming out of the religion of the Gentiles) and Judeo-Christianity.[79]

Only a year after the publication of Dunn's monograph, a joint publication was produced, edited by same the author and entitled: *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways AD 70 to 135*. This work comprises texts of such excellent researchers as P.S. Alexander, J. Neville Birdsall, A. Chester, M. Goddman, M. Hengel, W. Horbury or even C. Rowland (to mention just some of them). Examining articles entered and discussed at the symposium, the editor comes to the conclusion that the disunion of Church and Synagogue was a long-lasting and bitter process which was affected by multiple factors: social, geographical, political and theological. This

---

Judaism. New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries (London 1990). The same subject matter is presented in the works by A. Le Donne (*The Historiographical Jesus. Memory, Typology, and the Son of David*, Waco 2009; *Historical Jesus. What Can We Know and How We Know It?*, Grand Rapids 2011). See also: G. Lohfink, *Jesus von Nazaret. Was er wollte, wer er war*, Freiburg 2011; W. Stegemann, *Jesus und seine Zeit*, BE 10, Stuttgart 2010; A. Strotmann, *Der historische Jesus: eine Einführung*, Paderborn 2012.

79 "The parting of the ways was more between mainstream Christianity and Jewish Christianity than simply between Christianity as a single whole and rabbinic Judaism"; J. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London 2006, 313.

process cannot be confined to the period proposed in the title of the work, i.e. from the year 70 to 135.

The boundaries of this time frame were determined more by social and political factors than by factors relating to the interactions between Judaism and Christianity. Certainly the awareness of the divinity of Christ increased among Christians in this period as well as the understanding of his embodiment; however, the greatest progress in this area was made in the years 30-45. Conclusively, the book does not answer the question when it became clear that convictions of Christians concerning Christ can not be squeezed into the mainstream of normative Judaism, especially that prior to the year 70 it had a form of complex biblical Judaism which shortly afterwards gave way to the type of religiosity proposed by rabbis descending mainly (although not only) from Pharisaic environment.[80]

Dunn's publication was heavily criticized by Judith Lieu, an English researcher who in 2015 was selected the chairwoman of a prestigious international association Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. Although this criticism was expressed in the form of an article in a journal and not in a separate monograph, we have to mention it here. The article was published in the *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* and was entitled *"The Parting of the Ways": Theological Construct or Historical Reality?*[81] The main line of criticism is based on the allegation that Dunn and the co-authors of the book adopt an abstract concept of Christianity and Judaism, whereas both religions are of local nature and are strongly dependent on historical determinants. According to the author, one cannot therefore speak in general about parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity, but the process should be viewed through the prism of the situation within different communities and interrelations among them. The second important allegation concerns the identity of the Church. The lecturer of The Queen's College in Birmingham argues that very early (already in the 40s) Christians were aware of the difference between them and the Jewish community and they were perceived that way by the Roman authorities.

In 2003 a book entitled *The Ways that Never Parted*: *Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* was published. It was edited by Adam H. Becker (Princeton University) and Annette Yoshiko Reed (University of Pennsylvania). The authors depart from the traditional view that, at the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second one, there occurred a complete disunion between Judaism and Christianity. In their opinion until the Middle Ages there were numerous links between the two communities. These interactions and interchange resulted from the very nature of both religions and not from conscious support by whichever party concerned. There is no one who can clearly define the

80 J.G.D. Dunn, *Concluding Summary*, in: *Jews and Christians; The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 368.

81 J. Lieu, *"The Parting of the Ways": Theological Construct or Historical Reality?*, JSNT 56 (1994) 101–119.

moment that may be set as a turning point of coexistence of Christians and Jews within Judaism.[82] Becker and Reed postulate to modify the previous approach to research on the early Christianity and Judaism (especially rabbinic) and to continue analysis taking into consideration these mutual relations and interactions. According to the authors, some of the processes occurring during the first centuries of Christianity may be explained only when such an approach to the research is applied.

A monograph by Daniel Boyarin entitled *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* and published in the series Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion (Philadelphia 2004) also fits into the spectrum of research on the separation of Church from Synagogue. Already in the introduction the author, who is of Jewish descent, recognizes that Christianity is a respectable religion and personally he is full of admiration for many aspects of religious lives of the followers of Christ. He examines mutual relationship between Christians and Jews up to the fourth century inclusive, concluding that until the time of St. Jerome both religions had not been completely separated yet. If there were clear boundaries between them, they were "artificial, "imposed" and "political." Finally, the separation of both religions was in some way forced by the leaders of both communities[83], and on the part of the Church such thinkers as Justin Martyr or Irenaeus, who tried in their writings to clearly determine the identity of the followers of Christ, to a large extent contributed to this situation. This identity was largely founded on deliberate breaking away from rabbinic Judaism while at the same time the truth that Christianity had its roots in the religion of biblical Israel was emphasized. A similar process of self-identification also took place within Judaism. Rabbis saw themselves as the only heirs of the Torah and they determined their identity on

82 The authors formulate the following demand: "No longer can scholars assume that there was a single historical moment after which the texts, beliefs and practices of Jews became irrelevant to those of their Christian contemporaries – nor the converse. Too much is lost when we study the two in isolation from one another"; A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, XI.

83 The boundary between Christianity and Judaism is compared by Boyarin in a humorous way to a border crossing which a certain man had crossed for thirty years every day carting sand in a wheelbarrow. The customs inspector dug through the sand each morning, certain that the man must be a smuggler. On the day of his retirement from the service, he asked the smuggler to reveal what it was that he was smuggling and how he had been doing so. "Wheelbarrows; I've been smuggling wheelbarrows, of course." - answered the man. According to Boyarin, the guards are spiritual leaders of both religious communities who want to maintain an artificial partition; however the ideas, practices and habits freely flow through religious borders and they cannot be stopped; D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, DRLAR, Philadelphia 2004, 1–4.

this basis, dissociating themselves from – as they saw it – claims of Christians to the Pentateuch.[84] Finally, the process led to categorization of Christians by rabbis as the "Gentiles."

A valuable contribution helping to depict the relationship between rabbinic Judaism and Christianity is a work edited by the founder of the Biblical Archaeology Society, Hershel Shanks, and entitled *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism: A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development.*[85] The introduction was prepared by Geza Vermes (already deceased) and the articles contained in this book were written by excellent experts. The subject matter of Palestinian Judaism and Judaism in the diaspora in the first century was presented by L.H. Feldman; the life of Jesus was depicted by E.P. Sanders; J.D.G. Dunn dealt with the issue of the expansion of Christianity from Jerusalem to the Eternal City; L.I.A. Levine discussed the issue of Judaism starting from the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 to the fall of Bar Kokhba revolt (AD135). S.J.D. Cohen wrote about Judaism at the time of the creation of the Mishnah (i.e. from 135 to 220 AD) and I.M. Gafni analysed the period between 220 AD and the conquer made by Islam. The development of Christianity from the destruction of the Temple to the time of Constantine was shown by H.W. Attridge, and the topic was continued by D.E. Groh. J.H. Charlesworth showed Christians and the Jews in a parallel way in the first six centuries.

The value of the entire work lies in the fact that it shows the discussed matter from both Jewish and Christian perspective. The same issues are sometimes presented in a totally different, or even contrasted way, and it is, inter alia, caused by the fact that the authors are not only the followers of Christ, but also Jews. Thus, it was fortunate that in his introduction Geza Vermes briefly summerized each of the texts constituting the whole book (as the follower of Judaism who abandoned Christianity, he did it from the Jewish position), while in the last chapter James Charlesworth showed a more Christian perspective (quite specific because truly American). These two viewpoints are characterized by a certain emotional charge. Vermes suggests that if Jesus heard a lecture on Christian theology, He would not

84 Discussing the work of D. Boyarin, Emmanouel Grypeou from University of Cambridge states: "While Christian borders were constructed in order to define a new identity and religion and to exclude all heretics, including the Jews, Judaism constructed borders in order to exclude Christians"; *Daniel Boyarin, "Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity" (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2004)*, SCJR 1 (2005–2006) 7.

85 The book was published by the Biblical Archeology Society in Washington in 2011; this was the second and slightly modified edition of the work that originally saw the light of day in 1992. W. Chrostowski translated it into Polish. For many years, he had some doubts, if the first translation should be published (due to one-sided Jewish perspective concerning the presentation of some matters, especially in Chapters III and IV). Finally, the book was brought out in 2013 by the Vocatio publishing house, under the title *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju.*

believe that it had anything to do with Him, while Charlesworth believes that, in demonstrating history of Christianity, the fact that it grew out on the grounds of polemics, including polemics with Judaism, should be more emphasized.

A relatively new title, relating to the issues discussed here, is a book by Peter Schäfer, former professor of Judaic Studies at Princeton University and since 2013 the director at the Jewish Museum Berlin, entitled *Jewish Jesus. How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other.*[86] It is worth looking at its content more closely due to the fact that the German researcher devoted a lot of space to theological issues, sometimes finding nuances in different interpretations made by Jews and Christians. The author tries to provoke, sometimes with a very good result. A commonly accepted thesis that Christianity emerged from Judaism is slightly remodelled in the reflections of the former editor of the *Jewish Studies Quarterly.* Schäfer realizes that not only Judeo-Christianity, but also other Jewish sects[87], from who the successors of Pharisees cut themselves off, had an effect on the formation of rabbinic Judaism. Therefore, the German edition of the publication is provocatively entitled: *Die Geburt des Judentums aus dem Geist des Christentums. Fünf Vorlesungen zur Entstehung des rabbinischen Judentums* (Tübingen 2010). Focusing on the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, the author underlines the fact that both religions (previously both currents of Judaism: Christianity and Rabbinism) had a mutual influence on the ideas promoted by their followers and as a result also on shaping their final forms.

Seen from this angle, Christianity occurs to be an older religion than rabbinic Judaism. Reading the Talmud, Schäfer comes to the conclusion that strict statements of rabbis are not always addressed to heretics. It happens that some rabbis condemn others, those namely whose views they consider to be unorthodox. Schäfer carries out the analysis of the Jewish sources by following a double principle: chronological (first Tannaim, then Amoraim) and geographical (first Palestinian sources, then Babylonian ones). The investigator has given a lot of space to rabbinic explanations of the meaning of the name of God (YHWH, Elohim, Supreme God, Deus Sabaoth). The juxtaposition of Jewish sources with fragments of the works of the Fathers of the Church talking about trinity of God seems to be extremely accurate. In the chapter entitled – in accordance with the author's bias – in a rather provocative manner *The Young and the Old God,* a lot of space has been given to the midrash to Ex 20:2 where in the introduction to the Decalogue

86 The book was published in English version by Princeton University Press in Oxford in 2012.

87 On the information that in the first years the Church could be seen as a "sect" see: R. Scroggs, *The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, II, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, 1–23. "To define Christianity as a Jewish sect makes sense of the beginnings of Christianity"; J. Painter, *Just James. The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*, SPNT, Columbia 2004, 228.

the unity of God is stressed. In this part of the work Schäfer presents rabbinic dissection of the heresy of "two powers" which is based on the belief in the existence of two contradictory divine powers. In rabbinic Judaism, an idea of "two heavenly thrones" also appeared, one of which is intended for God, the other one – for the messiah coming from the House of David. Showing how rabbis tried to reject this heresy, not only does Schäfer refer to the apocrypha of the Old Testament and texts of the New Testament, but he also analyses the frescoes discovered in the synagogue in Dura Europos.

One of the parts of the book does not seem to concern the relationship between Judaism and Christianity, as it depicts Metatron known among the Jews as the highest angel. The author is able, however, to find parallels in the perception of such a figure in both religions. *Note bene* Schäfer devotes a separate chapter of his work to the figures of angels which, in a sense, is a summary of his earlier book entitled *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen* (Berlin–New York 1975). The research shows that early Christian discussion with Judaism also concerned a different look at the role of angels in both religions. For the German researcher the notion of God as the Father was also of great importance for parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue. It seems that in Christianity, through embodiment, the Son of God, God-Man, became someone closer to people than God perceived in Judaism as the Father. What is more, Judaism perceived God as the Father of the entire nation rather than the Father of individuals. The apocrypha *Life of Adam and Eve*, the notes of Philo of Alexandria and some references in the New Testament became a subject matter of Schäfer's interesting analyses regarding the figure of Adam seen through the prism of both stories about creation (Gn 1:1 – 2:3; 2:4-25). In this perspective, the perception of Christ as the new Adam by the inspired authors of the New Covenant fully fits in the polemics between Judaism and Christianity (and *vice versa*).

The reflections of the researcher of Princeton University concerning messianism seem to be extremely interesting. In the light of the Jewish sources, it is clear for the author that the idea of "suffering Messiah" is fully Jewish. However, after taking it over by Christians, it was effectively renounced by rabbinic Judaism. The early Christian interpretation of Isaiah's songs about the Servant of Yahweh also played an important role here. Despite some theses which appear to be slightly farfetched, the book by Schäfer constitutes a valuable contribution to the discussion on the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue. The Polish reviewer of the book, professor Mirosław Wróbel of the Catholic University in Lublin, notes that this publication provides us with excellent presentation of the relationship between the sisterly religions and it deserves a high position on the list of research work on early Judaism and Christianity.[88]

88 It should be specified more precisely that it concerns early rabbinic Judaism; M. Wróbel, *Peter Schäfer, The Jewish Jesus. How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other, (Princeton – Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012). Pp. 349.$ 30. ISBN 978-0-691-15390-2*, Biblical Annals 60 (2013) 3, 498.

And still one more title. One of the most recent studies devoted to the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue is a book published under the auspices of the Biblical Archeology Society and edited by aforementioned Hershel Shanks, the founder of *Biblical Archeology Review* and a well-known researcher of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The book is entitled: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two.*[89] Authors who contributed to the creation of this publication came from five countries: the United States, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand and Israel. The key to understanding the main thesis of this book is the term *partings*, included in the title. It suggests clearly that, in the opinion of the authors, there was not one key event that led to the disunion between Judaism and Christianity. The plural form of the term *partings* is the reflection of the view that the disunion between the two religious communities took place in a different way, in different times, in different places and was motivated by different factors.

The structure of the work may seem somewhat chaotic, but such was the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue – explains the editor. The authors represent different approaches to this problem. A look of a historian and a theologian, an archaeologist and a sociologist, a history geographer and a biblical scholar may be found in this work. In the first chapter Geza Vermes describes the complex world of Judaism at the time of Jesus, by placing in this mosaic the "movement of Jesus." In the next chapter James D.G. Dunn, the retired professor of Durham University, who in recent years became famous for the excellent trilogy *Christianity in Making* emphasising "Jewishness" of original Christianity, enumerates the crucial factors determining the origin of the split of both religious communities since the death of Jesus until the end of the first century. The parts of the book which follow are more detailed. Bruce Chilton, professor at the Bard College in Annandale (New York) and an outstanding specialist in the Targums, addressed the issue of "God-fearers" showing the different shades of meaning of this word in Christian and rabbinic books. The meaning of the word changed over time and was dependent on geographical location. Sometimes, it meant someone with the status of "half-Jew," another time the sympathizer of Christianity, in still another case a person with the views that may be placed somewhere between Judaism and Christianity.

Pamela Watson, an archaeologist at the University of New England in Armidale (Australia), questions the commonly accepted opinion that Christians, in order to avoid disasters which struck Jerusalem in the year 70, ran away from the city and took refuge in Pella. The belief raises doubts among researchers because apart from the reference made by Eusebius of Caesarea (and the authors making use of his works) it is not reaffirmed anywhere. Equally complicated appear to be the fates of Judeo-Christians who even after the year 70 declared their affiliation to Judaism but after the fall of the Bar Kokhba revolt they cut themselves off the religion of their ancestors to avoid the burden put on the Jews by the Roman authorities.

89 *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013.

Generally speaking, this is the opinion of the author of another text, Joan Taylor of King's College in London.

Annette Yoshiko Reed (University of Pennsylvania) and Lily Vuong (Valdosta State University) discussed the tensions between Judeo- and ethno-Christians[90], starting from the time of Paul and focusing on Antioch and ecclesial communities in Syria. Eri Meyers from the Centre for Jewish Studies of the Duke University shows that the disunion between Christianity and Judaism in Galilee occurred much later than it has so far been commonly believed. He is inclined to shift the date of creation of truly Christian communities (cut away from Judaism) in Jesus' homeland to after-Constantinian time. However, Christian community in Rome had separated from the Jews much earlier. Margaret H. Williams from the Centre for the Study of World Christianity at Edinburgh University discusses this issue in detail, taking into consideration the differences and similarities in mutual relations of the followers of Christ and Jews to Roman authorities. An extremely interesting study on the development of Christianity and its links with Judaism in the Egyptian diaspora was presented by Robert A. Kraft (University of Pennsylvania) and Anne Marie Luijendijk (Princeton University). Their research effort should be appreciated due to the fact that the authors had very little source material at their disposal.

Other articles in the collection discussed here depart from geographical scheme. In his research, Matt Jackson-McCabe focused on the Ebionites and the Nazarenes, wondering if they were closer to Judaism or Christianity. Professor of State University in Cleveland sees the main difficulty in answering this question in the fact that the Ebionites (who may have been derived from the Nazarenes) observed the Torah and rejected Paul's views and teachings concerning its interpretation. Shaye J.D. Cohen of Harvard in turn returns in his reflections to the topic which could not possibly be omitted in this study – that is to the *birkat ha-minim,* "blessing of heretics," spread in the environment of Jabneh. The picture of the Christian-Jewish relationship outlined here is enriched by the image drawn by Steven Fine (Yeshiva University in New York), who recognizes also the bright side of the interactions.

Then Lawrence Geraty (La Sierra University in Riverhead, California) poses a question concerning the process of abandoning the celebration of the Sabbath in favour of Sunday among Christians. Two Israeli scholars, Arye Edrei from Tel Aviv and Doron Mendels from Jerusalem dealt with social aspects of the organization of Christian and Jewish communities. Finally, the last chapter by James Charlesworth is intriguingly entitled "The ways that never parted" and it emphasizes the relations between Church and Synagogue that last to this day. Christianity arose form Judaism and can never renounce its roots. On almost four hundred pages, authors who come from different environments and represent different fields of

90 In this work the term "ethno-Christians" is used interchangeably with "Christians of pagan descent."

science outlined many aspects of the long and complex process of parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity. They managed to do this in a reliable and accessible manner.

Methodology

Now some methodological points. This work combines the elements of theological study with the presentation of historical processes. Its pattern is chronological. These principles determine the manner of presentation of the material. If one intends to show the development of certain theological ideas over time, he is forced to start at a specific point in history and mark particular stages of the development of the ideas. Such is also the principle of this work, which means that when a problem is presented over a period of several decades and then another problem is addressed, there is sometimes a need to return chronologically to an earlier period. For example, when the issue of *Fiscus Iudaicus* in the years 71 – 96 is being investigated, it does not mean that the question of the creation of the academy in Jabneh c. 90 AD will be raised in the same paragraph; it will be presented in a subsequent part of the book, although it entails slight violation of chronology.

It seems that the caesuras adopted for each part of the work do not require any justification. They are extremely important for Christianity as well as for transformations within Judaism. The approximate date of the death and resurrection of Christ (c. 30 AD) constitutes t*erminus a quo*, whereas the date of issue of the Milanese rescript (313 AD) is *terminus ad quem.* Between these events two further facts draw our attention: the fall of the Jerusalem Temple (70 AD) and suppression of the Bar Kokhba uprising (135 AD). Individual parts of the work have been divided into chapters also in accordance with historical events relevant to Judaism and Christianity: expulsion of the Jews from Rome and the so-called Council of Jerusalem (middle of the first century); the creation of the Academy in Jabneh (c. AD 90) and the outbreak of the Bar Kokhba revolt (AD 132), then the beginning of the activity of the first generation of Amoraims (220 AD).

Analyses which have been carried out are diversified in the sense that sometimes they concern one idea (e.g. monotheism, messianism, virginity of Mary) or source (literary, an archaeological artefact, an inscription or a decree), while sometimes – where it is possible – scriptural (literary) data have been compiled with the results of the research of archaeologists, historians, ethnographers, geographers, scholars of religion or specialists in cultural studies. In some cases it will be necessary to refer to elements of comparative study of the development of certain ideas, common to Christianity and Judaism. Examining issues of theological anthropology, F.J.P. Poole noted that differences make the comparative study interesting, whereas similarities make it possible.[91] This is the case of Christianity and rabbinic Judaism, religions that grew out of common roots.

91 "Difference makes a comparative analysis interesting; similarity makes it possible";

To conclude the brief presentation of methodological issues, one more thing should be signalled, which can sound irrelevant to some, yet, for certain bodies (especially for some Protestant theologians) it may turn out to be of consequence. In certain (fortunately not numerous) academic circles voices are being raised that Jesus was not a Jew! James H. Charlesworth even says that there are "too many Christian apologetics" who think in that way.[92] They support their thesis with the argument that Jesus came from Galilee which in the Bible is also called "Galilee of the gentiles." (Is 9:1; 1Mch 5:15; Mt 4:15) The consequence of the adopted assumption is the conclusion that Jesus as a pagan born in Galilee intended to found a new religion from the start, He did not observe the Jewish law, He broke the Sabbath rules and decided to destroy or replace the central institution of biblical Judaism, i.e. the Temple of Jerusalem. These views seem to be so irrational, that there is no need to analyse them in this work.

F.J.P. Poole, *Metaphors and Maps: Towards Comparison in the Anthropology of Religion*, JAAR 54 (1986) 3, 417.

92 "To many Christian apologetics contend that Jesus was not a Jew; he came from the 'Galilee of the gentiles'. Teachers today unfortunately continue this claim that Galilee is the home of gentiles and thus Jesus should be seen as a gentile"; J.H. Charlesworth, *Did They Ever Part?*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 283. The author added in the footnote that many of his students support this opinion because they were taught in this way at theological seminaries. He also poses a rhetorical question: "How can this nonsense be tolerated?"; ibid. 363.

Part I Church within Judaism (30–70 AD)

Israel's election is made concrete and specific in the
Sinai covenant and by the institutions based on it,
especially the Law and the Temple.
The New Testament is in continuity
with this covenant and these institutions.

The Jewish Nation and its Sacred Scriptures
in the Christian Bible (85)

I To the Expulsion of Jews from Rome (30–49 AD)

Four decades, counted from the death of Christ on the cross outside the walls of Jerusalem to the fall of the Temple of Jerusalem situated inside these walls, constitute the period of both the end and the beginning. For the Jews, it means the end of the form of Judaism which we call biblical ("the end," however, does not mean the absence of *continuum*). For those among the Jews and Gentiles who believed in Christ – this is the beginning of Church. Therefore, the dissolution of biblical Judaism takes place at the same time when Christianity spreads from Jerusalem, the capital of the Roman province in the east, to the capital of the entire empire. Christians see in this fact apparent fulfilment of Jesus' announcement which they interpreted as a prophetic oracle. There are many of them in the Hebrew Bible: "you will receive the power of the Holy Spirit which will come on you, and then you will be my witnesses not only in Jerusalem but throughout Judaea and Samaria, and indeed to earth's remotest end" (Ac 1:8).

However, it should be noted that for the first time the term "Christianity" was used in the second half of the second century (Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* 10,1-3; *Rom* 3,3). The name "Christians" was introduced just a little more than one hundred years earlier, about the year 40 AD in Syrian Antioch (Ac 11:26; 26:28; 1P 4:16). The title "Christ," (Greek "anointed," Hebrew "messiah") had already begun to function as the name of a person. At that time in Judea Christians were perceived as one of the branches of Judaism, like Sadducees or Pharisaic Judaism. In fact Palestine at the time of Jesus was the scene of diverse types Judaism, full of shades and varieties.

After all, Pharisees and Sadducees, Essenes (today they are identified with the Qumranians) and Zealots with their radical wing of Sicarii were all Jews; to some point in time also Herodians and the scribes (usually of the Pharisee provenance). One must not forget the supporters of John the Baptist (who in literature are sometimes rather unfortunately called "the Baptists") and also the Samaritans who still saw in themselves the successors and the followers of Moses' religion. In this array of groupings, factions or "sects," there appear the followers of the new Messiah, Christians, who were also called "Nazarenes." (Ac 24:5; cf. 24:14; 28:22) The term is used in Syria up to this day.[93] The entire movement was also described as a "way" (Ac 9:2; 19:9.23; 22:4; 24:14.22) to indicate the different style (way) of Christians'

93 J.H. Charlesworth comments: "Today, Jewish and Christian experts on Second Temple Judaism recognize the Palestinian Jesus Movement as one branch of early Judaism and acknowledge that what would become Christianity was for decades a sect within Judaism"; J.H. Charlesworth, *Did They Ever Part?*, 282.

life. Therefore, it is not groundless to look at the emerging Christianity as a "Jewish messianic sect."[94]

This "Jewish messianic sect," later, as a separate religion, named Christianity, owes its beginning not only to activity of Jesus, but also two events that took place shortly after his death. The first one is Christ's resurrection or – according to sceptics – conviction of His followers about His resurrection. Today, no one doubts that Jesus was crucified by Roman soldiers in the spring of circa the year 30. History knows some cases when after the death of a religious leaders their supporters believed that God in a miraculous way transferred them to heaven. This time, it was different. The supporters of Jesus were not satisfied with the statement that He ascended into heaven, but with full conviction they preached the truth about His resurrection from the dead. This truth was based on two empirically verifiable facts: after the death of Jesus His grave was found empty and He was seen alive a lot of times.[95] The second event that is at the origin of Christianity is the emergence of religious life and vigour among supporters of Jesus. The liveliness and vigour were so great and intense, because, as it was believed, they were the gift of the Holy Spirit. His coming down fifty days after the resurrection was the second crucial factor contributing to the rise of Christianity.

In this chapter an attempt has been made to outline the beginnings of the disunion between Church and Synagogue. It is concerned with the years between the death of Christ (c. 30 AD) and Claudius' expulsion of Jews from Rome (c. 49 AD). One of the most important sources for the research presented in this part of the work must be the book of the Acts of the Apostles. In recent years, it has become the subject of many interesting studies which make it clear that Luke not only rendered the account of history of the rising Church (of course fragmentarily), but his way of doing it changed it into a paradigm for the subsequent generations of

---

94 J.D.G. Dunn, *The Spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome: 30–70 C.E*, in: *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2011, 94.

95 The increased interest in the subject of resurrection has been continuing in contemporary exegesis at least since the early seventies of the last century, since the time when a book by X. Léon-Dufour, entitled *Résurrection de Jésus et message pascal* was published in Paris in 1971. An essential factor for the interpretation of the narrative about an empty tomb and revelations of the Risen One is the motif of "recognition," that is fulfilled in the "meeting." The "recognition" that Christ risen from the tomb and revealing himself to the disciples is the same person as historical Jesus is a key to these exegetic and theological deliberations. The French biblical scholar had a predecessor in the person of W. Marxen, the author of two publications about resurrection: *Die Auferstehung Jesu als historisches und als theologisches Problem* (Gütersloh 1964) and *Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth* (Gütersloh 1968). With the help of a phrase coined by himself "Die Sache Jesu geht weiter" ("the case of Jesus continues"), he showed that the fact of the resurrection itself is less important; what really counts is that Jesus is experienced as alive by his disciples.

Christians. Researchers claim that Luke was familiar with works of antique historiography and that this fact can be noticed in the Acts of the Apostles. The evangelist took over the conventions of Greek-Roman historiography and deliberately joined the circle of Hellenistic historiographers. He created paradigms which should be treated as models and patterns.

The author of the Acts not only wanted to inform his readers, but also to form them. Paradigms of figures built by him can be divided into positive and negative. The positive ones emphasize outstanding deeds, testimonies, traits of character, virtues, achievements of exceptional individuals in the early Church and they have universal significance. Negative paradigms, by contrast, should warn Christians against behaviour contrary to the professed faith. One can also talk about paradigms of a community where Church is seen as new people of God consisting of the Jews and Gentiles and being the only representative and continuator of Israel.[96] Therefore, when we use the Acts as a source, we should take into consideration restrictions resulting from Luke's style and purpose of his writing.[97] We will certainly also make use of the sources discussed in more detail in the introduction to this book. The Acts of the Apostles are discussed in more depth here, because the introduction only signalled the New Testament as the primary source of information.

The first two decades of the existence of Christianity are marked by the birth and growth of the first community in Jerusalem. Its appearance immediately became a source of controversy with official Judaism represented by the Sanhedrin and the Temple authorities, but the community was also distinguished by a specific power of attraction. The cause of the controversy was Jesus. Jesus' supporters saw him as the Messiah promised by God. The recognition of Jesus as Christ who suffered death for salvation of both the Jews and the Gentiles led to a change of approach to the most important institutions of biblical Judaism and also to reinterpretation of the law of Moses. The bone of contention (also within the ecclesial community) became the opening of the Church to the believers of Gentile origin.

Missionary dynamism of the apostle of the nations, Saul of Tarsus the former Pharisee, only exacerbated this conflict.[98] At the end of the thirties of the first century and therefore less than a decade after the death of Christ, there already were Samaritans in the new community. Presumably, shortly afterwards Christianity also reached Alexandria in Egypt, where Philo, the Jew living in the diaspora and

96 Detailed studies on this topic have been carried out by A.J. Najda in his work: *Historiografia paradygmatyczna w Dziejach Apostolskich*, RSB 39, Warszawa 2011.

97 The same conclusion was drawn by J.G.D. Dunn: "Acts can be treated as a considerable source, though always to be used with some caution"; J.D.G. Dunn, *The Spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome: 30–70 C.E*, 99.

98 S. Simonsohn, *The Jews of Italy. Antiquity*, BSJS 52, Leiden – Boston 2014, 264.

the supporter of the metaphorical interpretation of the Hebrew Bible which he knew in the Greek translation, was active.

The parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue was also influenced by political factors. Around 40 AD in Jabneh, which half a century later would become famous for the rabbinic academy, riots started between the Jews and the Gentiles, in which Christians did not participate. Still they had to leave Rome together with other Jews after the infamous edict of Claudius.

The post-paschal Perspective

There is no ultimate evidence of the resurrection and there cannot be, but there are lot of arguments for resurrection and they cannot be ignored. Let us have a look at only two of them.

Everything that Peter and John saw after the arrival at the tomb on Sunday morning on the third day after the death of Jesus constitutes the first argument. Analysis of funeral customs in Palestine in the first century AD shows that burial vestments: a shroud and a cloth, especially the one wrapped around the head of the dead person, had a particular purpose. In Jesus' time after anointing, a corpse was wrapped up in a shroud, the face was covered with *sudarion*, and legs and arms were tied with bands. The preparation procedure was as follows: the body of the dead person was placed on a long shroud, and then the corpus was covered with the second part of the shroud. After that it was wrapped across with the use of bands. A separate cloth was put on the head of the dead person. Wrapping of a head, apart from the fact that it prevented the jaw from dropping, had a symbolic meaning: it meant that the dead definitely went out of the living world and that the state was irreversible.

Knowledge of those customs holds specific meaning in John's narration about the empty tomb. When Simon Peter went into the tomb, he saw "the strips of linen lying there as well as the burial cloth that had been around [Jesus'] head. The cloth was folded up by itself, separate from the linen." (Jn 20:6b-7)[99] The reading of John's reference to the cloth refers to symbolism of the garment: separating the shroud from the cloth means that the state of Jesus' death was not definitive. Many biblical scholars are inclined to support the argument because in such a dry climate canvas, on which large quantities of dense oil were put, hardened and crusted very quickly, so John could see Jesus' shroud intact in structure still resembling an oval of human body or an Egyptian mummy, but empty inside. The body of Christ as if evaporated from the shroud, without touching its external structure. Such a view indeed could be a strong argument for the resurrection. Of course, this is just one of the assumptions.

The second argument for Christ's resurrection is the fact that its first witnesses did not hesitate to sacrifice their lives for their beliefs. From among the twelve (not

99 H. Latham, *The Risen Master*, Cambridge 1901, 29–56; M. Balagué, *La prueba de la Resurrección (John 20, 6–7)*, Est Bib 25 (1966) 169–192; K. Bornhäuser, *Die Leidens-und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu*, Gütersloh 1947, 140–41.

counting Judas, but counting Matthew chosen in his place) only John died a death from natural causes. All the other apostles gave their lives, suffering martyr's death and testifying through the death the resurrection of Christ. John also suffered persecution on the island of Patmos. It would be very difficult to accept the thesis that someone recklessly sacrifices himself for the truth as to which there is no (subjective at least) certainty. Thus, the apostles were sure about the resurrection of Christ and therefore they did not hesitate to pay the highest price.

The paschal perspective gave the opportunity to read the history of redemption in a completely different manner. It became the key to the entirely different reading of the Hebrew Bible, the new key of messianism realized in the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth.[100] In this perspective Jakub Slawik asks the question concerning the fundamentals of Christology of the New Testament:

> A fundamental question arises, therefore, if without the ground-breaking experience of Jesus' disciples i.e. meeting the living Jesus after his crucifixion, a New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament would be possible at all. Could Christian Christology come to existence only as a result of an interpretation of the Old Testament? It is a question about the significance of the event of Christ for the history of the interpretation of the Bible of Israel. In my opinion only one answer to this question is possible. Christological interpretation of the Old Testament tradition would be unthinkable without the paschal experience.[101]

Moreover, the rereading concerned not only the sacred writings of Israel, but also the historical life of Jesus. *Verba et facta Jesu,* incomprehensible to the apostles during His earthly life, became clear and understandable only when they were read from the perspective of the resurrection.[102]

---

100 It must be said that rereading Biblical texts was nothing new. Jews used to do this for centuries, so Christian reading anew of biblical passages concerning God's intervention in history and reading the entire Bible with the messianic perspective in mind belonged to the Jewish tradition (*The Jewish Nation and its Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible*, 19).

101 J. Slawik, *Stary Testament / Tanach w chrześcijańskiej Biblii*, RT 57 (2015) 4, 411.

102 Jesus' logion recorded in the Gospel of John may serve as an example: "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn 2:19). Naturally, the first recipients of these words thought about the Temple of Jerusalem. Its construction took forty six years. In Herod's time the sanctuary was radically reconstructed. The premises of the Temple were broadened of the largest platform called "The Court of the Gentiles." Decorating and finishing works lasted practically to the destruction of the Temple by the army of Titus in the year 70. Hence the adversary's answer that forty-six years were devoted to the building of the Temple. No wonder that Jesus' words of its reconstruction within three days seemed to be mad to their listeners. Only after the resurrection, Jesus' disciples were able to understand their real meaning: "But he was speaking of the Temple that was his body" (Jn 2:21). The announcement of the reconstruction of the Temple in three days was *de facto* the announcement of the resurrection.

Jerusalem – Judeo-Christian Community

The first Christian community was established in Jerusalem.[103] For two or three years after the death of Christ, His followers were connected mainly with this city, and they were gathered around Peter, whose leadership among the Twelve was established by Jesus himself. There are a few biblical arguments supporting this thesis. Firstly, among Jesus' disciples Peter is always in the first place (Mk 3:13-19). For obvious reasons Judas is the last one and except for Peter other disciples are mentioned in different order.[104] Placing Peter's name always in the first place makes us recognize his special role among the apostles.

Secondly, the Gospels contain other so-called primatial texts providing arguments for Peter's primacy. A fragment from Mt 16:18-28 is among them: "So I now say to you: You are Peter and on this rock I will build my church. And the gates of the underworld can never overpower it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven: whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." Within Hebrew environment keys constituted a symbol of power. In the culture of the West such a symbol was a sceptre or a crown. For the Hebrews, keys indicated their legal status as leaders (which does not mean that symbolic meaning of the royal insignia was ignored). So the significance of this text is unambiguous.

Another fragment which can be numbered among primatial texts is a narration on Christophany according to which the risen Lord asks Peter three times: "Simon son of John, do you love me?" After each confirmation (which is a peculiar rehabilitation of Peter after his triple denial of the Master), Christ entrusts him his sheepfold (cf. Jn 21:15-19).

Thirdly, the change of the name Simon to the name Peter is essential. It is a definitive change, after which the Gospels call the apostle consistently by the new name.

Fourthly, an important argument for Peter's primacy are his letters to the churches in Asia Minor. It was Paul who established Christian communities in Asia Minor during his missionary journeys. It appears, therefore, that he should have the natural right to take important decisions about these churches. Nevertheless, Peter writes his letters to these communities and their members in the first place take his opinion into account.

Fifthly, attention should be drawn to the fact that Paul paid homage to Peter who stayed in Jerusalem (Ga 1:18). Exegetes indicate that this type of acquaintanceship was aimed at recognition of authority.

---

103 J.D.G. Dunn speculates that in Jerusalem there could have been more Christian communities; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christianity in Making*, II, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 2009, 133–138.

104 On the leading role of Peter within the emerging community see: A.J. Najda, *Historiografia paradygmatyczna w Dziejach Apostolskich*, 337–355.

And sixthly, in the early Church the recognition of the authority of Peter's successor over other apostles was evident. Early Christian writings show that although some of the apostles were still alive (for example John on the island of Patmos), Christians from different regions turned to Rome to Peter's successor to settle their disputes.

It is almost certain that the leadership in the community of Jerusalem after Peter was taken over by James who also saw Christ after the resurrection (1Co 15:7). Paul accepted his leadership (Ga 1:19; 2,9).[105] Researchers speculate that when Peter was leaving Jerusalem (Ac 9:32-10:48), it was James who presided over the community of Christians. We do not have any evidence that he ever left the capital of Judea. This line of reasoning can be supported by the fact that he was known as "the Lord's brother." (Ga 1:19) This term is understood in three ways by theologians. According to the first hypothesis[106], brothers and sisters of Jesus were his cousins. Their father was probably Cleopas and their mother Mary, but different from the mother of Jesus (Mk 3:18; 15:40; Jn 19:25). According to the second hypothesis, "brothers and sisters of Jesus" are His siblings that were born to Mary and Joseph.[107] According to the third speculation, Joseph was a widower when he married Mary, and he already had children from his first marriage. This thesis is also proposed by the author of the apocryphal *Protoevangelium of James:*

> And the priest said unto Joseph: Unto thee hath it fallen to take the virgin of the Lord and keep her for thyself. And Joseph refused, saying: I have sons, and I am an old man, but she is a girl: lest I became a laughing-stock to the children of Israel. And the priest said unto Joseph: Year the Lord thy God, and remember what things God did unto Dathan and Abiram and Korah, how the earth clave and they were swallowed up because of their gainsaying. And now fear thou, Joseph, lest it be so in thine house. And Joseph was afraid, and took her to keep her for himself (*ProtEvJ* 9,1-3).

The argument supporting the thesis that Jesus did not have a brother born of Mary is the Jewish law. Dying on the cross, the Convict entrusted Mary to John, the youngest among his disciples (Jn 19:25-27). If Jesus had had his own brother, in accordance with the Jewish Law, the obligation to take care of Mary would have fallen onto him; the fact that Jesus entrusts her to John is an argument against the thesis about the existence of the brothers of Jesus.

James, also called the Fair (Epiphanius, *Haer.* 78,14), was regarded as a Jewish traditionalist. On the basis of Ga 2:12 one can presume that after the death of Christ, James still observed Jewish dietary rules (basing his convictions on Lv 20:23-26). One can also expect that the Christians gathered around James considered themselves to be a movement fully belonging to the very heart of Judaism; a

105 Eusebius also mentioned it (*Hist.* 1,12); J. Painter, *Just James. The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*, 107.

106 The fact is mainly accepted by theologians of the catholic provenance.

107 This hypothesis was adopted in certain Protestant circles.

movement aimed at revival of Israel. This is what the announcement of the New Covenant written in Jeremiah was supposed to mean (Jr 31:31-34).[108] It is known that Judeo-Christians, in the first years after the resurrection, were connected with the Temple of Jerusalem (Ac 2:46; 3:1). It is possible that some of them used to come to the Temple to make offerings (Ac 21:23-26), however, it is not certain. It was probably just the opposite: the followers of Christ realized very quickly that His sacrifice replaced the sacrifices of the Old Law. The followers of Christ attended the Temple, but only to pray, not to offer sacrifices prescribed by the Law.[109] We will address this issue in more detail when we discuss the different understanding of the role of the Temple in the eyes of the members of the nascent Church and the Jews who did not accept Jesus.

The presence of Judeo-Christians in the Temple and keeping the Law in the first years after the resurrection did not save them from persecution though (Ac 4:1-22; 5:17-40; 12:1-5) but it was still the persecution within the Jewish community. The followers of Jesus were convinced that he was the Messiah sent by God and the Son of God (Rm 1:4), in accordance with the words used by the psalmist ("You are my son, today have I fathered you"; Ps 2:7). Jesus was not only risen from the dead, but He has been sat on the right hand of God, in accordance with the Messiah's interpretation of Ps 110:1.[110] In Jesus the announcements of John the Baptist, who was recognized as a prophet by many Jews, were also fulfilled (Mk 1:8). Jerusalem community (and not only) was strongly convinced of an early return of Christ on the Parousia (1Th 1:10; 4:15; 1Co 7:29; 15:51; Rm 13:11-12; Ph 4:5). The one who was risen from the dead as the first one was to complete his task by raising others from the dead. The testimony of real waiting for the second coming of Christ is a prayer centred around the call *Marana tha!* (1Co 16:22). Many of Jesus' parables were read as a reference to the Parousia and a call to be ready for this day (especially

108 The oracle of Jeremiah became the subject of numerous exegetic studies. Among them three publications are worth mentioning: A. Schenker, *Der nie augehobene Bund. Exegetische Beobachtungen zu Jer 31,31–34*, in: *Der Neue Bund im Alten. Studien zur Bundestheologie der Beide Testamente*, QD 146, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1993, 85–112; J. Krašovec, *Vergebung und neuer Bund nach Jer 31,31–34*, ZAW 105 (1993) 428–444; A. Graupner, *Ewiger Bund (Gen 17) oder neuer Bund (Jer 31,31-34)? Überlegungen zu einem Grundproblem der Theologie des Alten Testaments im Horizont gesamtbiblischer Theologie*, RT 57 (2015) 4, 487.

109 In a different manner S. Mason: "Notice, that even after Jesus has risen, the apostles continue to attend Jewish Temple sacrifices (Acts 3,1)"; S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 200. Luke, however, says nothing about the sacrifices made by the apostles, but only about prayer (they "were going up to the Temple for the prayers"). Therefore, the conclusion of Mason on the continuation of the sacrificial cult of Israel by the apostles is too far-reaching.

110 P. Landesmann, *Anti-Judaism on the Way from Judaism to Christianity*, Wiener Vorlesungen: Forschungen 5, Frankfurt am Main – Berlin – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien 2012, 53.

Mk 13:28-37; Mt 24:32-44): The new movement of Judaism also introduced new practices:

(1) baptism administered by John the Baptist was taken over by the Christians and a new meaning was given to it. It was administered in the name of Jesus (Ac 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5; 1Co 1:13-15) and treated as the moment of inclusion into Church;
(2) although the Temple still remained an important place of prayer and teaching, Christians also gathered individually in private homes; the distinctive sign of their prayer was calling God the Father (*Abba*; Rm 8:15-16; Ga 4:6-7);
(3) meetings in private homes were connected with "breaking of the bread" (although there is no clear evidence how often the believers gathered to receive the Eucharist shortly after Christ's resurrection);
(4) the rule of common ownership of goods was implemented to provide aid to those who needed it most (Ac 2:44-45; 4:34-37).

One can only imagine Judeo-Christians who, in the first years after the resurrection and before the rhythm of Sunday Eucharistic meetings was introduced, had gathered together with other Jews at synagogue services.[111] The structure of such services was clearly determined.[112] After saying the opening prayers which included *Shema* and original *Shemone Esre* (the blessings were probably not eighteen in number in the first century, and their form was not the same as that established in the Jabneh's environment at the turn of the first century) reading of the Pentateuch started. The *hazzan* took out from a bookcase a sacred scroll, pulled off the covers and gave it to a lector. Even if the lector knew the text by heart, he had to read it. When he made a mistake, the *hazzan* used to correct him. If the text was scandalous or caused amusement among its listeners, the leader of a synagogue could interrupt the reading.

In Palestine the Hebrew text was always read (also in most synagogues in the diaspora) and it was then translated into Aramaic (Greek in the diaspora). The three-year cycle of readings used in Palestine included 167 *sedarim*; the annual Babylonian cycle divided the text into 54 *parashot.* After reading the Torah and its paraphrase in the form of the Targum, singing of psalms thematically related to the reading took place. Then there came the next reading, this time taken out of the prophetic books – fragments of the Major and Minor Prophets were divided into

111 B. Olsson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: An Introduction*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 32; C. Claussen, *Versammlung, Gemeinde, Synagoge. Das hellenistisch-jüdischen Umfeld der frühlichsten Gemeinden*, Göttingen 2002, 298.

112 L.H. Schiffman, *The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 47.

the *haftarot*.[113] After that reading the president of a synagogue or his helper (i.e. the *hazzan* mentioned above) appointed someone in the audience to explain the meaning of the text (cf. Ac 13:13-16). After parenetic commentary, the *Kaddish* was said, a prayer in which – according to some versions – the Jews thanked God that He had not created them Gentiles, slaves, or women.[114] The *Kaddish* has different forms. It is difficult to say unambiguously which of them was used in times of the New Testament, but the most likely option seems to be the liturgical one.

So, when after reading the fragment of the Hebrew Bible, its translation (or better: paraphrasing) had to be done in the form of the Targum, some tensions were inevitable. Judaean believers in Christ, when asked to prepare the Targum, would probably interpret many texts differently – using a Christological key – than supporters of other branches of Judaism. Study shows that in synagogue practice in the first century, the explanations of biblical texts were expected to be short and factual, getting straight to the heart of the matter.[115] If so, the believers of Christ probably used to talk directly about Jesus as the Messiah, what could cause offence to many present in the synagogue.[116] Although both of them spoke Aramaic and interpreted the same Hebrew text, Judeo-Christians explained it from the post-paschal point of view.[117] This different perspective might even have led to alienation of some Judeo-Christian synagogues from others, in which Jesus was not considered to be the Messiah. This must, however, remain a pure conjecture because of the absence in written or archaeological sources of any evidence indicating that some synagogues had Christian leaning and others did not.

The last of above mentioned practices, the common ownership of goods, was also known in other Judaic movements at that time. The rule of common goods was implemented for example by the Essenes and the Therapeutae. As far as the Essenes (today almost unequivocally identified with inhabitants of the community of Qumran) are concerned, new followers who wanted to join the sect had to offer all their properties to the community. The handover of material goods was connected with transferring the ownerships in favour of the community and

113 During the five holidays (the Octave of Passover, the Feast of Weeks, *Hanukkah*, the Feast of Tabernacles and *Purim*) so-called five scrolls (*Megillot*) were read, respectively Ca, Rt, Lm, Qo and Est.

114 Women expressed their appreciation that God made them "according to His will."

115 M. Baraniak, *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 109.

116 It can be illustrated on the example of Saul of Tarsus, who after his adhesion to Christ, during his missionary journeys, always started to proclaim the Good News in a synagogue, but then was thrown out and turned to the Gentiles.

117 E. Tov, *The Text of the Hebrew / Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 237–238.

renouncing any further claims to the profits. At first, possessions were located on the newcomer's personal account. In case of his death or withdrawal from the community during the three-year trial period, they had to be returned to him. After the trial period the community came into ownership of the property. The property was, however, understood in a particular way: the transferred property belonged entirely to God and the community was only the trustee. Only Yahweh was the owner of the land that He, so to speak, leased to Israel.

Another source of financial resources was the tithe, scrupulously paid by the members of the community. The Essens, unwilling to pay the tithe for the Temple in Jerusalem, allotted every tenth part of their income to their own communities because after all the members of those groups constituted a living Temple.[118]

As far as the Therapeutae are concerned, a Jewish group in the Egyptian diaspora, known to us only thanks to information contained in Philo's *De vita contemplativa,* we are informed that before joining the group candidates left their properties to their families or friends in order to devote themselves to contemplative life with greater freedom (*Contempl.* 2,13). Christians in turn placed their possessions at the apostles' feet, but they did not manage to avoid conflicts. Luke relates that the first sign of the tension was the neglect of Hellenist' widows by the Hebrews. Hellenists were certainly Jews who used the Greek language and lived in Palestine.[119] To resolve the conflict some deacons were appointed, who were responsible for distribution of food (Ac 6:1-7).[120]

The reference to tension and solution of conflicts is important not only because it makes the readers of the Acts of the Apostles aware of the fact that already in the early Church there was a need to combat the imperfections of human nature. Researchers of this period in the history of the emerging Church also realize that very early, perhaps two or three years after Christ's death and resurrection, his teaching must have been preached in Greek, since the Hellenists adhered to it. The Greek language became a vehicle which carried the Good News from the land of

118 It may seem that the divestiture of personal properties for the Community would lead to pauperization of the members of the Essene groups, while it was quite opposite: just because of the common ownership of goods the Essenes enjoyed greater wealth than other groups within Judaism; H. Stegemann, *Esseńczycy z Qumran, Jan Chrzciciel i Jezus*, 218.

119 For more information on identity of Hellenists see: R. Bartnicki, *Dzieje głoszenia Słowa Bożego. Jezus i najstarszy Kościół*, Kraków 2015, 263–265.

120 T. Seland, *Once More – The Hellenists, Hebrews, and Stephen: Conflicts and Conflict-Management in Acts 6 – 7*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 179–200.

the Aramaic language (and to a lesser extent the Hebrew) to the areas inhabited by Greek-speaking people. The Palestinian Jews did not know Greek well enough.[121]

The first herald of the growing conflict between Church and Synagogue that finally led to total parting of the ways between both communities (already as separate religions) is the mere fact of appearing of a new, organized group of Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah sent by God. The new community governed by its own rules (not unknown to Judaism, but not universal, as for example the common ownership of goods) appears as one of the fractions of the religion coming from Moses and gathering around the Temple in Jerusalem and the Torah. With the passing of time, it will become clear that this trinity: messianism – the Temple – the Law was interpreted differently within both groups.

Messianism of Judeo-Christians and Messianism of other Movements within Judaism

When Israelites lost their independence after the invasion of Babylonians in 586 BC, a period in which the Jews virtually did not have their own independent state began. It lasted for twenty-six centuries except for the relatively short time of the rule of the Hasmonean dynasty. They either inhabited the land named by the Romans Palestine, subjected to foreign powers (Babylonian, Persian, Hellenic, Roman, Byzantine, Arabian, Turkish and British), or they had to live in the diaspora. The return from Babylonian exile gave birth to Judaism (Greek *ioudaismos*) – a Jewish religion differing significantly from the original Jahwism and religion of Moses and the prophets. For the first time, the term *ioudaismos* appeared in Hellenic Jewish literature in 2Mch 2:21; 8:1; 14:38 and *Esther rabba* (7,11), and then in Ga 1:13-14.[122]

At the time when Jesus started His public activity, national and liberation movements among the Jews, who were then under the occupation of Rome, proved to be particularly strong.[123] They became visible in the second century BC when apocalyptic literature started to flourish. The beginnings of this type of literature

121 J.N. Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Century Jewish Christians Have Known?*, Leiden 1969, 65–71; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Languages of Palestine in the First Century*, CBQ 30 (1972) 501–531.

122 G. Wigoder, *The Encyclopedia of Judaism*, Jerusalem 1989, 397; K. Pilarczyk, *Rabinizacja judaizmu we wczesnym okresie pobiblijnym*, in: *Pan moim światłem. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Jerzego Chmiela w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, 286–287.

123 E. Schürer comments: "L'attesa di un futuro migliore era già uno degli elementi fondamentali della coscienza religiosa dei profeti veterotestamentari e il popolo non perse mai del tutto questa stessa speranza, anche se non sempre essa si manifestava così vigorosa come dopo la rivolta maccabaica"; *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo (175 a.C. - 135 d.C.)*, trans. V. Gatti, II, Brescia 1987, 588.

can already be sought at the time of the creation of the Book of Daniel i.e. in the third century BC. Apocalypses (and other apocryphal scriptures) were pervaded with hope for the establishment of an independent kingdom, governed by God's perfect Law, in accordance with the idea of a theocratic state.[124] These hopes were to be fulfilled by the expected Messiah or Messiahs, as the members of the association described in the letters found near Chirbet Qumran believed.[125] The Qumran community believed in coming of the Messiah of both Aaron and Israel.[126] The faith in two Messiahs is also reflected in a remark included in the Talmud (BT, *Suk.* 52a); the first was to come from the tribe of Judah, the second from Ephraim. The second was recognized as the Messiah whose mission was not successful. But this failed mission was to be sufficient preparation of the way for the Messiah from the tribe of Judah.[127]

An essential preliminary comment that has to be made about Jewish messianism at the time of Jesus is that, although the dreams and longings of the Jews for an independent state were still alive and even stronger, the idea of messianism was not central to their religiosity at all.[128] A. Causse in his insightful study on the subject showed that if one overestimates liveliness of the messianic expectations he or she looks at Judaism of the first century from the Christian perspective where the idea of messianism was particularly important. Hence Christianity emerging in the heart of Judaism was a thoroughly messianic movement.[129] The Jews were focused

124 S. Beyerle, *Die Apokalyptik als "Mutter alle christlichen Theologie" – die Apokalyptik im Alten und Neuen Testament*, RT 57 (2015) 4, 491–492; M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, New York – Oxford 1993, 95–97.

125 L.H. Schiffman, *Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 116–129.

126 Exegesis of the Hebrew Bible texts which were accepted as messianic developed in a different way among Qumranians and Christians: "The comparative study of New Testament and Qumranic evidence, then, helps clarify this characteristic Second Temple tension between inherited (and seemingly widespread) patterns of messianic exegesis and their sectarian offshoots"; S. Ruzer, *Mapping the New Testament. Early Christian Writings as a Witness for Jewish Biblical Exegesis*, JCPS 13, Leiden – Boston 2007, 129.

127 It is doubtful if creators of the Talmud made any allusion to Jesus who was killed, and therefore whose mission was not successful. It rather refers to the execution of Bar Kokhba whom some considered to be the Messiah; S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 322.

128 J. Lemański notices: „Większość głównych tekstów starotestamentalnych w ogóle nie jest przeniknięta oczekiwaniem na wypełnienie się jakiejś mesjańskiej nadziei"; J. Lemański, *W oczekiwaniu na Mesjasza?*, ScL 7 (2015) 35.

129 A. Causse, *Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem, du Deutéto-Esaïe à la III^e Sibylle*, RHPR 1 (1938) 397. See also: J.D.G. Dunn, *Messianic Ideas and Their Influence on the Jesus of History*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 365–381.

on the Temple and Jerusalem more than on the issues of messianism. For example, the *Apocalypse of Baruch* and the *Fourth Book of Ezra* attribute a very limited role to the Messiah and they mention him only in connection with the Holy City.[130]

It is necessary to emphasize strongly that Judaism at the time of Jesus was a colourful mosaic of convictions. As a result, the understanding of messianic mission varied.[131] The differences resulted essentially from the nature of religious environment in which the messianic ideas functioned (Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, Essenes etc.).[132] In this presentation, it will be possible to emphasize only key differences between the Christian understanding of this idea and its perception by different denominations of Judaism.

The messianic idea at the time of Jesus gradually acquired three features: universalism, individualism and politicization. Universalism allowed to think of the consequences of actions of the Messiah not only for the history of the chosen nation, but also for the fate of the entire world. Moreover, it presented in perspective not only the Jewish people as a whole, but also the fates of individuals who would accept or reject the Messiah. The political dimension was combined with longing for liberation of the land, once given to Abraham and his descendants, from foreign rule (Roman at the time of Jesus). Political issues and messianic concepts overlapped, and the latter included beliefs relating to final disasters (*4 Ezra* 6:24; 9:1-12; 13:29-31; *Sot.* 9,15), the second coming of Elias which would be the announcement of the second coming of the Messiah himself (Mi 3:23-24, the defeat of satanic powers (Dn 11; Ps 2; *OrSib* 3,663; *4 Ezra* 13:33; *1 Enoch* 90:16; 1QM 15-19; *As. Mos.* 10; *1 En* 90,18-27.37; *OrSib.* 3,652; *PsSal* 17,27.39; *ApBar* 39,7-40,2; 70,9; 72,2-6; *4 Ezra* 12,32-33; 13,27-28.35-38; *Praem.*16,95), gathering of Israelites dispersed in the diaspora[133], renewal of Jerusalem[134], the establishment of the kingdom of God,

---

130 P.D. Hanson, *Messiahs and Messianic Figures in Proto-Apocalypticism*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 67–75.

131 For extensive study on understanding messianism in the first century, see: R.A. Horsley, *'Messianic' Figures and Movements in First-Century Palestine*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 276–295.

132 J.A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who is to Come*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 2007, 1–6.

133 *Ps. Sal.* 11; *Praem.* 28–29; *4 Esd* 13,39–47. E. Schürer comments: "Era talmente ovvio che i dispersi d'Israele avrebbero avuto parte al. regno messianico e che a questo scopo sarebbero tornati nella terra santa, che una speranza del genere sarebbe stata nutrita anche senza le profezie veterotestamentarie"; *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo (175 a.C. - 135 d.C.)*, II, 632.

134 Judaic writings did not indicate explicitly whether Jerusalem would be renewed in temporal order: "Non è chiaro se i Giudei aspettassero un regno messianico sulla terra o se credessero che il Figlio dell'Uomo, predetto da Daniele, avrebbe portato a compimento gli avvenimenti apocalittici senza un preliminare regno terreste"; P. Grech, *Le idee fondamentali del Nuovo Testamento. Compendio di teologia biblica*, trans. A. Corticelli, Modena 1970, 16.

the universal resurrection and the Last Judgement. The Messianic era was to be marked by suffering. By rabbis it was named "sorrows of the Messiah" (cf. Hos 13:13; Mk 13:8; Mt 24:8) and the sorrows were supposed to be manifested by signs visible in the sky and, inter alia, hunger, fires and earthquakes. According to some apocryphal writings (e.g. *1 En* 9,16-38), the Messiah will appear after the Final Judgement and according to others before the Judgement Day (*OrSib.* 3,652-656; *Ps. Sal.* 17,24.26.27.31.38.39.41; *Praem.* 16,91-97).[135]

From the historical point of view, the Jewish messianism of the first century was vital, though – as mentioned – it did not constitute the basic religious idea. Followers of Jesus of Nazareth saw in Him the Messiah, but other believers of Judaism, although they rejected Jesus, still cultivated messianic expectations. These expectations were fuelled by zealotic movement and were clearly visible at the time of tensions and conflict with the Roman occupant. Josephus stressed many times that leaders of some groups were regarded by their members as the Messiahs. Such was the case of Menahem, the leader of the Sicarii, who appeared in Jerusalem dressed in royal garments. Although by his supporters he was widely acclaimed as anointed, supporters of Elazar, who later took possession of Masada, were openly opposed to him: "they made an assault upon him in the Temple; for he went up thither to worship in a pompous manner, and adorned with royal garments, and had his followers with him in their armour." (*Bell.* 2,443-444) In that place Menahem lost his life.

Another insurrectional leader Simon bar Giora was caught after the fall of the Temple, wearing a white tunic and a royal robe (*Bell.* 7,29).[136] Still another candidate for the Messiah was someone named Elazar ben Dinaja and was presented by Josephus as an ordinary insurgent (*Bell.* 2,235-236), but rabbis did not hesitate to recognize in him the characteristics of the "anointed." (*CantRab* 2,18) Rabbi Akiba allegedly announced Bar Kokhba as the Messiah. Bar Kokhba was the leader of the second Jewish War which ended in a defeat in 135 AD.[137]

In comparison to other pretenders to the messianic dignity mentioned above, it becomes clear that the vision of Jesus' messianic mission was almost devoid of political dimension (which is linked to the so-called Messianic secret in the Gospel according to Mark). However, features of individualism and universalism came to the forefront. They were much more emphasized in the teaching of Jesus than in

135 For insightful study of the messianic idea in Qumranian texts and apocryphal literature, see: M. Parchem, *Postać Mesjasza w literaturze międzytestamentalnej: zwoje z Qumran i apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ScL 7 (2015) 69–86.

136 L.H. Feldman, *Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism in the First Century*, in: *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2011, 18.

137 J. Lemański, *W oczekiwaniu na Mesjasza?*, 65.

official currents of Judaism.[138] Self-understanding of messianic mission by Jesus was full of suffering in imitation of Isaiah's "servant of Yahweh." It remained in opposition to the image of the triumphant Messiah present in the minds of the majority of the Jews.[139] These discrepancies in understanding of messianic mission constitute another element, separating the Jews from Judeo-Christians, and as a result they give rise to a conflict between Church and Synagogue.

It should be noted, however, that in recent years the voices of those who acknowledge the presence of the idea of the suffering Messiah in Jewish theology as early as in the first century BC have become more audible. In 2000, the Jewish theologian Israel Knohl published a book entitled *The Messiah Before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem 2000). According to the professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem the idea of the suffering Messiah was present in the views of the members of the Qumran community. The author proves his thesis, supporting it not only with the Dead Sea Scrolls, but also rabbinic literature which – although created in the Christian era – is the reflection of earlier beliefs, existing for decades or even centuries.

Israel Knohl's views seem to be confirmed in a record preserved on a stone stele, coming from Jordan, found in 2008 and today known as the Gabriel's Revelation. David Jeselsohn, a connoisseur and admirer of antiquity, acquired this almost one meter long stone at an antiquity market. After bringing it to Europe, he decorated the interior of his homestead with it. Ada Yardeni, an expert on the Hebrew language of Herod's time, took an interest in this artefact. Not hiding her surprise, she announced to her friend: 'You've got Qumran Scrolls written in stone!" What was new was the fact that the inscription was not forged or engraved, but was written in ink. Studies confirmed its ancient origin. What is more, it is almost certain that the tablet came into existence several years before the birth of Christ, probably at the beginning of the second half of the first century BC. And this is what makes the finding so significant.

It is highly probable that the inscription expresses the idea of a suffering Messiah who will rise from the dead or will demonstrate a "sign" after three days.[140] One of its lines reads: "In three days you will know that evil will be defeated by justice,"

---

138 An important study on understanding the idea of messianism has recently been edited by M.L. Morgan and S. Wietzman (*Rethinking the Messianic Idea in Judaism*, Bloomington 2015).

139 N.A. Dahl, *Messianic Ideas and the Crucifixion of Jesus*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 382–403.

140 Israel Knohl says: "The Christian myth of a Messiah who dies and is resurrected was shaped by a pre-existing Jewish myth. From the 'Gabriel Revelation' we learn that the motif of the leader's resurrection on the third day existed in Judaism prior to the birth of Christianity"; I. Knohl, *The Gabriel Revelation*, in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture. Proceedings of the international conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. A.D. Roitman[and others], Leiden 2011, 441.

and then words appear that are attributed to the Archangel Gabriel and addressed to the Messiah: "In three days you shall live.[141] I Gabriel command you." Precisely speaking, this announcement is addressed to "Prince of princes," but after all the Messiah was sometimes described in exactly that way. If up to date results of the examination of the stele are confirmed, it will mean that Jesus with his views fits fully into one of the Judaic trends of the Messianic tradition. The theme of "three days" (Mt 12:40; Lk 24:46; Jn 2:19; cf. 1Co 15:4) known from the Gospels appears in the inscription a few or even several decades before their creation.[142] Viewed from this perspective, the allegation that Christians after the death of Christ invented the announcements of His death and put them in His mouth is out of place. The relationship between Judaism and Christianity is much stronger than it has been thought until recently.

In non-biblical Jewish literature, the liberator, who was to come, was described not only as the Messiah[143] but also the "Son of Man,"[144] "God's Chosen One,"[145] "Son of God,"[146] or "David's son."[147] Each of these messianic titles referred to a man anointed by God (or possibly two anointed men, priestly and kingly – according to the convictions of the Essenes).[148] The Christian understanding of the title "Son of God" was characterized by the divine prerogatives, which the followers of Judaism could not accept, seeing in this belief the threat to monotheism. Therefore, the Christian understanding of sonship of God with reference to Christ, in the context of His messianic mission, constituted the next component of the conflict between Church and Synagogue.[149]

---

141 The second possible version of reading the inscription: "After three days – a sign"; T. Elgvin, *Eschatology and Messianism in the "Gabriel Inscription,"* 5–6.

142 The theme of redemption that comes at dawn or on the third day is based on biblical texts (Hos 6:3; Ps 46:5; Ex 8:19; 19:11.15; Gn 15:4).

143 *1 Hen* 48,18; 52,4; *ApBar* 29,3; 30,1; 39,7; 40,1; 70,9; 72;2; 1QSa 2,12.14; CD 12,23; 14,19; 19,10; 20;1; *Sot.* 9,15.

144 *1 Hen* 46,1–6; 48,2–7; 62,5–9.14; 63,11; 69,26–29; 70,1; 71,17. See: F.H. Borsch, *Further Reflections on 'The Son of Man': The Origins and Development of the Title*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 131–144.

145 *1 Hen* 39,6; 40,5; 45,3–5; 49,2–4; 51,3.5; 52,6–9; 53,6; 54,4; 61,5.8–10; 62,1; P.A. Cunningham, *Jesus and the Evangelists. The Ministry of Jesus and Its Portrayal in the Synoptic Gospels*, New York 1998, 114.

146 *1 Hen* 105,2; *4 Ezra* 7,28–29; 13,32.37.52; 14,9; 4QFlor 1,10–12.

147 *PsSal* 17,5.23; *4 Ezra* 12,32.

148 G.S. Oegema, *"The Coming of the Righteous One" in 1 Enoch, Qumran, and the New Testament*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, III, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 389–390.

149 B.M. Bokser, *Messianism, the Exodus Pattern, and Early Rabbinic Judaism*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 239.

Differences in understanding the messianic idea between followers of Jesus and those who did not accept Him could have already been observed on the day of Pentecost. The description of the event that left an indelible mark on the character of the rising Church and belongs to the basic constitutive facts of the new community, takes up only four verses (Ac 2:1-4). The rest of the account is devoted to the reactions of the participants (Ac 2:5-13). And because the reactions were diverse, Peter had to interpret the whole event in terms of the fulfilment of the eschatological prophecy about sending of the Holy Spirit of the Lord (Ac 2:14-36). The event made the experience of the resurrection complete.

In Luke's description of the events which took place on the morning of the Pentecost, a double mention of the fact that the scene was witnessed by "pious Jews" (Ac 2:5) and the "Jews and proselytes" (Ac 2:11) seems to be of significance. The presence of the pious is not surprising because others did not take part in such feasts. The mention of proselytes confirms the opinion of Josephus, which he included in the *Antiquitates judaicae* (20,38-48), that Judaism of the first century was sometimes very actively missionary.[150] The presence of the Jews from the diaspora, in a sense, is a preparation of the Christian missions among the Gentiles. Peter interprets the Old Testament in messianic terms, referring the psalmist's announcements (Ps 16:8-11; Ps 110:1) to Jesus. At the end of his speech, the first of the apostles makes a solemn declaration: "For this reason the whole House of Israel can be certain that the Lord and Christ whom God has made is this Jesus whom you crucified." (Ac 2:36)

Similarly to Peter on the day of Pentecost, the authors of the New Testament reread the Hebrew Bible, finding fragments which they referred to Christ. It should be noted that only a small number of texts, considered to be messianic by Christians, was recognized as such by the Jews and the fact clearly influenced the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue. The list of the messianic prophecies which have been fulfilled in Christ shall be as follows[151]:

---

150 The term "proselyte" in Greek means "a newcomer" to a specific place. Scientists sometimes contrast proselytism with missionary activity. Proselytism means that someone, on his own initiative, is interested in a religion and intends to join its followers, whereas missionary activity means active inducement and encouragement to engage in a new religious community. Both proselytism (in Judaism) and missionary activity (in Christianity) are aimed at a triple change: (1) religious conversion, e.g. from pagan religions to a new faith; (2) ethical conversion towards moral standards (nearly common to Jews and Christians) and (3) social conversion, i.e. a change of religious community; P. Borgen, *Proselytes, Conquest, and Mission*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 57–70.

151 On the basis of: J.H. Walton, H.W. House, R.L. Thomas, R. Price, *Tablice biblijne. Chrześcijańskie tablice encyklopedyczne*, I, Warszawa 2007, 412–413. Cf. D.E. Aune, *Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 404–422.

Prophecies of the Hebrew Bible	Theme of prophecy	Proclamation of fulfilment in the New Testament
Gn 3:15	Born of a woman	Ga 4:4
Gn 12:2-3	Descendant of Abraham	Mt 1:1
Gn 17:19	Descendant of Isaac	Mt 1:2
Nb 24:17	Descendant of Jacob	Mt 1:2
Gn 49:10	From the tribe of Judah	Lk 3:33
Is 9:7	The Heir to the throne of David	Lk 1:32-33
Dn 9:25	The birth of Christ	Lk 2:1-2
Is 7:14	Born of a virgin	Lk 1:26-27.30-31
Mi 5:2	Born in Bethlehem	Lk 2:4-7
Jr 31:15	Slaughter of the Innocents	Mt 2:16-18
Hos 11:1	Flight to Egypt	Mt 14-15
Is 40:3-5; Mi 3:1	Announced by his predecessor	Lk 7:24.27
Ps 2:7	Announced the Son of God	Mt 03:16-17
Is 9:1-2	Service in Galilee	Mt 04:17-19
Dt 18:15	The prophet that would come	Ac 3:20-22
Is 61:1-2	Healing of the broken in spirit	Lk 04:18-19
Is 53:3	Rejected by the Jews	Jn 1:11
Ps 110:4	Priest according to the order of Melchizedek	Heb 5:5-6
Zc 9:9	Triumphant entry of Christ into Jerusalem	Mk 11:7.9.11
Ps 41:9	Betrayed by a friend	Lk 2:47-48
Zc 11:12-13	Betrayed for thirty pieces of silver	Mt 26:15; 27:5-7
Ps 35:11	Falsely accused	Mk 14:57-58
Is 53:7	Silent towards accusers	Mk 15:4-5
Is 53:12	Crucified with criminals	Mk 15:27-28
Zc 12;10	Pierced hands	Jn 20:27
Ps 22:7-8	Derided and insulted	Lk 23:35
Ps 69:21	Receiving vinegar and gall	Mt 27:34
Ps 109:4	Prayer for enemies	Lk 23:34
Ps 22:18	Gambling for his garments	Mt 27:35
Ps 34:20	Jesus' bones were not broken	Jn 19:32-33.36
Zc 12:10	Pierced side	Jn 19:34
Ps 16:10; 49:15	Resurrected from the dead	Mk 16:6-7
Ps 68:15	Ascension to heaven	Mk 16:19

Rabbinic tradition concerning the Messiah contains a very interesting thread. Though Jews cut themselves off the Christian understanding of the messianic idea, there is a sign that like the believers of Christ they interpreted the prophecy of Micah in the messianic way: "But you (Bethlehem) Ephrathah, the least of the clans of Judah, from you will come for me a future ruler of Israel whose origins

go back to the distant past, to the days of old." (Mi 5:1) In the Aramaic text of the *Targum of Jonathan* the mysterious figure from Bethlehem was identified with the Messiah: "As for you, Bethlehem Ephrath, you were too little to be numbered among the tribes of the house of Judah. From you before me the Messiah will go out to be a servant, a ruler (or 'a servant of rulership') over Israel, whose name has been spoken from the beginning, from days of antiquity." Such an interpretation basically agrees with the explanation given by Matthew (Mt 2:6) who interprets this text, similarly to the author of the *Targum Jonathan,* from the messianic perspective.[152]

The Oracle of Balaam the son of Beor also received messianic interpretation among rabbis (in imitation of Christian interpretation): "I see him - but not in the present. I perceive him - but not close at hand: a star is emerging from Jacob, a sceptre is rising from Israel, to strike the brow of Moab, the skulls of all the children of Seth." (Nb 24:17) The *Targum of Onqelos,* without the slightest doubt, interprets this Oracle in a messianic way: "I see him, but not now; I behold him, but not nigh. When a king shall arise out of Jacob, and the Messiah be anointed from Israel, he will slay the princes of Moab, and reign over all the children of men." *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* also speaks here of the Messiah, what is in accordance with Matthew's interpretation (Mt 2:1-12). What is more, a fragment of the Numbers is interpreted by the author of the *Testimonia* from Qumran (4Q175) in the same way.[153] As we can see, in these interpretations, Christian and Jewish thoughts are consistent.

Moreover, Christian creatology, according to which God created the universe "by the Son" identified with the wisdom of God, has its equivalents in targumic texts. The *Targum Neofiti* to Gn 1:1 already reads: "From the beginning with wisdom the Son of Yahweh created and perfected the heavens and the earth."[154] Statements contained in the *Fragmentary Targum* are very similar and one can read that at the beginning with wisdom God created and formed the heavens and the earth. Convergent with the previous idea is also a record included in *Jerusalem Targum*: "At the beginning the Lord created the heavens and the earth." Such a targumic paraphrase in Gn 1:1 is based on Pr 8:22-31 where reference is made to the wisdom of the Creator during the work of creation. A little further in the Proverbs a statement appears that the One who has established the boundaries of the earth has a son (Pr 30:4).

---

152 M.B. Shepherd, *Targums, the New Testament and Biblical Theology of the Messiah*, JETS 51 (2008) 1, 57.

153 M. Baraniak discusses it in his work (*Prorok jak Mojżesz (Pwt 18,9-22). Hermeneutyka prawa o urzędzie proroka w Izraelu*, Warszawa 2005).

154 In M. Wróbel translation this verse is as follows: "Od początku w mądrości Syn Pana udoskonalił niebo i ziemię"; *Targum Neofiti 1. Księga Rodzaju*, trans. M. Wróbel, Biblia Aramejska 1, Lublin 2014, 3.

It does not seem, however, that the author of the Targum followed the Proverbs, but rather that he stopped over the play on words in which the Hebrew verb *bārā'* ("create") is read as an Aramaic noun "son" (in the defined state sounding identically). In Paul's Christology, however, Christ is depicted as an embodiment of divine wisdom (1Co 1:24); by the wisdom God created the world (Heb 1:2). Christ is also Logos (Jn 1:14), through Him all things came into being (Jn 1:1-3). This implies that the *Targum Neofiti* to Gn 1:1 and John the evangelist (Jn 1:1-3) recognize the Son of God as an intercessor of creation.[155] Therefore, Christian thought in this respect is not completely new, but constitutes a continuation of one of the currents of Judaism that was reflected in the targumic tradition.[156]

To sum up this naturally superficial reflection concerning the understanding of the messianic dignity of Jesus, a remark should follow, relating to the stereotypical attitudes among many Christians. The authors of the New Testament and the first lectors of these books, reading the Old Testament, looked at it from the point of view of messianism as one of the most important ideas. They looked for texts announcing the coming of the Messiah and explained some fragments which were read by the Jews only on historic level from the messianic perspective.[157] Such reading, strengthened throughout centuries and widespread in Christian writings, led many followers of Christ to a simple conviction: the Jews do not understand that messianic promises were fully fulfiled in Jesus. Such a conviction may lead to unfriendly approach to Judaism in general.

We can say, therefore, that W. Chrostowski was right when he claimed that making a point of Jewish refusal to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God leads to two dangerous simplifications that may influence the Christian outlook at the Old Testament. The first one refers to the fact that only messianic texts

155 M. Baraniak, *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, 112–115.

156 D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 139.

157 Although both Christians and the Jews read the same Hebrew Bible and made use of the same methods, they often came to different conclusions. Christian reading of the biblical texts was not only the historic reading but above all theological reading, what was reflected in the texts of the New Testament. Susan Docherty from Birmingham comments: "New Testament scriptural interpretation, like other forms of early Jewish exegesis, was in large part a response to perceived difficulties within the text, which challenges commentators to regard it as something more than purely Christological exegesis. New Testament scriptural interpretation is best understood then, within the wider context of early Judaism, as the first followers of Jesus commented on the same texts as other first century Jews, reading them in the light of the same interpretative tradition, and applying to them many of the same exegetical techniques, as they engaged in essentially the same task of making God's word as spoken in the scriptures relevant and meaningful to the communities for whom they wrote"; S. Docherty, *New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in Its Early Jewish Context. Reflections on the Status Quaestionis and Future Directions*, NT 57 (2015) 19.

are of great importance. Someone who starts to read the Old Testament presupposes that the only bond of individual holy books is the messianic thread and expects that during the reading the tension associated with it will constantly increase. The second simplification is sometimes equally fraught with consequences. Since the Jews, Jesus' contemporaries as well as those living in later generations and today, rejected Him as the Messiah and the Son of God, their obstinacy cannot be just a coincidence. Many Christians think that Jews were and continue to be the heirs and inheritors of the obstinacy of their biblical ancestors who repeatedly betrayed God.[158]

The Temple in the Eyes of Judeo-Christians and other Jews

The importance of the Temple of Jerusalem for biblical Judaism cannot be overestimated. Location of the Temple on the highest hill in the city unambiguously emphasized the idea of the reign of God over Israel. Historical sequence of events related to the Temple stresses its importance for the religiosity of the chosen people. Solomon ensured its dedication at the time of the general national assembly (1K 8). In the era of the kings, the Temple was a symbol of religious worship and political power. The prophets (Is 1:11-17; Jr 6:20) criticize the superficiality of the worship performed there. Announcement of the destruction of the Tabernacle is the symbol of God's punishment (Mi 3:12; Jr 7:12-15, Ezk 9-10).

Strong attachment to the Temple almost led to a superstition when magically understood words were repeated: "This is Yahweh's sanctuary, Yahweh's sanctuary, Yahweh's sanctuary!" (Jr 7:4) The importance of the Temple is emphasized by religious reforms of Hezekiah (2K 18:4; 2Ch 29-31). Josiah made the dream of one shrine real (2K 23:4-27) and Isaiah prophesied it would become the centre of worship for the entire humanity (Is 2:1-4). The Jews returning from exile took care, above all, of the reconstruction of the Temple (Ezr 3-6). After profanation made by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the Jews joined the uprising under the Maccabees' command in order to re-consecrate the Tabernacle and renew the cult after victory (1M 4:36-43).

According to J.P. Meier, in everyday religious practices the reference to the Temple was even more important than keeping the individual provisions of the Law.[159] The Temple represented the centre of worship and a place which God had chosen as his dwelling.[160] One can even risk a statement that when a Jew thought

158 W. Chrostowski, *Wizerunek Żydów i judaizmu a chrześcijańskie czytanie i objaśnianie Biblii*, in: *Stworzył Bóg człowieka na swój obraz. Księga pamiątkowa dla Biskupa Profesora Mariana Gołębiewskiego w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, Warszawa 2002, 76–77; J. Slawik, *Stary Testament / Tanach w chrześcijańskiej Biblii*, 420.

159 J.P. Meier, *Reflections on Jesus-of-History Research Today*, in: *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*, 84–86.

160 G. Witaszek, *Centralizacja kultu*, in: *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, 108; M. Rosik, *Gesù e il giudaismo. Passando oltre il confine*, 71–72; M. Rosik,

"God," his thought roamed not to heaven, but to the Temple hill.[161] It therefore comes as no surprise that reference to the Temple became another flashpoint in the conflict between Church and Synagogue.

Jesus' attitude to the most important religious institution of Israel is characterized by specific bipolarity: on the one hand Jesus recognizes its authority, on the other hand He shows his supremacy over the Temple.[162] During his mission on earth Jesus prepared his disciples to build their community as a living Temple for which the "cornerstone" is He himself (Mk 12:1-12).[163] As "the Lord of the Temple" (Mk 11:1-11) Jesus encourages the community of believers to became a true "house of prayer for all nations." (Mk 11:12-19) The scene of the purification of the Tabernacle is nothing more than an announcement of its destruction. With His gesture Jesus indicates radically a new form of Judaism – a religion devoid of the Temple.

Even more clearly this announcement is highlighted at the moment of the tearing of the Temple's curtain during Jesus' death (Mk 15:33-39).[164] According

---

Der Tempel von Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu, trans. J. Rosik, Jestetten 2008, 15–16; J. Maier, *Między Starym a Nowym Testamentem. Historia i religia w okresie Drugiej Świątyni*, MT, trans. E. Marszał, J. Zakrzewski, Kraków 2002, 225. A.A. Rupprecht, *The Cultural and Political Setting of the New Testament*, in: *The Expositor's Bible Commentary with the New International Version*, Grand Rapids 1978, I, 497. E.P. Sanders noted: "Dalla letteratura antica deriva l'impressione schiacciante che la maggior parte degli ebrei del I secolo, che credevano nella Bibbia, rispettassero il tempio e i sacerdoti e volontariamente facessero i doni e le offerte richiesti"; *Il giudaismo. Fede e prassi (63 a.C.-66 d.C.)*, 70.

161 That is why, up to the present day, synagogues throughout the world are constructed in such a way that the main architectural line is directed towards Jerusalem. If the praying person faces the holy city, his prayer - according to the Jews – will certainly reach the Lord (1K 8:44–48; cf. Dn 6:11).

162 G. Schrenk determines the attitude of Jesus towards the Temple as "the twofold attitude of Jesus," providing the following justification: "Throughout the Synoptic portrayal we find in Jesus both an affirmation of Temple worship as the divinely appointed way to worship God and also a superiority of Christ over the Temple"; *to; iverovn*, in: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, ed. G. Friedrich, trans. G.W. Bromiley, D. Litt, Grand Rapids 1999, 242.

163 J. Schreiber, *Theologie des Vertrauens. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Markusevangeliums*, Hamburg 1967, 188: "Der Tempel diente Jesus zwar als Stätte der Lehre, aber sein Lehren führte bei den Hörern, die Tempel Jahwe verehren wollten, nicht zur Umkehr. Daher verlor der Tempel seine Funktion als Wohnstatt Gottes und wurde durch den nicht von Menschen errichteten Tempel, die Gemeinde Jesu, ersetzt"; D. Dormeyer, *Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell. Literarische und theologische Analyse der Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte der Markuspassion*, Münster 1974, 281.

164 J. Marcus perceives the tearing of the Temple's curtain as one of the most important threads of Mark's theology because it symbolizes the "end of the central institution of Judaism"; *Mark - Interpreter of Paul*, NTS 46 (2000) 481. F. Watson is of

to P.A. Cunningham the tearing of the Temple's curtain has a double meaning. Firstly, it expresses God's wrath against the Temple whose fall had already been announced both directly (Mk 13:2), and by symbolic gestures of throwing the Temple vendors out and cursing the barren fig tree (Mk 11:12-14,20-25). Secondly, the tearing of the Temple's curtain in a symbolic way expresses opening the access to God for foreign nations.[165] Many exegetes interpret the tearing of the Temple's curtains of the Tabernacle through the prism of a gesture expressing pain, well-known in Judaic tradition; it refers to the gesture of tearing of the garments. When someone found out about the death of a close person, he or she tore the clothes. The veil of the sanctuary is like garments of God himself who in face of the death of His Son tears them, giving access to Himself to all those who will believe in what is happening on the cross. Since the death of Jesus, God's presence has not been "concealed" behind the veil of the Temple but has spread throughout the world and all worshippers of God may honour Him "in Spirit and truth" (Jn 4:23), and not on Zion.

This theme was developed in the theological interpretation made by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Under these provisions, priests go regularly into the outer tent to carry out their acts of worship, but the second tent is entered only once a year, and then only by the high priest who takes in the blood to make an offering for his own and the people's faults of inadvertence. By this, the Holy Spirit means us to see that as long as the old tent stands, the way into the holy place is not opened; it is a symbol for this present time. None of the gifts and sacrifices

---

the similar opinion: "the tearing of the veil in the Temple (15:38) [...] signifies God's abandonment of the Jewish system of worship and, by implication, Israel as whole. According to 15:38 f., the cross reveals God's rejection of the Jewish people, who have themselves rejected their Messiah, and his creating of a new community among the Gentiles who, like the centurion, will confess Jesus as the Son of God (cf.12:1–9)"; *The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme*, JSNT 24 (1985) 57.

165 The author adds: "Finally, the curtain's destruction could also relate to the parable Jesus had told in the Temple about the wicked vineyard tenants, who, after killing the owner's beloved son, will feel his wrath. 'He will come and destroy the tenants, and give the vineyard to others' (12:9). These 'others' clearly must mean the Gentiles, indicating that the Marcan church is largely Gentile one"; *Jesus and the Evangelists. The Ministry of Jesus and Its Portrayal in the Synoptic Gospels*, 39. "This complete destruction of the sanctuary veil indicates the termination of the handmade sanctuary as the holy place of God's presence and of authentic worship. By his death Jesus has in effect „destroyed" the handmade sanctuary and begun the „building" of the one that is not handmade (14:58; 15:29)"; J.P. Heil, *The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark*, CBQ 59 (1997) 98. According to G. Witaszek, tearing of the Temple's curtain meant that the former sanctum has lost its sacral nature. The Jewish Temple stopped to provide a function of the symbol of God's presence. This function has been replaced by a sign which is the body of Jesus; *Teologia świątyni*, in: *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, 98–99.

offered under these regulations can possibly bring any worshipper to perfection in his conscience." (Heb 9:6-9) Based on the ritual of the Day of Reconciliation, the author refers to the architectural layout of the Temple which restrictively determined access to the areas of the complex to particular groups of people. Taking as the basis the belief in presence of God in the Holy of Holies, concentric circles of incremental holiness were distinguished in the Temple.[166]

Particular stages are as follows: Holy of Holies (also known as the Most Holy Place) i.e. *Debir*, *Hekal* (Holy Place), the altar of incense and the "sea" in the Court of Priests, the men's Courtyard, the women's Courtyard, Temple hill with the Court of Gentiles, Jerusalem as the holy city, other fortified towns and the whole Promised Land. Thus, the design and plan of the Temple marked the path towards God. From the ordinary, mundane world one passes to the kingdom of chaos, the primordial sea and the Gentiles, and from there to the orderly world created by God. But man has a different perception of reality. The world consistently leads to God and man during his entire life on earth is heading for Him. In the same way the High Priest passes through the *Hekal* to the final reality which belongs to a different dimension but gives meaning to the whole. This is, of course, symbolized by *Debir*, separated from the *Hekal* and the visible world with one more veil. *Debir* is empty because it symbolizes something that exceeds our senses and concepts.[167]

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers directly to the ritual of the Day of Atonement when he states that the High Priest enters the inner part of the tabernacle only once a year to pray and to seek expiation.[168] As early as seven days before the feast, the High Priest moved into the room in the Temple courtyard (*palhedrin*) where through the whole week he studied the details of the feast

166 The Israelites knew that the breach of the sanctity of the tabernacle would result in death (Nb 18:3). Violation of sanctity was caused not only by invading the prohibited zones of the Temple structure or by touching the equipment intended for the purposes of the worship, but in case of breaking other rules, too. It is not only about the moral offences, but the omission of provisions relating to such circumstances as the birth of a child (Lv 12), leprosy (Lv13–14), excretions of human body (Lv 15) or death (Nb 19). Standards relating to food were also very important. The strictest rules on ritual cleanliness were in effect in case of death. Priests should strictly avoid such impurity (Lv 21:1–9), while the high priest should not touch the corpses of even his relatives (Lv 21:10–15).

167 K. Armstrong, *Jerozolima. Miasto trzech religii*, trans. B. Cendrowska, Warszawa 2000, 167.

168 Neither in Paul's letters nor in the Epistle to the Hebrews is there a clear indication that Judeo-Christians should give up the celebration of the Day of Atonement. But insightful study by Daniel Stökl ben Ezra indicates that at the beginning of the sixties of the first century believers of Christ descended from Judaism suspended this practice; D. Stökl ben Ezra, *'Christains' Observing "Jewish' Festivals of Autumn*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 54–73.

ritual together with the elderly. On the day of the feast, he made a daily morning offering, an offering of incense, and after ritual washing, he made atonement for his own sins with the sacrificial calf. Then he confessed his sins and the sins of his family, of the generation of Levi and finally of entire Israel (Lv 16:6).

Each time when he called the holy Name of God "Yahweh," uttered only on that day, people bowed in a gesture of prostration and answered: "Blessed be the name of His glorious kingdom for ever and ever." (*Sot.* 13,8; *Yom.* 39,2)[169] Then the archpriest drew two lots from a wooden container, one with the word "Azazel" and the other with the inscription "sacrifice for sins to the Lord." In this way one of the previously prepared goats was sent to the desert "for Azazel," the second was offered for sins. After chasing the goat into the desert, the archpriest continued the Temple ritual. After offering the incense in the Holy of Holies, the High Priest recited a pleading prayer for good weather, so that farmers could reap a bountiful harvest, then a prayer for Judah and Israel, and finally a prayer begging for the earthquake not to strike the Sharon plain.

This ritual – according to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews – was completely ineffective. The aim of reconciliation after all was uniting man with God. Meanwhile God was separated from His believers to such an extent that women could not even approach the altar of incense. Men could approach it only when they offered sacrifices. The line of reasoning of the author of the letter is more or less as follows: the ritual of reconciliation was celebrated once a year, and despite this God remained unavailable, living behind the veil of the sanctuary. Everything changed at the moment of Christ' s death on the cross[170], when He himself became the Temple – after all He talked about "the temple that was His body" (Jn 2:21). The time of the Temple had passed away. There appeared a new type of cult, in a Temple not built by men. This temple is His body; He himself is the one who gathers the nations and unites them in the sacrament of his Body and Blood. He himself is the new Temple of humanity. The crucifixion of Jesus means, at the same time, destruction of the old Temple. Along with His resurrection a new way of the worship of God has started.[171]

Judeo-Christians were aware of this since the dawn of the Church. No evidence has been left to suggest that there had been any controversies between them in

169 It is not known exactly how many times this procedure was repeated. The Treaty of the Mishnah *Yoma* gives inconsistent information: once it talks about 10 times (2,2), another time about 13 (3,7); B. Poniży, *Drugorzędne akty kultu*, in: *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, 244; F. Thiele, *Święta religijne żydów, chrześcijan i muzułmanów*, 15; A. Paciorek, *Najstarsze święta w Izraelu*, in: *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, 313–317.

170 R. Bogacz, *List do Hebrajczyków*, II, *Misja Chrystusa w świetle hapax legomenów*, Kraków 2006, 388.

171 J. Ratzinger, Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, 2, *Od wjazdu do Jerozolimy do Zmartwychwstania*, trans. W. Szymona, Kielce 2011, 32.

this regard. Although the attitude to the dietary law or to circumcision could be problematic (see the so-called Council of Jerusalem), the conviction about the end of theological role of the Temple was never questioned by them. An important example of Christian relation to the Tabernacle is Stephen's speech (Ac 7:2-53). The opinions on the Temple, the Law and the Jewish tradition presented lucidly could not remain without reaction among religious leaders of official Judaism. This reaction led to the death of Stephen.

Such a considerable difference in the approach to the institution of the Temple and understanding its role, in the years since the death of Christ to the year 70, had to result in growing tensions between Church and Synagogue. We can assume that the first martyr expressed convictions of Christians concerning the Temple more explicitly than the apostles, but they were representative of the entire Church. This is the conclusion that can be drawn from the reading of the Acts. However, it should be borne in mind that the book was written by Luke who was probably closer in views to Paul than e.g. James, and this is perhaps why he did not even once mention directly the offerings made in the Temple by the followers of Christ. It is possible that Judeo-Christians from the circle of James were more inclined to such sacrifices, but it cannot be stated with certainty on the basis of the New Testament.

One should not discern in Stephen's speech absolute rejection of the role of the Temple in religious tradition of Israel.[172] Since the death of Christ the Temple lost its importance because one sacrifice of Jesus Christ replaced all the offerings of the Old Covenant. This conviction was ultimately petrified by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Such is the High Priest that met our need, holy, innocent and uncontaminated, set apart from sinners, and raised up above the heavens; he has no need to offer sacrifices every day, as the high priests do, first for their own sins and only then for those of the people; this he did once and for all by offering himself." (Heb 7:26-27) The martyrdom of Stephen not only clearly revealed the differences between both groups (Christians and official mainstream Judaism) in relation to the Temple, but also led to the culmination of tension between them. For the first time, the tension reached its height and as a result religious leaders abandoned any appearance of legal procedure and initiated the persecutions of the Church on a relatively large scale.

Luke is extremely consistent in demonstrating the concept of the role of the Temple among the first followers of Christ. The first reference to the Temple could appear in the description of the events of the Pentecost, but the evangelist himself does not mention the tabernacle. The Feast of Weeks was also known in rabbinic tradition as the "Harvest" because it finished the paschal cycle.[173] On the occasion two loaves of bread were brought to the Temple to perform the gesture of swinging (Lv 23:17), then firstlings were presented (Ex 23:19; Dt 26:1-11) and offerings were

172 R. Bartnicki, *Dzieje głoszenia Słowa Bożego. Jezus i najstarszy Kościół*, 266.
173 K. Hruby, *La fête de la Pentecôte dans la tradition juive*, BVChr 63 (1965) 47.

made in compliance with the Law (Lv 23:18-20). Although it took place only just seven weeks after the death and the resurrection of Christ, the Antioch-born evangelist diligently overlooks the presence of the disciples in the Temple. They are, however, present in the cenacle where they had earlier consumed the Last Supper with their Master. Luke's silence can be understood in two ways: either the theological conviction about redemptive dimension of the death of the Messiah, which replaced any offerings made in the Temple, shaped itself so quickly, or the silence is the result of a longer reflection and Luke intentionally ignores the act of sacrifice made by the disciples to which all the Jews were obliged by the Law. The two possibilities confirm, however, that at the time of the final edition of the Acts of the Apostles the conviction about uselessness of offerings was already widespread in the Church.

Luke's further references to the central institution of biblical Judaism almost never relate to sacrificial offerings. Describing the members of Jerusalem community, the evangelist announces that "each day, with one heart, they regularly went to the Temple" (2:46) but he omits the issue of sacrifices. At the same time, he more than once mentions the fact that the Temple was a place of prayer for the first Christians (Ac 3:2-3.10) where they proclaimed the Good News (Ac 5:20-21.25.42). Throughout the entire book about the origins of the Church, the motif of immolation by the followers of Christ appears only once. It paradoxically confirms the view that it was not customary to Christians, especially to those who heard the words of the Good News from Paul.

When Paul came to Jerusalem to meet James and the elders, he heard charges from them: "You see, brother, how thousands of Jews have now become believers, all of them staunch upholders of the Law; and what they have heard about you is that you instruct all Jews living among the gentiles to break away from Moses, authorising them not to circumcise their children or to follow the customary practices. What is to be done? A crowd is sure to gather, for they will hear that you have come. So, this is what we suggest that you should do; we have four men here who are under a vow; take these men along and be purified with them and pay all the expenses connected with the shaving of their heads. This will let everyone know there is no truth in the reports they have heard about you, and that you too observe the Law by your way of life." (Ac 21:20b-24) Although Paul himself did not consider this to be necessary, he acted in accordance with the persuasion of the elders who probably (like James the Fair) observed the Law. From elsewhere, it is known, however, that they did not force the believers of pagan descent to do it (Ac 21:25).[174] What is more, in the quoted passage there is no direct information about making offerings in the sanctuary.

---

174 A prime example of the way in which the role of the Temple after the death of Christ was understood is Stephen's speech (Ac 7:1–53). His words about the Temple that "human hands have built" (Ac 7:48) sounded profane to the Jewish ear; in this way, prophets described statues of pagan idols (Is 2:18; 10:11); J.D.G. Dunn, *From the*

At the end of the century and thus already after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, the author of the *Sibylline Oracles* seemed to suggest that the very idea of temples (not only Jewish) is incorrect and he waited with hope for the days when these structures, made of silent stones, would no longer be useful and believers of God would simply "lift up to heaven holy hands":

> For to them alone the high God gave wise counsel
> and faith and an excellent wisdom of heart:
> who use not vain deceit,
> nor give honour to the works of men
> that fashion images of gold, brass, silver, ivory,
> wood and stone, things of clay
> smeared with vermilion,
> painted in the fashion of
> a likeness such
> as mortals make in the vanity of their mind;
> but they lift up to heaven holy hands.
>
> (*OrSib* 4,584-591)

This view is similar to the one which the first Christian martyr voiced in his speech. We will get back to it while trying to find an answer to the question on how the first Jewish war initiated in 66 affected the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue.

Understanding the Role of the Law

The sources of conflict between the emerging Church and Judaism should also be seen in Christian understanding of the Law.[175] According to Peter J. Tomson, professor of Faculteit voor Protestantse Godgeleerdheid in Brussels, the Christian view on the role of the Old Testament Law, since the very beginning of the Church, is characterized by specific ambivalence. On the one hand, the believers in Christ are fully aware of the anchoring of their own religious beliefs in the religion of the old Israel, on the other hand with the passing of time one can notice an increasingly critical understanding of the role of the Torah, especially orders and prohibitions of ritual nature.[176]

Crucifixion to the End of the First Century, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 32.

175 J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, IV, *Law and Love*, London 2009, 26–73; A. Edrey, D. Mendels, *Social Organization and Parting in East and West*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 270–272.

176 P.J. Tomson, *Halakhah in the New Testament: A Research Overview*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 135.

The perception of the Law by the disciples of Christ is anchored in life of their Master.[177] On the one hand, the thesis that Jesus rejected the Law remains unjustified[178], on the other hand – evangelists, in a very clear way, present His interpretation of the Law which is different from the common one. Jesus accepts and fulfils majority of religious and legal requirements of his own nation: He regularly attends the synagogue as a place of prayer and teaching (Mk 1:21.39); He comes to the Temple on the occasion of the pilgrimage feasts (Mk 11:15; 14:49); He eats paschal feast (Mk 14:12-16); He wears clothes which, in accordance with Nb 15:38-40, are of religious importance (Mk 6:56).[179]

Recognizing the importance and validity of the Law, Jesus was opposed to the wrong interpretation of it. It was not appropriate in his eyes when the interpretation moved away from the original intentions of God. Jesus put the moral value of observing the law above the ritual value.[180] Instead of paying attention to detailed specifications almost caricaturally hedged around the fundamental provisions (as Pharisees often did), Jesus referred to the essence of the Law.[181] And this meant

177 F. Avemarie, *Jesus and Purity*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 279; C.A. Evans, *The Misplaced Jesus. Interpreting Jesus in a Judaic Context*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 18; A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, San Francisco 2006, 21–33.

178 G. Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*, 11.

179 G. Foot Moore comments: "The attitude of Jesus and his immediate followers toward the so-called ceremonial laws was […] entirely orthodox. Not only does he declare in the most sweeping terms the perpetuity of the whole Law, but he enjoins obedience to it in ritual details"; *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim*, II, New York 1974², 9. A similar picture of Jesus - as a religious Jew, who was brought up in the religious tradition of his own nation, is painted by other synoptics. They also refer to the events from Jesus' childhood. M. Czajkowski points out that Jesus was presented to God of Israel in the Temple of Jerusalem and his mother was subjected to the rite of purification after offering a proper sacrifice (Lk 2:22–24), as prescribed in the Book of Leviticus (12:6–8). In the family environment, little Jesus breathed in atmosphere of fidelity to the Law of Israel. As early as a year before achieving maturity He was taken on a pilgrimage. It is a story of a young Jew, formed by the *Talmud Torah* who was well acquainted with the Bible and the oral tradition. A Jew who after returning to Nazareth probably sealed his religious maturity by public confession of his Jewish faith during the community ceremonial which turned him into *gadil*: an adult or *bar-sons*: the son of punishment, responsible for his acts (*bar-mitzva* is a later term)"; *Co to znaczy, że Jezus jest Żydem?*, CT 60 (1990) 3, 32. About Jesus in relation to Jewish tradition see also: W. Chrostowski, *Jezus a religijna tradycja żydowska*, CT 63 (1993) 2, 93–95.

180 R.P. Booth, *Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7*, Trowbridge 1986, 219.

181 F. Avemarie, *Jesus and Purity*, 269.

the love of God and the love of the neighbour reflected in pure intentions of a person.[182] The essential characteristics of Jesus' approach to the provisions of the Torah are interiorization, spiritualization and appealing to God's original will.[183] These three features of Jesus' approach to the Law create the next ray in a shaft of light revealing sources of conflict between Church and Synagogue. Interiorization is opposed to the Jewish formalism, spiritualization is opposed to ritualism and the reference to the original will of God (e.g. as regards divorces) is opposed to creating human traditions that with time become the burden difficult to bear.[184]

It seems that through the first two decades of the existence of Christianity and the development of the Church in Palestine, it was almost obvious that also ethno-Christians were obliged, like Judeo-Christians, to observe at least certain rules of the Law. This situation seemed natural because this was the Church of Judeo-Christians and a number of the Gentiles who joined it was still small. It can be assumed that it was the zeal to observe the Law which made some spiritual leaders of Israel look on Christians with some favour. In the case of Gamaliel the First (Elder), this favour was confirmed by St. Luke (Ac 5:33-40). In the rabbinic tradition, there survives a vague testimony of similar kindness to Christians of Rabbi Eliezer, living more or less at the same time.

Eliezer ben Hyrcanus, who turned to learning in his adulthood, was a student of Johanan ben Zakkai (Yohanan ben Zaccai) and after the fall of the Temple he moved to Jabneh where he quickly became one of the most important figures of the local academy. He was in favour of literal interpretation of the Law and often took an uncompromising stand on controversial issues.[185] Eliezer seemed to know that Christ was called the "good shepherd" and interpreted this phrase similarly to Christians. As a result, he had to avoid penetrating questions that other rabbis asked him about Christianity.[186]

The followers of Christ conformed to their Master's model of approaching the Torah.[187] How was then the approach to the Law in the Church of the first century shaped? The answers to this question may be found in Paul's letters. In

182 J.P. Meier, *Reflections on Jesus-of-History Research Today*, 94–95.

183 Not all researchers share this opinion. According to Thomas Kazen of Teologiska Sweden in Stockholm, recourse to the original will of God in discussions on the essential rules of Law should not be assigned to Jesus, but to theology of the emerging Church; T Kazen, *Jesus, Scriptue, and Paradosis: Response to Friedrich Avemarie*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 288.

184 W. Chrostowski, *Między Synagogą a Kościołem. Dzieje św. Pawła*, 32.

185 This attitude ultimately led to putting a curse on him by Sanhedrin in Jabneh; Z. Borzymińska, *Eliezer ben Hyrkanos*, in: *Polski słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, I, ed. Z. Borzymińska, R. Żebrowski, Warszawa 2003, 383.

186 W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, 400.

187 F. Mickiewicz, *Jezus Chrystus jako cel i wypełnienie Prawa (Rz 10,4; Ga 6,2)*, ScL 7 (2015) 217–218.

recent years the traditional view on Paul's perception of the Law has considerably changed in theology. "New perspective" initiated by E.P. Sanders underlines the fact that Judaism of the Second Temple was generally the religion of the Covenant, and not a religion reduced to the deeds of the Law.[188] It should be added at once that the fidelity to the Covenant is measured by the obedience of the Law.

The recurring themes in Paul's writings related to observing the Law (which became the bones of contention between Synagogue and early Church) are: the relationship between Jews and Gentiles; proselytism and circumcision; liturgy and prayer; consumption of food sacrificed to pagan gods; sexual ethics; the question of divorce.[189] Surprisingly, the topics are basically different from the issues discussed by Jesus with Pharisees and scribes in the Gospels and from topics of disputes of the apostles with other Jews reported in the Acts of the Apostles by Luke. The main sources of disagreement concerning the Law in the synoptic tradition (including the Acts of the Apostles) are observing the Sabbath, ritual cleanliness, and dietary rules.[190] We can also add here the issues concerning swearing an oath or burial customs.[191]

The Law given by God on Mount Sinai has a moral and cultic dimension[192], and its summit is the Decalogue. The Law was given to Israel by God not to liberate it from sins, but to make Israel realize its sinfulness (Rm 7:7), because "all that the Law does is to tell us what is sinful." (Rm 3:20b)[193] Breaking the commandment of God only once is enough to find oneself in a sinful condition as "one single offence brought condemnation' (Rm 5:16b). There is not a single man who has not broken at least one commandment – "no distinction is made: all have sinned and

188 T. Otero states: "la nueva perspectiva sobre Pablo, a partir de una vision del Judaismo del siglo I diferente de la tradicional, ha abierto nuevos horizontes para la comprensión de la teología paulina y, especialmente, de la doctrina sobre la justificación por la fe, contribuyendo a liberarla del marco demasiado estrecho en que la había colocado la tradición exegética de cuño luterano, que la explicaba únicamente como contraposición a la autosuficiencia humana que pretende ganarse la justificación por las obras"; *La 'nueva perspectiva sobre Pablo' y la justificatión por la fe*, ScTh 41 (2009) 3, 898.

189 P.J. Tomson, *Halakhah in the New Testament: A Research Overview*, 184–185.

190 B. Chilton, *Mapping a Place for Jesus*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 43–44.

191 P.J. Tomson, *Halakhah in the New Testament: A Research Overview*, 189.

192 W. Rakocy, *"Gdzie Duch Pański – tam wolność" (2Kor 3,17). Pneumatologia wyzwolenia i wolności*, ScL 4 (2012) 113; H. Hübner, *Das Gesetz bei Paulus. Ein Beitrag zum Werden der paulinischen Theologie*, Göttingen 1978, 77–80; H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29, Tübingen 1983, 23–28; M.E. Lodahl, *Shekhinah / Spirit. Divine Presence in Jewish and Christian Religion*, SJC, New York 1992, 17.

193 F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*, SNTS Monograph Series 56, Cambridge – New York – Port Chester – Melbourne – Sydney 1986, 124–130.

lack God's glory." (Rm 3:23) "All" refers both to the Jews and the Gentiles.[194] The Gentiles sin as they are not familiar with the Law, the Jews – although they know the Law – they are not able to observe it unaided. The Law can by no means set man free of sin, but can only make him realize the state of sinfulness. This is its basic function (Rm 5:12.21; 7:11).

What is more, in a way the Law immersed man in a sin even deeper. "It is only where there is no Law that it is possible to live without breaking the Law" (Rm 4:15b) – writes the apostle of the nations. There is no offence because man does not know what is right and what is wrong. It is the Law, which he is not able to observe relying on his own strength, that leads him to the consciousness of it. It is enough to break one commandment and man becomes a sinner and continues in this state, even though he obeys all the other commandments. No human effort is enough to overcome the sinful condition. Good deeds are something glorious, but they do not eliminate the bad ones. The man who once becomes a sinner (and such are all), cannot exit the state of sinfulness without the Redeemer. Being in a state of sin, man is its slave; he lives as if in prison (Ga 3:22-25). The only thing that can be done is to look for help to God who has the power to redeem and forgive sins. It is not the Law, but God in Christ who may reconcile man with himself. The Law is only a "pedagogue" or "supervisor" (Greek *Paidagōgos*; Ga 3:24); only faith can liberate man from the "supervision" (Ga 3:25).[195]

For those who believe in Christ, the function of the Law is ceased (Rm 10:4; Ga 3:19).[196] Of course, this does not mean that the believers in Christ do not have to obey the divine commandments. On the contrary, after the coming of Christ through the faith in Him, they gain the power to obey them – earlier they had been unable to do that unaided.[197] Christ redeemed man from the bondage of the Law and thanks to Him man has become a child of God (Ga 3:23-26). The child is not enslaved; the child of God possesses God's Spirit that gives it the strength to obey God's commandments. "What the Law could not do because of the weakness of human nature, God did." (Rm 8:3)

The commandments taught us what was good; the Spirit now gives the strength to do the good. The commandments taught us what the sin was; the Spirit gives the power to avoid it. The commandments did not equip us with the strength to avoid

194 C.H. Talbert, *Paul, Judaism, and the Revisionists*, CBQ 63 (2001) 2.

195 W. Rakocy, *„Gdzie Duch Pański – tam wolność" (2Kor 3,17). Pneumatologia wyzwolenia i wolności*, 117. See also: S. Ruzer, *Paul's Stance on the Torah Revisited: Gentile Addressees and the Jewish Setting*, in: *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, ed. T.G. Casey, J. Taylor, Rome 2011, 75–97.

196 More on Paul's understanding of the Law see: M. Czajkowski, *„Cały Izrael będzie zbawiony" (Rz 11,26). Rz 9-11 w kontekście całego Listu do Rzymian*, Perspectiva 21 (2012) 1, 5–22.

197 On the condition of man before the arrival of the Redeemer see: A. Paciorek, *Człowiek bez Chrystusa w soteriologii Listu św. Pawła do rzymian*, Tarnów 1995.

evil and do the good; the Spirit equips us with predilection for what is good, so doing good becomes a joy, and not a heavy obligation. The level of moral life is not dependent on the adoption of the commandments, but on the degree of unity with God: who relates to Him closely, does not need the commandments because God himself teaches him what is good and what is wrong as well as gives the strength to act well. The ability to observe the Law does not come from Paul himself, but from his union with Christ. It is not enough to know the Law to obey it. One must be united with God to receive the power to do it.

In the Targum to the Book of Isaiah there are signs of polemics between Judaism and Christianity regarding the role of the Law in the perspective of salvation. Christians read Isaiah's ascertainment as Christological: "for a son has been born for us, a son has been given to us, and dominion has been laid on his shoulders; and this is the name he has been given, Wonder-Counsellor, Mighty-God, Eternal-Father, Prince-of-Peace." (Is 9:5) Christ, says the prophet, is the way leading us to salvation. However, the Targumist in response to the Christian interpretation of the text explains that the son took the Law upon himself to protect it and great will be the reward for those who observe the Torah.[198]

Nevertheless, it is worth remembering that Palestinian Judaism of the first century was not basically legalistic, as it has been thought for many centuries, mainly because of the influence of Martin Luther.[199] Judaism remained the religion of covenant. Obeying the commandments was not, therefore, a condition necessary for entering the covenant because it was always God's initiative, but a condition for abiding in the Lord. Paul, however, excludes the Law from the process of justification. According to the apostle, it is not because the Law leads to legalism, but because the Law was never meant to lead to justification. The latter can only be achieved through the faith in Jesus and is understood as participation in His death and resurrection.

Justification understood in this way is accessible to both the Jews and the Gentiles, and cannot be confined to the first ones, which would be the case if it was dependent on the Law.[200] The apostle states that "all have sinned and are deprived

198 M. Baraniak, *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, 121.

199 F. Buzzi, *La teologia di Lutero nelle "Lezioni sulla Lettera ai Romani"*, in: M. Luter, *La Lettera ai Romani (1515-1516)*, Cinisello Balsamo 1991, 25–50; A. Napiórkowski, *Bogactwo łaski a nędza człowieka. Zróżnicowany konsens teologii katolickiej i luterańskiej o usprawiedliwieniu osiągnięty w dialogu ekumenicznym*, Kraków 2000, 332; A. Gieniusz, *„Identity markers" czy „solus Christus" – o co toczy się bój w Pawłowej nauce o usprawiedliwieniu przez wiarę?*, in: *„Duch i Oblubienica mówią: Przyjdź". Księga pamiątkowa dla Ojca Profesora Augustyna Jankowskiego OSB w 85. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2001, 119–121; D.A. Hagner, *Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate*, BBR 3 (1993) 111.

200 P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London 1977, 522. P. Sanders' view was criticised by R.H. Gundry; *Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul*, Bib (66 (1985) 1–38.

of the glory of God" (Rm 3:23), and if so, they all need justification, both the Jews and the Gentiles. Consequently, this means that the covenant must be extended to the Gentiles. It should not only concern the Jews. The "new covenant" formed in the blood of Christ meets this requirement. What is more, abiding in the new covenant, man does not stop to be a sinner; he still falls and he needs justification now and again.[201]

The traditional view which radically contrasts the deeds of the Law with faith in Christ, that is the contrast between justification through good deeds and grace freely given, has been slightly modified in recent decades. *De facto,* this is because the deeds of the Law cannot be fully identified with morally good deeds. Some of them have nothing to do with morality and only distinguish Israel from among other nations (circumcision, dietary rules, festive calendar).[202] The works of the Law constitute, therefore, identity markers and their observance cannot lead to justification which one may gain thanks to the faith in Christ under the same conditions for the Jews and the Gentiles.[203]

Thus preserving the Law is not about seeking justification through one's own moral efforts, but about emphasizing one's affiliation with the Chosen People, and affiliation as such cannot lead to justification.[204] In this context the deeds of the Law should be understood chiefly (though not only) as *identity markers* (ethnic and cultural ones) and their degradation by Paul does not mean at all that Christians are not obliged to moral life; quite the contrary – the apostle stresses the need of deeds of faith and obedience (Rm 2:6-11).[205]

It seems however – as noted above – that the deeds of the Law cannot be understood only and exclusively as an indicator of ethnic and cultural belonging;

---

201 For more information on this topic cf.: J.D.G. Dunn, *"Righteousness from the Law" and "Righteousness from Faith": Paul's Interpretation of Scripture in Rm 10:1-10*, in: *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, ed. G.W. Hawthorne, O. Betz, Grand Rapids 1987, 216–228.

202 S. Westerholm, *Law and Christian Ethics*, in: *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman World. The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. P. Richardson, S. Westerholm, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 4, Toronto 1991, 75–92.

203 "Paul's arguments against 'works of the law' do not concern the issue of righteousness by obedience to the law but simply Jewish badges of identity that separated Jews from the Gentiles"; D.A. Hagner, *Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate*, 115.

204 J.D.G. Dunn comments: "[…] we gain a clear picture of Paul fiercely resisting his own earlier pre-Christian assumption that God's righteousness was only for Israel, and only for Gentiles if they became Jews and took on the distinctive obligations of God's covenant with Israel"; *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, London – New York 2005, 371.

205 A. Gieniusz, *"Identity markers" czy "solus Christus" – o co toczy się bój w Pawłowej nauce o usprawiedliwieniu przez wiarę?*, 125.

it would be reductionism gone too far. A recently discovered Qumran document 4QMMT, containing the exact Hebrew equivalent of the term "deeds of the Law," (involving not only circumcision, dietary and calendar rules, but also numerous cultic issues), rules out such thinking. Moreover, according to the 4QMMT, preservation of these provisions is supposed to lead to justification understood as the forgiveness of sins.[206]

Research carried out in recent years has shown that Jewish particularism at the time of Jesus and Paul was not as radical as it was once thought.[207] Many rabbis accepted the inclusion of the Gentiles into the covenant by the practice of proselytism or the application of the category of "righteous Gentiles."[208] With this in mind, resolution of the issue of Paul's understanding of the deeds of Law and therefore the understanding of justification should be sought in Christology: salvation and justification reach definitive fulfilment in Christ and through Him (1Co 1:30). Regardless of the way in which the deeds of the Law are understood, they do not possess saving power; the saving agent is Christ himself and His work of salvation. Therefore, the inhabitants of Galatia are mistaken when, apart from Christ, they also attempt to see the works of the Law as a saving factor (Ga 2:15-21). The deeds of the Law are not an alternative way to salvation and they cannot replace Christ's role, as the Jews relying on those deeds would like to see them.

In the Epistle to Galatians Paul refutes the arguments of those who would like to see in the deeds of the Law another necessary redemptive factor, apart from Christ, and in the Epistle to the Romans, he rejects the convictions of those who in the deeds of the Law see the only way of salvation.[209] The latter approach, characteristic

206 M. Abegg, *Paul, „Works of the Law" and MMT*, Biblical Archaeologist Reader 20 (1994) 52–55.

207 S. Westerholm, *Torah, Nomos and Law*, in: *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman World. The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. P. Richardson, S. Westerholm, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 4, Toronto 1991, 45–56; C.C. Hill, *The Jerusalem Church*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 49–52.

208 T.L. Donaldson outlines those concepts in his works (*Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*, Minneapolis 1997; *"The Gospel that I Proclaim among the Gentiles" (Gal 2,2): Universalistic or Israel-Centered*, in: *Gospel in Paul. Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, JSNT Sup 108, Sheffield 1994, 166–193).

209 Mario Ferrero believes that Paul's resignation from the need to preserve certain rules of the Law by Christians descended from heathenism has become one of the reasons of ceasing missionary activities in Judaism: "the fateful decision made by the apostle Paul in his letter to the Galatians – that Gentile converts to Christianity did not have to submit to Jewish Law – can be interpreted as a strategic move that shut Judaism out of the mission field"; M. Ferrero, *Competition between Judaism and Christianity: Paul's Galatians as Entry Deterrence*, Kyklos 67 (2014) 2, 204.

of official Judaism, is marked by insularity which excludes the redemptive role of Christ.[210] Christians could not accept this approach and with Paul accused the Jews that "not recognising God's saving justice they have tried to establish their own, instead of submitting to the saving justice of God. But the Law has found its fulfilment in Christ." (Rm 10:2-4)[211] In other words, Judaism in the declining years of the Second Temple is nomocentric. Paul's Judaism is Christocentric.[212]

Opening the Church to non-Jews (about 36 AD)

The bone of contention between followers of Christ and the Jews was undoubtedly the issue of the relation to non-Jews.[213] Already Josephus in his *testimonium* confirms that also Greeks followed Jesus' teaching. After removing Christian additions from *testimonium Flavianum*, the text most likely takes the following form:

> Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day. (*Ant.* 18,63-64)[214]

---

210 A. Gieniusz, *„Identity markers" czy "solus Christus" – o co toczy się bój w Pawłowej nauce o usprawiedliwieniu przez wiarę?*, 136–137.

211 F. Mickiewicz, *Jezus Chrystus jako cel i wypełnienie Prawa (Rz 10,4; Ga 6,2)*, 228.

212 D.A. Hagner, *Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate*, 125.

213 The latest research shows that the attitude of Jews to foreigners (goys) was not thoroughly negative. Naturally, from the point of view of the Torah, they were ritually unclean, but this does not mean that the Jews were not able to cooperate with them and even be their friends. The ritual cleanliness was essential for those who headed for Jerusalem on the occasion of one of the *regalim* - pilgrimage feasts. Very interesting studies on this subject were carried out by M. Hengel: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*, I-II, Philadelphia 1974; *Jews, Greek and Barbarians: Aspects of Hellenisation of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period*, Philadelphia 1980. The work by D. Novakis worthy of note: *The Image of the Non-Jew in Judaism: An Historical and Constructive Study of the Noahide Laws*, Toronto 1983. See also: S. Pines, *An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications*, Jerusalem 1971; M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, Kraków 2015, 45–50; W. Chrostowski, *Czy jest potrzebna nowa chrześcijańska teologia judaizmu?*, CT 69 (1999) 2, 30.

214 F.F. Bruce, *Wiarygodność pism Nowego Testamentu*, Katowice 2003, 139. The author allows the possibility that interpolation regarded as originating from a Christian editor could have been written by Josephus himself who used to speak with sarcasm and with sneer about Christians; ibid., 140. The author also presents another reconstruction of the text that requires the adoption of certain and, in his opinion, justified changes of the text made by copyists and translators (e.g. skipping certain words or their incorrect understanding). After these alterations *testimonium*

A simple statement of the Jewish historian: "He drew over to him many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles" needs explanation and clarification. Paul, called the apostle of the nations, in almost every town started preaching the Gospel from a synagogue and then turned to the non-Jews. Consequently, the map of developing Church in the first century almost overlaps with the map of the Jewish diaspora. It should also be remembered that at the time of Paul's missionary expeditions, Judeo-Christians were regarded as Jews and usually indeed were Jewish.

Christianity was missionary almost from its very beginning and this is not only because of Christ's missionary comment, "Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations" (Mt 28:19), but also because it emerged from Judaism which at that time was a kind of missionary religion. It is enough to mention the writings of Philo of Alexandria who addressed them not only to his own co-believers, but also to the Gentiles. Inspiration of his writing is somewhat universal. In his work *De creatione mundi* he states that "the law corresponds to the world and the world to the law, and that a man who is obedient to the law, by doing so, becomes a citizen of the world."[215] At least the Jews, especially those in the diaspora, were familiar with the thought that Israel should be a kind of spiritual guide for other nations.

At the beginning of our era some Judaic environments in the diaspora, motivated by the calls of prophets, took up specific missionary activities.[216] The centre of this activity, whose vehicle became the Septuagint, were synagogues.[217] In contrast to the Temple, where access was strictly forbidden to the Gentiles, synagogues were more open. Since in synagogues in the diaspora, in principle, the Greek in its *koinē*

Flavianum would take the following form: "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day; as the divine prophets had foretold, these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day"; ibid., p. 141–142. Eusebius of Caesarea twice refers to the evidence of Joseph Flavius: in *Church History.* (1,11) and *Dem.* (3,5). cf. also: S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 163–175.

215 After: S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, trans. A. Giardina, Economica Laterza 373, Roma – Bari 2005, 35.

216 However, among scholars there are also opinions that Judaism in general was not missionary. Conversions to Judaism - in their opinion - were not so much the result of missionary effort, but rather the effect of fascination with a monotheistic religion; S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 184–185.

217 G. Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 260–261.

variety was used, this institution proved to be particularly useful in promoting the ideas of Judaism. And this is how proselytism was spreading.

It is difficult today to assess the size of proselytic movement in the first half of the first century, however, its importance should not be overlooked. It had two main effects: some adopted Judaism and became proselytes, accepting circumcision and committing themselves to preserve the moral and ritual Law recorded in the Torah, while others were a group of people defined as "God-fearing" (*theofoboumenoi*).[218] The descendants of the first ones became the Jews, but the "God-fearing" sympathized with Judaism by rejecting the worship of foreign deities, adoption of moral laws recorded in the Pentateuch and some cultic practices, i.e. taking on obligations resulting from the Noahide Covenant.

Among exegetes there is still some debate on who the term "God-fearing" actually referred to. The answer to this question is not explicit. It turns out that it evolved over time; moreover, the same term meant a different group in different places and in the teaching of different Jewish teachers.[219] A.A. Das tried to show this diversity when he wrote that the term "God-fearing" could concern individuals or groups interested in Judaism to some degree: from donators who worshipped pagan deities, through the persons interested in Jewish customs and uncircumcised followers of Judaism, and then also proselytes.[220]

In principle two different meanings of the term can be distinguished. The first meant those "God-fearing" who were inclined to adopt Judeo-Christianity, of course without the circumcision, but with emphasis on the belief in Jesus as the Messiah (cf. Ac10:2.22.35; 13:16.26.43.50; 16:14; 17:4.17; 18:7). From this position it was already not far to the reception of baptism. The second group constituted those who were closer to one of the forms of Judaism: in the first century to the Pharisaic current and later to rabbinic Judaism.

Those who were "God-fearing" constituted a recognizable group in the diaspora community. The evidence of this fact are archaeological discoveries in Sardis, Philadelphia, Miletus and Aphrodisia. It turns out that at stadiums and in the theatres, they had designated seats in the audience. This fact is certified by inscriptions on stone benches. On the walls of the synagogue in Aphrodisia in Asia Minor a graffiti was found testifying that Jews and Judeo-Christians as well as Gentiles sympathizing with those religious communities prayed there together. Next to the Hanukkah candlestick (nine-branched) a Greek cross was drawn.[221]

---

218 B. Chilton, *The Godfearers: From the Gospels to Aphrodisias*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 55.

219 S. Fine, *Non-Jews in the Synagogues of Late-Antique Palestine. Rabbinic and Archaeological Evidence*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 198–214.

220 A.A. Das, *Solving the Romans Debate*, Minneapolis 2007, 81.

221 I.A. Levinskaya, *The Inscription from Aphrodisias and the Problem of God-Fearers*, TynBul 41 (1990) 2, 312–318; M.H. Williams, *The Jews and Godfearers Inscription*

What is more, not only were the "God-fearing" recognized in ancient society but like the Jews, they were often mocked especially for the prohibition of consumption of pork (Petronius, Cicero, Plutarch).[222] However, apocryphal book of the *Sibylline Oracles* in the speech addressed to all the inhabitants of Asia and Europe (and not only to the Jews; *OrSib* 4,1) praised those who – as the followers of Judaism – blessed God before meals[223], condemned heathen temples, did not participate in sacrifices made there and did not take part in processions during which statues of deities were carried (*OrSib* 4,24-34).

As mentioned above, in principle the centre of proselytism was located in diaspora but, if we are to believe Matthew (Mt 23:15), also Pharisees zealously supported attracting the Gentiles to the religion of Israel.[224] The well-known saying of rabbi Hillel, who travelled to Palestine from the Babylonian diaspora, seems to confirm such a state of affairs: "Love your fellow creatures and bring them to the Torah."[225] In some areas and in certain favourable historical conditions Jewish proselytism grew stronger. In Josephus' letters as well as in works not written by Jewish writers, one can find evidence of the use of very intensive methods (sometimes aggressive ones) of winning new followers for Judaism.[226]

The opening of Judeo-Christians to the followers of Greco-Roman polytheism was not, however, simple enough to present it only as a matter concerning

---

from Aphrodisias: A Case of Patriarchal Interference in Early 3rd Century Caria?, Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte 41 (1992) 3, 297–310; P. Trevilco, *The Jews in Asia Minor, 66 – 235 CE*, in: *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, IV, *Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*, ed. S.T. Katz, Cambridge 2006, 80–81.

222 L.H. Feldman, *Jews and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton 1993, 152.

223 The difference between the customs of Jews and Gentiles in relation to the consumption of meals is illustrated by Mark the evangelist in the description of the multiplication of bread by Jesus (two versions). It is speculated that the two versions of the miracle of the loaves is a deliberate measure applied by Mark for theological purposes. Miraculous feeding of five thousand people (Mk 6:32–44) was to be a sign for the Jews, feeding four thousands (Mk 8:1–10) a sign for the Gentiles. To make the interpretation clear, the evangelist himself introduces two different words describing the prayer before the meal. Being among the Jews, Jesus "blessed" breads; being among the Gentiles, Jesus "expressed thanksgiving." The author of the *Sibylline Oracles* praises those who according to the Jewish tradition bless God before eating a meal.

224 M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of Roman Empire*, Oxford 1994, 60–63; B.C. McGing, *Population and Proselytism. How Many Jews Were There in the Ancient World?*, in: *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*, ed. J.R. Barlett, London 2002, 88–106.

225 The situation already changed in the second century. In those days some of the rabbis remained open to the missionary work, others were against it; S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 36.

226 P. Borgen, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, Edinburgh 1996, 68–69.

Christians and Jews.[227] Both within the emerging Church and within Judaism different currents and groups were still in conflict.[228] Judaism and Christianity did not constitute homogeneous entities and the early Church was as varied in its forms as the Synagogue was. Judaism was divided into various religious factions; the complexity of the Church is confirmed by the New Testament.[229] Therefore, speaking only about the relationship between the Church and Synagogue is not enough. It should always be taken into account which currents of the Church and Synagogue are taken into consideration. Ethno-Christians and Judeo-Christians had a different attitude to Judaism. What is more, their approach changed over time, what should also be borne in mind (e.g. Judeo-Christians treated Judaism in a different way in the forties of the first century and differently at the end of that century).

To make the matter even more complicated, the same Judeo-Christians treated differently various currents of Judaism (e.g. pharisaic and Sadduceic when it still existed, that is before the destruction of the Temple). To look at the whole issue synthetically, a wider context of their mutual influence should also be considered. Basically, four communities interacted with each other: Judaism in Palestine and in the diaspora, Judeo-Christians, ethno-Christians, and followers of Greco-Roman polytheism. Among the worshippers of Judaism there were also Hellenists, namely Jews speaking Greek, some of whom believed in Christ. According to some researchers, the term "Hellenists" does not signify the group of Jews born and raised in Jerusalem, who adopted Greek culture, but people who did not use their own Aramaic language at home, even if they understood it, but Greek, due to the fact that they themselves or their families had lived for a long time abroad in Hellenized cities, and after the stay they returned to their homeland. Those who did not accept Christianity had their own synagogues in Jerusalem.[230]

---

227 J.D.G. Dunn, *From the Crucifixion to the End of the First Century*, 34–36.

228 S.J. Tanzer speaks about several "Judaisms" in the first century AD. This terminology is justified by the claim that in the first century AD Judaism was not a monolith, but was very diversified, see: *Judaizmy w I w. po Chr.*, in: *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, ed. B.M. Metzger, M.D. Coogan, Polish edition. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1996, 276. Among these "Judaisms" the author distinguishes pharisaism, sadduceism, essenism and other denominations. The element uniting particular groups was the faith in one God, the idea of belonging to the chosen people, the rejection of God's images in cult, the central nature of the Torah and circumcision. Similarly, R. Kraft postulates talking about "Christianities" in the first centuries; R. Kraft, *The Weighing of the parts. Pivots and Pitfalls in the Study of Early Judaisms and their Early Christian Offspring*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 88; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christianity in Making*, I, *Jesus Remembered*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 2003, 265–281.

229 J. Gnilka, *Pierwsi chrześcijanie. Źródła i początki Kościoła*, trans. W. Szymona, Kraków 2003, 424.

230 W. Jaeger, *Wczesne chrześcijaństwo i grecka paideia*, trans. K. Bielawski, Bydgoszcz 2002, 27.

Talking about the opening of the Church to the non-Jews in such a varied environment, one must bear in mind gradual changes in mutual relations between the Palestine Jews and the diaspora Jews on the one hand and Judeo-Christians and ethno-Christians on the other hand as well as between Judeo-Christians and ethno-Christians and the followers of Greco-Roman polytheism. It must not be forgotten that Judaism in the diaspora was not monolithic (Pharisees, Sadducees, the Scribes, Zealots, Essenes, supporters of John the Baptist, Herodians and Samaritans – by some not recognized as Jews – and after the destruction of the Temple – rabbis)[231], and that great centres of Judaism (e.g. Rome or Alexandria) had their own unique character.[232]

Even in Jerusalem itself, as noted above, there lived Jews speaking Greek who did not know the Aramaic language used there on a daily basis. When they started to join the emerging Church, it quickly became necessary to appoint a group of people whose task was to respond to the needs of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians. An outstanding figure among them was Stephen – his speech against the Temple eventually led to his martyrdom (Ac 7:54-60). It seems logical that the Jews of the Greek language living in Palestine more willingly attended their own synagogues, where they used a language they could understand, than the Temple where Aramaic was in regular use in speech.[233] It was easier for them – as less connected to the institution of the Temple – than for Judeo-Christians to start Christian mission in the Hellenistic world.[234]

Among the Hellenized Jews, Nicolaus, one of the seven deacons, was an active missionary. He came from a big Syrian city – Antioch on the Orontes. It can be assumed that after conversion to Christianity, he never severed the links with his home town, but according to tradition, he returned there to build a Christian

231 According to R. Kraftand G. Nickelsburg, early Judaism presents "almost unlimited diversity and variety"; *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreter*, Philadelphia-Atlanta 1986, 2. D.J. Harrington, however, thinks that "the simple picture of Palestinian Judaism in Jesus' time no longer exists. Perhaps best known factor in breaking down the old consensus was the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the late 1940s and early 1950s"; *The Jewishness of Jesus: Facing Some Problems*, 128.

232 N. Walter comments that "there was obviously no such thing as 'standard' Hellenistic Judaism, that is, Judaism as monolithic entity with a unified understanding of the basis of Judaism and its essential theological 'contents' "; *Hellenistic Jews of Diaspora at the Cradle of Primitive Christianity*, in: *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. by P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody 1997, 41.

233 G. Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue*, 262.

234 "[…] the initial outreach beyond the boundaries of Judea and the Holy Land should almost certainly be credited to the Hellenistic believers in Jesus, diaspora Jews who saw a wider field of opportunity for their evangelistic message"; J.D.G. Dunn, *The Spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome: 30–70 C.E*, 108–109.

community. What is more, this community grew quickly and the Church in Antioch became one of the most dynamic centres of early Christianity.[235]

In this complex and complicated mosaic of religious groups, at the beginning of the Church, even before the first ethno-Christians joined it, the Judeo-Christians regarded themselves as the Jews who met the Messiah and were seen as such by other Jews. Although the tension between Judeo-Christians and other Jews appeared already at the very beginning of the Church (Ac 4:1-31), there was no denying that Judeo-Christians adhered to Judaism. It seems that they were considered to be a fraction of Judaism also when the Church opened its door to the non-Jews, although the latter were no longer called the Jews (even if before the year 51 they were circumcised and observed the essential provisions of the Law, they became in the light of the Torah only proselytes).

The doctrinal justification for this opening can be found in Peter's speech made in the house of Cornelius (Ac 11:1-18) and in *praxis* of the Church after the beginning of the missionary activities of Paul of Tarsus. The so-called Small Pentecost binds together with a mysterious thread the two coastal cities of Palestine – Jaffa and Caesarea, and two characters - Peter and Cornelius.

Peter lived in Jaffa after the paschal events. There, when he was praying on the terrace of his house, he had a vision, but he was at a loss over its meaning (Ac 10:9-16). The distance from Caesarea to Jaffa was one and a half day's journey. Caesarea used to be an abandoned Phoenician settlement known as Strato's Tower. Herod's crazy architectural ideas changed the haven into a modern port, built in the least suitable place – on the dunes of a straight coastline, devoid of any bays or beachheads. New residents began to flock quickly to the city built in honour of Caesar Augustus.

The town was home to Cornelius, who served the empire as a centurion. When on God's order he sent emissaries to Jaffa with an invitation addressed to Peter, he was aware that Peter would have to break one of his strong convictions, legitimized by the requirements of the law of Judaism, namely, that a Jew should not cross the threshold of the house of a Gentile. Peter, listening to the story of Cornelius (Ac 10:30-33), came to deeper understanding of his own vision (Ac 10:9-16). He realized that it was not affiliation with any particular nation or preservation of its customs that made man "acceptable to God," but the "fear of God" (Ac 10:34-35), on the grounds of which one could accept salvation brought by Jesus (Ac 10:36). Unexpected coming down of the Holy Spirit, which interrupted Peter's speech, was a sign confirming the gift of salvation to the Gentiles. The path for the missions among the Gentile nations was thus open.

The persecution of the followers of Christ which was initiated by Stephen's stoning to death, made some of the believers come to Syrian Antioch (Ac 11:19-24). It should be presumed that right there – even before the beginning of Paul's

235 G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, Princeton 1961, 273; A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 69.

missionary activity – Christian theology significantly developed. We owe to Hellenists, including the Christians of Antioch, several significant stages of this development:

(1) translation from Aramaic to Greek and spreading of the first oral tradition concerning the life and activities of Jesus (especially His suffering and resurrection);
(2) adoption of the Septuagint as the Christian Bible in place of the Hebrew Bible;
(3) adoption of the title "Christ" as the equivalent of the Hebrew "Messiah" and using that title as a proper name; similarly, adoption of Greek *Kyrios* in place of Aramaic *Mar* and the emergence of the name "Christians";
(4) initiation of the process of gradual departing of the Christian movement from Jewish roots, especially in terms of approach to the Temple worship and circumcision;
(5) the beginning of ecclesiology, in which the crucial role in communities is played not only by "the elderly" but also by charismatic leaders (Ac 13:1).[236]

The Beginning of Apostolic Activity of Paul of Tarsus

After these incidents it is Saul of Tarsus, the eyewitness to Stephen's martyrdom, a Pharisee from a line of Pharisees, and a Roman citizen[237], who takes the lead in bringing the Gentiles to the Church. Born to a Jewish family in Cilician Tarsus, he was sent to the school of rabbi Gamaliel in Jerusalem for a thorough study of the faith of his fathers. As a Pharisee, he had to be an excellent expert in the field of the Law and had to obey it meticulously. It was just the literal faithfulness to the juridical provisions of the Law of Moses which distinguished Pharisees from

236 J.D.G. Dunn, *The Spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome: 30–70 C.E*, 110–111.

237 The issue of the alleged change of the name of Saul to Paul requires some clarification. The name "Saul" appears in the Acts twenty four times (Ac 7:58; 8:1.3; 9:1.4 – 2 times, 8.11.17.22.24.27; 11:25.30; 12:25; 13.1.2.7.9; 22:7 – 2 times, 13:26,14 – 2 times). The future apostle of nations is called "Saul" not only before the description of the experience on his way to Damascus and not only in this context. It is hard to fully agree with the opinion that this change took place later (e.g. in Ac 13:9). The name "Paul" appears much more frequently. So there is no - as some think - clear caesura after which the Pharisee Saul disappears and Christian Paul emerges. Born to a Jewish family in Cilician Tarsus, Saul functioned under three names. In Greek areas, for example in his place of birth he was named *Paulos*; when he was in Palestine and spoke Aramaic, he was called *Saul*; when he appeared in Rome and spoke Latin he was called *Paulus*. As a Roman citizen, he was probably called both names from his childhood since double names were something normal in the Jewish diaspora; R. Brownrigg, *Wszystkie postacie Nowego Testamentu*, trans. R. Stiller, Warszawa 2003, 184; J. Turnau, *Za co uwielbiam Pawła z Tarsu?*, in: *Paweł Apostoł. Dzieło i myśl*, ed. J. Turnau, Warszawa 2008, 18–19.

other religious groups in Palestine in the first century. In terms of their beliefs, they were even closer to Christians than the Sadducees who did not believe in the existence of angels[238], in life after death, resurrection of bodies, judgement, or God's Providence. The legal provisions were collected by Pharisees, later rabbis, in a system of six hundred and thirteen commandments, interpreted in a detailed way at schools and synagogues. In this way they built "a fence around the Law" not to transgress any of these commandments.

Saul, belonging to the group that placed great emphasis on knowledge of the Law and on the oral tradition, had to strive to observe it in order to lead a life blameless in moral terms. He confided to the inhabitants of Galatia of his zeal: "You have surely heard how I lived in the past, within Judaism, and how there was simply no limit to the way I persecuted the Church of God in my attempts to destroy it; and how, in Judaism, I outstripped most of my Jewish contemporaries in my limitless enthusiasm for the traditions of my ancestors." (Ga 1:13-14) One may be tempted to propose a theory that it was exactly the extraordinary zeal and blameless moral conduct which made the archpriests choose him to go to Damascus with the authenticated letters against the Christ's believers.

The nature of the event which took place outside Damascus' gates requires some clarification.[239] Paul himself would like to see it in terms of Christophany.[240] That is the way in which he presents it in his writings and he has even managed to bring many modern theologians round to his way of thinking.[241] It is enough to refer to

238 In recent years the view that Sadducees did not believe in the existence of angels was questioned by some researchers. Sadducees approved the authority of the Torah in which one can find numerous references to angels, so the members of the group should not doubt their existence. Therefore, some theologians believe that it is not the angels which were meant, but the souls of people who died.

239 W. Chrostowski, *Między Synagogą a Kościołem. Dzieje św. Pawła*, 47. In recent decades studies of scholars of religion on the nature of "conversion" have led to the conclusion that each religious community determines what should be understood by this concept; A.F. Segal, *Paul and the Beginning of Christian Conversion*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 79.

240 In the history of exegesis other proposals were also made as to the nature of Paul's experience and as to the literary relation itself. C. Hedrick is convinced that the story in Acts 9 is a narration about the healing that in two consecutive narrations transforms into a narrative about an appointment. J. Ashton refers to the tradition of the Hebrew mysticism; *La religione dell'apostolo Paolo*, Brescia 2002, 261–310. R.B. Gaventa calls the experience the "defeating of the opponent"; *From Darkness to Light*, Philadelphia 1986, 66. According to S. Reymond the encounter of Paul and Jesus is an "inner experience"; *Paul sur le chemin de Damas (Ac 9, 22 et 26)*, NRT 118 (1996) 520–538.

241 H. Windisch, *Die Christophanie vor Damascus und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Parallelen*, ZNW 31 (1932) 1–23.

the famous catalogue of people to whom resurrected Christ appeared, included in the correspondence with Corinthians: "The tradition I handed on to you in the first place, a tradition which I had myself received, was that Christ died for our sins, in accordance with the scriptures, and that he was buried; and that on the third day, he was raised to life, in accordance with the scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas; and later to the Twelve; and next he appeared to more than five hundred of the brothers at the same time, most of whom are still with us, though some have fallen asleep; then he appeared to James, and then to all the apostles. Last of all he appeared to me too, as though I was a child born abnormally." (1Co 15:3-8)

Paul's attempt to show himself in the same line with the other apostles is clearly noticeable here. The problem, however, is that the apostles and other witnesses of the resurrection used to see Christ before His accession to heaven, for forty days after the resurrection and before the ascension. They could talk to Jesus, put their hands in His wounds or eat a meal together (Mk 16:9-20; Mt 28:9-10; 16-20; Lk 24:1-12.13-49; Jn 20:1-18; 20:19-21:19; Ac 1:3-9). It was physical presence of Christ. Everything indicates that Paul would like to see himself in the perspective of similar meetings with the Risen One. Still, literary studies indicate a mystical vision rather than Christophany.[242]

Paul himself justifies his appointment for the apostolic mission on the basis of "seeing" the risen Christ: "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (1Co 9:1). At this point it seems only fair to settle the issue whether Paul on the way to Damascus only saw the blinding bright light or resurrected Christ. According to Ac 22:17-21, the vision of Christ took place in the Temple in Jerusalem. In Ac 9:1-31 only the blinding bright light is mentioned, but not seeing the Lord directly. Christ makes himself known only through His voice (Ac 26:14). But the mention of Paul's companions who "heard the voice [but] they could see no one" (Ac 9:7) suggests that Paul saw the person of Christ. Also, Ananias speaks of Jesus as the one who appeared to Paul (Ac 9:17).

Paul's references in his letters are similar. Therefore, it should be accepted that Paul had seen not only brightness from heaven, but that he had a vision of Christ. In 1Co 9:1 the verb *eōraka* appears. It is also used in Jn 21:7; Lk 24:16.31 and then in the stories about Christophanies. In 1Co 15:8 Paul uses the verb *ōfthē*, which is characteristic of confession of faith in the resurrection (Lk 24:34; Ac 9:17; 13:31 26:16).[243] The Apostle shows that in the vision Christ has given him a mission to carry out and transmitting the mission is an integral element of

242 Thus J. Gnilka, *Paweł z Tarsu. Apostoł i świadek*, trans. W. Szymona, Kraków 2001, 53; X. Léon-Dufour, *Chrystofanie*, in: *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, trans. K. Romaniuk, Poznań – Warszawa 1973, 128; J.M. Everts, *Conversion and Call of Paul*, in: *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, ed. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, D.G. Reid, Leicester 1993, 156.

243 M. Rosik, *Kłopoty z nawróceniem św. Pawła*, in: *Przeznaczeni do głoszenia Ewangelii. Rok Świętego Pawła*, ed. W. Irek, Wrocław 2009, 9–26.

Christophany. Another argument in favour of the view that Paul treats differently the event from Damascus than the visions that took place later is his use of different terminology: while the term *horama* is used for all visions, with reference to Damascene experience – in addition to the verbs *eōraka* and *ōfthē* – he uses the term *apokalypsai* (Ga 1:16).[244] It is therefore reasonable to assume with high probability that the event from Damascus was a mystical vision that was shown by the apostle in his writings as Christophany.

This vision, however, has for Paul the dimension of a calling, a vocation to proclaim the Good News among the Gentiles, which will leave an indelible mark on the relationship between Church and Synagogue.[245] The testimony that Paul treats the event at Damascus as commissioning into service is included in the fragment from Ga 1:1-17.[246] Already in the address of his letter Paul introduces himself as "an apostle appointed not by human beings nor through any human being but by Jesus Christ." (Ga 1:1) Directly after the Damascene experience he treats himself as an apostle: "to go up to Jerusalem to see those who were already apostles before me. Instead, I went off to Arabia, and later I came back to Damascus." (Ga 1:17) More yet, Paul believes that God who revealed himself to him had chosen him and appointed in his mother's womb (Ga 1:15).[247]

---

244 Summing up the discussion on a vision or Christophany A. Paciorek has no doubts that Paul saw Jesus and that he equalled his vision to the visions of Peter, James and other witnesses of Risen Christ; *Wydarzenie pod Damaszkiem w świetle nowotestamentowych wypowiedzi*, in: *Mów, Panie, bo sługa Twój słucha. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Ryszarda Rubinkiewicza SDB w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1999, 167.

245 G. Vermes notes that it was Paul's missionary activity which constituted the most important moment in the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue: "Paul's successful missionary activity among Gentiles is the primary source of the parting of the ways"; G. Vermes, *The Jewish Jesus Movement*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 23.

246 "Paul experienced not conversion to a new faith, not a change of religion, but a call and commission to bring the gospel to the Gentiles"; D.A. Hagner, *Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate*, 114.

247 It is a clear reference to the scenes showing calling of a prophet (Jr 1:5; Is 49:1–6; Ezk 2:1). Already St. Jerome uncovered many similarities between the event from Damascus and the commissioning of Jeremiah: "Et Jeremias antequam formaretur in utero et conciperetur in vulva matris suae, notus Deo sanctificatusque perhibetur" (*Ad Galatas*, PL 26,349–350); A. Paciorek, *Wydarzenie pod Damaszkiem w świetle nowotestamentowych wypowiedzi*, 164. Very often the story of the calling in the Old Testament contains a so-called revealing conversation. God told Jacob to return to his homeland (Gn 31:11–12) and go to Egypt (Gn 46:2–15); Yahweh appeared to Moses in the burning bush (Ex 3:2–10). In both these disclosure talks a double call by the name appears ("Jacob, Jacob…" - Gn 46:2; "Moses, Moses…" - Ex 3:4). It corresponds exactly to the calling "Saul, Saul…" (Ac 9:4–6). In all the stories the form of a self-presentation also appears ("I am the God of your ancestors…"; "I am Jesus…"). The call that Jesus addressed to Paul in the last of the descriptions (Ac 26:16–18)

If one looks at the event that took place outside the gates of Damascus from Paul's point of view, it turns out that it has a major impact on the formation of the relationship between Church and Synagogue. Paul regards himself as called by God to fulfil evangelizing missions among the Gentiles, thus including them into the ranks of the faithful of the Church. The Gentiles receiving baptism are not, however, proselytes, i.e. the followers of Judaism since in Judaism, as already mentioned above, a Gentile who decided to convert to the new religion, at first became the proselyte and only his descendants were fully-fledged Jews. Paul founded Churches and brought the faithful to Christ, but he did not encourage them to adopt the Law.[248] Somebody like him could not be regarded as a proselyte. This mode of behaviour of the apostle of the nations contributed to widening of the gap between the Church of the Gentiles and the Church of Judeo-Christians as well as the other Jews.[249]

---

is modelled on the calls of great prophets. These can be included in the following comparison:

Paul	**The prophets**
"But get up and stand on your feet"	"Son of man, get to your feet" (Ezk 2:1)
"I shall rescue you from the people and from the nations"	"I am […] to rescue you" (Jr 1:8)
"[…] I have appeared to you for this reason: to appoint you as my servant and as witness"	"I appointed you as prophet to the nations" (Jr 1:5)
"[…] I send you to open their eyes, so that they may turn from darkness to light"	"I have made you […] light to the nations, to open the eyes of the blind" (Is 42:6-7)

All the parallels come from scenes of appointment. In the case of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, it is commissioning into sevice as a prophet; in the case of Isaiah reference is made to the appointment of the servant of Yahweh. Some distinguish two types of narratives on callings. The first type presents a meeting with God or His emissary who expresses his concern and then assures of divine assistance, in accordance with the scheme shown above (cf. call of Moses: Ex 3:1–4,9; Gideon: Jg 6:12–23; Jeremiah: Jr 1:4–10). The second type is represented by the call of Isaiah (Is 6:1–13), who in a received vision accepts his mission. It seems that the second type is relatively close to the event near Damascus; W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel*, I, BKAT 13/1, Neukirchen – Vluyn 1969, 100.

248 J.M.G. Barclay, *Paul among Diaspora Jews: Anomaly or Apostate?*, JSNT 60 (1995) 111–112.

249 D.A. Hagner believes that, in some sense, Christianity could be called "Judaism for Gentiles"; "Christianity is thoroughly Jewish in its theology, its worldview, and its fundamental moral commitments. Though it is not strictly correct, Christianity has with good reason been called a kind of Judaism for Gentiles"; *A Positive Theology of Judaism from the New Testament*, SEÅ 69 (2004) 18. cf. also: B. Nongbri, *The Concept of Religion and the Study of the Apostle Paul*, JJMJS 2 (2015) 1–26.

Of course, apart from Paul, also other Jewish missionaries were active. They preached the Good News of Christ's resurrection according to the indications included in Missionary Discourse (Mt 10:1-42). Like Paul, they always started their work from the Jewish community because they hailed from Judaism and did not have an intention to break with the tradition of their fathers. It should be presumed that they themselves had heard the content of the gospels during their journeys to Jerusalem or during trade expeditions and later, having returned to their places of residence in the diaspora, they conveyed it to their friends, other Jews and finally also to the Gentiles, among whom they were dispersed.[250] The early Christian treatise *Didache* is a testimony to such missionary activities:

> Let every apostle who comes to you be received as the Lord. But he shall not remain more than one day; or two days, if there's a need. But if he remains three days, he is a false prophet. And when the apostle goes away, let him take nothing but bread until he lodges. If he asks for money, he is a false prophet. And every prophet who speaks in the Spirit you shall neither try nor judge; for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven. But not everyone who speaks in the Spirit is a prophet; but only if he holds the ways of the Lord. Therefore from their ways shall the false prophet and the prophet be known. And every prophet who orders a meal in the Spirit does not eat it, unless he is indeed a false prophet. And every prophet who teaches the truth, but does not do what he teaches, is a false prophet. And every prophet, proved true, working unto the mystery of the Church in the world, yet not teaching others to do what he himself does, shall not be judged among you, for with God he has his judgement; for so did also the ancient prophets. But whoever says in the Spirit: Give me money, or something else, you shall not listen to him. But if he tells you to give for others' sake who are in need, let no one judge him. (11,4-12)

Among such Jewish missionaries who acted like Paul, there probably were Priscilla and Aquila because they were leaders of the Corinthian community after meeting there the apostle of the nations as well as Andronicus and Junias who had preceded Paul in becoming Christians (Rm 16:7). Aquila was Jewish although he came from Pontus and carried a pagan name. It is known that he moved to Rome, but after the infamous edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome, he went to Corinth. It is not known whether his wife was a Jewish or a pagan woman; the name Priscilla (in an abbreviated form Priska; Rm 16:3; 2Tm 4:19) is a typical Roman name. It is not clear when exactly they both became Christians, but for sure they accompanied Paul in his journey to Ephesus when he left Corinth (Ac 18:18). Greetings that Paul

250 Jews converted in Jerusalem or during commercial travels were able to preach the Good News in Alexandria or Carthage and became the advocates of Christ's religion; A.G. Hamman, *Życie codzienne pierwszych chrześcijan (95–197)*, trans. A. Guryn, U. Sudolska, Warszawa 1990, 91. Cf.: J.L. Sumney, *Paul and Christ-Believing Jews Whom He Opposes*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 57–60.

sends to the befriended couple in his correspondence with the Romans (Rm 16:3) allow us to presume that they were known to Roman Christians, what may also be confirmed by the fact that they acted at least for some time as a couple of itinerant missionaries who from Rome arrived in Corinth and then in Ephesus.

In the same greetings Andronicus and Junias are mentioned. Despite some doubts, today in the history of exegesis the dominating thesis is that Junias is a male name whose full form is Junianos. Paul addresses Adronicus and Junias by the name of the apostles: "Greetings to those outstanding apostles, Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen and fellow-prisoners, who were in Christ before me." (Rm 16:7)[251] Despite the fact that Paul and other Jewish preachers of Good News about Christ exercised their mission also in gentile environments, in the middle of the first century the split between Judaism and Christianity was not taken into consideration yet, not to mention the emergence of two separate religions.

In Palestine Christians were regarded as followers of the Jewish faith even several decades after the termination of Paul's activities, while in some environments of the diaspora, the split could take place even later. The main testimony for this is the fact that at the turn of the first century in the necropolis in Carthage in north Africa (in Gamart, a little south of Carthage) Jewish graves were located next to the graves of Christians, what could be the sign of rather peaceful (though not devoid of tension) coexistence of both communities. A similar phenomenon could be observed in a Phoenician colony, Hadrumetum (today Sousse in northern Tunisia).[252]

In the Acts of the Apostles Luke remarks that Paul for a year and a half dedicated his life to teaching in the Corinthian community. Initially, residing with Priscilla and Aquila, on weekdays he busied himself with craftwork to earn his living; on the Sabbath he went to the synagogue and there he proclaimed the Good News about salvation. The situation changed radically when Silas and Timothy arrived in Corinth. "After Silas and Timothy had arrived from Macedonia, Paul devoted all his time to preaching, declaring to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ." (Ac 18:5) It seems highly possible that both missionaries coming from Macedonia helped Paul in his handicraft and took over the production of tents, thanks to which Paul had more time for evangelization activities.

Luke notes that when Paul devoted himself to preaching the Good News, a conflict with the Jewish community in Corinth arose: "When they turned against him and started to insult him, he took his cloak and shook it out in front of them, saying: Your blood be on your own heads; from now on I will go to the Gentiles." (Ac 18:6)[253] That was also when Paul moved out of the house of Priscilla and Aquila

---

251 K. Romaniuk, *Uczniowie i współpracownicy Pawła,* Warszawa 1993, 7–19.

252 Discoveries at the Gamart necropolis are related by A. Dellarte (*Gamart*, Lyon 1985). On Hadrumentum, however, see: A.F. Leyraud, *Les catacombes africaines Sousse – Hadrumète*, Alger 1922; J. Ferron, *Epigraphie juive*, Cahiers de Byrsa 6 (1956) 99–102.

253 In the nineties of the last century some researchers proposed quite a radical thesis that until the year 70 the term "synagogue" was not used to describe a building, but

and lived with a man named Justus, of pagan descent. As "God-fearer" (Ac 18:7) Titus Justus was already a believer in monotheism, albeit he did not comply with the law of Moses. It is known that his house was located near the synagogue. Leaving Priscilla and Aquila's home by Paul does not necessarily indicate a conflict with them; presumably Paul remained in good relationship with those Judeo-Christians but left their home as a sign of breaking off relations with the Jewish community which rejected the teaching about Jesus the Messiah.

Earlier for around a year, Paul taught in Antioch with Barnabas (Ac 11:26). He taught even longer in Ephesus; Luke mentions two years (Ac 19:8-10). Such long stays in one place of the itinerant missionary (a year, a year and a half, two years) gave the foundation for the hypothesis that Paul created his own school in imitation of the Pharisaic schools of Jerusalem.[254] The hypothesis could be confirmed by some remarks in Paul's letters (especially those about "handing of tradition") and technical terms associated with educational activity. If indeed such Pauline schools functioned in these three cities (Antioch, Corinth, and Ephesus), it is possible that they were focused not only on the ability to interpret the Bible and teach the doctrine of the faith, but also on the issue of Christology.

The apostle of the nations included in his preaching Christological material coming from tradition (1Co 15:1-11; 11:23-25). The tradition was passed by Paul in the diaspora and in Palestine where Hellenists coexisted with Jews – in Greek and in Aramaic. Paul adopted elements of tradition not to discuss them or to undermine their content but to explain and pass them along. In his letters Paul included only certain aspects of explanation of the tradition because the letters were occasional writings created for clearly defined objectives; they were not a complete explanation of the faith.

When passing the tradition of faith, Paul develops his own way of explaining and reasoning based on the Tanakh – sacred writings of Judaism. Surprisingly, he hardly ever reaches for synoptic tradition. In practice, he does not even once refer to Jesus' statements recorded by synoptics. But it does not mean that Paul did not know the synoptic tradition and there is evidence for this. Firstly, very clear

---

only a meeting of people (view shared by Howard Kee), and that until 70 synagogues were not a place of Sabbath meetings (view shared by Heather McKay). The two opinions were verified by many scientists and rejected; P. van der Horst, *Was the Synagogue a place of Sabbath Worship before 70 CE?*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 16–37. cf. also: R.S. Ascough, *Paul, Synagogues, and Associations: Reframing the Question of Models for Pauline Christ Groups*, JJMJS 2 (2015) 27–52; L.I.A. Levine, *The First Century C.E. Synagogue in Historical Perspective*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 4–5.

254 H. Conzelmann, *The Pauline School*, in: *Theologia crucis – Signum crucis*, ed. C. Andersen, G. Klein, Tübingen 1979, 179.

similarities between 1Th 2:14-16; 4:15-17; 5:1-11 and Mt 23:31-36; 24:30-31.36.43; 25:1-13 suggest that Paul was familiar with Matthew's or pre-Matthew's tradition. Secondly, references in Ga 4:6 and Rm 8:15 suggest that Paul knew of Jesus calling *Abba* in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mk 14:36). Thirdly, the 1Co 10:16-17.21 and 11:23-26 show that Paul was familiar with Luke's (or pre-Luke's) tradition concerning the establishment of Eucharist. Fourthly, there are similarities to Luke's tradition: in 1Co 2:6-8 Paul alludes to the Passion of Christ, following the pattern which can be found in Ac 3:17 and 13:27; in 1Co 15:3-6, speaking of Christophanies, he uses the pattern from Lk 24.[255]

All similarities mentioned above show that Paul's school cannot be considered as independent of the synoptic tradition, or may not be regarded as an alternative to it.[256] It is linked to the tradition, although in Pauline teaching criticism of the Law, discussed elsewhere, plays a significant role. The criticism greatly contributed to the separation of the ways between Church and Judaism.[257]

Let us come back for a moment to the discrepancy between Paul's letters and synoptic tradition. As mentioned before, a fragment of correspondence of the apostle of nations with Thessalonians (1Th 2:14-16) has been considered as "anti-Semitic" by many researchers.[258] It is worth quoting these verses in full:

> For you, my brothers, have modelled yourselves on the churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judaea, in that you have suffered the same treatment from your own countrymen as they have had from the Jews, who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too, and persecuted us also. Their conduct does not please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race, because they are hindering us from

255 P. Stuhlmacher, *The Understanding of Christ in the Pauline School: A Sketch*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 164. The direction of influence could have also been reversed as Luke's Gospel was written later than Paul's writings.

256 P. Stuhlmacher, *Jesus von Nazareth und die neutestamentliche Christologie im Lichte der heiligen Schrift*, in: *Mitte der Schrift? Ein jüdisch-christliches Gesprach. Texte des Berner Symposions vom 6.-12. Januar 1985*, ed. M. Klopfenstein, U. Luz, S. Talmon, and E. Tov, Judaica et Christiana 11, Bern - Frankfurt am Main 1987, 93–95.

257 P. Stuhlmacher states: "As far as the question of a parting of the ways between Jews and Christians in the first and second centuries is concerned, this means that the christologically grounded critique of the law presented by Paul and his school deepened and rendered completely irreversible the disputes between Jews and Christians which since the martyrdom of Stephen could not be overlooked"; *The Understanding of Christ in the Pauline School: A Sketch*, 172.

258 W. Chrostowski, *Czy Żydzi „nie podobają się Bogu i są wrodzy wszystkim ludziom" (1Tes 2:14-16)? Niewiara w Jezusa Chrystusa a wrogość wobec Niego i Jego wyznawców*, CT 70 (2000) 2, 47. Even if some of these researchers agree that today the majority of Christians are devoid of anti-Semitic attitudes and feelings, yet they add that the New Testament is pervaded with them; S. Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1978, 160.

> preaching to gentiles to save them. Thus, all the time they are reaching the full extent of their iniquity, but retribution has finally overtaken them.

It cannot be denied that Paul's language is crude, and the whole passage has polemical character. Some even regard it as a later addition to the letter, made by a copyist or a glossator.[259] One of the arguments in support of this thesis would be the language of the passage, apparently different from the entire body of the letter and inconsistent in terms of its content with Rm 9-11. However, new studies have excluded the possibility of interpolation. This passage is an integral part of the letter and was written by Paul.[260] It can be properly understood only in the context of the experience of the apostle who suffered much oppression and hostility from the members of his own nation after the acceptance of Christ. The account of St. Luke, who in the Acts of the Apostles a number of times refers to an unfavourable attitude and even hostility of the Jews towards Christians, is an eloquent testimony. Almost like a chorus the already mentioned pattern appears there, regarding the activities of the apostle of the nations: Paul comes to a city of diaspora, preaches the Good News in a synagogue, then he is treated with open hostility by the Jews, he is expelled from the congregation of the worshippers of Judaism and directs his steps towards the Gentiles who delightedly open their hearts to the Gospel.[261]

This pattern was also repeated in Thessaloniki where Paul preached Christ for three Sabbaths and then hostile Jews instigated unrest and gathered in the city in crowds, forming the manifestation against the Gospel preacher (Ac 17:1-9). Not being able to legally accuse Paul (all the more so because they did not find him), they had to disperse.[262] Having such experience, Paul directed an occasional (not doctrinal) letter to the inhabitants of Thessaloniki, in which in literal translation, he noted: "For you, my brothers, have modelled yourselves on the churches of God in Christ Jesus which are in Judea, in that you have suffered the same treatment from your own countrymen as they have had from the Jews, who put the Lord

---

259 Thus: B. Pearson, *1 Thessalonians 2,13–16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation*, HTR 64 (1971) 79–91; D. Schmidt, *1 Thess 2,13-16: Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation*, JBL 102 (1983) 269–279; H. Boers, *The Form-Critical Study of Paul's Letters: 1 Thessalonians as a Case Study*, NTS 22 (1975–76) 140–158.

260 W. Chrostowski, *Czy Żydzi „nie podobają się Bogu i są wrodzy wszystkim ludziom" (1Tes 2,15)? Niewiara w Jezusa Chrystusa a wrogość wobec Niego i Jego wyznawców*, 48–52.

261 R.J. Korner, *Ekklēsia as a Jewish Synagogue Term: Some Implications for Paul's Socio-Religious Location*, JJMJS 2 (2015), 69.

262 There are no grounds to devalue the credibility of Luke's account regarding the conflict of Paul with his compatriots in cities in the diaspora, as this is done by G. Luedemann (*Early Christianity according to Acts*, Minneapolis 1986, 185–188).). The credibility is defended by R. O'Toole(*Are There Passages in Acts of the Apostles which Could Lead to Anti-Jewish Interpretation?*, in: *Radici dell'antigiudaismo in ambiente cristiano. Colloquio Intra-Ecclesiale. Atti del Simposio Teologico-Storico. Città del Vaticano, 30 ottobre – 1 novembre 1997*, Vaticano 2000, 147–162.

Jesus to death, and the prophets too, and persecuted us also. Their conduct does not please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race, because they are hindering us from preaching to gentiles to save them. Thus, all the time they are reaching the full extent of their iniquity, but retribution has finally overtaken them." In literal translation of the Pauline text, the apostle of the nations has in mind some, not all, members of his nation. This statement refers to one specific situation and shows it in the light of an analogous situation in which the Christians in Judea found themselves. It is necessary to point to the fact that it is not about all the Jews, but rather the people of Judah. According to Paul they serve as a guiding light for the Christians in Thessaloniki. As Christians in Jerusalem and the neighbouring Judea suffered a lot from their compatriots, so did the inhabitants of Thessaloniki. Therefore, we have to do with an internal Jewish polemic which is not much different from the reproach of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, included in 2Ch 36:15-16: "Yahweh, God of their ancestors, continuously sent them word through his messengers because he felt sorry for his people and his dwelling, but they ridiculed the messengers of God, they despised his words, they laughed at his prophets, until Yahweh's wrath with his people became so fierce that there was no further remedy."[263]

Excursus: The Greco-Hellenistic Mentality and the Jewish Mentality

It is worth asking a question about the reason for the success of the mission of Paul of Tarsus. His missionary activity, after all, introduced Christianity to Europe and spread throughout a significant part of the Mediterranean. What made the Jewish beliefs (as they should be referred to in the middle of the first century) win the hearts of so many inhabitants of the Empire? Certainly, the answer to this question may partly be attributed to the genius of the apostle of the nations himself who was able to combine the heritage of his own religion with the culture of the Greeks. Paul's way of thinking was rooted both in Jewish and in Hellenistic culture. Usually alien to each other, in his teaching they seemed harmonized or even mutually enriching. Let us have a look at some differences between Semitic mentality and Greco-Hellenistic mentality, which make the two cultures worlds apart.

The Jewish way of thinking was anchored in real concepts and images, not abstract ones. Historical events and their impact on the present moment were of great importance for the Jews. Abstract concepts initially did not exist at all in the

263 W. Chrostowski, *Czy Żydzi „nie podobają się Bogu i są wrodzy wszystkim ludziom" (1Tes 2,15)? Niewiara w Jezusa Chrystusa a wrogość wobec Niego i Jego wyznawców*, 65. See also: G. Lohfink, *Antijudaismus bei Paulus? Die Kirche und Israel in 1 Thess 2, 14-16 und Rom 9 – 11*, in: *Radici dell'antigiudaismo in ambiente cristiano. Colloquio Intra-Ecclesiale. Atti del Simposio Teologico-Storico. Città del Vaticano, 30 ottobre – 1 novembre 1997*, Vaticano 2000, 163–196.

Hebrew language; with the passing of time they started to be created on the basis of real names of objects or phenomena. It is enough to mention that *rahămîm* originally meant "kidneys," "interior" and only then "mercy." The abstract concept "peace" originates from the term "entire," "everything." One can provide a lot of similar examples.

The situation was very different in Greek, where abstract concepts like "truth," "goodness," "beauty," "peace," "happiness," or "virtue" had already been used many centuries before Christ. It all resulted in large-scale development of philosophical thought. Greeks and Hellenists extracted from reality what was permanent in it and what could be separated as a principle. This is how abstract concepts were created.

The abstract way of thinking of Greeks differed from logical thinking of the Jews even in terms of fundamental grammatical approach. The basic grammatical tense of verbs in the Hebrew language was the past tense. Its essential form was in the third person singular. "He made" – refers to the specific events in the past which had an impact on the present day. This event happened and was objective. Greeks vice versa – used to think subjectively and in the abstract way, hence the basic grammatical form was the first person singular of the present tense. The reason was that in their mentality the activity of the speaking subject was essential.

Going further, it should be stated that Greeks preferred to analyse reality in the form of philosophical discourse in which the basic part of speech was a noun. The Hebrews were focused on history and past events, or prophecies (oracles) and future events. The fundamental part of speech which creates the Hebrew language is a verb. It allows to tell stories, to present different events and to link their combinations in groups of facts revealing increasingly deeper meaning of reality in which man lives. Synthetic way of thinking of the Jews also contributed to the creation of a different image of human person than the one shaped by Greek analytical mind. This was the most important difference.[264]

The Greek way of thinking was based on logical deduction, in which the sequence of events and links between cause and effect were of great significance. A theory that could not be logically justified was not reliable. The way of thinking of the Hebrews, however, was graphic. As a result, the logical sequence was not of primary importance. Let us quote as an example Jesus' parable about the invitation to the wedding which can be difficult to interpret from the logical point of view. The reader may wonder: since the host invited all men without exception (" 'go to the main crossroads and invite everyone you can find to come to the wedding.' So, these servants went out onto the roads and collected together everyone they could find, bad and good alike"; Mt 22:9-10), why was he surprised that one of the participants came without a wedding outfit ("How did you get in here, my friend, without a wedding garment?"; Mt 22:12)?

---

264 P. Poniży, *Między judaizmem a hellenizmem. Σοφία Σαλωμώνος księgą spotkania*, Studia i Materiały 166, Poznań 2013, 41.

For the Jews of Jesus' time this midrash did not pose any interpretative problems. They saw two images in it: the first informed about the fact that all people were invited to the kingdom of God, the second one – that the kingdom of God could not be entered by anyone undeserving. Conclusions drawn from both images are entirely correct, although there is no logical connection between them. Oracles of Old Testament prophets where next to announcements of punishment and destruction one can often find announcements of mercy and salvation sound similar; from the Greek point of view they are not connected in any logical way.[265]

Another sphere of dissimilarity between Hebrew and Greek mentality is the tension between activity and contemplation. The Jews expressed reality in an active way and the basic form of its description was activity. The Greeks chose meditation. For them, the most important were concepts constant and permanent, and governed by clear rules. They rejoiced in exploring and giving names to rules governing reality.

The Hebrew preference for activity and action, and the Greek preference for contemplation resulted in a different way of looking at time and history. Graphically, one can present the course of time in Jewish mentality in the form of a continuous line and in the Greek mentality - in the form of a circle. Time in linear perspective has its roots in the assumption that history has its beginning (for the Jews it was the creative act of God), and subsequent events develop the course of history. Every event contributed a new element to the history of the world. The Greeks understood time in a different manner. The events return cyclically in a similar way to the seasons of the year. It seems that this difference in mentality was captured in a perfect way by Josephus in his work *Contra Apionem*:

> "[…] that almost all which concerns the Greeks happened not long ago: nay one may say, is of yesterday only. I speak of the building of their cities; the invention of their arts; and the description of their laws. And as for their care about the writing

265 One of the greatest Jewish theologians of the twentieth century, Abraham Joshua Heschel, tried to explain these seemingly contradicting oracles. He agreed that the discrepancies noticeable in the prophetic messages can be confusing. The following words come from the Book of Amos: "The time is ripe for my people Israel" (8:2) and "She has fallen down, never to rise again, the virgin Israel" (5:2). It ends with the following prophecy: "I shall restore the fortunes of my people Israel; they will rebuild the ruined cities and live in them, they will plant vineyards and drink their wine, they will lay out gardens and eat their produce. And I shall plant them in their own soil and they will never be uprooted again from the country which I have given them, declares Yahweh, your God" (Am 9:14–15). What relation is there between anger and compassion, between "ravaging fire" and "eternal love"? Does the obvious contradiction in the prophet's statements debunk the validity of his message? It would be the case if the prophecy concerned only the laws or rules. But the prophet touches on the relationship between God and man where the contradiction is inevitable; A.J. Heschel, *Prorocy*, trans. A. Gorzkowski, Kraków 2014, 62–63.

> down of their histories, it is very near the last thing they set about. However, they acknowledge themselves so far; that they were the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, and the Phoenicians, (for I will not now reckon ourselves among them) that have preserved the memorials of the most ancient, and most lasting traditions of mankind. For almost all these nations inhabit such countries, as are least subject to destruction from the world about them. And these also have taken especial care to have nothing omitted of what was [remarkably] done among them; but their history was esteemed sacred, and put into public tables, as written by men of the greatest wisdom they had among them." (*Ap.* 1,4-6)

Hebrew and Greeks way of looking at man was also different. For the Hebrews a human being constitutes a mental, physical and spiritual unity. A person is always seen as a whole. Physical and spiritual life are woven together and they interact with each other. The Greeks looked at man rather through the prism of dichotomous division into body and soul. Platonic thought, which stressed this duality, eventually led to the conviction that body was seen as a contrasting or even opposing element to the soul. The lack of connection between the spiritual and material worlds could be seen, in the case of Greeks, even in the existential dimension: many of them were either ascetics or hedonists, depending on which of the dimensions was considered more important. Meanwhile, according to the Hebrews, the supernatural world has an impact on the material world what is reflected even in understanding the Eucharist as real, physical presence of Christ, brought about by a religious celebration.

The apostle Paul, with his deep intuitive understanding of both worlds, was well acquainted with those spheres of mentality. What is more, he was perfectly able to transfer thoughts between them. That is why Jewish religious beliefs presented in a Christian form could be understood by minds formed by Hellenistic culture and not only be accepted, but also quickly developed.

Success of Mission among the Gentiles as a Separation Factor

Seven letters of Paul (1Th, Ga, 1Co, 2Co, Ph, Phm, Rm) dated from the fifties and sixties of the first century hold evidence of a concern for communities in which he preached the Good News, or which he intended to visit. In his correspondence with churches, the apostle tries to give an answer to the current problems of the communities that he had founded (except for the community in Rome). He took pride in the fact that he had exceeded many of his peers in the zeal for Judaism (Ga 1:14) and in obeying the Law had been without fault (Ph 3:6). But all of this, he considered as "loss" (Ph 3:8) after meeting Christ and this event can also be treated as an element of the initial stage of the process of separation between Judaism and Christianity.

Paul's opinion on those who accepted Christ and came from paganism was particularly important. The Pharisee, educated by Gamaliel, did not see the need

for circumcision and preservation of Jewish legal provisions to become part of the "Israel of God" (Ga 6:16). As cited above, Paul did not hesitate to use crude words about the Judeans who killed Christ and the prophets (1Th 2:14-15), saying that they read sacred writings with "hearts covered with a veil." (2Co 3:15) Extracts from letters to Galatians, Corinthians (2Co) and Philippians show that Paul had adversaries also among Christians who argued that ethno-Christians should observe the Jewish law in its entirety.[266]

However, studies that have been generally called the *new perspective on Paul* have proven that the apostle saw the fulfilment of God's promises in Jesus and the Christian movement as a trend within Judaism.[267] The evidence can be seen in two texts in particular: Ga 3 and Rm 11. In the middle of the first century Paul wrote to Galatians whom he had converted to Christianity preaching the gospel during his missionary journeys. After Paul's leaving Galatia, the region in the central part of Asia Minor, other missionaries arrived at the newly created community. They expressed the view that Christians of local community should be fully embraced by Judaism. When the apostle learned about this, he was astonished that Galatians wanted to accept a "different gospel." (Ga 1:6) He was convinced that since they had received the Holy Spirit, they would not want to turn away from Him to rely in their faith on the "deeds of the Law."

The edge of Pauline polemic was not directed against the Jews in general, but against Judeo-Christians and Christians of ethnic origin who wanted to adopt Judaism. In Ga 3:6-29 the apostle presents a whole series of biblical arguments that should dissuade the members of the communities in Asia Minor from their decision to accept the Law. Affiliation with the people of God depends mostly on faith and not on circumcision or performing the deeds of the Law. An example

266 P. Fredriksen, *Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 209–239.

267 For more information on this topic see: K. Stendhal, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays*, Philadelphia 1976; P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London 1977; above all: J.D.G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul*, Tübingen 2005; P.J. Tomson, *Halakhah in the New Testament: A Research Overview*, 172–179; T. Otero notices: "La llamada «nueva perspectiva sobre Pablo», a partir de una vision del Judaismo del siglo I diferente de su tradicional consideración como religión legalista, propone una nueva explicación de la doctrina paulina de la justificación. El rechazo por parte de Pablo de las «obras de la Ley» como medio de justificación sería, sobre todo, rechazo de que la pertenencia al pueblo de la alianza, manifestada por el cumplimiento de la Ley, otorgara ventaja alguna para obtener la justificación. La identificación de las «obras de la Ley» con los signos de pertenencia al pueblo judío lleva también a una nueva de interpretación del significado de la fe por la que el hombre es justificado"; *La 'nueva perspectiva sobre Pablo' y la justificatión por la fe*, 889–898.

for Paul would be Abraham who "put his faith in Yahweh and this was reckoned to him as uprightness." (cf. Gn 15:6) After all, at Abraham's time there was no mention of the Torah but still he was regarded as righteous. The promise given to Abraham finds its fulfilment in Christ, both among the Jews and the Gentiles, if only they adhere to faith, not to the Law.[268] For this reason, in Christ there is "neither Jew nor Greek." (Ga 3:28)[269]

Even more mature reflection can be found in Paul's correspondence with the Romans, *nota bene* the community which he had not visited before writing the letter (c. 58-59 AD). He comes to a conclusion that "there is no change of mind on God's part about the gifts he has made or of his choice." (Rm 11:29) God who had chosen Israel adheres to His decision, as Judeo-Christians remain chosen thanks to the grace of God, and also ethno-Christians have access to the gift of election due to the grace of faith. In the heart of the apostle hope is born that the members of his nation who did not accept Christ will become envious and will finally open their hearts to the Gospel.

To express this hope Paul uses the image of an olive tree whose roots symbolize Judeo-Christians (as Paul himself)[270], the grafted branches – ethno-Christians and branches temporarily cut off – the Jews who have not opened their hearts to Christ (Rm 11:17-24). There can only be one conclusion: if God was able to graft into the olive tree wild branches, it would be much easier for Him to attach branches temporarily cut off! How will that be done? It is difficult to give a definite answer. Anyway, Paul is worried about his compatriots who have not accepted the Good News yet (Rm 9:1-5) and is convinced that God will find a place for them in his plan of salvation (Rm 11:17-26). He himself, however, directs his mission to the Gentiles.

From the point of view of sociology of religion the process of the split between Jews and Christians of Jewish and pagan origin, the split which also Paul laid foundation to in the first half of the first century, developed according to a pattern possible to recreate: (1) after numerous attempts Paul abandoned proclaiming the Good News among the Jews, convinced that God had hardened the hearts of his people; (2) then he turned to the Gentiles and to ensure the success of his mission, he resigned from the pressure to preserve the Jewish Law; (3) this attitude led to distancing (and finally to the separation) of the Jews and Christians; (4) and the

268 D.J. Harrington adds: "Paolo descrive lo scopo della Legge in modo vario, come preparazione a Cristo, come stimolo al peccato e disciplina temporanea (*paidagogos*). L'argomentazione porta alla conclusione che i veri figli di Abramo (e dunque imembri del popolo di Dio) sono quelli che sono stati 'battezzati in Cristo' come i 'semi' di Abramo"; D.J. Harrington, *L'emergere graduale della Chiesa e la „separazione ('the parting of the ways') tra ebraismo e cristianesimo"*, 153.

269 A. Runesson, *Inventing Christian Identity: Paul, Ignatius, and Theodosius I*, in: *Exploring Early Christian Identity*, ed. B. Holmberg, Tübingen 2008, 59–61.

270 T.L. Donaldson, *Jewish Christianity, Israel's Stumbling and the* Sonderweg *Reading of Paul*, JSNT 29 (2006) 1, 44–45.

separation, though not named as such yet but in practice being a fact, required justification on objective grounds.

The process of rational justification of the partition, which became a reality, had according to sociologists of religion three stages: *denuntiatio – antithesis – re-interpretatio*.[271] It was perfectly reflected in Paul's correspondence with the Romans and the Galatians, discussed above. The first stage (*denuntiatio*) is an accusation against a hypothetical Jew[272] in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: he dares to judge Christians (Rm 2:1-3) even though his acts are wrong (Rm 2:17-24), and believes in justification only because he was circumcised (Rm 2:25)[273] and, as a Jew, he takes salvation for granted. Such an attitude is a sign of hardness of the heart (Rm 2:5).[274]

To show the wrong conduct of his opponents, Paul uses a whole series of antitheses. This is what the second stage of the process of rational justification of the separation of the two communities consists of – *antithesis*: deeds of the Law versus the faith in Jesus Christ (Ga 2:16; Rm 3:27; 4:16; 9:32); the Law versus Christ (Ga 2:21); body versus Spirit (Ga 3:3; 4:29); curse versus blessing (Ga 3:10); the Law versus promise (Ga 3:15-18); slavery versus sonship (Ga 4:1-7); captivity versus freedom (Ga 4:22-5:1); circumcision versus Christ (Ga 5:2); the Law versus grace (Ga 5:4). In Paul's other writings, the list of antitheses is extended: death versus life (2Co 3:6); letter versus spirit (2Co 3,6; Rm 7:6); condemnation versus justification (2Co 3:9). Antitheses are used as rhetorical figures, designed to emphasize the differences that separate the two religious communities.[275]

---

271 F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*, 40–41.

272 In Rm 2:1 Paul rhetorically addresses his adversary as "man" but it is clear in the context of Rm 2:17 that he has a Jew in mind.

273 "Circumcision raises an interesting element for defining identity as well as behavior. It is an identity marker for males that does not signify precisely the same thing as do other elements of Jewish behavior, such as observing days and diets, which, while ethnic, do not determine whether one is a Jew or not"; D. Nanos, *Paul's Non-Jews Do Not Become 'Jews,' But Do They Become 'Jewish'?: Reading Romans 2:25–29 Within Judaism, Alongside Josephus*, JJMJS 1 (2014) 28.

274 When Paul was writing the letter to the inhabitants of Rome, he still saw the local Christians as those who did not break ties with Judaism: "The letter which Paul wrote to the Romans offers the modern interpreter literary evidence of Paul's thought and of the social setting of the Roman believers in Christ, before the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity, before believers in Christ formally functioned outside of the identity and jurisdiction of the synagogue, before they were understood by Paul as anything other than participants in a Jewish coalition"; M.D. Nanos, *The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans*, CBQ 61 (1999) 304.

275 F. Watson draws more far-reaching conclusions: "These antitheses therefore legitimate the separation of church from synagogue, a separation which took place for practical reasons and not because of any theoretical incompatibility between the practice of Judaism and faith in Jesus Christ. To put it another way: faith in

Finally, the third stage of rationalization of separation of Church and Synagogue, which has already happened in practice, lies in the reinterpretation (*re-interpretation*) of certain truths. Paul refers here to the figure of Abraham. He does it because the Jews referred to the first patriarch for the purpose of self-identification. They considered themselves to be Abraham's descendants, the participants of the covenant between God and Abraham, and his successors through circumcision. They thought of themselves as heirs to the covenant. Paul ascribes all these attributes to Christians (mostly of gentile descent), thereby sealing the split into two religious communities.

It is worth mentioning here that Paul is conscious of the fact that, similarly to the way in which he interpreted the role of Abraham in the history of salvation, he could interpret the function of the Law and circumcision (Rm 2:29). He prefers however to leave this domain to his Jewish opponents, claiming that correct understanding of the Law lasts in the emerging Church (2Co 3:14-18). As a result, Paul uses the reinterpretation of Abraham's figure to highlight the privileged position of Church in comparison with the position of Synagogue, and a reinterpretation of Law serves to emphasize commitment of the Jewish community to commandments which no one is actually able to obey.

Philo of Alexandria and Biblical Allegory in Christian Exegesis

A long time before Philo, Alexandrian Judaism was subjected to Hellenization but also Hellenism underwent a process of "Judaization." In other words, the Jewish and Hellenistic ideas in Alexandria shaped and interpenetrated each other.[276] Philo of Alexandria decided to introduce in his writings the Jewish religion to the Gentiles.[277] Uniqueness of Philo's works lies in the fact that their author was very sensitive to the conflict of the two traditions – Judaic and Hellenistic – that he belonged to. Although with all his heart he adhered to monotheism, yet his

---

Christ is incompatible with works of the law because the church is separate from the synagogue"; F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*, 47. See also: D. Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, Minneapolis 2002; idem, *Paul and the Jewish Tradition: The Ideology of the Shema*, in: *Celebrating Paul. Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.*, ed. P. Spitaler, CBQMS 48, Washington 2012, 62–80.

276 P. Grech, *Początki teologii chrześcijanskiej*, in: *Historia teologii*, I, *Epoka patrystyczna*, ed. A. di Bernardino, B. Studer, trans. M. Gołębiowski, J. Łukaszewska, J. Ryndak, P. Zarębski, Kraków 2003, 42.

277 However, C.D. Moldenhawer, creating a catalogue of the royal library in Copenhagen, did not hesitate to place Philo's works as the first volume among *Patres Graeci*; he did so due to a similar understanding of the Old Testament in Philo and in Christianity; S. Giversen, *The Covenant - theirs or ours?*, 15.

mentality was shaped by the philosophy of the Greeks. He, therefore, tried to systematize the Jewish thought in Greek terms. He even stated that Greek philosophers were inspired by the same God who inspired the authors of the Law, the Prophets and the Scriptures, and that the truth discovered by logical reasoning was included in inspired scriptures. Without highlighting the truth which was the pride of the Jews, namely the conviction of their election by God, he could with greater ease build a bridge between his religion and the Hellenistic world.[278]

It may be astonishing that rabbinic writings remain silent about Philo. It might seem that for rabbis this great representative of the diaspora did not exist at all. Was he considered heretic from the point of view of Palestinian Judaism and Babylonian diaspora? It is difficult to answer this question explicitly but it is indisputable that for the Jews living in the Alexandrian diaspora he was one of the greatest mentors, and it was him who was chosen to represent the local Jewish community before the emperor.[279]

Philo, contemporary to Paul, with great determination promoted or at least spread knowledge about Judaism in the environment of the Alexandrian diaspora. Not using Hebrew, he based on the Septuagint and quoted numerous Greek authors. Interestingly, he did not refer at all to the then schools of rabbis Hillel and Shammai. It is possible that he did not know them although he supposedly made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Instead of quoting Jewish writers, he was eager to refer to Greek rhetors, poets, and authors of tragedies. He used Greek rhetorical techniques and showed exceptional knowledge of the theory of music.[280]

When the Alexandrian scholar described Moses, he pointed out that the liberator of the chosen people from Egypt had studied music, arithmetic and geometry. He had also learnt other liberal arts from teachers coming from Greece (*Moses* 1,5). For Philo, liberal arts (not the Jewish education) gave access to superior wisdom which, according to him, was philosophy. In the Alexandrian diaspora, the Jews did not mind sending their children to gymnasiums where competitions of athletes were often held on the occasion of pagan feasts. And similarly, theatrical plays were put on during feasts devoted to different gods. Philo was a regular visitor of theatres and he practised boxing and wrestling (*Cher.* 24,80-81; *Prob.* 05,26). In his philosophy, the scholar of Alexandria combined faith and reason (*fides et ratio*). Thus, the beginning of Christian philosophy is rooted in the thoughts of a Jew, Philo of Alexandria.[281]

---

278 M. Rosik, *Jezus a judaizm w świetle Ewangelii według św. Marka*, 32–33.

279 S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 177.

280 L.H. Feldman, *Philo's View on Music*, JJML 9 (1986–1987) 36–54.

281 "Thus, the history of Christian philosophy begins not with a Christian, but with a Jew, Philo, an older contemporary of Paul. The Church itself preserved the numerous treatises of Philo still extant; on the other hand, Philo is not cited by a single Jewish writer (except briefly by Josephus) until the 16th century"; L.H. Feldman, *Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism in the First Century*, 41.

The concept of God in Philo is marked by transcendence but in a sense the material world is seen as His opposition. One thing which can be directly and certainly said about God is that He exists. Since there is no similarity between God and the world, so negative statements are closest to the truth about God: it is easier to state who God is not than who He is. Knowing well the Greek idea of deities, Philo in his treatise on the Decalogue wrote: "There is an error of no small importance which has taken possession of the greater portion of mankind […] for some nations have made divinities of the four elements, earth and water, and air and fire. Others, of the sun and moon, and of the other planets and fixed stars. Others, again, of the whole world. […] for these false gods put out of sight that most supreme and most ancient of all, the Creator." (*Decal.* 12,52-54)[282]

Philo introduces the Greek concept of the Logos to his reasoning.[283] For him the Logos is the hypostasis of God's wisdom. The similarity between the ideas of Philo and John the evangelist, who in the prologue to his Gospel also speaks of the Logos, cannot be considered accidental. Obviously, for Philo the Logos would never "become a body," but John's thought about Jesus as the Logos probably dates all the way back to the school of Alexandria. Man reflects the Divine Wisdom but his relationship with God has been weakened by sins. Man should be guided in his life by the rules of conduct laid down by God.[284]

The Alexandrian scholar became famous mostly for the fact that he used the allegorical method of interpretation of the Bible. According to him, biblical texts have two levels of meaning: literal and allegorical. One does not eliminate the other.[285] Some of his explanations of biblical ideas take on characteristics that are similar to Greek myths. The influence of Stoic and neo-Platonic thought can be easily noticed. The stories of the Old Testament were still far from philosophical currents of Greece and their parallels should have been searched rather in the

282 J.J. Collins, *Natural Theology and Biblical Tradition: The Case of Hellenistic Judaism*, 7. According to Philo, those amongst philosophers who are looking for true God, even if they are mistaken, are estimable; those who ceased to search are involved in idolatry and are regrettable (*Decal.* 66).

283 D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 114.

284 J. Legowicz, *Judaizm i filozofia grecko-rzymska*, in: *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, Warszawa 1990, 208.

285 "For Philo these two levels of the text are complementary. The allegorical is, of course, the deeper meaning of the text and participates in the basic reality of the universe and of the relationship between God and humanity. Philo's fascination with the deeper meaning of the Torah makes all the more significant his assertion that one must, nevertheless, observe the literal details of the biblical laws, and he sharply criticizes those who use allegorical exegesis as the grounds for neglecting the explicit requirements of the Law"; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*, 213–214.

pre-philosophical period when myths played an important role in explaining the nature of the universe and human life.[286]

The allegorical method of interpretation of the Bible significantly affected the development of Christian exegesis.[287] It is sufficient to recall the writings of another Alexandrian scholar, Origen, whom none of the early Christian writers equals in his literary legacy. Clemens also made liberal use of the allegorical method developed by Philo. Later the method was adopted by Christians in their writings in Latin and in this way, allegorical look at the Bible began to dominate in the Western Church.[288]

One can assume that the presentation of the religion of his ancestors by Philo of Alexandria to some extent paved the way for the emerging Christianity. Philo wrote in Greek, gladly referred to Greek ideas and convictions, referred to Greek philosophers as well as used metaphors well-known in Greece. Those who read his writings, both the Jews living in the diaspora and the Gentiles, looked at Judaism from the Greek point of view. What is more, the Gentiles who read Philo knew only this face of Judaism. Consequently, when the Good News rooted in the Hebrew Bible began to reach them, it was not already completely alien to their way of thinking. Since they knew the main content of the Jewish sacred texts as well as the main beliefs of the worshippers of Judaism, Christianity became for them a kind of continuation of the religion presented by Philo.

Acceptance of Christianity by Samaritans (c. 37 AD)

When Christ was departing from this world to heaven, He promised to send the Holy Spirit to the apostles and He announced the process of evangelization that was to take place along a specific geographical route, saying: "but you will receive the power of the Holy Spirit which will come on you, and then you will be my witnesses not only in Jerusalem but throughout Judea and Samaria, and indeed to earth's remotest end." (Ac 1:8) The pattern: Jerusalem - Judea - Samaria - the "earth's remotest end," in the strict sense, is realized by the mission of deacon Philip in Samaria (Ac 8:4-13). The Word of God proclaimed by followers of Christ had already borne fruit in Judea and its capital Jerusalem, and now it also reached

286 An example could be his interpretation of the biblical myth from the Genesis in which Adam is for Philo an epitome of reason, Eve is personification of the senses and the serpent symbolizes desire. The first parents' decay shows the force of desire that first attacks the senses and finally overcomes reason; R.C. Solomon, K.M. Higgins, *Krótka historia filozofii*, trans. N. Szczucka-Kubisz, Warszawa 1996, 138–139.

287 K. Bardski, *Chrześcijańska lektura Starego Testamentu w kluczu symboliki literackiej*, RT 57 (2015) 4, 450–451.

288 E. Kessler, *An Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations*, New York 2010, 49.

Samaria, the region inhabited by people who identified themselves with the Mosaic tradition[289] but who were treated by the Jews as pagan.[290]

After deportation of many Jews living in Samaria by the Assyrians in the year 721, the pagan population began to settle in that region.[291] They were mainly the Cuthim, residents of Persia, who took their name from the river Cutha. Josephus did not have a high opinion of them. What is more, he had no opinion about whether they were related to the Jews or not. He wrote:

> But they alter their attitude according to circumstances and when they see the Jews prospering, call them their kinsmen, on the ground that they are descended from Josephus and they are related to them through their origin from him, but, when they see the Jews in trouble, they say that they have nothing whatever in common with them nor do these have any claim or friendship or race, and they declare themselves to be aliens of another race (*Ant.* 9,387).

289 Apart from honouring Yahweh, the Samaritans also worshipped other gods, what resulted in rejection of their help during the construction of the Temple: "The king of Assyria brought people from Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath and Sepharvaim, and settled them in the towns of Samaria to replace the Israelites; these took possession of Samaria and lived in its towns" (2K 17:24). With the passing of time, apart from the deities that they had professed, they also started to worship Yahweh but not as the only God but as one of many (2K 17:25–41). The fact became one of the main reasons for the rejection of their offer of help during the rebuilding of the Temple; U Szwarc, *Świątynia jerozolimska*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, 85. In a different manner: E. Zawiszewski, *Instytucje biblijne*, Pelplin 2001, 81; in the opinion of the author the Samaritans were monotheistic. However, most researchers are of the opinion that the reason of disunion between the Jews and the Samaritans could have been the fact of blending the latter with mixed population.

290 Such seems the attitude of the authors, who almost do not mention the Samaritans in studies devoted to Judaism: E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, Philadelphia 1985; E.P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, London – Philadelphia 1990; E.P. Sanders, *Judaism. Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE*, London – Philadelphia 1992; G. Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism*, Philadelphia 1983; G. Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*, Minneapolis 1993; I.M. Zeitlin, *Jesus and the Judaism of His Time*, Cambridge 1988.

291 Just before this siege of Samaria by Assyria a large number of its inhabitants fled to the south and settled in Jerusalem. Archaeological excavations proved that at the end of the eighth century BC the city expanded, giving rise to a new district inhabited by twenty thousand people. However, the Assyrian king resettled most residents of the Northern Kingdom to Mesopotamia. One of the preserved inscriptions, from the time of Sargon II, tells about the deportation of 27 290 people from the "land of Omri's home." Some researchers seek the beginning of the conflict between the Samaritans and Judeans in the ninth century BC; C.A. Evans, *Introduction: Finding a Context for Jesus*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 1–2.

When after years of captivity, the exiles from Babylon began to return to their homeland after the edict issued by Cyrus in the years 537/6, the Samaritans were eager to help them during the reconstruction of the Temple. This offer was rejected by Zerubbabel who shared an opinion common among Babylonian exiles that the Samaritans were no longer Jews[292] because they had betrayed their nation by marrying the Gentiles (cf. Ezr 4:2).[293] The Samaritans, turned off by the attitude of their – as they believed hitherto – fellow citizens, decided to build their own temple which was raised at the top of Mount Gerizim in the fourth century BC.[294] The author of the *Samaritan Chronicle* maintains that the temple stood there already in the days of Joshua, then it was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, and reconstructed after the Babylonian exile by Sanballat. However, the testimony of the *Samaritan Chronicle* should not be considered as reliable. It is clear that its author took an apologetic attitude in order to justify the cult on Gerizim.

At the time of the Ptolemies and the Seleucid dynasty, Samaritan cities were Hellenized and marriages to the Gentiles became even more frequent[295], which did not go unnoticed by the Jews. Culmination of the conflict was the destruction of the temple on Gerizim by the army of John Hyrcanus in the year 128 BC. With time, the hostility between the Jews and the Samaritans grew, which was confirmed by the references in the Gospels (Mt 10:5; Lk 9:52; Jn 4:1-42).[296] King Herod the Great's marriage to a Samaritan woman did not help although the king hoped to quiet the feuding parties by this marriage. The fact that about the year 6 AD (*nota bene* more or less at the same time when 12-year old Jesus taught in the Temple) a group of Samaritans scattered bones of dead bodies on the courtyard

---

292 Samaritans did not consider themselves as the Jews although they claimed that they were true heirs to the Mosaic religion. According to M. Wróbel, they firmly rejected the term "Jews" with respect to their identity; M. Wróbel, *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*, 205.

293 A certain midrash relates the moment when those who started to rebuild the Temple had returned from Babylon. The Samaritans, named so after the city of Samaria in which they resided although in fact they were the Gentiles, in the number of one hundred and eighty thousand, declared a war against them. They wanted to kill Nehemiah deceitfully and disrupted works on the Temple for two years; Pacifici, *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, 150.

294 J. Warzecha, *Samarytanie – perspektywa polityczna i religijna*, in: *„Słowo Twoje jest prawdą" (J 17,17). Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Stanisława Mędali CM w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, 342–343.

295 G. Bornkammbelieves as follows: "The Samaritans are looked upon by the Jews as religiously unclean, because of their intermarriage with pagans, but more so as followers of a satanic heresy"; *Jesus of Nazareth*, New York 1960, 41–42.

296 E.A. Amstrong, *The Gospel Parables*, London 1967, 161; R. Bauckham, *The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan: Jesus' Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses*, NTS 44 (1998) 475–489; J.D. Purvis, *Samarytanie*, in: *Encyklopedia biblijna*, ed. P.J. Achtemeier, Polish ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1999, 1079–1081.

of the Temple in Jerusalem, thus profaning the Tabernacle, confirms that the disagreement still lasted. The hostility between the two ethnic groups became even proverbial because the following saying was coined: "He that eats the bread of the Samaritans is like the one who eats the flesh of swine."[297]

Religiosity of the Samaritans, who described themselves by the use of the term *shemarim* ("preserving") claiming that it was their interpretation of the Law which was faithful, was based on four pillars:

(1) they worshipped God whose name they wrote down in the tetragrammaton JHWH as did the Jews;
(2) they performed sacrificial worship on the mountain of Gerizim near Sichem;
(3) they argued that the priests employed on Gerizim belonged to the orthodox line of Levi priests;
(4) from Jewish writing tradition they adopted only Pentateuch with minor theological changes among which the most important one was the inclusion into the Decalogue in Ex 20:17 a commandment that required worship on Mount Gerizim.[298]

The mission among the Samaritans was initiated by Jesus himself. The conversation which developed between Jesus and the woman from Samaria (Jn 4:1-42) switched to the subject of messianic expectations. The Samaritans expected the arrival of a mysterious person who they described using the term *Taheb*. He was to be a new Moses as announced in the Deuteronomy: "Yahweh your God will raise up a prophet like me; you will listen to him" (Dt 18:15).[299] A Samaritan woman alluded to this belief in the conversation with Jesus: "I know that Messiah - that is, Christ - is coming; and when he comes he will explain everything." (Jn 4:25) After a while Jesus revealed himself as the expected Messiah. The complicated past did not hinder the Samaritan woman from the correct recognition of His identity. What is more, she became a witness and began to bring others to Jesus: "Come and see a man who has told me everything I have done; could this be the Christ?" (Jn 4:29)

One of the most interesting allegorical and symbolic interpretations of John's narrative requires to see in Jesus' interlocutor all inhabitants of Samaria. The

297 B.B. Scott, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, Edinburgh 1926, 197.

298 J.P. Meier, *The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans. What Can Be Said?*, Bib 81 (2000) 206. The Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) in approximately six thousand variants departs from the adopted Masoretic Text (MT); these are mainly orthographic changes. In almost one thousand and nine hundred variants SP agrees with the LXX, in contrast to the MT.

299 *Taheb* is connected with Mosaic tradition also by the beliefs of some Samaritans that he would restore the ark of the covenant, Moses' cane and an omer of manna; W. E. Barton, *Jakob ben Aaron. The Messianic Hope of the Samaritans*, Open Court 21 (1907) 295–296; M. Baraniak, *Mojżesz a Taheb Samarytan*, in: *Oto idę. Księga pamiątkowa dla Biskupa Profesora Jana Bernarda Szlagi w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2005, 111–112.

woman had five "faithful husbands," (Jn 4:18) what indicates the fact that once Samaria was faithful to five books of the Torah. Now, the Samaritan woman lives in adultery (Jn 4:17-18) because the population of this region allied with pagans and, in accordance with the prophetic oracles, idolatry is the same as adultery. It turns out, however, that soon ("but the hour is coming - indeed is already here"; Jn 4:23) the Samaritans like the members of the Chosen People will be able to obtain the grace of salvation. And it is all thanks to the fact that they will be given the "water of life," that is the Holy Spirit, in step with the announcement of Jesus made during the Feast of Tabernacles: Let anyone who believes in me come and drink! As scripture says, "From his heart shall flow streams of living water." (Jn 7:38) The evangelist scrupulously and straightforwardly explains the symbol of living water: "He was speaking of the Spirit which those who believed in him were to receive." (Jn 7:39)[300] The death of Jesus is already close. The one who believes in what happens on the cross will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit and will no longer praise God on Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem Temple but "in spirit and truth." (Jn 4:23)

Meeting of Jesus with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well rooted and justified the Christian mission in Samaria. The detailed description of this dialogue led some exegetes to a belief that John's Gospel was addressed to the Samaritans.[301] Not getting into a debate on such an extreme view, one must acknowledge that the elements of the Samaritan tradition and beliefs play a significant role in the work of John the evangelist. The messianic idea incorporated in the figure of *Taheb* mentioned above seems to be clearer in this perspective. The Samaritan Messiah is a prophet and a king. His arrival is described in *Memar Marqah*, a piece of writing created by the Samaritans:

> The Taheb will come in peace to reign over the place which God chose for the good people (…). Joseph came and he was rewarded with a kingdom after servitude and those who had oppressed him sought his favour (…) There is none like Josef the king and none like Moses the prophet. Both were elevated: Moses possessed the gift of prophecy and Joseph possessed the good Mountain [Gerizim]. There is none greater than either of them (4,12).[302]

A liturgical Samaritan text entitled *Durran* sounds similar. It describes Joseph's elevation after death. His bones were relocated by the great prophet Moses "who

300 J. Kręcidło, *Duch Święty i Jezus w Ewangelii świętego Jana. Funkcja pneumatologii w chrystologicznej strukturze czwartej Ewangelii*, SBP 2, Częstochowa 2006, 177–187.

301 Thus: J. Bowman, *Samaritan Studies*, BJRL 40 (1958) 298–327; G.W. Buchanan, *The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John*, in: *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenouth*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1968, 149–175; E.D. Freed, *Samaritan Influence in the Gospel of John*, CBQ 30 (1968) 580–587; E.D. Freed, *Did John Write His Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?*, NT 12 (1970) 241–256.

302 M. Wróbel, *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*, 205.

was called god by the One who rules. God was pleased with two men: Joseph – the king and Moses - the prophet." (22)[303] The Samaritans put strong emphasis on the Deuteronomic element of the tradition, according to which God had promised to raise up a great prophet (Dt 18:18-19). The importance of the text is highlighted by the fact that in the Samaritan Pentateuch, it is repeated after Ex 20:21 and constitutes a specific conclusion following the reception of the Law. Similarly to these Samaritan beliefs, John the evangelist stresses the fact that Jesus was a prophet and links Him to the figure of Joseph. As mentioned above, the Samaritan woman recognizes the prophet in Jesus (Jn 4:29). Crowds regard Him as the prophet after the miraculous multiplication of the loaves of bread (Jn 6:14); the same thing happens during the Feast of Tabernacles (Jn 7:40-43).

Traces of Samaritan tradition on Moses the prophet and Joseph the king seem to emanate from the confession of Philip: "We have found him of whom Moses in the Law and the prophets wrote, Jesus son of Joseph, from Nazareth." (Jn 1:45) Obviously, Philip speaking of Joseph had Mary's husband in mind; however according to Jn 1:49, Nathanael identifies Jesus as the "king of Israel" and according to Jn 2:5 Mary tells the servants at the wedding to do what Jesus will order them to do, i.e. she uses the imperative taken over from the story of the patriarch Joseph (Gn 41:55). John, therefore, tries to recall the figure of the patriarch Joseph and connect it with Jesus. These efforts seem to be intentional to get the message of the Good News across to the inhabitants of Samaria. Moreover, according to Jn 8:48 Jesus himself was called the Samaritan.[304]

Followers of the cult on Mount Gerizim believed in pre-existence of Moses. Therefore, those who accepted Christianity emphasized their convictions of the pre-existence of Jesus who had been with God and then came down to the earth and brought His revealed words to people. The crucial perspective of John's image of Jesus was the fact that the Son of God came down from heaven, from above, from the throne of God where He had already existed before the creation of the world (Jn 17:5). Jesus in synoptic tradition never speaks about his existence with the Father before coming down to the earth. In the Gospel of John the whole mission of the Saviour results from the fact of pre-existence: everything that Jesus says and does is the reflection of what He had seen and heard from the Father (5:19; 7:16; 8:28.38; 12:49). This element of Christology, the pre-existence of the

303 A.E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, Oxford 1909, 76.

304 This fact may indicate that John's community was seen by the Jews as a community sharing some beliefs with the Samaritans: "The Johannine Jesus (who undergoes the harassment suffered historically by the Johannine community) says that he has come from God (8:41), only to be challenged by Jews who exclaim: 'Aren't we right, after all, in saying that you are a Samaritan?' (8:48). This suggests that the Johannine community was regarded by the Jews as having Samaritan elements"; R.E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*, New York 1979, 37.

Son of God, became one of the main reasons for the disunion with the Synagogue. The Jews accused John's community of the rejection of monotheism to accept the other God – Jesus. They were not able to accept the thesis about the unity of Jesus with his Father, or the fact that He called God his Father, making himself equal to Him.[305]

Philip, one of the seven deacons (Ac 6:5), appeared in Samaria to preach the word of God, confirmed by numerous signs: "The people unanimously welcomed the message Philip preached, because they had heard of the miracles he worked and because they saw them for themselves. For unclean spirits came shrieking out of many who were possessed, and several paralytics and cripples were cured. As a result, there was great rejoicing in that town." (Ac 8:6-8)[306] The activity of Philip in Samaria proved to be the perfect fulfilment of the words included in one of the endings of the Gospel according to Mark: "the Lord working with them [disciples] and confirming the word by the signs that accompanied it." (Mk 16:20b)

An extraordinary event was the conversion of Simon the Sorcerer or Simon the Magician who was very respected and esteemed in Samaria. Although the Samaritans accepted Pentateuch, they broke orders included there since they admired Simon. With his magic tricks, he transgressed God's orders written down in the Deuteronomic tradition: "There must never be anyone among you who makes his son or daughter pass through the fire of sacrifice, who practises divination, who is soothsayer, augur or sorcerer, weaver of spells, consulter of ghosts or mediums, or necromancer. For anyone who does these things is detestable to Yahweh your God." (Dt 18:10-12a)[307] Magic is an attempt to use supernatural powers by means of specified measures, procedures, manipulations, and spells; it is an attempt of exercising a control over the supernatural powers. Neither Jesus nor Philip used magic practices performing miracles. Healings performed in faith through the intercession of a deacon preaching the Good News were more appealing to the inhabitants of Samaria than the magic tricks of Simon. Although Simon converted to the Lord and was baptized (Ac 8:13), he did not fully understand the message because when Peter and John arrived in Samaria to continue Philip's mission, Simon decided to buy the powers of bestowing the Holy Spirit (Ac 8:19). He was severly and effectively reprimanded by the apostles and finally asked them for an intercessory prayer (Ac 8:24).[308]

His attitude, however, is not very surprising when we look at it from the perspective of the early Christian testimonies on the use of spiritual gifts that attracted attention of not only Christians but also people from outside the Church.

---

305 J.F. O'Grady, *According to John. The Witness of the Beloved Disciple*, New York 1999, 25.

306 R. Bartnicki, *Dzieje głoszenia Słowa Bożego. Jezus i najstarszy Kościół*, 271.

307 Cf. also: Dt 13:2; 11:28; 18:10–15; Lv 19:26.31; 20:6.27; 2K 9:22;17:17; 21:6; 1S 15:23; Ws 12:4; Is 44:25; Jr 27:9; 29:8; Mi 5:11; Ac 16:16; Rv 21:8;22:15.

308 A.J.M. Wedderburn, *A History of the First Christians*, London – New York 2004, 63.

Many such testimonies were recorded in the time span of our interest (30-313 AD). The author of *Didache* (the end of the first century) commands to value the gift of prophecy: "Now regarding the Apostles and Prophets, according to the decree (command) of the gospel […]: Let every Apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord […]. But every true Prophet who wishes to settle among you is worthy of his food (or, support)." (11,3-4; 13,1) Around the year 95, Clement of Rome admonishes the Corinthians: "Let our whole body, then, be preserved in Christ Jesus; and let everyone be subject to his neighbour, according to the special gift bestowed upon him (*Ep. Cor.,* 38,1).[309]

The author of the *Epistle of Barnabas* mentions briefly charismatic activity of the Holy Spirit with the use of the following words: "[…] God truly dwells in us, in the habitation which we are. […] himself prophesying in us, himself dwelling in us […]. by opening the door of the temple (that is the mouth) to us." (*Ep. Bar.,* 16,9)

In the middle of the second century Hermas in his work T*he Shepherd* gives advice on how to use the gift of prophecy: "When then the man who hath the divine Spirit cometh into an assembly of righteous men, who have faith in a divine Spirit, and intercession is made to God by the gathering of those men, then the angel of the prophetic spirit, who is attached to him, filleth the man, and the man, being filled with the Holy Spirit, speaketh to the multitude, according as the Lord willeth." *(Shep.,* 43,9)

A further testimony, this time from Justin Martyr, concerns the gift of liberation from the impact of evil spirits. He describes exorcizing of evil spirits as follows: "[Christ] was made man also, as we before said, having been conceived according to the will of God the Father, for the sake of believing men, and for the destruction of the demons. And now you can learn this from what is under your own observation. For numberless demoniacs throughout the whole world, and in your city, many of our Christian men exorcising them in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, have healed and do heal, rendering helpless and driving the possessing devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, and those who used incantations and drugs (2 Apol.6, 5-6).

In the second century Irenaeus specifies the gift of tongues: "In like manner [in Paul's times] we do also hear many brethren in the Church, who possess prophetic gifts, and who through the Spirit speak all kinds of languages, and bring to

309 Clement of Rome was broadly educated. He had knowledge of Greek culture but, at the same time, he was a biblical man of the same spiritual tradition as Moses and Isaac. He knew the Scriptures of the Old Testament very well, and quoted them either from the Hebrew original or from the Septuaginta translation. So we have two possibilities: either he was a Jew, thoroughly familiar with Greek culture and brought up in it, or a pagan, belonging to those *foboumenoi* – "God-fearing" who were strongly associated with the Synagogue; M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 132.

light for the general benefit the hidden things of men, and declare the mysteries of God, whom also the apostle terms "spiritual," they being spiritual because they partake of the Spirit […]." (*Adv.* V,6,1) In another testimony by Irenaeus a number of charisms are mentioned by their names. The list of them is similar to the one included in the first letter to the Corinthians by St Paul: "Wherefore, also, those who are in truth His disciples, receiving grace from Him, do in His name perform [miracles], so as to promote the welfare of other men, according to the gift which each one has received from Him. For some do certainly and truly drive out devils, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently both believe [in Christ], and join themselves to the Church. Others have foreknowledge of things to come: they see visions, and utter prophetic expressions. Others still, heal the sick by laying their hands upon them, and they are made whole. Yes, moreover, as I have said, the dead even have been raised up, and remained among us for many years. And what shall I more say? It is not possible to name the number of the gifts which the Church, [scattered] throughout the whole world, has received from God, in the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate." (*Adv. haer.* II, 32,4)[310]

It is interesting to note that a lot of attention is paid to charisms in the writings of the Samaritan, Justin Martyr. We may suppose that the people of Samaria in general showed vivid interest in supernatural phenomena. Similar examples of testimonies concerning spiritual gifts, found in the writings of early Christian writers (such as Hippolytus of Rome, Novatian or, above all, Origen of Alexandria), could be multiplied. They all confirm what happened in Samaria: the inhabitants of the region were amazed by the supernatural manifestations of spiritual gifts and accepted Christ in a mass.

---

310 The spiritual gifts in the original Christianity are also testified by Tertullian who joined the Montanists: "the Creator would speak with other tongues and other lips, while confirming indeed the gift of tongues" and he adds that: "there are women that can also have the gift of prophesy" *(Adv. Marc.* 5,8,10). In the debates with Marcion, he appealed to him to show to him action of the Holy Spirit in the community: to show that there are prophecies, the gift of interpretation of tongues and the gift of special knowledge in the community *(Adv. Marc.* 5,8,12). In the treatise *On the Soul* he gave a very interesting testimony on charismatic gifts which one woman in his community was endowed with: "We have now among us a sister whose lot it has been to be favoured with sundry gifts of revelation, which she experiences in the Spirit by ecstatic vision amidst the sacred rites of the Lord's day in the church: she converses with angels, and sometimes even with the Lord; she both sees and hears mysterious communications; some men's hearts she understands, and to them who are in need she distributes remedies. Whether it be in the reading of Scriptures, or in the chanting of psalms, or in the preaching of sermons, or in the offering up of prayers, in all these religious services matter and opportunity are afforded to her of seeing visions" *(De amina 9).*

The identity of the Samaritans has been studied in recent decades and a hypothesis has been formulated that should be mentioned here. It relates to their possible connection with the Essenes of Qumran. There were many similarities between the two communities regarding their moral code and beliefs. The latter concern the issue of the Sabbath, the calendar, the priesthood, the law of succession, many regulations on issues of ritual purity, as well as the manner of pronouncing the sacred text.[311] The Samaritans and the Qumranians celebrated holidays at the same time, according to the solar calendar which was rejected by the official Temple of Judaism. In Jerusalem sanctuary the lunar calendar was used, hence the dates of the holidays differed from the dates adopted by the Samaritans and the inhabitants of Qumran. What is more, studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Samaritan Pentateuch as well as the Septuagint have resulted in surprising findings: in almost one third of the deviations from the Masoretic text, the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Bible of the Seventy.[312]

Both communities, the Samaritans and the inhabitants of the settlement near the Dead Sea, lived in isolation, away from the Jews and the Gentiles (non-Jews). When the Samaritans had to pass through Jerusalem, they stayed in the Essen district of the city. This happened at the time of Herod the Great (37- 4 BC), after the earthquake which hit Qumran. Following the disaster, many Qumran residents settled in the south-west part of Jerusalem.[313] After their returning to Qumran, the settlement grew rapidly, and it is possible that its members could have come from Samaria.[314] If this happened after Philip's mission in Samaria, one should not reject a provisionally accepted hypothesis that the news of Christianity had reached Qumran before it was abandoned prior to the invasion of the Roman army during the first Jewish uprising.

How could the preaching of Philip, Peter, and John, which took place in Samaria amid the signs and manifestations of the Holy Spirit[315], affect the relationship

311 W. Chrostowski, *Samarytanin na drodze z Jerozolimy do Jerycha (Łk 10,30-37). O możliwych związkach Samarytan z Qumran*, in: *Mów, Panie, bo sługa Twój słucha. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Ryszarda Rubinkiewicza SDB w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1999, 63–65. Some foundations for the hypothesis of the relationships between the Samaritans and the Qumranians can be found in the book by T. and M. Thordson *Qumran and the Samaritans* (Jerusalem 1996).

312 As many as 1,900 deviations out of 6,000 agree with the Septuagint; J.C. VanderKam, *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego*, trans. R. Gromacka, Warszawa 1996, 125.

313 S. Mędala, *Le camp des Esséniens de Jérusalem à la lumière des recentes recherches archéologiques*, Folia Orientalia 25 (1989) 67–74.

314 According to J.T. Milikit was not, however, so large as prior to the fire; *Dziesięc lat odkryć na Pustyni Judzkiej*, trans. Z. Kubiak, Kraków 1999, 54–55.

315 Probably mainly thanks to the gift of tongues, as in the New Testament the statement "they received the Holy Spirit", used also in Ac 8:17b, usually indicates this charism.

between Church and Synagogue? In the thirties and forties of the first century, Christians increasingly distanced themselves from the official mainstream Judaism of Pharisaic provenance by creating their own communities. The Samaritans had been subjected to similar isolation for centuries while the Qumranians for decades. Since the Jews regarded the Samaritans as pagans (just as they rejected the type of piety proposed by members of the Qumran sect), the adoption by some of them of Christianity had to influence the attitude of official Judaism to the growing Church. The latter began to include in its ranks the worshippers of Yahweh from Mount Gerizim who in the eyes of the Jews had betrayed the faith of their fathers. The admission of the Samaritans to the Church could not have been viewed favourably by the religious leaders of Israel. While they could still accept the presence of Judeo-Christians in the Temple, it was unthinkable that the Samaritans who had converted to Christianity could have access to the Jerusalem sanctuary. The separation of Church from Synagogue became even more obvious.

Early Christianity among Ethiopian Jews (c. 38 AD)

The kingdom of Meroë, i.e. the area of today's Sudan, in earlier times also Ethiopia where the Blue Nile meets the White Nile, had been already known to the Jews at the time of Isaiah when leaders originating from this Ethiopian region ascended to the throne of pharaoh. When deacon Philip preached Christ to the Ethiopian courtier, the queen's name was Aminatare (to 41 AD) and one of her royal titles was Kandake.[316] From historical point of view, the presence of the Jews in Ethiopia is well proven. They settled there several centuries BC, and the diaspora in north Africa constituted the largest group of the Jews outside Lebanon.[317] This is where the largest stream of pilgrims flowed from to the Temple in Jerusalem.

Three of the Jewish festivals were considered as pilgrimage feasts: the Passover, Sukkot, and Shavuot (Dt 16:16).[318] Palestinian Jews, most likely from Judea, and therefore living relatively close to Jerusalem, endeavoured to participate in the Temple observances three times a year.[319] Jews living in the diaspora dreamed of visiting Jerusalem at least once in their lifetime, preferably on the occasion of one

316 L. Shinnie, *Meroe, a Civilization in the Sudan*, New York 1967, 61; R. Głuchowski, *Nawrócenie dworzanina królowej etiopskiej typem ewangelizacji bez granic. Społeczno-geograficzny wymiar Łukaszowego uniwersalizmu zbawczego w Dz 8,25-40*, Studia Biblica Lublinensia 5, Lublin 2010, 38–39.

317 S.J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids 1990, 312.

318 M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, AB 5, New York 1991, 69.

319 Of course, it was only possible in the case of those Jews who lived in close proximity to the Temple. If e.g. residents of Galilee wanted to observe this imperative scrupulously, they would stay away from home for approximately ten weeks; E.P. Sanders, *Il giudaismo. Fede e prassi (63 a.C. – 66 d.C.)*, trans. P. Capelli, L. Santini, Brescia 1999, 167.

of these feasts.[320] Most often the Jews used to go to Jerusalem in groups, creating caravans that provided security for both people and money allotted for the Temple taxes. All men were obliged to participate in these gatherings.

Josephus Flavius describes this habit as follows: "Let them assemble in that city in which they shall establish the temple, three times in the year, from the ends of the land which the Hebrews shall conquer, in order to render thanks to God for benefits received, to intercede for future mercies, and to promote by thus meeting and feasting together feelings of mutual affection. For it is good that they should not be ignorant of one another, being members of the same race and partners in the same institutions; and this end will be attained by such intercourse, when through sight and speech they recall those ties to mind." (*Ant.* 4,203-204)[321] Historical testimonies confirm the fact that the Jews living in this diaspora made offerings in the Temple in Jerusalem; even if they interpreted the Law more freely, during their pilgrimage to the Holy City, they complied with the laws of sacrifice.[322]

Many pilgrims arriving in Jerusalem from the distant diaspora did not stay in the city only for the festivals but extended their stay to several weeks or even months. The aim of a longer stay in the city, in whose heart the Temple was vibrant with life, was often studying the Law under the supervision of skilled Jerusalem teachers. Rabbinic schools of Jerusalem were known not only in Palestine but also in some important centres in the diaspora and very often the schools, taking their names from their leading teachers, constituted a reference point in discussions concerning observance of the Law. It is doubtful whether the Ethiopian who read the Book of Isaiah in his chariot came to Jerusalem to study the Law but certainly he could have met pilgrims who stayed in the town to study and perhaps, intrigued by their attitude, he himself started reading the inspired writings.

The courtier of the Ethiopian queen had to cover the distance of nearly one thousand kilometres from his kingdom to Jerusalem. According to the Mishnah

---

320 S. Safrai, *Temple*, in: *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, II, ed. S. Safrai, M. Stern, Amsterdam 1976, 900. S. Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple Period*, Immanuel 5 (1975) 55; M. Goodman, *Pilgrimage Economy of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period*, in: *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. L.I. Levine, New York 1999, 72.

321 R. Głuchowski notices that the pilgrimages and other links between the diaspora and the Jewish homeland did not begin with the conquest of the East by the Romans but since approximately the middle of the first century BC the bonds were particularly strong, and the number of pilgrimages to the Temple increased because of favourable political and military conditions; *Nawrócenie dworzanina królowej etiopskiej typem ewangelizacji bez granic. Społeczno-geograficzny wymiar Łukaszowego uniwersalizmu zbawczego w Dz 8,25-40*, 121.

322 S. Safrai, *Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel*, in: *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, I, ed. S. Safrai, M. Stern, Amsterdam 1976, 186.

(*Taan.* 1,3) pilgrims within one day covered the distance of around forty kilometres, which means that one-way journey of the Ethiopian in a chariot[323] must have taken more than twenty days. In view of Ac 8:26, where Gaza is mentioned, it seems logical to assume that the Ethiopian travelled along *Via Maris* which crosses the city.[324] It can also be assumed that the journey took place on the occasion of the Passover celebration because then Jerusalem was visited by pagans who wanted to become proselytes.[325]

Deuteronomy prohibits the Israelites to celebrate Passover outside Jerusalem (Dt 16:1-8). The author of the apocryphal *Book of Jubilees* lays emphasis on the fact that the paschal lamb could only be consumed in Jerusalem and only in the Temple (it presumably means an open area in front of the Temple before it was surrounded by walls). The requirement is repeated several times which might suggest that not everyone followed the instruction. There are a lot of testimonies confirming that the Gentiles wishing to become proselytes used to go to Jerusalem to take part in the festival of the Passover to fulfil obligations required by the Law (*Pes.* 8,8). One of them was a sacrifice of a pair of pigeons as the conversion was not full when this requirement was not met.

If the Ethiopian really participated in the celebration of the Passover in Jerusalem, one must be aware of the limitations to which he was subjected. Since he was a pagan, he could not go with other Jews (even if he knew them and they were his friends) to the men's Courtyard but had to stop in the Court of the Gentiles and only watch those who made offerings. Even if he was convinced internally about the truth, the validity and usefulness of the celebration, he could not fully participate in it. The splendour of the Temple could intimidate him and make him feel the majesty of God but he still remained outside. He did not know or fully understand the writings although the fact that he read them on the way back meant that he was very keen on exploring the religiousness of Israel. So when he met Philip who explained the meaning of Isaiah's prophecy to him (Is 53:7-8), he accepted baptism, which Philip had probably mentioned to him, without hesitation (Ac 8:36). Being baptized, he was united with the nascent Church and became the first representative of his nation who recognized the Lord and the Saviour in Christ.[326]

---

323 These were usually very small chests, D-shaped in cross-section. The suspension of the chariots was very low so that it was easy to get on and off. Springs were not known yet so the chariot's floor was made of flexible net which, well stretched, amortized shocks. Chariots were often pulled by a pair of horses.

324 Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible. A Historical Geography*, Philadelphia 1979, 45–50.

325 S. Safrai, *Relations Between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel*, 187; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, London 1967, 75; R. Głuchowski, *Nawrócenie dworzanina królowej etiopskiej typem ewangelizacji bez granic. Społeczno-geograficzny wymiar Łukaszowego uniwersalizmu zbawczego w Dz 8,25-40*, 131.

326 F.S. Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts. A Study of Rules and Relations*, JSNTSup 67, Sheffield 1992, 183.

Luke, reporting the entire event, seems to put emphasis on the clear description of the Ethiopian's relation to Judaism. He is described as an eunuch (five times) and as God-fearing. These are special categories of people in Judaism. According to the Law, the eunuch could not become a full member of the community of Israel. It was regulated by the following legal provision: "A man whose testicles have been crushed or whose male member has been cut off must not be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh." (Dt 23:2) Exclusion from the community of Israel takes place primarily because of the lack of reproductive capacity; such a person is compared by Isaiah to a dead tree. For the same reason, he was unable to take part in the official activities of the entire national community (Lv 21;20; Ws 3:13-14). Thus, according to the Law, eunuchs were ritually unclean, and this is of course an indelible impurity.[327] It is no wonder that such people could not be admitted to priestly or Levitical ministry (Lv 20:21).[328]

In the Hellenic times, the regulation included in Dt 23:2 was not obeyed with too much rigour, as probably three of Herod's courtiers were eunuchs *(Bell.* 1,448) and also the servant of Josephus (*Ant.* 6,492). Despite the fact that the Law practically excluded eunuchs from the Israeli community, there was some hope for them. Only three chapters further (of course, in the courtier's Bible there was no division into chapters) from the text that the Ethiopian read, Isaiah notes: "No eunuch should say, Look, I am a dried-up tree." For Yahweh says this: "To the eunuchs who observe my Sabbaths and choose to do my good pleasure and cling to my covenant, I shall give them in my house and within my walls a monument and a name better than sons and daughters; I shall give them an everlasting name that will never be effaced." (Is 56:3b-5)

The second term characterising the pilgrim from Ethiopia is a "God-fearer." It is more likely that the courtier of Kandake, the Queen of Ethiopia, was a pagan sympathizing with Judaism rather than an Ethiopian Jew.[329] As it has already been mentioned, God-fearers differed from proselytes. The latter fully accepted the

---

327 According to M. Douglas, a British researcher of the idea of purity, eunuchs are unclean because they cannot be unequivocally linked to the world of women or men. In this context, the author gives a similar example of an eel that does not resemble fish but cannot live on land; it therefore also cannot be clearly assigned, which makes it unclean; *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London 1966, 47–49.

328 During the festival of Purim, the eunuchs were allowed to read the scrolls of the Book of Esther only after orphans and foundlings, i.e. at the very end of the list of people entitled to such reading.; J.H. Neyrey, *The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts: "They Turn the World Upside Down"*, in: *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. J.H. Neyrey, Peabody 1991, 279–280.

329 The Falasha are Ethiopian Jews called also "black Jews"; they were supposed to be the descendants of the queen of Sheba and king Solomon. However, most exegetes are in favour of the pagan origin of the courtier; E.J. Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission*, London 2004, 685.

Jewish religion (the faith in one God, ethical standards, and circumcision for men). The former, however, did not make the decisive step to formally accept Judaism. The decision could be in many cases hindered by the necessity of circumcision since many more pagan women became proselytes than men did.[330] It is however certain that for a eunuch becoming a proselyte was impossible.

The ties of those who feared God with Judaism were more or less close and were triggered by various motives (fascination with monotheism, lack of heavy financial obligations in Judaism, a bond between people who observed the same rules and read the same books, even the option of staying in synagogues while travelling).[331] In modern exegesis the status of "God-fearers" is still under discussion; the debate comprises also other terms used by Luke to indicate the links between a person of pagan origin and Judaism (Ac 13:43.50; 16:14; 17:17; 18:6-7).[332] Regardless of its results, it is known that Luke's character felt a bond with or liking for Judaism although he could not fully belong to the community of Yahweh's followers.

The Ethiopian as a God-fearer felt close to Judaism but he was a eunuch and as such could not cross the border leading into the heart of the religion he preferred. However, it could be done by baptism and through inclusion into Church. The Church was still perceived as a religious group within Judaism. The vision of the kingdom announced by Isaiah, in which eunuchs will also have their proper place, can be realized in the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus. Christianity appeared in Philip's teaching still as a splinter group of Judaism. No wonder that the Ethiopian willingly became one of Christ's followers, thus feeling invited to join the community of Judaism. Other groups of Judaism, with the Pharisaic movement in the lead, could not offer him such affiliation. Paraphrasing Paul's sentence – "What the Law could not do because of the weakness of human nature, God did" (Rm 8:3) – one could say: "What the Pharisaism could not do because of the weakness of human nature, Christians did." The acceptance of the Good News meant that the obstacles posed to the Ethiopian by the Law of the Old Covenant disappeared.[333]

---

330 E. Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, Cambridge 2003, 550.

331 C. Claussen, *Meeting, Community, Synagogue – Different Frameworks of Ancient Jewish Congregations in the Diaspora*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 150–151.

332 A.T. Kraabel, *The Disappearance of the „God-Fearers"*, Numen 28 (1981) 113–126; F. Siegert, *Gottesfürchtige und Symphatizanten*, JSJ 2 (1973) 109–162; K. Lake, *Proselytes and God-Fearers*, in: *The Beginning of Christianity*, V, ed. F. Jackson, K. Lake, Michigan 1965, 74–96; M. Wilcox, *The God-Fearers in Acts – A Reconsideration*, JSNT 13 (1981) 102–122; T.M. Finn, *The God-Fearers Reconsidered*, CBQ 47 (1985) 75–84.

333 R. Głuchowski, *Nawrócenie dworzanina królowej etiopskiej typem ewangelizacji bez granic. Społeczno-geograficzny wymiar Łukaszowego uniwersalizmu zbawczego w Dz 8,25–40*, 260.

The story of the courtier of the Ethiopian Queen and his conversion fits well into the context of Luke's ecclesiology, according to which an important element of teaching about the Church is the issue of the transition from official Judaism to the Christian community. Luke wants to show the continuity that exists between Israel and the Church. The Church is the final stage of God's plan of salvation (Ac 2:17); its existence is anchored in the Old Testament prophecies. Luke seems to ease the tension between Judeo-Christians and Christians of pagan origin, portraying the Gentiles as "God-fearing," people at least to some extent accepted by the Synagogue.[334] In showing the way of the Ethiopian to faith in Christ, Luke strongly emphasizes the relationship between Judaism in its main form and Christianity which still remains in the bosom of Judaism but opens up more and more to ethno-Christians. This transition from Judaism to Christianity, that is from the community of Israel to the community of the Church, is accompanied by the Holy Spirit who once led the Old Testament prophets, and then Philip (Ac 8:26.29.39).[335]

Christian missionaries reached the Upper Nile only three hundred years after the conversion of the courtier of Kandake. We do not know whether any small Christian community was established there in the middle of the first century. An interesting fact is that the local people knew the sign of the cross but the meaning of this symbol was not understood. Certainly, the converted courtier of the queen talked about his experience during the journey to Palestine in his own country; however, it is uncertain whether the origins of Christianity can be found in this area in the first half of the first century or rather (what is more likely) in the fourth century.[336]

Riots in Jabneh (c. 40 AD)

In 39 or 40 AD riots in Jabneh (Jamnia) started. The Greek inhabitants of the town erected an altar in honour of the emperor but the Jews were strongly opposed to it. This was the time when Caligula was supposed to attack the Temple: "Hereupon

334 J. Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*, Cambridge 1996, 23–25.

335 G.C. Bottini, *Introduzione all'opera di Luca. Aspetti teologici*, Jerusalem 1992, 195–199; A.J. Najda, *Historiografia paradygmatyczna w Dziejach Apostolskich*, 284–285.

336 Tradition linked missionary activities in Ethiopia with St. Matthew and John the Presbyter. The eunuch at the Ethiopian court, who was converted by the deacon Philip, could have been one of the first evangelizers of his own people, and his efforts were crowned with certain success. It is possible that a few years later the apostle Matthew followed in his footsteps. The faith of those people was reborn in the fourth century, and since then, although Islam surrounded them from all sides, the Ethiopians have remained Christian. The Christian kings of Ethiopia formed the basis of the famous legend of John the Presbyter, the ruler of the lost Christian kingdom in the east which fuelled the imagination of first Portuguese and then Spanish explorers; W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, 406.

Caius [...] sent Petronius to be president of Syria, and successor in the government to Vitellus, and gave him order to make an invasion into Judea, with a great body of troops; and if they would admit of his statue willingly, to erect it in the temple of God; but if they were obstinate, to conquer them by war, and then to do it." (*Ant.* 18,8,2; cf. *Bell.* 2,10,1; *Legat.* 188,198-348)

Although accounts of Josephus Flavius and Philo of Alexandria on those events differ considerably, it is known that Judeo-Christians did not make offerings in the Temple, so one can assume that they were not engaged in this conflict, on the assumption that any Christian community existed in Jabneh at all. Ten years had passed since the death of Christ, so there is no doubt that the news about the new movement of Judaism had reached the town located not far from Jaffa, where Peter lived (Ac 8:32). Even though no reliable sources concerning the issue exist, it is logical to propose a thesis that the passive attitude of Christ's followers inhabiting Jabneh to the events, combined with the fact of opening the door of the Church to non-Jews, must have caused deep resentment of the Jewish community and their detachment from Judeo-Christians.[337]

Ban on Bringing Judeo-Christians to Alexandria? (41 AD)

In Egyptian Alexandria, the beginning of the forties of the first century AD was marked by the conflict between the Jews and other residents of the city. It all began with the issue of nationality. Only worshippers of polytheistic cults could acquire Greek citizenship and the rule of course excluded the Jews.[338] And since the Jews could not become full citizens of the state in which they lived, they were heavily overtaxed. The Alexandrian Jews recognized this situation as discriminating and this could lead not only to tensions but also to an open conflict. Already in the years 32–38 AD, during the reign of Aulus Avillius Flaccus who held the function of the Prefect of Egypt, open signs of dissatisfaction on the Jewish part were visible because of the status of the followers of Judaism. The visit of the king of Judea, Agrippa, in Alexandria became the spur for a conflict. The Roman Prefect ordered to place statues of Caligula in the city's synagogues. It is obvious that from the point of view of the Jews this demand could not be executed. As a result of the refusal to meet the demand, Flaccus announced the Jews to be "strangers." Philo describes those events as follows:

> There are five districts in the city, named after the first five letters of the written alphabet, of these two are called the quarters of the Jews, because the chief portion of the Jews lives in them. There are also a few scattered Jews, but only a very few,

337 J. Ciecieląg, *Palestyna w czasach Jezusa. Dzieje polityczne*, 105–109.

338 R. Krawczyk, *Diaspora żydowska. Tożsamość narodowa i religijna w warunkach emigracji*, in: *Jak śmierć potężna jest miłość. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Księdza Profesora Juliana Warzechy SAC (1944–2009)*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Ząbki 2009, 244.

> living in some of the other districts. What then did they do? They drove the Jews entirely out of four quarters, and crammed them all into a very small portion of one; and by reason of their numbers they were dispersed over the sea-shore, and desert places, and among the tombs, being deprived of all their property; while the populace, overrunning their desolate houses, turned to plunder, and divided the booty among themselves as if they had obtained it in war. (*Flac.* 55-56)[339]

The events described by Philo could have been the reason for the creation of the Book of Wisdom. According to one of more recent hypotheses which is gaining more and more followers, the Book of Wisdom was created not long after 40 AD[340] and it represents a response to the work *Flaccus* by Philo of Alexandria.[341] The hypothesis is indeed surprising because it means, among other things, that the last book of the Old Testament was created when the First and the Second Letter to the Thessalonians had already been in existence! The author of the Book of Wisdom, claiming to be Solomon, reaches for antonomasia, a stylistic procedure involving the replacement of geographical names and personal names with general names.[342] The late dating of the book might be confirmed by *hapax legomena*. There are almost twenty percent of them. As many as forty terms used there had not been known until the first century AD. The main objective of the book would be to encourage the Jewish and pagan inhabitants of Alexandria to rise above the disputes and quarrels as recorded by its author: "so that they may abstain from evil and trust in you, Lord." (Ws12:2)[343]

---

339 Philo of Alexandria confirmed that even Jewish women had not been spared and they were told to eat pork. Those who gave in were set free but on women refusing to eat pork tortures were inflicted (*Flac.* 96). This account is very similar to the description of the martyrdom of Eleazar (2M 6:19–33) and of the seven brothers with their mother (2M 7).

340 P. Poniży notes that it is therefore highly probable that the Book of Wisdom was written shortly after the pogrom against the Jews in Alexandria which took place in 38 AD, and perhaps even during it. The tension and horror that became the experience of the Jews during those cruel persecutions, can still be sensed.; B. Poniży, *Między judaizmem a hellenizmem. Σοφία Σαλωμώνος księgą spotkania*, 31–32. The supporter of such a late dating of the Book of Wisdom is also D. Winston(*The wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York 1979).

341 E. Osek, *Flakkus. Pierwszy pogrom Żydów w Aleksandrii*, Kraków 2012.

342 Throughout the whole book there are only two proper nouns: the name of the Red Sea and the cities of Pentapole.

343 P. Poniży claims that the political context that best explains the content of the Book of Wisdom consists of the events and the situation in Alexandria in the year 38, under the reign of the Emperor Gaius Caligula.The didactic interpretation of the story of the Exodus appears as a response to the rebellion that took place in the Hellenistic metropolis. The Biblical interpretation of the Exodus seems to be intended as consolation and hope for the Jews immediately after the rebellion of the Greeks against the Israelites; B. Poniży, *Kiedy powstała Księga Mądrości?*, in: *„Słowo*

At the time when Philo of Alexandria described the persecution of Jews and the author of the Book of Wisdom was calling for forgiveness, in Rome before the Emperor Claudius a dispute took place between the delegation of the pagan inhabitants of Alexandria and the local Jews.[344] A gymnasium headmaster named Izydoros showed to the Emperor the danger which the conspiring Jews constituted. However, he did so in such a way that the Emperor himself felt accused of not taking care of the Empire. The impudent – according to the Emperor – behaviour of Izydoros demanded proper punishment – and this could only be death. Six months after the execution of the sentence, Claudius addressed an appeal to the inhabitants of Alexandria. Since the text of the proclamation is extremely important for showing a possible reference to the relationship between Christianity and Judaism, let us quote a longer fragment of it:

> But for the riot and uprising against the Judaeans (=Ioudaioi), rather, if the truth be told, the war, which of the two sides was responsible, even though your envoys strove for great honour from the confrontation, and especially Dionysios son of The[o]n, still I did not want to have a strict investigation, while storing up in me unrepentant rage against the ones starting again. But I announce frankly that, unless you put a stop to this destructive, relentless rage against each other, I shall be forced to show what a benevolent leader is when turned toward righteous rage. For this I yet again still bear witness that Alexandrines, on the one hand, behave gently and kindly with the Judeans, the inhabitants of the same city from a long time ago, and not be disrespectful of the customs used in the ritual of their god, but let them use their customs as in the time of the god Sebastos even as I myself, after hearing both sides, have confirmed; to the Judeans I give strict orders not to agitate for more than they had before, nor as though dwelling in two cities to send in future two delegations, which had not ever been done before; nor intrude in the gymnasiarch or cosmetic contests reaping the fruits of their households while enjoying the abundance of benefits without envy in a foreign polis; nor to introduce or bring in Judeans from Syria or sailing down from Egypt, from which I shall be forced to have serious suspicions; or else I shall take vengeance on them in every way as though rousing up some common plague on the world.[345]

What attracts attention in the cited passage of the proclamation of the emperor to Jewish and pagan inhabitants of Alexandria is the ban on bringing in the Jews from Syria and Egypt. Where did the prohibition come from? What was it motivated

---

Twoje jest prawdą" (J 17,17). Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Stanisława Mędali CM w 65. rocznicę urodzin, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, 277.

344 E.S. Gruen, *Diaspora. Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge – London 2002, 77–81;

345 London Papyrus VI, 1912. After: J. Mélèze-Modrzejewski, *Żydzi nad Nilem od Ramzesa II do Hadriana*, Biblioteka zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 3, trans. J. Olkiewicz, Kraków 2000, 228–229.

by? What was its origin? Some exegetes see obvious similarity of the terminology used in the Emperor's proclamation to the terminology used by Luke in Ac 24:5. Before the court of prosecutor Felix a lawyer named Tertullus accused Paul of causing a disturbance: "We have found this man a perfect pest; he stirs up trouble among Jews the world over and is a ringleader of the Nazarene sect."[346] If the terms "plague" and "anxieties" and the Jewish context of both passages were to indicate their relationship, perhaps we might have here the first extra-biblical reference to Christianity.[347] This opinion still remains a hypothesis but it should be remembered that Christianity could have reached Alexandria shortly after Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost. The Jews from Egypt (and maybe from Alexandria) were also witnesses to this speech (Ac 2:10).

The *ex silenitio* argument for the presence of Christianity among the Alexandrian Jews already in the forties of the first century may be the fact that Paul, who intended to go to Spain (where he would have to speak Latin), does not mention his plans of going to a relatively close Jewish colony in Egypt (where he could freely use his own native language). The lack of such plans may have resulted from the specific division of the Christian mission referred to in Ga 2:7-9: Paul and Barnabas were to bring Good News to pagans, while Peter, James and John – to the Jews.[348] With this assumption, Alexandria would be the missionary area of Peter and his companions, and perhaps they just instilled Judaeo-Christianity there. It also seems that the Judeo-Christian collaborator, and sometimes rival of Paul, Apollos, a native of Alexandria, could have been baptized in his hometown (cf. Ac 18:24) but there is uncertainty about it.

With a great deal of doubt, however, we should refer to the remark of Eusebius of Caesarea that the Jewish group of the Therapautae, living in Egypt, consisted of Christians (*Hist. eccl.* 2,17). Such an opinion cannot be completely rejected but it can hardly be supported by any sources since apart from Eusebius none of the early Christian writers mentions that fact.[349] An essential source of information about the group whose members were called "citizens of heaven and earth" *(Contempl.*

346 The first comparative study of the terminology used in both texts was carried out by S. Reinach (*La première allusion au christianisme dans l'histoire*, Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 90 (1924) 108–122) and F. Cumont(*La lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins*, Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 91 (1925) 3–6); A. Tronina, *Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum (J 19,19)*, ScL 7 (2015) 197.

347 S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 94.

348 „Zwischen dem Jerusalemer Judenchristentum und der paulinischen Mission gab es gravierende Missverstlindnisse und unausgeglichene Ansprilche"; F. Siegert, *Vermeintlicher Antijudaismus und Polemik gegen Judenchristen im Neuen Testament*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 81.

349 R. Kraft, A. Luijendijk, *Christianity's Rise After Judaism's Demise in Early Egypt*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 180.

11,90) is Philo's work *De vita contemplative.*[350] According to Philo, the Therapautae occupied various areas but they were especially scattered in Egypt, and particularly in the colonies of Alexandria, in the valleys, because they consciously avoided large urban centres, seeking isolation.

Their settlement, located near a lake, comprised the main building of shared use and a few private apartments, situated far enough from each other to guarantee adequate privacy but close enough to maintain the spirit of brotherhood, and, if necessary, provide defence against robbers. In each private apartment one of the rooms was turned into the so-called monastery, built in the shape of a sanctuary, which was entered only for the purpose of prayer and meditation of "laws, prophetic oracles and psalms." (*Contempl.* 3,25) The central place of prayer was the main building (called the "common monastery") which also served as a refectory. There were separate spaces intended for men and for women. They were situated in such a way that men and women could hear but not see each other.[351]

Although both sexes were represented in the community, they were all celibates.[352] It is known that before joining the association, the candidates left their properties to family or friends in order to devote themselves more freely to contemplative life. This custom reminds us of the rule of common goods that Luke speaks about in the Acts of the Apostles. The hierarchical order among the Therapautae was based on the length of internship in the congregation. The Sabbath liturgy was always headed by the oldest member of the community, also considered to be the greatest doctrinal authority. White robes were worn for congregational prayers. During preparation to a prayer silence had to be kept.

The Therapautae devoted themselves to the service of God by taking care of their own souls and contemplating the truth. Every morning they turned their faces to the rising sun, asking God to enlighten their minds with His light of grace. And again, there is an analogy to Luke's remark that Jesus is "the rising Sun [that] has come from on high." (Lk 1:78) Despite these analogies as well as Eusebius'

350 J. Maier, *Między Starym a Nowym Testamentem. Historia i religia w okresie Drugiej Świątyni*, 318.

351 E. Schürer, *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo (175 a.C. - 135 d.C.)*, II, 705–707.

352 The description of the Therapautae practices and beliefs, provided by Philo in *De vita contemplativa,* is sometimes consistent with the accounts of the same author concerning the life of the Essenes. Both groups used to gather at common meals, lived outside marriage, put more emphasis on self-control than other Jewish believers, with particular emphasis on the Law of Moses. The members of both groups left the city to devote themselves to prayers and meditation of the lives of saints, far from commotion of the urban areas. Theology of the Therapautae was marked by clearly intellectual character. Also their outfit was different from other Jews.

identification of the Therapautae as a Christian group, in the present state of research, the prevailing opinion is that they were Jews not linked to the Christian movement.[353]

Claudius' Expulsion of Jews from Rome (c. 49 AD)

The Jews of the diaspora were guaranteed the following rights by the Roman authorities: the right of assembly and of possessing the places of assembly, i.e. synagogues; the right of observing the Sabbath; the right of observance of dietary rules; the right of decision concerning their home affairs and of fund-raising.[354] This situation changed in the Eternal City in the middle of the first century.

Claudius from the very beginning of his reign treated the Jews with certain caution. In the letter dated November 10, 41 (i.e. soon after ascending the throne) he reminds the inhabitants living in the Alexandrian diaspora that they cannot claim full civil rights because they do not live in their own country (*the Letter to Alexandrians*, 95). In the year 49 or 50 AD, the emperor issued a decree expelling the Jews from Rome.[355] Luke says: "After this Paul left Athens and went to Corinth, where he met a Jew called Aquila whose family came from Pontus. He and his wife Priscilla had recently left Italy because an edict of Claudius had expelled all the Jews from Rome." (Ac 18:1-2a)

Suetonius claims that the decree concerned the Jews who caused disturbance because of someone named Chrestos ("Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit"; *De vita caes.* 5,25,4).[356] If "Chrestos" refers to Christ (and this opinion is no longer called into question by researchers)[357], it becomes

---

353 S. Inowlocki, *Eusebius of Caesarea's* Interpretatio Christiana *of Philo's 'De vita contemplativa'*, HTR 97 (2004) 305–328.

354 E.P. Sanders, *Common Judaism and the Synagogue in the First Century*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 2.

355 E.S. Gruen, *Diaspora. Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*, 37–41.

356 Josephus confirms the attitude of Claudius to the Jews, when he quotes his decree: "It will therefore be fit to permit the Jews, who are in all the world under us, to keep their ancient customs without being hindered so to do. And I do charge them also to use this my kindness to them with moderation, and not to show a contempt of the superstitious observances of other nations, but to keep their own laws only" (*Ant.* 19,290). Cf.: F.F. Bruce, *Wiarygodność pism Nowego Testamentu*, 152.

357 In relation to Suetonius' remark Margaret H. Williams states: "Among the various scholarly interpretations of this much-discussed passage, the one that sees in Chrestus a reference to Jesus Christ seems to me to be the most persuasive, since Chrestus is clearly attested as an alternative spelling of Christus and Suetonius rarely bothers to supply the names of the minor characters occasionally featured in his work"; M.H. Williams, *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington

clear that the Emperor's decree embraced not only Jews, including Judaeo-Christians, but presumably also some of the ethno-Christians identified with Judaism (since the practice of proselytism was well known).[358] Suetonius himself, however, is not thoroughly familiar with the matter because the context in which the remark about the expulsion of Jews appears suggests that the author thought Christ was in Rome at that time.[359]

The issue is made more complicated by the fact that in another passage the author seems to be aware of the Christian cause; he uses the proper term "christianum" instead of the expected "chrestianum." (*De vita caes.*16,2) Suetonius does not say whether it refers to all followers of Judaism or only those who were the most aggressive in the eyes of the authorities. Statisticians calculate that around fifty thousand Jews could have been living then in the Eternal City, so the expulsion of such a large population must be regarded as unlikely.[360] The statement of Luke that Claudius expelled "all" (Gr. *pantes*) Jews is contradicted by the information provided by Dio Cassius, who thinks that the Roman Jewish population was too large to make it possible for all the Jews to leave the city.

It is not clear how Christianity spread in Rome.[361] Suetonius' remark shows that about twenty years after Christ's death, Christianity must have been so well known in the Eternal City that it raised objections of the ruler of the Empire. Tradition (quite reliable) has it that when Peter arrived in Rome, the believers of Christ had already been present there. It is possible that Paul had arrived there even earlier than Peter (because he is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans) although the apostle of nations had corresponded with the believers in Christ in Rome even before his arrival in the capital of the Empire. Hence neither Peter nor Paul may be considered as the founders of Christian community in Rome. It must have been established by anonymous Christian missionaries faithful to Christ's command recorded in Ac 1:8.[362]

It is highly probable that the first advocates of the Gospel in the Eternal City were the Jews who made a pilgrimage from Rome to Jerusalem. If they accepted faith in Jesus as the Messiah in Jerusalem, they certainly brought the news to the city on the Tiber River. It is well known that Luke's description of the events during the Feast of the Pentecost is theologically amended but one cannot exclude

---

2013, 154–155. For more information see: D.W. Hurley, *Suetonius: Divus Claudius*, Cambridge 2001, 177–178.

358 R. Penna, *Les Juifs a Rome au temps de l'apôtre Paul*, NTS 28 (1982) 328.

359 B.B. Bruce, *Wiarygodność pism Nowego Testamentu*, 152.

360 J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain. Leur condition juridique, économique et sociale,* I, Paris 1914, 209–210.

361 D.W.M. O'Connor, *Peter in Rome*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, II, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, 146–147.

362 S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 74.

the possibility that newcomers from Rome listened to Peter's first speech (Ac 2:10). It must be added that during the period known as the *Pax Augusta* pilgrimages to the native land of the Jews were rather safe, therefore many worshippers of Judaism willingly participated in them.[363]

It may be assumed that the preaching of the Good News started in Rome in local synagogues and was initiated by the Jews returning from pilgrimages to Jerusalem. Research clearly shows, however, that not only Jews but also "God-fearers" and proselytes attended synagogues in Rome, just like in the eastern provinces of the Empire.[364] Apparently, the last two groups originated from religion of the Gentiles. In a sense, these groups were even more prone to accept the news that Jesus of Nazareth was the expected Messiah, and the reason was that after the acceptance of the gospel many ritualistic laws of the Torah (which for the Gentiles had no cardinal significance) underwent re-evaluation in the same way as the centralized worship in the Temple of Jerusalem.

Those who accepted the Good News of salvation in the Roman synagogues no longer had to worry about organising a trip to Judea to offer sacrifices in the Temple, nor did they have to care about circumcision or food restrictions, which made life difficult in the Roman environment. For this reason, the "new faith" could turn out to be more attractive for the "God-fearing" and proselytes than for the indigenous Jews living in the Eternal City. Paul's correspondence with the Romans indicates this turn of events. When he was writing to them, most likely approximately in the year 56, the local community was largely shaped by etno-Christians.

According to Orosius, the expulsion of the Jews took place in the ninth year of Claudius' reign, i.e. between January 25, 49 and January 24, 50. Orosius properly cites Suetonius but corrects his mistake and does not talk about Chrestos, but Christ: "Anno eiusdem nono expulsos per Claudium urbe Iudaeos Iosephus refert. Sed me magis Suetonius movet, qui ait hoc modo: Claudius Iudaeos impulsore Christo adsidue tumultuantes Roma expulit; quod, utrum contra Christum tumultuantes Iudaeos coherceri et conprimi iusserit, an etiam Christianos simul velut cognatae religionis homines voluerit expelli, nequaquam discernitur." (*Hist. adv. pag.* 7, 6, 15)[365] It is possible, however, that Suetonius did not make a mistake which had to be corrected by Orosius because Christian literature of the 3rd and 4th centuries testifies that both versions of the name were sometimes used

363 M.H. Williams, *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*, 154; L.I.A. Levine, *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.)*, Philadelphia 2002, 252.

364 R.A.J. Gagnon, *Why the „Weak" at Rome Cannot Be Non-Christian Jews*, CBQ 62 (2000) 64–65.

365 According to S. Cappelletti it was not Orosius who improved the text by Suetonius but the change might have been made in a different source that Orosius made use of; S. Cappelletti, *The Jewish Community of Rome. From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E*, SJSJ 113, Leiden – Boston 2006, 73.

interchangeably, which was pointed out by apologists.[366] Some scholars argue that pagans or Christians descending from the pagan religious environment did not understand the meaning of the title "Christ" in terms of the Jewish concept of messianism (which in general was alien to them) but simply recognized that "Chrestos" was a specific nickname or surname attached to the name of Jesus. Such a hypothesis would be confirmed by the fact that a Roman inscription was found in which the word "christianus" appeared instead of the word "chrestianus."[367]

Dio Cassius indicates that expelling all the Jews from Rome was impossible because of the huge number of them and that *de facto* Claudius did not expel them at all but only placed a prohibition on public gatherings (*Hist. rom.* 60, 6, 6). The mention of Cassius has led some researchers to the adoption of the thesis that two different regulations were issued by the emperor.[368] It has not been explicitly ruled out that Suetonius and Dio Cassius speak of two different events: regulation from the year 41 (restricting Jewish gatherings) and from the year 49 (expelling the Jews from Rome). Interventions of Claudius with regard to the Jews would not be anything unprecedented. Tiberius, for example, expelled the Jews from Rome in the year 19 AD.[369] Nevertheless, the thesis about two different decrees seems to be unlikely.

Historians do not agree as to who the edict of Claudius referred to. Some believe that it concerned Jews and Christians (including ethno-Christians), others talk about the followers of Judaism and Judeo-Christians, others only about Judeo-Christians[370], still others only about the members of one Roman

366 Tertulian's explanation may be an example: „Nunc igitur, si nominis odium est, quis nominum reatus? Quae accusation vocabulorum, nisi si aut barbarum sonat aliqua vox nominis, aut infaustum aut maledicum aut impudicum? Christianos, vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur. Sed et cum perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos), de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Oditur itaque in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum" (*Ap.* 3.5).

367 S. Cappelletti, *The Jewish Community of Rome. From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E*, 78. The author adds: "It was not a local phenomenon: the iotacism is standard in the Christian inscriptions written in Greek language found in Asia Minor, in particular in the Phrygian area. Most of this group of inscriptions dates back to the third century, evidence of the persistence of this phenomenon in later period" (ibid.).

368 Thus: E.M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*, SJLA 20, Leiden 1981, 215; F.F. Bruce, *Chronological Questions in the Acts of the Apostles*, BJRL 68 (1985) 281.

369 W. Rakocy, *Paweł Apostoł. Chronologia życia i pism*, Częstochowa 2003, 106. "In an unknown year the Senate enacted a ban of expulsion together with (or before) a ban forbidding the gatherings: the holy service is eventually forbidden. The literary evidence, Acts, Suetonius and Cassius Dio, contradict each other"; S. Cappelletti, *The Jewish Community of Rome. From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E*, 78.

370 Thus: V.M. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius*, Cambridge 1940, 170.

Synagogue.[371] Another view is that the edict only concerns those Jews and Christians who were actively involved in the disputes.[372] The mention in Ac 18:1-2 stating that the spouses named Priscilla and Aquila came to Corinth from Rome after the edict of Claudius, does not help in the settlement of these disputes at all. This is because it is not clear if they accepted Christianity in Rome or if it took place after the meeting with Paul.[373] Anyway, expulsion of the Jews was not a definitive act and it did not last long. When Paul writes a letter to the inhabitants of the Eternal City, Priscilla and Aquila are present there again, as evidenced by salutation at the end of the letter, written in accordance with the rules of ancient epistolography (Rm 16:3-5).[374]

Some researchers combine the fact of discovering the inscription of the emperor's edict (Greek *Diatagma kaisaros*) found in 1878 and concerning the ban to plunder the graves with the issue of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Claudius. Very few works concerning the problem of the *parting of the ways* have given any attention to it although archaeologists and historians of Judaism refer to it quite often. The thesis according to which the marble tablet was supposed to be sent from Nazareth[375] to Wilhelm Froehner, a young epigraphist and archaeologist from Baden, is tangled in many uncertainties. Today it seems more likely that the tablet was acquired by Froehner at an antiquity market (not at the site of excavations) and after completion of conservation works was placed in the National Library in Paris.

The inscription written originally in Greek reads: "It is my decision [concerning] graves and tombs—whoever has made them for the religious observances of parents, or children, or household members—that these remain undisturbed forever. But if anyone legally charges that another person has destroyed, or has in any manner extracted those who have been buried, or has moved with wicked intent those who have been buried to other places, committing a crime against them, or has moved sepulcher-sealing stones, against such a person, I order that

371 For more information on the opinions see W. Rakocy, *Paweł Apostoł. Chronologia życia i pism*, 105; V.M. Scramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius*, 151; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul. A Critical Life*, Oxford 1996, 12.

372 J. Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, New York 1950, 81.

373 The supporter of the first opinion was E. Dąbrowski (*Dzieje Pawła z Tarsu*, Warszawa 1953, 41), the supporter of the second one was K. Romaniuk (*Uczniowie i współpracownicy Pawła,* Warszawa 1993, 10–11).

374 The married couple is also mentioned in the Second Letter to Timothy but both the date of creation of the letter and its authorship are still the subject of disputes among exegetes (cf. 2Tm 4:19).

375 With the development of research works different places of origin of the stele were proposed. In addition to Nazareth, Sepphoris, Sebaste in Samaria, one of the cities of Decapolis were also taken into consideration. Finally, Galilee has been indicated; E. Grzybek, M. Sordi, *L'edit de Nazareth et la politique de Neron à l'égard des chrétiens*, ZPE 120 (1998) 279.

a judicial tribunal be created. Just as [is done] concerning the gods in human religious observances, even more so will it be obligatory to treat with honour those who have been entombed. You are absolutely not to allow anyone to move [those who have been entombed]. But if [someone does], I wish that [violator] to suffer capital punishment under the title of tomb-breaker."[376]

Although the edict does not clearly state who its author is (researchers suggest emperors from Caesar Augustus to Hadrian), already after the first publication of the content of the inscription (1930) a thesis was formulated that the edict resulted from the rumour that the disciples of Jesus had stolen his body from the grave and began to preach His resurrection.[377] Scholars' opinions immediately split up. The thesis found fervent defenders and sworn opponents.[378] Many researchers challenged the authenticity of the artefact, claiming that it was a counterfeit dating back to ancient times, or to the nineteenth century. Indeed, the typeface and spelling of some words leave much to be desired although this latter objection can be explained by the fact that the Greek text was a translation from Latin.[379]

---

376 Clyde E. Billington provided the following English translation on the basis of: G. Purpura, *L'Editto di Nazareth* De violatione sepulchrorum, IAH 4 (2012) 151–154.

377 Grzybek and Sordi ascertain: „les savants ont tenté de dater ce texte d'une manière précise. Mais leurs différentes propositions couvrent une période de plus de cent cinquante ans, allant d'Auguste à Hadrien. Ces études portent en grande partie sur l'évolution du droit romain à propos des violations de sépulture et des ripostes des empereurs contre de tels délits. Mais là où les esprits se séparent totalement, c'est sur la question de savoir si le texte se réfère aux événements de Golgatha après la crucifixion du Christ, possibilité que, sur les deux dernières pages de son article, le premier éditeur a eu l'honnêteté de signaler et, finalement, de ne pas *exclure absolument*. Il faut donc se deman- der si le texte avait pour but de protéger désormais toute tombe d'une possible violation ou s'il ne visait qu'à mettre en accusation les disciples du Christ. Interprétation "laïque" et interprétation "chrétienne" s'affrontent au sujet de cette inscription depuis sa première publication"; E. Grzybek, M. Sordi, *L'edit de Nazareth et la politique de Neron à l'égard des chrétiens*, 279. The authors of the article argue in favour of the argument that the edict was issued during Nero's governance; ibid., 288.

378 G. Purpura comments: „Forte quindi appariva la suggestione che si trattasse di una possibile reazione all'accusa gravante sui discepoli di Cristo di averne fatto sparire il corpo dal sepolcro; ipotesi tale da dividere immediatamente gli studiosi tra fautori di una esegesi 'laica' e sostenitori di un'interpretazione 'cristiana'. Soprattutto il testo era tale da richiamare un'attenzione che avrebbe potuto indurre a valutazioni distorte"; *L'Editto di Nazareth* De violatione sepulchrorum, 133.

379 The Latin edict could have read as follows: „Placet mihi sepulchra tumulosque, quae ad religionem maiorum fecerunt vel filiorum vel propinquorum, manere immutabilia in perpetuum. Si quis autem probaverit aliquem ea destruxisse, sive alio quocumque modo sepultos eruisse, sive in alium locum dolo malo transtulisse per iniuriam sepultorum, sive cuneos vel lapides, amovisse, contra illum iudicium iubeo fieri. Veluti de diis, in hominum religionibus, multo magis enim decebit sepultos colere. Omnino ne cuiquam liceat loco movere. Sin autem, illum ego capitis damnatum

Some proposed the hypothesis of two edicts whose fragments were joined on one stele; others thought that the imperial order had only local character; still others were troubled by the fact that reburials were practiced in Palestine, so it was not possible to observe the edict.[380] Today, however, the vast majority of researchers recognize the authenticity of the marble stele. *Causa Christiana* of the edict's publication may be indicated not only by a reference to the transfer of the bodies of the dead but also to offending gods by worshipping people. Although there is no consensus among the researchers as to which of the emperors issued the edict forbidding the plundering of graves, there are arguments in favour of Claudius.[381] In one of recent works on the Edict of Nazareth, Gianfranco Purpura, lecturer of Roman law and history of law at the Facoltà di Giurisprudenza dell'Università di Palermo, expresses no doubts that it was released shortly after the year 44.[382] If this was the case, Claudius's decree expelling Jews from the Eternal City would have had one more motivation.

As we can see from the above, the issue of Claudius' decree leaves us with a lot of ambiguities: we cannot be sure which group the decree concerned. Also, there is no certainty as to its dating (although the thesis about two regulations is both poorly documented and arguable). Without any attempt to find a definitive solution to this issue, one can assume at the moment that at least some followers of Judaism (Suetonius speaks of the Jews) and some Christians (most probably those of Jewish descent) were encompassed by the Emperor's decree. Although both suffered the same fate (i.e. had to leave the Eternal City), paradoxically, the decree must have contributed to the intensification of the tensions between Church and Synagogue. It is likely that Christians who descended from groups sympathizing with Judaism ("God-fearing" and possibly proselytes) could stay in Rome. The Jews who did not accept Christ may have blamed Christians for the situation, and such accusations could not remain without consequences, thus stimulating the growing conflict.

---

nomine sepulchri violati volo"; attempt of reconstruction: G. Purpura, *L'Editto di Nazareth* De violatione sepulchrorum, 153–154.

380 The solution to this problem is to adopt the thesis that the edict concerns "strangers", and not the relatives of the dead.

381 E. Garzetti, *From Tiberius to the Antonines. A History of the Roman Empire AD 14-192*, London 1974, 140. Of the same opinion were G. De Sanctis, M. Guarducci, E.M. Smallewood; G. Purpura, *L'Editto di Nazareth* De violatione sepulchrorum, 140.

382 The author rejects however the Christian hypothesis; G. Purpura, *L'Editto di Nazareth* De violatione sepulchrorum, 147.

II Until the Fall of Jerusalem (50–70 AD)

Two events which took place at approximately the same time – the decree expelling Jews (and together with them Christians) from Rome and the so-called Council of Jerusalem – constitute the first important caesura in the life of the arising Church. On the one hand, the presence of believers of pagan descent in the ecclesial community was legally sanctioned. On the other hand, the Jewish and Christian residents of the Eternal City suffered the same fate. Paradoxically, the fate united them (both groups had to leave Rome) and at the same time divided them (Jews who rejected Christ blamed Christians for bringing about the decree of Claudius). Both events contributed significantly to the split of Church and Synagogue. Perhaps they also contributed to the fact that ten years later the persecution of Christians in Jerusalem intensified, which ultimately led to the execution of the leader of the local Church, St James.

It seems that not all the Jews and Christians left Rome after the infamous decree. It is also possible that many returned from exile, since in the year 64 Nero accused the followers of Christ of inciting the fire of the Empire's capital. It is important to note that the centre of apostolic authority moved to Rome at that time. There was Peter, who later suffered a martyr's death, and soon after Paul who met the same fate.

In the process of separation of Church and Synagogue, not only specific historical events were significant but also the rising tension and theological discrepancies. The awareness of the divinity of Christ had in fact already paved the way to the minds of all his followers, an idea Jews could not agree with, as in their view it undermined the very foundation of their religion, namely monotheism. Christians – not without the considerable influence of Paul's teaching – redefined the Old Testament's idea of the election of Israel. They also began to gather on Sunday although some Judeo-Christians probably celebrated the Sabbath as well.

From the social point of view, the status of women and slaves in both religious communities was different. The fact that Paul's writings were becoming more popular and the Gospels about the life and activities of Jesus were created was not without significance. The first, chronologically speaking, canonical Gospel was addressed to the Romans (the Gospel according to Mark) and the polemics between Christians and Jews were reflected in the Letter to the Hebrews. The New Testament collection of writings was gradually becoming a reality. At the same time in Judea, the national liberation movement, called by many the first Jewish war, started.

So-Called Council of Jerusalem (51 AD)

Probably in the year 51 in Jerusalem a meeting of the apostles and the elders of local community was held, called (a bit pretentiously in the opinion of some

scholars) the Apostolic Council or the Jerusalem Council.[383] The story was told by Luke (Ac 15:4-29)[384] who showed the reason for the assembly, i.e. a dispute initiated in Antioch by Judeans whose names we do not know concerning the status of the converted ethno-Christians.[385] In literature, this dispute is known as the "Antiochian crisis." One of the main reasons for the dispute was the issue of circumcision.[386] This act is one of the most important Jewish identity markers and many believe that it is even the condition *sine qua non* of being a Jew. This is where the promises given to Abraham are rooted (Gn 17:9-14).

The practice is based on the divine command directed to Abraham: "This is my covenant which you must keep between myself and you, and your descendants after you: every one of your males must be circumcised." (Gn 17:10)[387] The Israelites were obliged to circumcise not only their male descendants but also their slaves or servants, both the Jews and foreigners (Gn 17:12-13). Only a circumcised servant could participate in the Paschal feast (Ex 12:43). That commandment had been observed so scrupulously that even the Sabbath rest did not stand in its way

383 In the opinion of Joachim Gnilka, the word "council" in this context sounds anachronistic; J. Gnilka, *Paul of Tarsus. Apostoł i świadek*, 129.

384 The Apostolic Council can almost certainly be identified with the events described by Paul in Gal 2:1-10, although the differences between the two descriptions made some interpreters speak of separate events. Within the framework of historical reconstruction, Paul's report should be given priority since he was the participant of the Council although only as a neutral observer; R. Stoops, *Sobór Apostolski*, in: *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, ed. B.M. Metzger, M.D. Coogan, trans. J. Marzęcki, Warszawa 1996, 713.

385 Describing this historic event Luke wants to emphasize its importance and universal character. The author presents a model of solving all intra-ecclesial conflicts and tensions between representatives of various groups and opinions. He shows that both parties in the dispute must be open to debate and true dialogue. The debates should not only present and clarify various points of view but should also help to overcome prejudice and lead to a rational resolution of the problem. In most cases, a compromise is needed. In principle, it can only be reached in relation to the matters that are not necessary for salvation, for example, the principles of ecclesiastical discipline or Christian life. In addition, all parties of the conflict must be ready to reach a compromise and to resign from some of their unnecessary demands in favour of others; A.J. Najda, *Historiografia paradygmatyczna w Dziejach Apostolskich*, 345.

386 W. Chrostowski, following the question of David H. Stern asking if a Jew can become a disciple of Jeshua Messiah without the necessity of becoming a *goy*, notes that the dilemma of the first Christians has now been completely reversed.; W. Chrostowski, *Między Synagogą a Kościołem. Dzieje św. Pawła*, 138.

387 The fact that the custom is very old is testified by excavations of stone knives used to perform circumcision. The Israelites probably took the custom over from the Midianites. In ancient societies of the Middle East circumcision was executed before marriage and constituted a sign that a man was ready to perform sexual activities.

if the Sabbath fell eight days after the birth of a boy.[388] Circumcision had triple meaning: it was a sign of covenant, purification, and inclusion into the community of people chosen by God. The Mishnah's tractate *Nedarim* stresses the importance of this ritual: "Circumcision is a great precept, for it overrides the strict laws of Sabbath" because it is written: 'If I have not created day and night and fixed the laws governing heaven and earth.' " (Jr 33:25)

Great importance was attached to this sign of election. Many Jews were willing to sacrifice their lives to preserve signs which showed their alliance with the Chosen People and the covenant with God, as it was at the Maccabees' time (1M 1:60-61). The fact that the custom of circumcision was very old was proved by the excavations during which stone knives used to perform the ritual were discovered. It is probable that the custom was taken over from the Midianites. With time, the external sign of affiliation with God became the symbol of spiritual commitment to Yahweh and a metaphor for purity of heart and mind: "Circumcise your heart then and be obstinate no longer." (Dt 10:16)[389] *The Book of Jubilees* reminds God's people about the obligation of circumcision: "And every one that is born, the flesh of whose foreskin is not circumcised on the eighth day, belongs not to the children of the covenant which the Lord made with Abraham, but to the children of destruction; nor is there, moreover, any sign on him that he is the Lord's, but (he is destined) to be destroyed and slain from the earth, and to be rooted out of the earth, for he has broken the covenant of the Lord our God." (*Jub.* 15,26)

However, not all the Jews shared such radical views on circumcision. Philo of Alexandria did not condemn the lack of circumcision among his compatriots and co-believers at all. His opinion was not solitary. The Alexandrian scholar admits that many Jews from his town were not circumcised although many Egyptians (not following Judaism) observed this custom (*De Abr.* 86-93; *Quaest. in Ex.* 2,2). Philo knew very well the practice of epispasm, i.e. removal of the external signs of circumcision. It was widespread not only among the Alexandrian Jews who wanted to avoid ostracism in public baths or during sports competitions but throughout the diaspora communities.[390]

---

388 A. Uterman, *Rytuał w życiu Żydów*, in: *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, trans. J. Zabierowski, Kraków 1990, 81.

389 U. Szwarc, *Dzieci i ich wychowanie w Starym Testamencie*, 235–236.

390 J.H. Charlesworth states explicitly: "Circumcision does not seem to have been practiced by all Jews in the ancient world"; *Did They Ever Part?*, 288. J. Ciecieląg adds that the most obvious marker of Jewishness seemed to be circumcision but the matter was not so simple. From the very beginning, circumcision applied only to men, so what about women? Udoubtedly, circumcision functioned as a sign of Jewishness but not in every place and at every time. It became the sign of Jewish identity during the Maccabean period (at least in Judea) although circumcision was given a religious status by Esdras. The Jews who had renounced Judaism usually tried to hide their circumcision by epispasm, which meant stretching of the remaining foreskin in order to give the male member the appearance of an uncircumcised organ. It

What is more, some people considered themselves to be Jews, even though they did not have to undergo the practice of epispasm because they had never been circumcised. So not all Jews could be proud of the sign of circumcision on their bodies. The son of Queen Helena of Adiabene, Izates, did not circumcise at the moment of accepting Judaism but many Jews considered him as being converted to Judaism and as a full member of the chosen people.[391] Adiabene lies halfway between Antioch on the Orontes and the Caspian Sea. Izates grew up in Characene which was situated not far from the Persian Gulf. One day a certain Jew named Ananias visited the king of Characene. He persuaded Izates to accept Judaism. In the meantime, Izates' mother contacted another Jew, Eleazer of Galilee, who in turn persuaded her to accept the religion of Israel. Nevertheless, both Jews expressed different opinions on circumcision. Ananias considered it to be necessary, Eleazer was of a different opinion. Izates shared the opinion of the latter. According to Josephus, "he was afraid lest such an action being once become public to all he should himself [Ananias, the interlocutor of Izates who encouraged him to accept circumcision – M.R.]be in danger of punishment for having been the cause of it, having been the king's instructor in actions that were unseemly. He said that Izates might worship God without being circumcised, if he had resolved to be a devoted adherent of Judaism and that such worship of God was of a superior nature to circumcision. He added that God would forgive him, though he did not perform the operation, since it was omitted out of necessity and for fear of his subjects." (*Ant.* 20,41)[392]

Antiochian conflict was founded on the fact that Judeo-Christians intended to induce the Gentiles, who accepted the faith in Christ, to circumcision and to observance of the Mosaic Law.[393] Paul (*nomen omen* a former Pharisee) and Barnabas could not agree with such an attitude.[394] The apostle of nations expressed his opinion

---

is difficult to say to what extent such attempts were successful; J. Ciecieląg, *Kogo uważano za Żyda w starożytności?*, SJ 8 (2005) 1–2, 42. For more information on epispasm see: R.G. Hall, *Epispasm and the Dating of Ancient Jewish Writings*, JSP 2 (1988) 71–86.

391 Herod, who expanded and strengthened Jerusalem, built inside the city a small palace for the royal family from Adiabene. In return, the members of the royal family from Adiabene founded a mausoleum, today known as the Tombs of the Kings; K. Armstrong, *Jerozolima. Miasto trzech religii*, 163.

392 According to tradition, Christianity reached Adiabene already at the end of the first century. The Good News was to be proclaimed by Adday, who baptised Pekhida, the first bishop of Arbela (in the years 105–115). Christian missions started in the Judaic environment, which can be illustrated by the fact that the first bishops of Adiabene had Jewish names (Samson, Isaac, Abraham, Moses and Abel). Tatian the Syrian, who was born at the end of the second century, also came from the region; R. Bartnicki, *Dzieje głoszenia Słowa Bożego. Jezus i najstarszy Kościół*, 295.

393 J.D.G. Dunn, *From the Crucifixion to the End of the First Century*, 36–37.

394 M. Zetterholm, *A Covenant for Gentiles? Covenantal Nomism and the Incident in Antioch*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented*

on the question of circumcision in his correspondence with the Corinthians: "To be circumcised is of no importance, and to be uncircumcised is of no importance; what is important is the keeping of God's commandments." (1Co 7:19)[395] Using the form of parallelism, the apostle shows the first application of the principle of acting in accordance with God's call; he addresses it to the circumcised and the uncircumcised alike, calling them to remain as they are. Each of the parts of the parallelism reflects the situation of one of the two groups of Christians: the first – descending from Judaism, the second – coming from among pagano-Christians.

In Antioch, the tension concerning circumcision and other regulations of the Jewish Law must have been strong among Christians, since it made Paul come back to Jerusalem after fourteen years. He did it for two reasons: because of the vision he had experienced and because of the desire to present to the apostles his gospel, to answer the question: "am I running or not running in vain." (Ga 2:2) It may be assumed that for fourteen years, the apostle of nations was so certain that the "gospel without the Law" preached by him was correct, that he saw no reason to contact the people recognized as the highest authorities in the Church about it. The tensions, however, increased to the point where the matter had to finally be clarified. In addition, Paul became a dangerous competitor for the Synagogue in the diaspora which was trying to win God-fearing pagans to its side. The separation of the Jerusalem Christians from the Synagogue was still not visible then. Therefore, there was a demand for a closer connection with Judaism of the churches founded by Paul by obliging them to obey the Law."[396]

Paul and Barnabas arrived in Jerusalem in order to clarify this issue in the circle of the highest authorities of the Church. Titus, who was a Christian converted from paganism and who accompanied them (Ga 2:3), took on a specific role of a litmus paper since Judeo-Christians demanded his circumcision. Peter and James played the leading roles in the congregation. *De facto,* however, three fractions took part in the gathering: Paul with Barnabas and Titus, Peter with James and other representatives of the Church of Jerusalem as well as "false brethren who came deceitfully, to determine our freedom that we have in Christ Jesus to us again lapse into captivity" (Ga 2:2).

This last group strongly emphasized the necessity of circumcision, and not only on the basis of the Torah but also the oral tradition recognized by the Pharisees. D.H. Stern in the following way translates from Greek the text of Luke describing the views of this faction: "You cannot be saved if you do not get circumcised in the way that Moshe commanded" (Ac 15:1); and then he adds that Moses did not comment on the way in which the ritual should be performed but only emphasized its necessity. It was the Pharisaic tradition which regulated the practical aspect of

---

at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 174–176.

395 J.D.G. Dunn, *Christianity in Making*, II, 446–450.

396 J. Gnilka, *Paweł z Tarsu. Apostoł i świadek*, 132.

performing circumcision and it was codified about one hundred and seventy years after the gathering of the apostles in Jerusalem.[397]

The decree which crowned the meeting was addressed to the communities in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. The provisions of the decree ordering "to abstain from anything polluted by idols, from illicit marriages, from the meat of strangled animals and from blood" (Ac 15:20) generally overlapped with the requirements laid down to foreigners (non-Jews) who intended to settle in Judea (Lv 17-18). They are close to the imperatives of the Noahide Laws: "Our Rabbis taught: seven precepts were the sons of Noah commanded: social laws; to refrain from blasphemy, idolatry; adultery; bloodshed; robbery; and eating flesh cut from a living animal." (*Sanh. 56*,1) Decisions of the apostles, at least initially, contributed to the improvement of the relations in the Christian communities of different provenance but as one might guess, they resulted in distancing of the Jews from the followers of Christ.[398] Absence of circumcision, in the light of the Torah, was a visible sign of being outside the sphere of influence of the covenant with God and of the community of Israel.

If the decision of the assembly of the apostles in Jerusalem had been different, it could have made it much more difficult for many Gentiles to join the Church. Circumcision, as a painful procedure, deterred some men from accepting Judaism but imposing it on the Gentiles converting to Christianity would undermine the essence of Christ's message. The faith in Jesus as the Saviour leads to salvation, and not the observance of the Law. Those gathered at the Jerusalem meeting paid heed primarily to Peter's opinion, who recalled the events in the house of Cornelius (Ac 15:7-12), and James, who foretold the conversion of many Gentiles (Ac 15:13-21).

The document prepared in writing confirmed the freedom of Christians converted from paganism. It was handed over in an official form to the community in Antioch and was greeted with indescribable joy. It increased enthusiasm as it was a clear sign of overcoming the crisis and an announcement of even greater evangelizing successes.[399] As it has already been mentioned, such a turn of events must have affected the already strained relations of the followers of Christ with the Jews. It also had an impact on the unity of the Church, because although the purpose of the congregation in Jerusalem was to preserve its unity, it became clear that a Christian can be the one who follows the commandments of the Law and

397 D.H. Stern, *Komentarz żydowski do Nowego Testamentu*, 430.

398 U. Jochum, *Der Urkonlikt des Christentums. Paulus – Petrus – Jakobus und die Entstehung der Kirche*, Innsbruck 2011, 37–47; A. Baron, H. Pietras, *Chrześcijaństwo*, in: *Religie starożytnego Bliskiego Wschodu*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, J. Drabina, Kraków 2008, 456.

399 S. Stasiak, *Komentarz teologiczno-pastoralny do Biblii Tysiąclecia. Nowy Testament*, II, *Dzieje Apostolskie, List do Rzymian, 1 – 2 List do Koryntian, List do Galatów*, Poznań 2014, 151.

also the one who rejects them.[400] In the long run, it had to lead to the parting of the ways of the Judeo-Christians and the followers of Christ of Gentile descent.

Conflict with Jewish Community in Corinth (51 AD)

Another hotspot of conflict or even hostility between Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism became Corinth. Located in the north-western part of the Peloponnese over two ports, Lechaion on the Corinthian Gulf and Cenchreae on the Saronic Gulf, the city had an active Jewish community. By all accounts, it was a cosmopolitan city: Roman veterans and freed slaves, people from Asia Minor, Egypt, Syria, and Palestine settled there. It is not difficult to guess that the cosmopolitan character of the city between the ports also resulted from the coexistence of many religious communities.

The synagogue was located in the very centre of Corinth. This topographical location of the synagogue is evidenced by archaeological excavations, namely by an inscription discovered there, believed to have decorated the front wall of the synagogue, and ornaments depicting a menorah and fruit which most probably decorated the building. Archaeologists discovered the ruins of the synagogue in 1898 and they date back its foundation to the first century BC. It was supposed to function for about three centuries and was situated in an affluent district, which may indicate the economic status of the Corinthian Jews.[401]

Paul came to Corinth probably in the spring of the year 50. The analysis of data derived from Ac 18:1-11 compiled with chronology of Gallio's tenure as the proconsul of Corinth allows such dating.[402] Since the apostle arrived in the city in 50, the open conflict with the Jews began a year later, in the year 51. The conflict arose when Paul devoted himself solely to preaching the Good News because the arrival of Silas and Timothy liberated him from the obligation to earn his living as a tentmaker. Having listened to Paul's arguments concerning the messianic mission of Jesus, the Jews protested against the preacher. However, in accordance with the ancient customs in the diaspora, not only Jews could listen to teachings in synagogues but also proselytes.

If so, Paul could encounter the pagan residents of Corinth and the Good News could spread not only among the Jews but also among the Gentiles. And those are not only assumptions because the author of the Acts of the Apostles notes that every Sabbath Paul tried to convince the Jews and Greeks to the Good News

400 How to preserve the Gospel's unity after this meeting? Does not the distinction between the Gospel for the circumcision and the Gospel against the circumcision threaten its unity? What is the function of the Law? We can assume that Jerusalem Judeo-Christians circumcised their children, observed the Sabbath, paid the Temple taxes, and so on; J. Gnilka, *Paweł z Tarsu. Apostoł i świadek*,135.

401 E. Dąbrowski, *Dzieje Pawła z Tarsu*, 38–39.

402 W. Rakocy, *Paweł Apostoł. Chronologia życia i pism*, 111.

brought by Christ (Ac 18:4). He did that inside the synagogue buildings to which also "God-fearing" people had access. Rich synagogues apart from the prayer room had a separate room for the teaching of the Law. If there was not enough space, teaching was done in the assembly hall.

Luke's statement that Paul taught in the synagogue "every Sabbath" allows us to assume that it might have happened on the occasion of the service in the synagogue. The service had a clearly defined structure:

(1) the opening prayers: "Hear, O Israel" and blessings which gave rise to the prayer *Shemone Esre*;
(2) reading of a fragment of the Torah with translation into Aramaic in Palestine and Greek in the diaspora;
(3) singing of psalms;
(4) *haftara* from the prophetic books;
(5) explanation of readings in the form of *darasha* (with an emphasis on the concord of readings) or *pesher* (sentence by sentence analysis)[403];
(6) saying the *kaddish*;
(7) the blessing (Nb 6:24-26).[404]

If one assumes that Paul was speaking during synagogue service and not before its beginning or after its ending, then he must have done it after biblical readings and before saying *kaddish*. Moving out of the house of Priscilla and Aquila gave him the opportunity to preach not only on the Sabbath but every day. Paul's teaching and perhaps also his generosity (cf. 2Co 11:8-9) resulted in, inter alia, conversion of the superior of the synagogue named Crispus (18:8). It is possible that precisely this event contributed to the Corinthian conflict since this was the leader of the synagogue who should have been deeply rooted in the faith of the fathers, rejecting all novelties. Instead, he was baptized by Paul and turned into Christ's follower (1Co 1:14).

Paul moved into the house of Titus Justus and lived with him for a year and a half. The young Corinthian community started to build up around this person. It was a thriving community but still in its infancy. It comprised mainly Greeks but also proselytes and a few followers of Judaism who opened their hearts to the message of the Good News about Jesus.

At least some of the gatherings, or perhaps informal meetings of the Corinthian Christians, probably took place in the house of Titus Justus. It is difficult to imagine that the members of the commune did not visit Paul, even if only for private purposes. The physical proximity of Paul's lodgings to the synagogue, to which the whole house was attached (Ac 18:7), must have given rise to tensions with the Jewish community. One did not have to wait long for the result of these tensions.

403 S. Jędrzejewski, *Peszer jako metoda egzegetyczna*, Seminare 24 (2007) 1–17.
404 H. Daniel-Rops, *Życie w Palestynie w czasach Chrystusa*, trans. J. Lasocka, Warszawa 2001, 336–339.

After eighteen months of Paul's stay in Corinth, a new consul of Achaia, Gallio, arrived.[405] Until 41, Achaia was ruled by Caesar's legates but, after coming to power, Claudius established proconsuls. An interesting fact is that Gallio – called because of his gentleness or even indolence *dulcis Gallio* – was the brother of Seneca. As soon as he appeared in the city, the Jewish community brought charges against Paul to him. It was an appropriate moment for them also from the psychological point of view. He was a new arrival in Corinth, he did not know the environment yet, so it was easier to bring him around to somebody else's way of thinking. The Jews accused the apostle of introducing a new religion without the consent of the authorities, which was contrary to the Roman legislation. However, the proconsul (in accordance with his nickname) dismissed the entire delegation and did not even make an attempt to hear what Paul himself had to say in his defence.

The words with which he sent away the Jews revealed, in a sense, the direction of his future rule. "If this were a misdemeanour or a crime, it would be in order for me to listen to your plea; but if it is only quibbles about words and names, and about your own Law, then you must deal with it yourselves – I have no intention of making legal decisions about these things." (Ac 18:14-15) After this event riots in the city started. The Greeks battered Sosthenes, who had taken the place of the converted Crispus as the leader of the synagogue. The behaviour of the pro-consul may be surprising, as he arrived from Rome shortly after Claudius's decree which had expelled Jews from the capital for provoking riots. In Corinth the situation was analogous – the Jews started riots again – and Gallio did not respond, ignoring the matter. Apparently, he found this solution to be the best.

After the incident and Paul's departure from Corinth, the apostle reminded it at least twice in his correspondence with the local Church that his mission in the synagogue had not brought the expected results. He states that the Gospel is "to the Jews an obstacle they cannot get over" (1 Co 1:23) and claims that there is a curtain on their hearts (2 Co 3:15). The Jews themselves are guilty of this because their minds remain "dull." What were the reasons for the rejection of Paul's teaching by the Corinthian diaspora? Firstly – the misunderstanding of Jesus' messianic

405 The stay of Gallio in Corinth turns out to be helpful in dating Paul's residence in this city. The inscription found in Delphi during archaeological excavations conducted in the years 1892–1903 and known as *inscriptio delphica* in its first verses announces: "Iunius Gallio, my friend and a proconsul of Achaia." The inscription also mentions the so-called prosecutorial acclamation that lasted for twelve years and was performed by each consecutive emperor. Since Claudius began his reign on January 25, 41, his acclamation lasted until January 25, 53. The next took place on 1 August, 52 what is known from the inscription on the the aqueduct arc *Aqua Claudia*. Gallio must have been a procurator before that date. Most probably in May 52 he was already in Corinth and a year later he left Achaia. Paul met the proconsul probably at the beginning of his tenure. For more information see: M. Rosik, *Pierwszy List do Koryntian. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKBNT VII, Częstochowa 2009, 40.

mission. The subject of the apostle's debates with the Jews was the person of Jesus as the Messiah (Ac 18:5). It might be assumed that the Messianic expectations of the Jews in Corinth were shaped by the Pharisaic teachings.

It is true that the Pharisees rejected the Greek books of the Septuagint, which, as we know, were not later included in the canon of the Hebrew Bible but the Messianic idea was hardly present in these books. Even if the Corinthian Jews read the Septuagint with its books originally written in Greek, their understanding of the messianic idea could not have diverged significantly from the Pharisaic beliefs shaped by books originally written in Hebrew. The second reason for the Jews to reject Paul's teachings might have been their tendency to "look for signs." (1Co 1:22) What does it mean? Christ himself faced similar demands from the Pharisees, to whom he had to give a stern response that no sign would be given to them. In the case of Jesus, the demand for a sign was nothing else but the expression of the lack of understanding of his mission, and of the fact that God was its source. The term "sign" (*sēmeion*) often refers to miracles performed by Jesus (Mk 8:11.12; Mt 12:38.39; 16:1.3.4; Lk 11:169.29.30), and in the Septuagint itself it appears 79 times, as the translation of the Hebrew term *'ôt*, which often refers to events that confirm the veracity of someone's statement. It is possible, therefore, that the Corinthian Jews demanded such "signs" from Paul.

Misunderstanding and rejection by the Corinthian diaspora of Paul's teaching about the messianic mission of Jesus, the demand for "signs" by the local Jews (regardless of how we understand them), the incident with a delegation sent to Achaia's proconsul and the conversion of the Synagogue's leader to Christianity – all those events contributed to the fact the in the middle of the first century the paths of Church and Synagogue in the Peloponnesian port city separated for good.

Intensified Persecution by Jews and Romans (Approx. 60 AD). The Role of James, Brother of the Lord

The dislike of institutional Judaism towards the followers of Christ could be noticed at the very beginning of the Church. It started with the interrogation of the members of ecclesiastic communities before the Sanhedrin (Ac 4:1-22) and the prohibition of preaching the gospel, issued by the Sadducees (Ac 5:17-18). It is interesting that the first martyr, Stephen the deacon, fell into disfavour with not only the Sanhedrin but also with the Jewish diaspora, which proves that Christianity was already known also outside of Palestine (Ac 6:9). Persecution of Christians which stared soon after was so relentless that they scattered throughout the territory of Judea and Samaria (according to Ac 1:8) and reached Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch (Ac 11:19). Residents of Samaria are believed to have accepted Christianity in a mass as the result of Philip's preaching. The faith in Christ, thanks to the courtier of the Ethiopian queen, began to reach Egypt. In addition, Jewish converts to Christianity came to Antioch and proclaimed Christ to Greco-Roman polytheists who were baptized under their influence (Ac 11:20). The Jews who did not accept the message of Christ were not pleased with this state of affairs.

Hostility between the followers of Christ and the Jews who did not accept Jesus grew to such an extent that James, the leader of the Jerusalem Church, was executed in the year 62. James did not call for the rejection of Judaism but he encouraged Christians to abandon the "vastness of evil," (Jm 1:21) "pride," (Jm 4:10) and "quarrels." (Jm 5:9).[406] It seems that for him, as for Hillel, the commandment of love was the summary of the whole Torah.[407] In spite of such teaching, according to the tradition, he was dropped from a rock in the Kidron Valley or pushed down from a balcony (or the roof of the Temple), and then stoned.[408] James's martyrdom falls at the time of a temporary vacancy in the position of prosecutor and was carried out at the instigation of the high priest (*Ant.* 20,197-73).[409] Josephus describes the death of James in his work *Antiquities judaicae*:

> Possessed of such a character, Ananus[410] thought that he had a favourable opportunity because Festus[411] was dead and Albinus was still on the way. And so he convened

406 A.J.M. Wedderburn will not hesitate to call the *Letter of James* the letter belonging to the "judaizing Christianity"; *A History of the first Christians*, 156; P.J. Hartin, *The Religious Content of the Letter of James*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 203–232. See also: M.R. Niehoff, *The Implied Audience of the Letter of James*, in: *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, ed. G.A. Anderson, R.A. Clements, D. Satran, Leiden 2013, 57–77. It must be admitted that the opinions of researchers in reference to the circumstances of the creation of the Letter of James are divided. J. Painter lists four opinions: (1) the letter is a typically Jewish document; (2) it is an early Christian creation; (3) it was written in two stages; (4) the author is unknown and only refers to James; *Just James. The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*, 240–241.

407 S. Ruzer, *The Epistle of James as a Witness to Broader Patterns of Jewish Exegetical Discourse*, JJMJS 1 (2014) 73. On the importance of the commandment to love one's neighbour (Lv 19:18) in Judaism of the Second Temple see: G.E. Sterling, *Was There a Common Ethic in Second Temple Judaism?*, in: *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, STDJ 51, ed. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling, R.A. Clements, Leiden 2004, 171–94.

408 J.-P. Isbouts, *Wspólne korzenie. Od Mojżesza do Mahometa*, 250; B. Chilton, *Getting It Right: James, Jesus, and Questions of Sanctity*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 112–115. D. Lambers-Petry, *Verwandte Jesu ale Referenzpersonen für das Judenchristentum*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 32–35.

409 C. White, *The Emergence of Christianity*, Greenwood Guides to Historic Events of the Ancient World, Westport – London 2007, 39–40.

410 Ananus performed the function of the archpriest; he was the son of Annas.

411 Porcius Festus was the procurator of Judea.

> the judges of the Sanhedrin and brought before them a man called James, the brother of Jesus who was called the Christ, and certain others. He accused them of having transgressed the law and delivered them up to be stoned. Those of the inhabitants of the city who were considered the most fair-minded and who were strict in observance of the law were offended at this. They therefore secretly sent to King Agrippa urging him, for this was not the first time that Ananus had acted unjustly, to order him to desist from any further such actions. Certain of them even went to meet Albinus[412], who was on his way from Alexandria, and informed him that Ananus had no authority to convene a committee without his consent. Convinced by these words, Albinus angrily wrote to Ananus threatening to take vengeance upon him. King Agrippa[413], because of Ananus' action, deposed him from the high priesthood which he had held for three months and replaced him with Jesus the son of Damnaeus (*Ant.* 20,200-203).[414]

The Romans themselves did not pose a threat to Christians in Palestine at that time (unlike in Rome). Paul, for example, was warned by the Romans about the danger of an attempt on his life which was being prepared by the Jews (Ac 2:12-30), and the decurion Cornelius of Coastal Caesarea accepted Christianity (Ac 10:1-12). At that time, the Romans were more receptive to the followers of Christ than the Jews who rejected the message of the Good News. The split between Judeo-Christians and other Jews deepened. Nevertheless, the Church remained within Judaism as one of the Jewish currents. The argument confirming this thesis is the fact that the signs (miracles) that were performed by members of the Church had their analogies in other Jewish groups. For example, in the early sixties of the first century, Hanina ben Dosa, a rabbi who became famous as a miracle worker, was active in Palestine. It is said that he used to be asked for prayer with the same frequency as James the Fair was asked for intercession.

At the same time persecution affected the Christians in Rome. In the *Annales* Tacitus refers to the rumours according to which Nero was supposed to set fire to Rome in the year 64:

---

412 Albinus was also the procurator of Judea. He brutally suppressed the Syrians.

413 Herod Agrippa II was the son and Agrippa I and Kypros. He appealed to Claudius for the benefit of the Jews in their dispute with the Samaritans.

414 S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 175–181. The death of James is described a bit differently by Hegesippus in *Diaries* cited by Eusebius: "And while they were thus stoning him one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, the son of the Rechabites, who are mentioned by Jeremiah the prophet, cried out, saying, 'Stop! What are you doing? The just one prays for you.' And one of them, who was a fuller, took the club with which he beat out clothes and struck the just man on the head. And thus he suffered martyrdom. And they buried him on the spot, by the temple, and his monument still remains by the temple. He became a true witness, both to Jews and Greeks, that Jesus is the Christ" *(Hist.* 2,23,17–19).

> Therefore, to scotch the rumour, Nero substituted as culprits, and punished with the utmost refinements of cruelty, a class of men, loathed for their vices, whom the crowd styled Christians. Christus, the founder of the name, had undergone the death penalty in the reign of Tiberius, by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilatus, and the pernicious superstition was checked for a moment, only to break out once more, not merely in Judaea, the home of the disease, but in the capital itself, where all things horrible or shameful in the world collect and find a vogue (*An.* 15,44).

Suetonius in the *Life of Nero* wrote about the same event: "He likewise inflicted punishments on the Christians, a sort of people who held a new and impious superstition." (16) The night of the fire (July 18, 64) marks the beginning of a 250-year period of persecution. During the first period of persecutions, the followers of Christ died for the very fact of being Christians; there was no need to provide any evidence of their fault.[415] It can be assumed that Christians were no longer identified with (other) Jews in Rome at the time. In spite of Claudius's infamous decree, the Jews were once again present in Rome during Nero's governance[416] (*Ant.* 20,8.11) but they were not accused of setting the fire in the city. In the eyes of authorities, Christians and the Jews already constituted two separate communities.

At the same time, the Jews manifested proselytic activity. It was so extensive that Philo did not hesitate to use the phrase that the Jewish population reached almost half of humanity (*Mosis* 2,5). Of course, this statement is exaggerated but it reflects the exceptional success of the Jewish proselytism. The Alexandrian scholar does not hesitate to name the ones who rejected Judaism the "enemies of the Jewish nation." (*Virt.* 41,226)[417] In a similar spirit, Josephus speaks out when he claims that many Greek-speaking people adopted Jewish laws and customs. It is true that many of them later returned to paganism, yet many proselytes remained faithful to Judaism *(Ap.* 2,210). It seems that the state of affairs can find its reflection in the words which Matthew puts into the mouth of Jesus: "Alas for you, scribes and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You travel over sea and land to make a single proselyte, and anyone who becomes one you make twice as fit for hell as you are." (Mt 23:15) According to the tradition Matthew the evangelist settled in Antioch[418], and that is where – according to Josephus – Jewish ceremonies attracted many pagans *(Bell.* 7,45).

---

415 W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, trans. J. Morka, Wrocław 2009, 446–449; W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, New York 1967, 126–130; A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again*, JTS 3 (1952–1953) 199–213.

416 E. Zawiszewski, *Historia zbawienia*, Pelplin 1993, 79.

417 L.H. Feldman, *Proselytism and Syncretism*, in: *World History of the Jewish People. The Diaspora in the Hellenistic-Roman World*, ed. M. Stern, Z. Baras, Jerusalem 1984,188–207; B.J. Bamberger, *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period*, Cincinnati 1939, 267–273.

418 J.D. Kingsbury, *Matthew, the Gospel According to*, in: *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, ed. P. Achtemeier, San Francisco 1985, 613.

Extremely interesting is the phenomenon of spreading of Judaism in the middle of the first century in the Phoenician cities of Tyre and Sidon on the Syrian coast as well as in the colony founded by Phoenicians in North Africa – Carthage. At that time, these cities lost their autonomy and Judaism became very popular in them. Links between the religion of the Phoenicians and the religion of the Jews had already been established for centuries. It is claimed that Melchizedek the King of Shalom and the priest of El Elion (Supreme God) who offered Abraham a meal, was a Phoenician. The Solomon Temple, built of Lebanon's cedars, was constructed in the same way as the Phoenician temple Melqart (the same cedar wood was used by Egyptian pharaohs). Solomon at the end of his life began to worship Phoenician Astarte. The daughter of Ithobaal, the priest of the goddess Astarte and the ruler of Tyre, Isabel, married Ahab, the ruler of the North Kingdom. In this way the cult of Baal deepened in Samaria. What could have attracted the Phoenicians to Judaism in the first century AD was circumcision that had been practiced by them for centuries. This custom, known in both religions, brought them closer to each other and could have facilitated the transfer of followers of Phoenician cults to the circles of Jewish proselytism.

Research carried out over the past decades has led to the hypothesis that many Phoenicians who had Jewish slaves were willing to accept Judaism.[419] The inhabitants of Syria could also have been attracted to Judaism due to similar language, which was Aramaic. Josephus testifies that during the first Jewish war many Phoenician women converted to Judaism. The inhabitants of Damascus would have been happy to murder the Jews who they gathered in the gymnasium, their "only fear was of their own wives who, with few exceptions, had all become subject to (or been brought under) the Jewish religion and so their efforts were mainly directed to keeping the secret from them." (*Bell.* 2,560-561) Phoenician women could have been attracted to Judaism because of the higher social status of women among Jews than in their native communities; however, "higher" does not mean that the position of women in Judaism was privileged.

Numerous conversions to Judaism also took place in other parts of the empire. This happened e.g. in Adiabene, Babylonia[420] and, above all, in the capital of the

419 L.H. Feldman, *Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism in the First Century*, 36. This state of affairs seems to be confirmed by the sentence attributed to the great Rabbi (Abba Arika, the first of the amoraites, living at the turn of the second and third centuries), who was supposed to say: "from Tyrus to the west and from Carthage to the east, Israel and his God are known" (*Menahot* 110,1; bab).

420 L.H. Schiffman, *The Conversion of the Royal House of Adiabene in Josephus and Rabbinic Sources*, in: *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. L.H. Feldman, G. Hata, Detroit 1987, 293–312; J. Neusner, *The Conversion of Adiabene to Judaism*, JBL 83 (1964) 60–66; cf. *Genesis Rabba* in Gn 46,10; *Ant.* 20,35. On the presence of active Jewish communities in the diaspora see: J. Ciecieląg, *Żydzi w europejskiej części Cesarstwa Rzymskiego*, Kraków 2013. The author discusses the situation of the Jews in the western provinces of the Empire, such as Thrace, Mezia, Panonia, Dalmatia, Macedonia, Achaia, Italy, Sicily and Malta, Sardinia, Spain and Gaul (Noricum,

former occupants of Judea. Besides, many inhabitants of Babylonia maintained Jewish customs and festivities without conversion to Judaism. This concerns, for example, the Sabbath or the Day of Atonement (*Moses* 2,4). As many as eleven passages of the Acts of the Apostles mention "God-fearers." (Ac 10:2.22.35; 13:16.26.43.50; 16:14; 17:4.17; 18;7) According to Josephus, there was no city where the Sabbath, lamp lighting and Jewish eating habits were not observed (*Ap.* 2,282).

In Egypt, the custom was to give to some children born on the Sabbath the name of Sambation although they were born in families which did not have any links to Judaism. At least five Egyptian documents on papyrus confirm this custom.[421] The satirist Petronius made a mocking distinction between those who worshipped "the pig God" (i.e. retaining the Jewish diet) and those who were circumcised and who obeyed the whole Law (37). Epictetus in the second half of the first century asked in one of his works why his adversaries played the role of the Jews even though they were Greek (*Diss.* 2,19-21).

As it can be seen from the above, in the sixties of the first century, the Church grew and strengthened substantially in pagan environments, which did not prevent Jewish proselytism from intensifying in the same places. Official division into Judaism and Christianity did not occur yet. The Gentiles were offered both, even though the differences relating to customs and celebration became increasingly delineated at that time. It is possible that what fascinated the Gentiles was the belief in one God. The Jews and believers in Christ emphasized monotheism, and this may have constituted the power of attraction of Judaism and Christianity in environments marked by polytheism for centuries. The problem, however, was that the followers of official Judaism did not consider Christians to be monotheist.

Divinity of Christ and Monotheism of Judaism

Only about two decades after the resurrection of Christ, Paul would write in his correspondence with Corinthians: "Though there are so-called gods, in the heavens or on earth – and there are plenty of gods and plenty of lords – yet for us there is only one God, the Father from whom all things come and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom all things come and through whom we exist." (1Co 8;5-6) The apostle outlines in a concise manner the essence of Christian worship. Firstly, he firmly rejects polytheism omnipresent in the Greek and Roman world and favours monotheism preached by Judaism. However, he also clearly implies that the monotheism should be understood in a different way than it was suggested by the Jewish teachers of his time who did not accept Christ. This is

Receipt, Germany and Britain were omitted because there is no source material of Jewish presence in these provinces). For each of these regions, he mentions the main urban centres in which there were Jewish communities and he carries out a detailed and penetrating analysis of the source material.

421 *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicorum*, III, 43–87.

because he puts God who he calls the "Father" in "one line" with Jesus Christ, to whom he assigns the title "Lord," which – according to official Judaism – is only attributed to God.

According to the Jews who did not join the Church, the view of the deity of Christ was irreconcilable with the convictions of Judaism in its various forms and currents.[422] The Decalogue, the most important Jewish law of biblical as well as of rabbinic Judaism, puts clear emphasis on the singularity of God (Ex 20:3-17; Dt 5:7-22). A similar notion is contained in the prayer *Shema* declaimed by the Jews every day (Dt 6:4-9). In the developing Christology, the Jewish scholars saw a threat to the idea of pure monotheism. At the same time, Christians gladly referred to the words of their Master uttered during the feast of Consecration of the Temple: "The Father and I are one." (Jn 10:30) The Jews could not reconcile Christian references to Jesus' self-awareness of God's sonship (Jn 10:36) with the idea of the uniqueness of God.[423] Even more, they rejected Christian ascertainment that Jesus is the only way to God (Jn 14:6).[424] Rabbis were also forced to reject the Christian exegesis of Ps 110 which saw in the psalm the messianic message referring to Jesus.[425]

Careful reading of John's Gospel, however, leads to the conclusion that the Christology of this work is shaped by the evangelist in such a way as to show its specificity against the background of Jewish monotheism. Jesus is the incarnated Word of God who remains in unity with the Father; He is the Son of God living in constant community with God. The divine prerogatives of Jesus can be seen here perfectly well against the background of customs and beliefs depicted on the pages of the Old Testament. Jesus is Logos, Creator, Judge, the Master of life and death. He claimed that whoever saw Him saw the Father. God reveals himself in Jesus as the Son, what can be confirmed by frequent use of the formula "I am" by John (Jn 6:35.41.48; 8.12; 10:7.9.11.14; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1).[426] The idea of the divinity of Jesus spread in the environment of Judeo-Christians who were perfectly familiar with the Old Testament. They gathered "in the name of Jesus," prayed to Him, sang

---

422 This subject is widely discussed by L. Hurtado in the book *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (London 1998).

423 M. Wróbel, *Motywy i formy żydowskich prześladowań pierwotnego Kościoła (I-II w. po Chr.)*, Biblical Annals 60 (2013) 3, 423–424.

424 J.H. Charlesworth, *The Gospel of John: Exclusivism Caused by a Social Setting Different from that of Jesus*, in: *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium 2000*, ed. R. Bieringer, D. Pollyfeyet, F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, Assen 2001, 479–513.

425 *„In Christ All Will Be Made Alive" (1 Cor 15:12-58). The Role of Old Testament Quotations in the Pauline Argumentation for the Resurrection*, European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 6, Frankfurt am Main – Bern – Bruxelles – New York – Oxford – Wien 2013, 93–128.

426 M. Wróbel, *„Ja i Ojciec jedno jesteśmy" (J 10,30). Chrystologia Ewangelii św. Jana wobec żydowskiego monoteizmu*, in: *Jezus jako Syn Boży w Nowym Testamencie i we wczesnej literaturze chrześcijańskiej*, ed. H. Drawnel, AnBibLub 1, Lublin 2007, 53–62.

hymns to Him, acknowledged Him as the Lord elevated over all spiritual beings, attributed to Him titles that Old Testament uses only in reference to God, and they accepted Him as the divine Redeemer.[427]

The Christian understanding of the idea of Jesus' sonship of God, which differs fundamentally from the Jewish understanding of the same idea, has already been mentioned. It is obvious that awareness of the divinity of Christ had been growing gradually within the emerging Church.[428] On the pages of the Synoptic Gospels the prerogatives of God are assigned to Jesus: Jesus forgives sins, performs miracles, knows human thoughts, embodies the wrath of God, and is referred to as the "Lord of the Sabbath" and the "Holy" one. All these powers and terms the Hebrew Bible reserves for JHWH.

The Jews believed that only God could forgive sins (Ex 34:6-7; Nb 14:19-20; 1K 8:31-34; Am 7:2; Dn 9:19; Jr 5:1.7; 31:34; 33:8; 36:3; 50:20). The request for the forgiveness of sins is inseparable from the ritual performed at the Temple on the Day of Atonement. Meanwhile, healing the paralytic (Mk 2:1-12), Jesus proclaims the forgiveness of the sins of the sick person before he utters the miracle-forming formula. And although the passive form of the verb *afientai* (Mk 2:5b) in the statement, "Son, your sins are forgiven you," may be an allusion to God's forgiveness (just like *passivum divinum*), the witnesses of the event, however, realize that Jesus attributes to himself the power to forgive sins.

The Jews also believed that only Yahweh could perform miracles. The greatest miracle in the history of the nation was the deliverance from Egypt, attributed to Yahweh. Only God can heal (Ex 15:26b), raise from the dead (Ws 16:1), or free from the power of demons (1S 16:23; Tb; 8:2-3 *Ant.* 8,47-48; 14,107). Sometimes He gives the authority to people (1K 17:17-24; 2K 4:18-37). But the evangelists suggest that Jesus is not only a man endowed by God with miraculous power (like Moses, Elias, or Elisha), but by performing miracles, He himself is in the position that the Hebrew Bible ascribes to JHWH. For example Jesus' command "Hold out your hand!" in Mk 3:5, addressed to a man suffering from paralysis, is synonymous with God's command given to Moses at the Red Sea. Another argument reinforcing the

427 L.W. Hurtado adds: "the cultic veneration of Jesus as a divine figure apparently began among Jewish Christians, whose religious background placed great emphasis upon the uniqueness of God. It is evident that their devotion had its own distinctive shape, a kind of binitarian reverence, which included both God and the exalted Jesus. Also it is obvious that these Christians did not have the benefit of the prolonged and intricate developments and discussions that led to the theology reflected in the Nicene Creed and that one must refrain from reading these later developments back into the earlier period with which we are concerned"; *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, 11.

428 M. Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, London 1976, 23–34. More see: C. Setzer, *You Invent a Christ! Christological Claims as Points of Jewish – Christian Dispute*, USQR 44 (1991) 315–328.

thesis that the evangelists see in Jesus the Divine Power able to perform miracles is that the Old Testament "miracle workers" acted as mediators between God and a man who needed help (or a group of people), with the prayer being its (the miracles') external expression. Jesus, on the other hand, did not formulate intercessory prayers before performing miracles.

The Israelites were convinced about God's omniscience, and this conviction was depicted on the pages of the Bible (e.g. in Ps 139,1-3) as well as in extra-biblical literature. Rabbis are convinced that "before man is formed in the womb of his mother, his thought is already known to God. (…) Before a thought is formed in a man's heart, it is already revealed to God." (*GenRab* 9,3)[429] The tractate *Pirke avot* states laconically: "Everything is foreseen." (3,19) Meanwhile on the pages of the Gospel Jesus is depicted as the one who knows human thoughts (e.g. Mk 2:8; 3:5; 10:5; 12:15.44b). In this way, He once again assumes the divine prerogatives.

In the opinion of the Israelites, God's wrath is a retribution for man's sin. The Hebrew Bible uses such terms as "revenge,"[430] "jealousy,"[431] or "wrath"[432] in relation to JHWH. Wrath expresses dissatisfaction of Yahweh with human conduct.[433] This is how evangelists see Jesus' wrath in the story about healing of the man with a paralysed hand (Mk 3:1-6) or in the narrative about the purification of the Temple (Mk 11:15-18).

According to the Israelites only God is the absolute Lord of the Sabbath: "You will work for six days, but the seventh will be a day of complete rest, a day for the sacred assembly on which you do no work at all. Wherever you live, this is a Sabbath for Yahweh." (Lv 23:3) However, the Gospels call Jesus "the Master of the Sabbath," (Mt 12:8) again attributing the prerogatives of God to Him. The title "Lord" in reference to Jesus does not have to indicate divine authority; however, in the light of worship with which the first Christians began to surround His Person, with time it began to indicate deity.[434]

---

429 A. di Nola, *Ebraismo e giudaismo*, Roma 1996, 248.

430 Ml 5:14; Dt 32:35.41.43; Jr 11:20; 20:12; Ezk 25:12; Lv 26:25; Nb 31:3; Is 34:8; 47:3; 61:2; 63:4; Ps 94:1; 149:7.

431 Ex 20:5; 34:14; Nb 25:11; Jos 24:19; Dt 4:24; 6:15; Ezk 5:13; 16:42; 23:25.

432 Ex 32:10; Dt 6:15; 2K 13:3; Is 30:28; 51:17.22; Ezk 13:13; 38:22; Nb 16:22; Jb 19:11.

433 W. Eichrodt comments: "Even if it is sometimes unintelligible, *Yahweh's anger has nothing of the Satanic about it*; it remains simply *the manifestation of the displeasure of God's unsearchable greatness*, and as such is far above human conception. Nevertheless, it does also arouse in men the feeling that there must be a higher law, in virtue of which God's mysterious and wonderful power is exempt from assessment in terms of the rationalistic categories of reward and punishment"; *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. J. Baker, I, London 1961[6], 261. Cf. *Gniew*, in: *Słownik symboliki biblijnej. Obrazy, symbole, motywy, metafory, figury stylistyczne i gatunki literackie w Piśmie Świętym*, ed. L. Ryken, J.C. Wilhoit, T. Longman, trans. Z. Kościuk, Warszawa 2003, 218–220.

434 L.W. Hurtado comments: "the cultic veneration of Jesus in early Christian circles is the most important context for the use of the Christological titles and concepts.

In beliefs of the Israelites the concept of holiness combines the idea of perfection and total dissimilarity, otherness, or transcendence.[435] In this sense, God is holy (Is 6:3; 40:24 57:15; cf. Hos 11:9; Ps 99:5; Hab 3:3; Jb 6:10). The holiness of God is emphasized by Qumran documents (1QGenAp 2,14; 11,14; 20,17; 1QM 11,15; 17,2; 1QSb 5,28) and rabbinic documents (*Sanh.* 92,1; *Sif.* 112 to Nb 15,21).[436] Thus understood holiness is attributed by evangelists to Jesus, what can be seen on the example of the healing of the possessed in a synagogue. The words which come from his lips are: "I know who you are – the Holy One of God." (Mk 1:25b) Once again, the prerogatives of JHWH have been assigned to Christ.

The gradual increase of the awareness of the followers of the Risen One about His divinity can be found on the pages of the New Testament. It was expressed in the most mature way in Christological hymns of Paul and in Johannine writings. In the case of John, it is worth referring to the narrative about the empty tomb of Jesus (Jn 20:1-19), in which the evangelist consciously refers to the Yahwistic description of the creation of the world and the fall of the first people (Gn 2:4b – 3:24). The Yahwist looks at God as the Gardener who not only planted the garden in Eden (Gn 2:8) but also walked among its trees (Gn 3:8). Mary Magdalene before recognizing the Risen One at first perceives in Him the gardener, that is the one who "plants" and takes care of life. Thus, Jesus is likened in John's analogy to God in the Yahwistic description of the creation and fall of the first people.

Some researchers claim that in the targumic tradition one can find anti-Christian polemic in the interpretation of Psalm 45. The psalmist announces, "Your throne is from God, for ever and ever, the sceptre of your kingship a sceptre of justice, you love uprightness and detest evil. Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with oil of gladness, as none of your rivals." (Ps 45:6-7) For the author of the Epistle to the Hebrew these two verses constitute an argument for the deity of Christ (Heb 1:8-9); the psalm was interpreted in a similar way by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 38,56,63,86), Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3,6,1), Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* 13) and Origen (*Cels.* 1,56).The Targumist, however, did everything in his power to avoid assigning the attributes of deity to a person referred to in the psalm and proposed the following

---

This context indicates what they signified and gives us insight into the pattern of the religion in which they functioned. For example, "lord" either in Greek (*kyrios*) or in Aramaic (*mareh*) was used with a variety of connotations in the ancient world. But once we see this tide in the context of the early Christian cultic actions of prayer and hymn, it acquires a much more specific connotation. The term "lord" in either language does not automatically connote divine status. But the use of the tide in such cultic actions implies much more than simple social superiority of or respect for the figure to whom it is given"; *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, 13.

435 M. Wojciechowski, *Jezus jako Święty w pismach Nowego Testamentu*, RSB 2, Warszawa 1996, 14–15.

436 M. Rosik, *Jezus a judaizm w świetle Ewangelii według św. Marka*, Rozprawy i Studia Biblijne 15, Warszawa 2004, 631–634.

paraphrase: "Your throne, O God, will last forever and ever, and righteousness will be the scepter of Your kingdom. [And thou, King of the Messiah, because] You have loved righteousness and hated wickedness; therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness beyond your companions."[437]

An example of a Christian-Jewish polemic can also be the targumic interpretation of the plural form in God's decision to create man: "Let us make man in our own image, in the likeness of ourselves." (Gn 1:26) For the first Christians, this form revealed the mystery of the Holy Trinity already on the pages of the Old Testament (Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* 16). However, the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* suggests another reading of this line: "And God said to the angels who serve before Him and who had been created on the second day of the Creation of the world, Let us make man in Our image."[438] In a sense, the passage from the Mishna that refers to the description of man's creation can also be considered as the Jewish answer to the Christian interpretation of this passage:

> Therefore, humans were [Adam was] created singly, to teach you that whoever destroys a single soul [of Israel], Scripture accounts it as if he had destroyed a full world; […] And for the sake of peace among people, that one should not say to his or her fellow, "My parent is greater than yours"; and that heretics should not say, "There are many powers in Heaven." (*Sanh.* 4,5).

The noun for heretics used here is *minim*, often applied to describe Christians in rabbinic writings (as it will be shown in the part of the work referring to the so-called "blessing of the accursed"). Emphasising the creation of Adam, the first man, by God alone, the authors of the Mishnah pointed to monotheism, thus opposing all forms of polytheism including also the faith of the followers of Christ.

It is worth noticing that the Jews had already found the plural in Gn 1:26 troublesome a few centuries before Christ. The Septuagint translates the phrase "after our likeness" as *kath' homoiōsin* ("according to likeness"), omitting the possessive pronoun. Some versions of the Septuagint leave out the possessive pronoun, and the personal pronoun in the phrases "in our image, after our likeness," and the phrase "let us make man" are rewritten in the singular ("I will make a man"). The fact that such lessons in Gn 1:6 existed in the Greek language, can be testified by some Gnostic writings quoted by the Fathers of the Church.[439] For example,

---

437 M. Baraniak, *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, 116–117.

438 M. Baraniak, *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, 118.

439 Quotes from the writings of the Fathers of the Church are discussed by Menahem Kister from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, signalling earlier: "One may raise the question whether a version of the Greek Bible which read "in image and likeness" (or "according to image and according to likeness") ever existed. A clue to the answer can be found in the Gnostic myths relating to the verse in question, as narrated by some Church Fathers"; M. Kister, *Some Early Jewish and Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism*, JSJ 37 (2006) 4, 567.

Satornilus, whom Epiphanius mentions, created a system according to which seven angels rebelled against God and decided to create the world (*Hear.* 23,4-7). In the Greek Bible of Satornilus, there are no pronouns in the phrase "Our image, similar to Us."[440]

Justin Martyr cites two Jewish interpretations of the plural in Genesis 1:26 (rejecting both of course): (1) God said, "let us make" to Himself; (2) God addressed these words to "elements" (Greek *stoicheia*) – the earth and other primary elements (*Dial.* 62). Then he remarks that some people claim God pronounced the words "let us make" while thinking of angels. He admits that the Jews themselves considered the last suggestion to be heretical. At the same time he is convinced that God addresses these words to his Son, identified with the Wisdom of God, in accordance with the record of the tradition of wisdom (Pr 8:22-35).

Returning to the Jewish tradition, according to the midrash to the Book of Genesis, God "consults" the decision to create man with the elements and with angels (so Justin's opinion that the Jews reject this proposal is untrue) or with his own heart *(GenRab* 58-62).[441] Moreover, the view that God creates man in cooperation with angels also appears in the writings of Philo and the Gnostics.[442] According to the sapiential tradition, God created the world in his Wisdom (Ws 9:1-2; Pr 9:1-4; 2 Hen 30:8), hence the phrase "let us make a man" may indicate God who addresses himself to Wisdom. In this way the verse from Gn 1:26 is interpreted in the tractate *Sanhedrin* (8,9).

In the Christian tradition, the Wisdom of God is personified by the Son of God, or the Holy Spirit; hence the reading of Gn 1:26 contributed to the development of the Trinity doctrine.[443] It must be said, therefore, that the opinion of Justin Martyr and other early Christian writers is nothing else than the development of the Jewish interpretation of the plural in Gn 1:26, what even the authors of Jewish origin admit today.[444] On the other hand, the view held by some writers that in Gn

---

440 F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, NHS 35, Leiden 1987, 64.

441 E.E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, Jerusalem 1979, 205.

442 "Notwithstanding the enormous difference between them, the Gnostic system and Philo's system are based on a common concept: a differentiation between the creation by the Supreme God and that by the inferior powers (and apparently also the dichotomy between body and soul, shared by some Hellenistic schools, by some Jewish groups in Palestine of the Second Temple period, and by Gnostics)"; M. Kister, *Some Early Jewish and Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism*, 570.

443 H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*, Lund 1947, 122–23.

444 "Justin's Christological opinion disagreeing with the 'teachers of the Jews' – an opinion which became, in various formulations, the main view in Christian interpretation over the generations – is in fact a direct development of a Jewish concept"; M. Kister, *Some Early Jewish and Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism*, 578.

1:26 we are dealing with *pluralis maiestatis* is impossible to maintain since such a concept was not known to the authors of the Pentateuch. It appears in the Jewish tradition only in the ninth century AD in the writings of Rav Saadia Gaon. In this context, it is a strange thing that in the fifth century Theodoret of Cyrhus refutes the alleged views of the Jews that God expresses himself using the form of *pluralis maiestatis* (*Quest. in Gen.* 101).[445]

In this context, it cannot be overlooked that the ground for recognizing the divine prerogatives in the person of Christ had been prepared by the Jewish tradition.[446] Let us provide some more examples from apocryphal literature. In Latin version of the apocrypha *Life of Adam and Eve* a scene was presented in which God commanded angels to worship Adam who was created in the image of God. In Paul, "He [Christ] is the image of the unseen God, the first-born of all creation." (Col. 1:15) There is no evidence that any current in Judaism worshipped Adam but the very idea of worshiping God's image lays the foundations for the cult of Christ, the new Adam.[447] The poem *Joseph and Aseneth* [448] shows the main character who asks her mysterious husband to reveal his name so that she could adore it. Further on in the Ethiopian *Book of Enoch* there is a figure called "the Chosen One" and the "Son of Man," to whom homage is paid:

445 M. Kister, *Some Early Jewish and Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism*, 578–579.

446 M. Mach, *Concepts of Jewish Monotheism in the Hellenistic Period*, in: *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, ed. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis, Leiden 1999, 41–42.

447 Some Jewish authors found divine prerogatives in Moses who for Matthew the evangelist became the inspiration to show Christ as the "New Moses." It is enough to mention: Si 45:1–5; *Asc. Mos.* 1,14; 11,16–19; Philo, *Mosis* 1,155–159.

448 To this day discussion has been held among researchers whether the poem is of Jewish or of Christian origin. There are more arguments supporting the idea that it was written by a Jewish writer. J.J. Collins concludes his studies as follows: "Whatever we conclude about its provenance is a matter of inference, not of certainty. Nonetheless, some inferences can claim more probability than others. In this case, the balance of probability still favours the consensus view that the story originated in Hellenistic Judaism. […] The lack of clear Christian elements seems to me to argue against any claim of extensive Christian redaction, let alone Christian authorship in *Joseph and Aseneth*. The Christian copyists already found much that was congenial to their interests in the tale"; J.J. Collins, *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture. Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*, SJSJ 1000, Leiden – Boston 2005, 127; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times*, in: *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT 2/II, Assen 1984, 65–72.

> All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him, and will praise and bless and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits. And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden before Him, before the creation of the world and for evermore. And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits hath revealed him to the holy and righteous; for he hath preserved the lot of the righteous, because they have hated and despised this world of unrighteousness, and have hated all its works and ways in the name of the Lord of Spirits: for in his name they are saved, and according to his good pleasure hath it been in regard to their life. (*1En* 48,5-7)

In this short fragment not only the idea of paying homage to "the Lord of Spirits" appears but also the thought of his pre-existence, which Paul stresses with reference to Christ. Elsewhere in the same work, bowing down before the Son of Man is mentioned, and surely that worldly title Jesus willingly related to himself: "And all the kings and the mighty and the exalted and those who rule the earth shall fall down before him on their faces, and worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man, and petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands." (*1En* 62,9) It seems that these scenes of worship appeared in the apocryphal literature not without an influence of the prophetic thought (Is 45:14-15; 49:7.23). The author of the Apocalypse refers them to Christ: "I will make them come and fall at your feet." (Rv 3:9b) It follows from the above that post-exile religious literature of Judaism (biblical and extra-biblical) presenting the figures whose position is analogous to the position of God Himself in terms of worship, provided Christianity with an appropriate framework in which one could place the figure of Christ seated "at the right hand of the Father" without renouncing monotheism.

Not delving into a long-standing debate on whether the term "God" refers at any point in the New Testament directly to Christ or not, it must be clearly stated that the inspired authors see God's prerogatives in Christ. It was, according to the rabbis, a real threat to the Judaic understanding of monotheism, which also intensified the conflict between the Jews and Christians.[449] Moreover, identification of divine prerogatives in the figure of Christ had been prepared by the Judaic tradition. The Jewish ideas of the pre-existence of the Torah or Wisdom played a significant role here, as well as the stories of such figures as Elijah raised to heaven in mysterious circumstances, or the biblical and apocryphal figure of Enoch who lived at such great peace with God that he was physically taken to heaven (Gn 5: 22, Heb 11:5).

Looking at the figure of Christ from the perspective of the idea of pre-existence or uplifting to heaven prepared the ground for the imminent recognition of divine

---

449 This opinion is shared by L. W. Hurtado, when he comments: "Jewish-Christian cultic reverence of the exalted Jesus in terms and actions characteristically reserved for God (…), though it was initially a development ('mutation') within Jewish monotheistic tradition, was a sufficiently distinctive variant form to have been seen by many non-Christian Jews as compromising the uniqueness of God in the important sphere of cultic action"; *First-Century Jewish Monotheism*, JSNT 71 (1998) 24.

attributes in Him. This reflection was accompanied and even preceded (in accordance with the principle assuming that in the Church practice precedes theology) by liturgical worship of Christ. The reflection of the rabbis over the message and teaching of Jesus went in an entirely different direction. They looked at Jesus neither from the perspective of pre-existence nor from the perspective of ascension into heaven, so they could not accept the thought of Christ's divinity.

Election of Israel

Different understanding of the election of Israel became another source of conflict between Church and Synagogue. The Jews were convinced that the election encompassed the whole life of Israel which belonged to God (Dt 7:6; 14:2). But the Jews who listened to the teaching of Jesus and saw His work lacked openness to God's gift of salvation and readiness to cooperate with Him. Waiting for the Messiah and foreseeing His imminent coming, they did not recognize Him when it actually occurred. Instead of listening to the voice of God speaking to them, they were focused on their own purely human interpretations, images and longings, confining themselves to the earthly reality, limited in time and space.[450]

Since Israel and its institutions of the Second Temple period rejected Jesus as Christ (the Messiah), His followers had to look at the election of Israel from a different perspective. Paul struggled with this topic in Rm 9:11[451]; 11:5.7.28.[452] As the choice of God is irrevocable, so Israel still remains the chosen people, but only because of God's mercy (Rm 9:16), not because of its acts.[453] By the grace of God, strangers have also been included in Israel and it remains Israel only when it is faithful to the divine intention suggested by Is 56:1-8. Otherwise it becomes the *lo-ammi* ("not my people"). Therefore, God's promise has been given to everyone who may belong to Israel understood in such a way, and thus also to other nations.[454]

---

450 U. Szwarc, *Jezus a judaizm*, 203.

451 In order to convince the Jews of the importance of his theses, Paul used arguments typical of rabbis; W. Rakocy, *Elementy argumentacji rabinackiej w Rz 9,6-29*, CT 63 (1993) 3, 97–102.

452 M. Czajkowski, *„Cały Izrael będzie zbawiony" (Rz 11,26). Rz 9 – 11 w kontekście całego Listu do Rzymian*, 5–7. For more information see: D.Juster, *Powrót do korzeni. Podstawy teologii biblijnej judaizmu mesjanistycznego*, trans. K. Dubis, [there is not the place and the year of the issue], 62-73.

453 E. Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, London 1974, 103–107.

454 W.A. Elwell concludes that Paul's problem is the fact that he tries to ensure the everlasting election of Israel while Israel has lost its role. The apostle resolves the problem by finding a deeper sense of election in God's design, seeking the real Israel in the bosom of Israel, pointing at himself as the redeemed Israelite and announcing the future redemption of Israel; *Wybranie a predestynacja*, in: *Słownik teologii św. Pawła*, ed. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, D.G. Reid, Polish ed. K. Bardski, Warszawa 2010, 939; W.S Campbell, *„A Remnant of Them Will Be Saved" (Rom 9:27): Understanding Paul's Conception of the Faithfulness of God to Israel*, JJMJS 2 (2015) 79–101. More on the topic of election in the Bible see classic monograph by

According to Paul, the election of Israel by God for God's special ownership (Ex 19:5) and as a priestly and kingly nation (Ex 15:6) has never lost its relevance because "there is no change of mind on God's part about the gifts he has made or of his choice." (Rm 11:29)[455] The choice does not result from merits of Israel but only from God's grace. Moreover, collecting merits at the moment of election was impossible because Israel did not exist at the time! After all, God said to Abraham: "And I shall maintain my covenant between myself and you, and your descendants after you, generation after generation, as a covenant in perpetuity, to be your God and the God of your descendants after you." (Gn 17:7)

For Paul, the argument in support of his thesis that God did not reject his people, and that Israel still remains the chosen nation, is a retrospective view of history: if despite unfaithfulness and sins of the Israelites, God has remained faithful to them, it could be assumed that this would be the case this time, too (Rm 11:4). Furthermore, God can generate good out of unfaithfulness of Israel and the good can be shared by the Gentiles, too: "their failure [the Jews] has brought salvation for the gentiles," (Rm 11:11) "their fall has proved a great gain to the world, and their loss has proved a great gain to the gentiles." (Rm 11:12)[456] Despite the fact that Israel as a nation betrayed God rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, salvation is still available to its individual members: "part of Israel had its mind hardened, but only until the gentiles have wholly come in." [to Church] (Rm 11:25)[457]

As it has already been mentioned above, the question of the election Israel has been one of the most important theological questions from the emergence of the Church up to the present day, and the attempt to answer it always impinges on the relations between Christians and the Jews. It is impossible to resort to Paul's "by no means!" in order to close the debate because the situation of Israel before and after the coming of Christ is quite different. Biblical Judaism was a religion of waiting for the Messiah who, when he finally appeared, was rejected by most of the followers of this religion. Those Jews who accepted Christ were eventually excluded from Synagogue which became the "carrier" of a completely different form of Judaism, called rabbinic or Talmudic.

Christ was accepted by many pagans although his teaching was directed primarily to the "house of Israel." The apostle of the nations was aware of these

---

H.H. Rowleya *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* (London 1950) and K. Wengsta *Jesus. Zwischen Juden und Christen* (Stuttgart 1999, 83–91).

455 U. Szwarc, *Berit 'olam w wyroczniach proroków niewoli*, RTK 38–39 (1991–1992) 1, 35–42.

456 U. Szwarc, *Jezus a judaizm*, 201.

457 More about the election of Israel in Rm 11, see: P.J. Bekken, *Election, Obedience, and Eschatology: Deuteronomy 30:2-14 in Romans 9 – 11 and the Writings of Philo*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 315–331.

complexities. His psychological situation had to be extremely difficult because as a member of the chosen nation he performed his mission among the Gentiles, knowing that he became an enemy to those among Israelites who had rejected Christ. He was also treated suspiciously by Judeo-Christians. And he was still a Jew and loved his nation very much, as it was testified by his dramatic confession: "I could pray that I myself might be accursed and cut off from Christ, if this could benefit the brothers who are my own flesh and blood" (Rm 9:3).

It is not known to what extent Paul knew the situation of the ecclesial community in the capital of the Empire when he was writing his letter to its residents. Essentially his missionary activity was based on the scheme outlined before: arriving in the city – proclaiming the Good News in a synagogue and acquiring the first followers – being thrown out of the synagogue – developing missionary activities among pagans and attracting more followers. The reading of the Acts of the Apostles a number of times describes such a sequence of events. However, the situation of the Church in Rome was different. It was not Paul who first proclaimed Christ there. Neither theologians nor historians have fully explained the beginnings of the community. However, it is certain that when Claudius issued the decree expelling Jews from the Eternal City, Christianity had already been known and widespread there. And it may be assumed that the followers were not only those who descended from Judaism (since the imperial decree as the reason for the exile indicated the riots initiated by a "Chrestos") but also the natives of Rome of pagan descent.

Paul must have learned much about the situation of the Church in Rome from two exiles who were a married couple. Luke the evangelist testifies on the pages of the Acts of the Apostles that probably in year 51 Paul met Priscilla and Aquila in Corinth. "After this Paul left Athens and went to Corinth, where he met a Jew called Aquila whose family came from Pontus. He and his wife Priscilla had recently left Italy because an edict of Claudius had expelled all the Jews from Rome." (Ac 18:1-2)[458] This brief remark provides us with information that Aquila was born in Asia Minor and later he moved to Rome. He left this city probably already in 49 or 50 and stopped in Corinth. Little is known about his wife. It is difficult to say if – like her husband – she came from Pontus or if she was a true-born Roman, what her name might indicate. In fact, the name Aquila is also typically Roman, so it is possible that the Jew began to use it only in the Eternal City. In any case, the husband and wife were staying in Corinth when Paul arrived there during his second missionary journey. It is not known whether the couple had already been Christians at that time. Some think they had accepted Christianity already in Rome[459], others suppose that they were baptized under the influence of Paul's

458 S. Gądecki, *Święty Paweł – świadek Słowa między Azją a Europą*, in: *Mártyres tū Lógū*, ed. C. Korzec, Studia i Rozprawy 7, Szczecin 2006, 32.

459 Thus, E. Dąbrowski (*Dzieje Pawła z Tarsu*, 41) and W. Chrostowski claim that Priscilla and Aquila, who arrived in Corinth around the year 49 after Claudius's edict, had

preaching.[460] Because of his Jewish origin, Aquila had to leave the city, regardless of whether he had already clung to the Christian community or not. Undoubtedly, however, both spouses could have been the source (though probably not the only one) of information given to Paul about the state of Christianity in the capital. In Rome, like in all other communities, the answer to the question of the election Israel may have been of interest to three groups of people: Judeo-Christians who found themselves in a situation identical to that of Paul himself; ethno-Christians, curious as to whether the privileges of Israel also applied to them now; and the Jews who rejected Christ but who were watching the spread of the new faith with interest but not without fear. Answering the question concerning the election of Israel, Paul had to take into account the fact that soon after sending the letter, he would meet his compatriots in Jerusalem. It is widely accepted that the Letter to the Romans was written in 57 or 58, and that the apostle soon after was on his way to visit the Jerusalem community.[461]

It is extremely interesting that the Apostle, condemning his past as a persecutor of the Church (1 Co 15:9; Ga 1:13; Ph 3:5-6; 1Tm 1:13-15) in principle never denies losing the privilege of election of those Jews who rejected Christ. "It is characteristic that although Paul recounts his former conduct as a persecutor of the Church with disapproval and shame, and despite the fact that he never attempts to whitewash or belittle the Jewish unbelief, his outlook is essentially positive. He explains that God used the refusal of Israel to show mercy to pagans. The rest of the chosen ones shows that God did not reject his people, and, furthermore, that God's omnipotence and love also embrace the other Jews.[462] Why is it so? It seems that essentially the answer must concern the fidelity of God and the authority of the Scriptures.

Paul used the Greek Bible (as is evidenced by the overwhelming number of quotations in his letters – quotations drawn from the Septuagint, not from the Hebrew Bible). The psalmist notices: "Yahweh will not abandon his people." (Ps 94:14) Paul's confession included in Rm 11:2 clearly refers to this psalm: "God never abandoned his own people." Even the terminology is selected by the apostle of the nations in such a way that the Jews in the diaspora (and thus the inhabitants of Rome) reading his letter would clearly understand the allusion to the words of the psalmist; both in the psalm and in Paul's statement the verb *apōtheomai* and the expression *ton laon autou* are used. Paul recognizes the authority of the

already been a Christian; *„Czyż Bóg odrzucił lud swój?" (Rom 11:1). Refleksja biblijno-teologiczna*, CT 75 (2005) 2, 41.

460 Tak K. Romaniuk (*Uczniowie i współpracownicy Pawła,* 10–11).

461 J.A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB 33, New York 1992, 85–87.

462 W. Chrostowski, *„Czyż Bóg odrzucił lud swój?" (Rom 11:1). Refleksja biblijno-teologiczna*, 48. It seems that the Paul's attitude to the members of his own nation, who rejected Christ, was ambivalent; L. Ballarini, *Paolo e il dialogo Chiesa – Israele. Proposta di un cammino esegetico*, SB 312, Bologna 1997, 33–34.

Scripture[463], moreover he seems to draw attention to the form of the verb, indicating the irrevocability of God's decision: God did not reject, does not reject and will not reject in the future the people whom He has chosen as his own possession.

The apostle finds confirmation of this declaration of the Scripture in his own experience. After all, he himself was the persecutor of the Church and even of Christ himself (cf. Ac 9:4b). However, God did not reject him but allowed that Christ appeared to him as to "a child born abnormally." (1Co 15:8) The phrase does not refer to premature birth, but to a foetus which is dead in the womb and is born dead. The term *ektrōma*, "a child born abnormally," occurs only once in the New Testament but it was used three times in the Septuagint (Lb 12:12; Hi 3:16; Qo 6:3). One can see in this comparison an allusion to Hos 13:13: "Pangs as of childbirth overtake him [Ephraim], and a stupid child he is; his time is due, but he does not leave the womb."[464]

This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the quotation from Hos 13:14 appears in 1Co 15:55. It is possible, however, that the apostle calls himself a miscarried foetus – thus following the Old Testament prophets – to emphasize the radical initiative of God in his calling to be an apostle.[465] There are exegetes according to whom Paul is referring here to the slander which he could have encountered. The charge in question is that he should not call himself an apostle, because he was not one of the twelve.[466] This offensive phrase is read by the apostle in a symbolic way: the one who had been summoned by God from the womb of his mother (Ga 1:15-16) was a "miscarried foetus" – one born dead but then enlivened by the meeting with the risen Christ.[467]

In this way Paul explains his conduct before he began his apostolic ministry. He used to persecute the Church of God because he was "dead" and did not know the way to salvation back then, nor was he willing to receive the Good News. That is why he is "unfit to be called an apostle." However, he adds quickly that the foundation of his apostleship was not his own choice or decision but God's initiative

---

463 J. TrebolleBarrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible. An Introduction to the History of the Bible*, trans. W.G.E. Watson, Leiden – Grand Rapids – New York – Cambridge – Köln 1998, 497.

464 M. Schaeffer, *Paulus 'Fehlgeburt' oder 'unvernünftiges kind'?*, ZNW 85 (1994) 217; P.R. Jones, *1Cor 15:8: Paul the Last Apostole*, TynBul 36 (1985) 5–34; P.J. Kearney, *He Appeared to 500 Brothers (1Cor 15:6)*, NT 22 (1980) 264–284.

465 H.W. Hollander – G.E. van Der Hout, *The Apostel Paul Calling Himself an Abortion: 1Cor 15,8 within the Context of 1Cor 15,8-10*, NT 38 (1996) 224–236.

466 P. Von der Osten-Sacken, *Die Apologie des paulinischen Apostolatu in 1Kor 15:1-11*, ZNW 64 (1973) 245.

467 J. Munck, *Paulus tanquam abortivus, 1Cor 15:8*, in: *NT Essays: Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester 1959, 180; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Tradition and Redaction in 1Cor 15:3-7*, CBQ 43 (1981) 582–589; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *An ektrōma, Though Appointed from the Womb: Paul's Apostolic Self-Description in 1Cor 15 and Gal 1*, HTR 79 (1986) 198–205.

which he describes as *charis* ("grace"; cf. Rm 1:5; 15:15; Ga 1:15; 2:9). Thanks to grace, in the same way as God has not rejected Paul, He will not reject His own nation but will finally offer his people salvation: "part of Israel had its mind hardened, but only until the Gentiles have wholly come in [to church]; and this is how all Israel will be saved." (Rm 11:25)

The theological problem which remains unresolved to this day and constitutes the bone of contention between Christians and Jews remains the question of how Israel's salvation will be achieved. There are Christians who claim that they should not take up a mission among the Jews because on the basis of God's choice they will achieve the fullness of salvation. These theologians seem to share the view that there are two ways leading to God, Judaism and Christianity, and that they are equivalent.[468] This view, however, seems unacceptable because it would mean in practice that the coming of Christ, his passion, death and resurrection did not change anything in the situation of the Jews rejecting Christ. Therefore, many authors instead of talking about the "own way" of salvation of Israel (Ger. *Sonderweg*) prefer to talk about a "special place" (Ger. *Sonderplatz*) which God has prepared for Israel in His plan of salvation. It was Israel, after all, which God had blessed by the promises given to Abraham; it was Israel who God gave the Law on Mount Sinai to; it was Israel who God promised the Messiah coming from its ranks

468 M. Czajkowski asks – if Judaism is so close to Christianity, should we evangelize its followers? And he adds that we are always happy when a Jew, without renouncing his or her Judaism, believes in Christ but we are sent with the mission to the Gentiles, not to the people of the Covenant; *Katechizacja – judaizm – ewangelizacja. Dokument Kościoła*, in: *Kto spotyka Jezusa, spotyka judaizm*, ed. S. Kołtan, M. Rosik, Wrocław 2009, 45. The argumentation of M. Czajkowski, however, is not entirely convincing. The author claims that the mission activity of the Church should be addressed to the Gentiles because in the missionary interrogative (Mt 28:16-20) the term *ethnē* is contained (the equivalent of the Hebrew *gojim*, "gentile nations"), not *laos* ("nation"). The Jews and the Church should only bear "witness," in accordance with the Ac 1:8: "but you will receive the power of the Holy Spirit which will come on you, and then you will be my witnesses not only Jerusalem but throughout Judea and Samaria, and indeed to earth's remotest end." This argumentation raises two questions: 1) does the giving of testimony not include the preaching of the Good News?, 2) can Jesus' command in Ac 1:8 be reduced to a testimony without the proclamation of the Good News, when Peter preaches it directly to the Jews who came to Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost? As it is only a testimony of life, devoid of active missionary activity, one must acknowledge that Peter was disobedient to the precept of Ac 1:8 when he delivered his first speech (Ac 2:14-36), and then the next speech after the healing of the lame man (Ac 3:12-26) and the speech before the Sanhedrin (Ac 4:8–22). Besides, it is enough to use Ga 2:7, where the apostle of nations directly states that he was entrusted with preaching the Gospel among the uncircumcised, just like Peter among the circumcised. The words refer directly to "preaching the Gospel" among the Jews, and not to providing testimony.

to; it was the "rest of Israel," to whom Messianic promises were given, stating that the chosen nation would share them with the Gentiles.[469]

According to the traditional views of theology, Paul's announcement of the salvation of Israel was interpreted as the ultimate conversion of all followers of Judaism to Christ and to the Church.[470] Today, however, when the simple theology of substitution, according to which Israel has been replaced by the Church, is no longer valid, many theologians are far from such understanding of the issue.[471] Other proposals are being made, of which one in particular is coming to the forefront. According to it, Israel will gain salvation not through conversion immediately preceding the Parousia but thanks to the initiative of God who is infinitely merciful. The key to such a concept is God's grace, given entirely for free (as the term *charis* indicates), unconditionally and without any merit of the endowed. It is also fully consistent with the Jewish tradition.

On the pages of the Old Testament, the formula "to win favour" appears about forty times, and the word "God" constitutes its direct object thirteen times.[472] This phrase belongs to courtly language; superior is always the one who shows grace to the subordinate. The relation between the king and his subordinate on the pages of the Old Covenant has its equivalent in the relation of God and man. The literary tradition of Judaism knew a few people who were said to have "won Yahweh's favour." This phrase first appears in reference to Noah. Human wickedness was great on earth "but Noah won Yahweh's favour." (Gn 6:8) The grace of God was revealed in the salvation of Noah and his whole family. The cause of receiving God's grace by Noah was his impeccable life: "Noah was a good man, an upright man among his contemporaries, and he walked with God" (Gn 6:9). Through Noah God makes a covenant with the whole humanity. Because it is a universal covenant, hence the "Seven Laws of Noah," known in the Jewish tradition, apply to all mankind:

(1) recognition of sovereignty;
(2) prohibition of blasphemy;
(3) prohibition of idolatry;
(4) prohibition of incest;

---

469 "Paul does not hold out a special way to salvation for Israel, he nevertheless sees Israel as occupying a special place. […] While Paul does not envisage a *Sonderweg* for Israel, he nevertheless assigns his own people a *Sonderplatz* within God's single program of salvation"; T.L. Donaldson, *Jewish Christianity, Israel's Stumbling and the* Sonderweg *Reading of Paul*, 52.

470 W. Chrostowski, *„Czyż Bóg odrzucił lud swój?" (Rom 11:1). Refleksja biblijno-teologiczna*, 54.

471 M. Czajkowski, *Czy Żydzi mają diabła za ojca? Przyczynki do dialogu chrześcijańsko-żydowskiego*, Warszawa 2013, 39–47.

472 G. Gerleman, *ms' – finden*, in: *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, ed. E. Jenni, C. Westermann, I, München 1971, 925.

(5) prohibition of killing;
(6) prohibition of robbery and theft;
(7) prohibition of consumption of meat with blood.

Similarly, Abraham "found grace" with God because He did not refuse his hospitality (Gn 18:3).[473] This fact was later confirmed by the announcement of the birth of Isaac. Here we should see the confirmation of the announcement made at the moment of entering into the covenant with Abraham: "Then taking him outside, [God] said, 'Look up at the sky and count the stars if you can. Just so will your descendants be', he told him" (Gn 15:5). Hittite leaders considered Abraham as "a prince of God." (Gn 23:6) Two features define the attitude of the patriarch to God: faith ("Abram put his faith in Yahweh and this was reckoned to him as uprightness"; Gn 15:6; cf. Heb 11:8), and obedience ("So Abram went as Yahweh told him"; Gn 12:4). For this reason the authors of the New Testament look on the patriarch as the "father of all believers."

Lot turns to God asking for mercy: "You have already been very good to your servant and shown me even greater love by saving my life, but I cannot flee to the hills, or disaster will overtake me and I shall die." (Gn 19:19) Lot accompanied Abram on the way to the land of Canaan (Gn 11:31) and to Egypt (Gn 13:1). When he settled in the land he had chosen, he offered angels his hospitality (Gn 19:1-3). Because of an immoral way of life of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, God decided to destroy the cities but he saved Lot's life. This salvation is seen as the grace of God shown to Lot. It was confirmed by God's consent to hear the request as to the place of escape: God agreed that Lot with his family would run away to Soar which he himself chose as his home.

Moses in the conversation with God refers to God's words: "You have said, 'I know you by name and you enjoy my favour.' " (Ex 33:12) On the basis of these assurances, Moses does not hesitate to ask God to accompany the whole nation across the desert. The construction of the Tent of Meeting and the prayers in it (Ex 33:7-23) show that the grace that Moses found with God was not a single act of kindness but it permeated the entire relationship of the Saviour of the nation and Yahweh. It is this relationship, full of intimacy and based on grace, that becomes the foundation of Moses' entire activity. It is him who marks the origin of the history of Israel. Also, to him God revealed his name: "I am who I am." It was through him that a covenant was made on Mount Sinai when the people of the Old Law received the Decalogue from God. Some prophets reschedule the moment of entering into the covenant to the moment of leaving Egypt. The moment of forming of the first covenant is seen by Jeremiah not in the revelation on Mount Sinai (Dt 5:2-5) but in the fact of the liberation from Egypt (Jr 31:32a; cf. 7:22;

473 According to Gn 7,15 the name Abraham was derived from *ab-hamon* ("the father of many nations"), however, the translation *abiram* ("my father is dignified") with the reference to God is also possible.

11:4.7; 34:13). This interpretation depicts Yahweh as a father who leads his son by his hand. Thus the grace of God encompasses the whole nation.

When David became the King of Israel, he proclaimed Jerusalem "David's City" and it became the political centre of the nation. After such an accurate move, the king decided to turn it also into a place of worship. Following the first unsuccessful attempt, he had to make the effort to bring the Ark of the Covenant to the city again. David was forced by Absalom to run away from Jerusalem and he could return there only thanks to the divine grace: "The king [David] then said to Zadok, 'Take the ark of God back into the city. Should I win Yahweh's favour, he will bring me back and allow me to see it and its tent once more. But should he say, "You displease me," here I am: let him treat me as he sees fit.' " (2S 15:25-26) The fact that the Ark eventually reached the Holy City is a proof that, because of David's faith, the Lord showed grace to him.

As it can be seen in the examples above, it was Noah who first found God's grace and with whom God made a covenant encompassing all nations (Israel had not existed at that time yet), and then patriarchs and the leaders of the chosen nation were granted grace: Abraham, Lot, Moses and David. One can assume that God will in the similar way offer his grace to the whole Israel at the end of time so that it can be saved. This does not mean, however, that there are two separate and equal ways leading to salvation, namely Judaism and Christianity.

The Eucharist – Nourishment for Christians and Scandal for the Jews

From the point of view of Judaism, it seemed impossible to accept the idea of eating human meat with blood. The corresponding imperative of the Law states: "you must not eat flesh with life, that is to say blood, in it." (Gn 9:4) At the same time Jesus strongly encourages his followers to participate in the Eucharistic meal: "In all truth I tell you, if you do not eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you." (Jn 6:53)[474] It seems that there are no written testimonies dating from the first century or from the first half of the second century (the charges against Christians of cannibalism were formed later)[475] which would directly echo Jewish objections against Christians, accusing them of violation of the aforementioned prohibition of the Law. It is difficult, however, to imagine a situation in which the followers of Judaism hear from Christians that they consume the Body and Blood of Christ and it does not cause scandal (cf. Jn 6:22-71). Thus,

474 Some translators try to render the words of Jesus more precisely, which makes the translation even more naturalistic: ["if you do not bite the meat of the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in you"].

475 Athenagoras, an apologist, refuted the charges in the work *Legatio pro christianis*; A.-Ch. Jacobsen, *Athenagoras*, in: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 83.

the question of the Eucharist may have been another contribution to the conflict between Church and Synagogue.

The statement that the feast referring to the messianic ideas was an absolute novelty in the polymorphous Judaism of the first century cannot be maintained. Analogous practices had already been known to the residents of the Qumran community. Joachim Gnilka argues that the Essenes as the first introduced the practice of a religious feast which, because of its messianic tinge, had some analogies to Christian celebration of the Eucharist.[476] However, this practice was known only in Qumran and was not generally accepted among the Jews. Moreover, it was entirely rejected when Christians recognized the Eucharistic feast as the highest expression of their religious practice.

It is possible that the fragment of the Tosefta concerning the sacrifices was written with the Christian Eucharistic cult in mind, or at least was interpreted in this way: "If meat is found in the hand of a non-Jew, it is permitted to derive benefit from it. [If it is found] in the hand of a min, it is forbidden to benefit from it. That which comes forth from the house of a *min*, indeed it is the meat of sacrifices to the dead (idolatrous worship), for they said: The slaughtering of a *min* is idolatry; their bread is the bread of a Samaritan; their wine is the wine of [idolatrous] libation." *(Hul.* 2,20.21) The term *min* is often used in rabbinic literature as a reference to Christians. If this is the case, then the Christian congregations are called "houses of idolatry" whereas "the sacrificial flesh for the dead one" would point to the Eucharist in honour of Christ whose resurrection was naturally rejected by the Jews. What is more, the phrase "Samaritan bread" may also indicate the Eucharistic bread as the Gospel of John contains a confirmation that the Jews (Judeans) called Jesus Himself by that name (Jn 8:48). The bread and wine in the minds of the followers of Christ were interpreted in relation to the Eucharistic sacrifice.

One of the earliest extra-biblical mentions of the Eucharist celebrated by Christians is a record contained in an anonymous work titled *Didache*, also known as the *Teachings of the Twelve Apostles*. This treatise was most probably created in Syria in the first half of the second century and it was included in the Coptic Church canon.[477] Researchers disagree about the extent to which the text refers to

476 J. Gnilka, *Pierwsi chrześcijanie. Źródła i początki Kościoła*, 426.

477 D. Flusser, H. van de Sandt, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 14. The authors of the book propose the thesis that the original text of the Judaic work, which could be called the "Treatise of Two Ways", was transformed by a Judeo-Christian into a work that eventually took the form known today as the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.* According to Jonathan A. Draper *Didache* represents "Christian Judaism"; J.A. Draper, *The Holy Vine of David Made Known to the Gentiles through God's Servant Jesus: 'Christian Judaism' in the Didache*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 257–284.

the Eucharist (some of them think that the reference pertains to the accompanying prayers) but the Eucharistic allusions and themes are quite evident there:

> And on the Lord's Day come together, and break bread, and give thanks, having before confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. Let no one who has a dispute with his fellow come together with you until they are reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: "In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles." (*Did.* 14)

A work created a little bit later, *Apology* by Justin Martyr, presents the pattern of a prayer gathering of Christians on Sunday. This pattern clearly distinguishes the reading of God's word (the author calls the Gospels the "Apostolic Diaries"), its explanation in the homily, in which parenetic elements also appear, the offering of bread and wine, thanksgiving by a priest on behalf of all, the moment of consumption of the Body and Blood of the Lord and sending out the Holy Communion to those absent for various reasons. At that time, the institution of the deacon was already widespread and had a clearly liturgical character. Justin Martyr also lays emphasis on the fact that the wealthier members of the community share with those in need goods necessary for living:

> And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen. and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need (*Apol.* 67).

It seems that in the targumic tradition we find traces of ironic Jewish polemics with Christians regarding the Eucharist. The targumist tries to explain a passage from the Book of Job which refers to the visit some friends pay to the main character: "The news of all the disasters that had fallen on Job came to the ears of three of his friends. Each of them set out from home – Eliphaz of Teman, Bildad of Shuah and Zophar of Naamath – and by common consent they decided to go and offer him sympathy and consolation." (Jb 2:11) The biblical text does not explain how the comforters of the tragedy-stricken Job learned about his misfortune. The

targumist tries to find the following answer to this question: "They saw that trees of their orchards withered and bread of their feasts became a living flesh and their wine came blood." The sign of withered trees understood as a bad omen is common in rabbinic literature whereas the reference to bread turned into meat and wine turned into blood seems to be, according to many researchers, an ironic reference to transubstantiation. Ironic because in this case it is a sign of misfortune and not of salvation.[478] A completely different understanding of the Eucharistic feast – which for the Christians was the deepest form of communion with God while for the Jews it was nothing more than an idolatry feast (later also recognized as cannibalism) – strongly influenced the mutual separation of both religious communities.

Sabbath and the Lord's Day

Similarly to the issue of the Eucharist, celebration of Sunday also stirred up trouble. Initially, the followers of Christ who originated from Judaism celebrated the Sabbath and Sunday as the day of the resurrection and Christophany which took place eight days after the Sabbath (this fact, according to most authors, laid a foundation for the celebration of Sunday).[479] This is clearly evidenced by a document known as the *Apostolic Constitutions*: "You shall observe the Sabbath, on account of Him who ceased from His work of creation, but ceased not from His work of providence: it is a rest for meditation of the law, not for idleness of the hands." *(Const. Ap.* II,36,2)[480] The order to celebrate the Sabbath appears here but, unlike in the case of the Jews, there is no obligation to abstain from work. The *Apostolic Constitutions*, however, is a relatively late work (perhaps coming even from the fourth century) but already in the New Covenant days, the "Lord's Day" began to replace the Jewish Sabbath: the Christians in Troada (Troas) used to gather for breaking of the bread on Sunday (Ac 20:7), and on that same day Paul commanded the collection of alms for the poor (1Co 16:2). In his homilies to the Book of Leviticus, Origen encouraged the Christians who were present in the synagogue the day before to come back on the following day – that is on Sunday – to

478 M. Baraniak, *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, 118–119.

479 The main reason for the replacement of the Sabbath with Sunday was already mentioned by St. Ignatius who made a reference to the commemoration of the resurrection which gave the day a joyful character; there is no fasting or kneeling on this day. Justin Martyr links it with the first day of the creation and St. Isidore of Sevilla, much later, with the arrival of the Holy Spirit; see entry *Niedziela*, in: F.L. Cross, E.A. Livingstone, *Encyklopedia Kościoła*, trans. T. Głogowski, II, Warszawa 2004, 342; L.T. Geraty, *From Sabbath to Sunday: Why, How and When"*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 256.

480 *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VII, *Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, 2 Clement, Early Liturgies*, red A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, Peabody 1999, 413.

listen to him.[481] However, things had already been quite different a century earlier in other parts of the empire. For Ignatius of Antioch, who died approximately in the year 110, celebrating Sunday was already a clear sign of the distinction between Christians and the Jews:

> Let us therefore no longer keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, and rejoice in days of idleness; for 'he that does not work, let him not eat.' For say the [holy] oracles, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.' But let every one of you keep the Sabbath after a spiritual manner, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in relaxation of the body, admiring the workmanship of God, and not eating things prepared the day before, nor using lukewarm drinks, and walking within a prescribed space, nor finding delight in dancing and plaudits which have no sense in them. And after the observance of the Sabbath, let every friend of Christ keep the Lord's Day as a festival, the resurrection-day, the queen and chief of all the days [of the week]. (*Ad. Magn.* 9,1).[482]

Abandoning of the celebration of the Sabbath for the sake of Sunday by followers of Christ must have provoked conflicts between the two communities. How did it come about? Did it only mean moving of the festive day from the Jewish Sabbath to Christian Sunday? Can one indicate the exact *terminus a quo* of the beginning of the celebration of Sunday? Or *terminus ad quem*, as far as the celebration of the Sabbath among Christians is concerned? The matter seems to be much more complex. Why? "Since the Sabbath and Sunday are not celebrations which functioned based on rivalry. This state existed at least until the institutionalisation of the fight against Judeo-Christianity."[483]

---

481 P. Landesmann, *Anti-Judaism on the Way from Judaism to Christianity*, 92.

482 J. Ratzinger – Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, II, 156. After: *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, I, *The Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus*, red A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, Peabody 1999, 62–63.

483 W. Linke, *Od szabatu do niedzieli. Ciągłość i nieciągłość tradycji świętowania*, in: *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Waldemara Chrostowskiego w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, II, ed. B. Strzałkowska, Warszawa 2011, 1021. The author incorrectly adds that there was no moment in the history of the institution when the Sabbath replaced Sunday; ibid. It is about replacing the Sabbath with Sunday, not the other way around. For more information see: S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, Biblical Perspectives 1, Rome 1977; J. Salij, *Poszukiwania w wierze*, Poznań 1991, 228–229; H. Witczyk, *Czasy święte*, in: *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, 288–306; H. Pietras, *Dzień święty. Antologia tekstów patrystycznych o świętowaniu niedzieli*, Kraków 1992; H.A. McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism*, Leiden 2001; P. Massi, *La domenica nella storia della salvezza. Saggio liturgico–pastorale*, Napoli 1967; R. Dufay, *Le dimanche hier et aujourd'hui*, Paris 1979; J. Lopez Martin, *El domingo, fiesta de los cristianos*, Madrid 1992; M. Augé, *La domenica. Festa primordiale dei cristiani*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995; O. Vezzol, *Domenica, giorno*

At the time of the nascent Church (and also earlier, since the beginning of the Hellenistic period), celebration of the Sabbath, along with preserving the dietary rules and worship, was one of the criteria for establishing the Jewish identity. Whoever obeyed the prescribed rules could be considered a righteous Jew but who did not observe the Sabbath, lost his Jewish identity.[484] The Jews secretly obeyed the Sabbath Law even in the midst of persecutions, as evidenced by the violation of the prohibition referred to by the author of the 2 Maccabees: "No one might either keep the Sabbath or observe the traditional feasts, or so much as admit to being a Jew." (2M 6:6)

The institution of the Sabbath was shaped gradually. It was a long process which grew stronger in Israel after the exile when some attempts were made to give the Sabbath as the festive day the air of antiquity. Then the Sabbath was set in theological *milieu*: in the work of creation (Gn 2:3)[485], in the Decalogue (Ex 20:8-11; Dt 5:12-15) and in the journey of the Israelites across the Sinai desert (Ex 16:22-30). This was when penal standards for infringement of the Sabbath were also established (Ex 31:12-17; cf. Nb 15:32-36). Some look for beginnings of the institution of the Sabbath in neomenia (the new moon), what was testified by prophetic texts (Am 8:5; Hos 2:13; Is 1:13), others in establishing of the identity of Israel (Ezk 20:12), and still others in connection with the Feast of Unleavened Bread or in celebration of freedom as the aim of the Sinai covenant (Ex 20:11).[486] A Jewish legend has it that Adam, the first man, when he learned that God had forgiven him his sin, on the day of the Sabbath intoned the first thanksgiving song, the Sabbath anthem.[487]

In the pre-exile time, practising of the Sabbath was irregular although, according to the author of the *Book of Jubilees*, the Sabbath had already been celebrated by patriarchs (*Jub.* 2,19-24). Strong rigorism in this respect was introduced by the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ne 10:31; 13:15-22).

Through the writings of Philo of Alexandria (*Decal.*102-105) and Aristobulus (*Aristobulos*, passage 5) the Hellenistic world could get to know the practice of the Sabbath. Philo, wishing to stress the importance of the day, called the Sabbath the "birthday of the world." (*Spec.* 2,59.70) For Ovid the practice is foreign and a little bit strange (*Rem. Am.* 220), for Juvenal it defines the Jewish identity (*Sat.* 14,96).

---

del Signore. Percorsi di lettura biblico–teologica, Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 4.2, Brescia 1998.

484 J.M.G. Barclay, *Diaspora. I giudei nella diaspora mediterranea da Alessandro a Traiano (323 a. C. – 117 d. C.)*, Brescia 2004, 413–414.

485 Celebrating the Sabbath is explained by the author of the Torah by God's need to rest after the work of creation. But God – in accordance with a thought recorded by Isaiah – does not have to rest as "He does not grow tired or weary" (Is 40,28); hence the Sabbath day was understood primarily as a reminder for man that God was the master of time.

486 W. Linke, *Od szabatu do niedzieli. Ciągłość i nieciągłość tradycji świętowania*, 1023–1025.

487 H. Daniel-Rops, *Życie codzienne w Palestynie w czasach Chrystusa*, 313.

According to Suetonius, it was obeyed very scrupulously by the Jews (*Div. Aug.* 76,2) and in the opinion of Seneca the Younger it managed to spread beyond the Jewish community (*Ep. moral.* 14,95,47).[488] However, Seneca was not in favour of the dissemination, which he expressed in *De superstitione*: "The customs of that most criminal nation (Israel) have gained such strength that they have now been received in all countries." (*De sup.* 14-15)

Tacitus is equally critical of the Sabbath celebration: "We are told that the rest of the seventh day was adopted, because this day brought with it a termination of their toils; after a while the charm of indolence beguiled them into giving up the seventh year also to inaction." (*Hist.* 5,5) The mention that the Jews fast on the Sabbath day (*Suetonius, Oct. Aug.* 76,2) was probably the result of a mistake by Strabo who confused refraining from work with refraining from eating (*Geogr.* 16,2,40). The misunderstanding of the customs of Jews living in the diaspora was not only limited to the allegations of idleness on the Sabbath days but it also comprised mockery of the refusal to eat pork or of the imageless worship of God, which was considered a form of atheism.

Such an attitude of the non-Jewish population towards the followers of Judaism was confirmed by Tacitus who claimed that they were charged with worshipping the head of an ass, accused of having been driven by pharaoh out of Egypt as lepers and of their hatred for all foreigners (*Hist.* 5,35). Tacitus mocked the Jews, claiming that they lost one seventh of their lives spending the Sabbath on inactivity and ate cold food just because Saturn was cold. In his work, Josephus presented a complaint of a Jew named Nicolas, who spoke in court in the presence of Agrippa and Roman officials:

> Now our adversaries take these our privileges away in the way of injustice; they violently seize upon that money of ours which is owed to God, and called sacred money, and this openly, after a sacrilegious manner; and they impose tributes upon us, and bring us before tribunals on holy days, and then require other like debts of us, not because the contracts require it, and for their own advantage, but because they would put an affront on our religion, of which they are conscious as well as we, and have indulged themselves in an unjust, and to them involuntary, hatred (*Ant.* 16,45).

The imperative to observe the Sabbath is confirmed by the apocryphal tradition: "He created heaven and earth and everything that He created in six days, and God made the seventh day holy, for all His works; therefore He commanded on its behalf that, whoever does any work thereon shall die and that he who defiles it shall surely die." (*Jub.* 2,25-26) The law of the rest is broken by "every man who

488 According to Jewish tradition the day of the Sabbath rest was established by God only for Israel, not for other nations: "The Creator of all things blessed it, but he did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone" (*Jub.* 2,31). See also: J.J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, BRS, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 2000², 6–13.

does any work thereon, or goes a journey, or tills (his) farm, whether in his house or any other place, and whoever lights a fire, or rides on any beast, or travels by ship on the sea, and whoever strikes or kills anything, or slaughters a beast or a bird, or whoever catches an animal or a bird or a fish, or whoever fasts or makes war on the Sabbaths." (*Jub.* 50,12-13)[489]

The Mishnah tractate *Sabbath* lists thirty nine activities which are forbidden on the Sabbath day. Among them there are ploughing, sowing, harvest, binding sheaves, threshing, selection of the seeds, cleaning grains, sieving, grinding, kneading, bread making, sheep shearing, leather bleaching, combing of materials, dyeing, spinning, three weaving operations, dissolving yarn, tying and untying knots, sewing, tearing fabrics, hunting, slaughtering, skinning, skin treatment and scraping, marking, cutting material, writing and wiping, building, destroying things, lighting and extinguishing the fire, hammering and finishing construction, carrying loads from the private to public places and vice versa.[490]

For the Jews the Sabbath was not only the day of rest and of worshipping God but it also aimed at the sanctification of a person: "And every one who observes it and keeps Sabbath thereon from all his work, will be holy and blessed." *(Jub.* 2,28)[491] Therefore the Sabbath day is "separated" (Hebrew *qadosh*) from other days, as the chosen nation is separated from other nations: "I will separate unto Myself a people from among all the peoples, and these shall keep the Sabbath day, and I will sanctify them unto Myself as My people, and will bless them" *(Jub.* 2,19).

Christian perspective on the Sabbath is based on the texts in which Jesus is seen as a Master of the Sabbath (Mt 12:8; Mk 2:28; Lk 6:5). The title "Lord of the Sabbath" is in contrast to the texts of the Torah in which, according to the Septuagint, God is the "Lord" (Gr. *kyrios*) of the Sabbath (Ex 16:25; 20:10; 31:15; 35:2; Lv 23:3). Contrary to the opinion of some researchers,[492] it should be stated that naming Jesus with

---

489 Many more examples of works prohibited on the Sabbath are contained in a passage from *Damascus Document:* "A long section outlines appropriate Sabbath observance (X 14 – XII 5). Sabbath prohibitions include such things as walking further than 1,000 cubits (X 21), eating that which is prepared on the Sabbath (X 22), drinking outside of the camp (X 23), drawing water up into any vessel (XI 2), voluntary fasting (XI 4–5), opening of a sealed vessel (XI 9), wearing of perfume (XI 9–10), lifting of stone or dust at home (XI 10b–11a), aiding a beast in birthing (XI 13a), lifting an animal that has fallen into a pit (XI 13–14), lifting a person that has fallen into a place full of water (XI 16–17), and having sexual relations in the city of the sanctuary (XII 1). These rigid demands are more or less like the Sabbath *halakhah* of normative Judaism outside of the Qumran community", S.T. Kimbrough, *The Concept of the Sabbath at Qumran*, RQ 20 (1966) 498–499.

490 Rabbis formulated the list of works prohibited on the Sabbath on the basis of biblical texts; N. Kameraz-Kos *Święta i obyczaje żydowskie*, Warszawa 2000^2, 29–30.

491 The day of the sabbatical rest was established by God only for Israel: "The Creator of all things blessed it, but he did not sanctify all peoples and nations to keep Sabbath thereon, but Israel alone" (*Jub.* 2,31).

492 For example Joachim Gnilka (*Marco,* Assisi 1991, 160).

this title has all the hallmarks of historicity because it is anchored in his public activity. Jesus' healing activity on the Sabbath day gave rise to objections of His adversaries (e.g. Mark 3:1-6; Luke 13:10-17).[493] The Jewish law was quite radical in this respect: only fatal diseases could exempt from the obligation to observe the sabbatical rest.[494]

One was allowed, therefore, to help a fatally ill person (*Yom.* 8,6) but, if we refer for example to the miracle of Jesus healing a man with a "dry" hand, the paralysis of his hand did not put his life at risk.[495] Referring to this rule Rabbi Simon b. Menasiah around the year 180 AD says: "the Sabbath is given to you but you are not surrendered to the Sabbath."[496] However, if the patient was not threatened by an immediate danger of death, the principle of sabbatical rest had to be maintained:

> How do we know that the risk to life abolishes the Sabbath? Rabbi Akiba says: 'If the death penalty abolishes temple service and the temple service abolishes the Sabbath, how much more the preservation of life abolishes the Sabbath.' Rabbi Jose Galilean says: When is it said? Therefore shalt keep only my sabbath (Ex 31:13), "only" shall distinguish. There Are Sabbaths when you rest and there are Sabbath when you do not rest (*Mekh.* Ex 21,12-17).[497]

It was, however, unacceptable to treat a patient in the absence of the threat to life. The regulations were so detailed that, for example, it was forbidden to soak the sponge to wash the wound with it but it was allowed to wash the wound with a sponge directly in the water because the sponge absorbed water in a "natural" way, and the action was not performed by the man *(Sab.* 12,14). It was not allowed to take vinegar into one's mouth to alleviate toothache but it was allowed to season the food with vinegar, hoping to relieve the pain (*Sab.* 14,4). Healing sick people on

493 J. Sauer, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mk. 3:1-6*, ZNW 73 (1982) 199–200; S.J. Stasiak, *Controversia in Galilea e guarigione dell'uomo con la mano inaridita (analisi sincronica di Mc 3,1-6)*, Antonianum 77 (2002) 637; P. Geoltrain, *La violation du Sabbat. Une lecture de Marc 3,1-6*, Foi et Vie 69 (1970) 87–89; S.H. Smith, *Mark 3,1-6: Form, Redaction and Community Function*, Bib 75 (1994) 164; E.K. Broadhead, *Teaching with Authority. Miracles and Christology in the Gospel of Mark*, JSNT Supplement Series 74, Sheffield 1992, 83.

494 L. Doering, *Sabbath Laws in the New Testaments Gospels*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 253.

495 M. Czajkowski, *Galilejskie spory Jezusa. Struktura kerygmatyczna Mk. 2,1-3,6*, Warszawa 1997, 154.

496 E. Lohse, *Jesu Worte über den Sabbat*, in: *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments. Exegetische Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, ed. E. Lohse, Göttingen 1973, 68.

497 After: M. Casey, *Culture and Historicity: The Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2.23-28)*, NTS 34 (1988) 1, 15.

the day of the Sabbath, and motivated by a desire to alleviate suffering, Jesus did not obey these special provisions of the oral tradition.[498]

Picking the ears of corn on the Sabbath was a similar case (Mk 2:23-28).[499] It was an activity forbidden in the Mishnah and this ban was also confirmed by Philo: "for there is no shoot, and no branch, and no leaf even which it is allowed to cut or to pluck on that day, nor any fruit which it is lawful to gather." (*Mosis* 2,22) Jesus, justifying the conduct of his disciples in the dispute with the Pharisees (it would be interesting to know whether in order to find themselves in the field on the Sabbath day they had not trespassed the rule of *techum shabbat* by accident), refers to the example of David. If one is looking for a reason justifying David's conduct, there can be only one: David was in danger of death because Saul kept pursuing him and the threat to life abolished the Sabbath commandments. Jesus, surrounded by His disciples, speaks of David and those "who were with him."

The evangelist, introducing David's companions to the scene, creates a clear parallel: David and people around him, and Jesus and his disciples. In this way, the disciples become representatives of the nascent Church, and the Christian perspective on the law of the Sabbath rest is anchored in the historical event in the life of Jesus and his apostles.[500] Probably in the eyes of the members of the Christian community, Jesus was even more entitled to such a conduct than David himself. The reasoning is based on the *a minori ad maius* argumentation. In this order Jesus exceeds David.[501] "A transgression for the sake of Heaven is equivalent to a mitzva not for its own sake," (*Naz.* 23,2) says a rabbinic maxim and it can certainly be referred to Jesus transgressing the law of the Sabbath.

Jesus himself never abolished the Sabbath and he never intended to do that. His voice was just a contribution to the then widespread debate concerning the ways of observing the sacred day.[502] One of his arguments was: "My Father still goes on

---

498 „Gesù ha occhi e cuore per chi è nella sofferenza; gli avversari sono [should be: 'hanno'; case – MR] occhi e cuore unicamente per muovere accusa a Gesù. E questa fondamentale divergenza trova nella scena come la sua consacrazione o manifestazione culminante: per una parte Gesù con gesto taumaturgico guarisce il poveretto, per altra parte i Farisei s'accordano con gli Erodiani per uccidere Gesù"; G.G. Gamba, *Struttura letteraria e significato dottrinale di Marco 2,23–28 e 3,1–3*, Salesianum 40 (1978) 573.

499 K.L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Berlin 1919, 92; M. Czajkowski, *Galilejskie spory Jezusa. Struktura kerygmatyczna Mk. 2,1–3,6*, 116; M. Casey, *Culture and Historicity: The Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2:23–28)*, 1; V.K. Robbins, *Plucking Grain on the Sabbath*, in: *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, ed. B.L. Mack, V.K. Robbins, Sonoma 1989, 113; A.J. Hultgren, *The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23-28*, JBL 91 (1972) 38–39.

500 W. Weiss, *„Eine neue Lehre in Vollmacht". Die Streit- und Schulgespräche des Markus-Evangeliums*, Berlin – New York 1989, 55.

501 M. Gnilka, *Marco*, 157.

502 E.P. Sanders notes: "Jesus behaved on the Sabbath in a way which fell inside the range of current debate about it, and well inside the range of permitted behaviour.

working, and I am at work, too" (Jn 5:17). With regard to the Sabbath, Jesus by this statement could have supported those followers of Judaism who were not rigorous about the preservation of the Sabbath rest because, while reading the first description of the creation of the world, they followed the Septuagint, and not the text of the Hebrew Bible.

According to the Hebrew text, well known in Palestine, God completed the work of creation on the seventh day, and then He rested: "On the seventh day God had completed the work he had been doing. He rested on the seventh day after all the work he had been doing." (Gn 2:2)[503] According to the "improved" text of the Septuagint ("And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because on that day he rested from all the work which he had done"; Gn 2:2)[504], God completed His work on the sixth day and then, on the seventh day, He took a rest.[505] Jesus, therefore, advocated the Hebrew version of the text, although the Greek version had been used in the diaspora for three centuries and it must have been known in Palestine as well.

Through the healings performed on the Sabbath, Jesus exposed himself to the sanctions provided by the Law: stoning for voluntarily breaking the sabbatical rest (Lb 15:32-36); the necessity of sacrifice for involuntary violation of the law of the rest (Lv 4:27-31), or even exclusion from the community (Ex 31:14-15). Presumably, at the time of Jesus, death penalty for violating the Sabbath was no longer applied, all the more that the Sanhedrin with the High Priest in the lead could not condemn anyone without the consent of the Roman Prefect. In addition, it should be remembered that Herod Antipas usually left religious issues to the local authorities which comprised priests, Levites and the elders in their respective localities. They constituted a kind of magistrate in which court cases were assigned to a group of seven selected persons (*Bell.* 2,571). Their competence was, however, restricted and they were not allowed to administer capital punishment.[506]

The record of Josephus is confirmed by the fragment of the *Damascus Document*: "If, however, a man desecrates the Sabbath or the festivals through (mental) aberration, he is not to be put to death. In that case, it is the duty of men to keep him under observation. If he recovers, they are to watch him for seven years, and only thereafter may he be readmitted to public assemblies." (CD

He is depicted as being queried about some of his actions, and about permitting his disciples to pluck grain when they were hungry; but he defended every case by some sort of legal argument (sometimes not a very good one), and there is no indication that his justifications were not accepted or that those who scrutinized him laid charges with the local magistrate. Other Jews disagreed about equally substantial issues"; *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, 23.

503 Translation after: *The New Jerusalem Bible*, London 1990.

504 The author's translation.

505 J.H. Charlesworth, *Did They Ever Part?*, 286.

506 E.P. Sanders, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, 18.

12,3-6) In practice the sanctions were therefore less strict than those suggested by the Torah. According to *Sab.* 7,1 a person who unintentionally transgressed the Sabbath, even many times, must offer sacrifice for his sins, but everyone who violated the law deliberately, for every violation of the Sabbath, ought to offer sacrifice for his sins. It is difficult to determine with certainty when such regulations came into force: whether it was so at the time of Jesus or whether this was the rabbinic interpretation of the Sabbath regulations.

The evangelists testify that on the Sabbath day Jesus not only participated in the synagogue service but he also took upon himself the role of a lecturer and a preacher (Mt 12:9-10; Mk 1:21; Mk 1:3:1-2;6,2; Lk 4:16-31;13:10). There are two arguments supporting the view that Jesus did not intend to replace the Sabbath: Jesus himself stated that He did not come to abolish the Law (Mt 5:17) and he used a statement known also in the Talmudic tradition that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." *(Mekh.* Ex 31,13 [109b]) The last argument indicates that Jesus was not opposed the fundamental Jewish theological thought relating to the Sabbath. The first Christians were faithful to the practice of celebrating the Sabbath through the participation in synagogue services (Ac 13:14.44-45; 17:2; 18:4). This list must also be completed with Acts 16:13 where it is stated that Paul came to the place of Jewish prayers by the river because there was no synagogue in Philippi at that time.

The theological reason why the followers of Christ began to celebrate Sunday is His resurrection which took place on the first day after the Sabbath. This is also when some of the Christophanies happened (Mt 28:9; Luke 24:13; Jn 20:19).[507] Moreover, the fact that Christ appeared to the apostles in the Upper Room "after eight days" (Jn 20:26) for many researchers constitutes an argument for the establishment of the cycle of Sunday celebrations. However, there was no clear transition between the celebration of the Sabbath and Sunday. At a certain stage of the development of Christianity, both days remained important, although, as mentioned above, Christians departed from celebrating the Sabbath in a Jewish manner. The *Apostolic Constitutions* confirm that:

> But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord's day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival. For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for Him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than His own creatures (*Const. Ap.* VII, 23,3-4).[508]

507 S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, 79–81.

508 *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VII, *Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, 2 Clement, Early Liturgies*, 475.

The earliest Christian text confirming the celebration of Sunday can be found in the First Letter to the Corinthians. In the final part of the letter, Paul encourages the collection of money to help Christians in Jerusalem: "On the first day of the week, each of you should put aside and reserve as much as each can spare; do not delay the collection till I arrive" (1Co 16:2). The Apostle does not mention the liturgical gathering on this day nor the fact that Sunday was a day of collection of donations or finances but it seems logical to accept that it was so.

Some researchers believe that Paul encouraged the collection of money on the first day of the week because then a budget was planned for the whole week. If nothing was put aside for the divine purpose on the first day of the week, it could turn out that little was left at its end. Besides, the collection could not have been ordered on the Sabbath because, according to the Law, trading was not allowed on that day. In order to respect the Law – as some scholars claim – Paul moved the date of the collection to the next day.[509] All these arguments are true but there is nothing in them that would undermine the thesis of celebrating Sunday during the liturgical gathering.

Another important text concerning Sunday celebration by Christians is Ac 20:7 where the phrase "breaking the bread," typical of Luke, appears (Ac 2:46; 20:11; 27:35; cf. Lk 24:35; Ac 2:42). This is a passage in which Luke uses the first person plural, revealing in this way that he was an eyewitness to the described events. Breaking of the bread took place on "the first day of the week" (Greek *mia tōn sabbatōn*). Eucharistic connotations here are not to be undermined although it is not entirely clear what the Eucharist of the early Christians looked like.[510] Luke most probably uses the Jewish way of counting time, according to which a new day begins after sunset; according to this measurement of time, he speaks about the resurrection of Christ in the Gospel, so here we should adopt a similar principle.

As the context of the story about the miracle in Troada confirms, the breaking of the bread took place in the evening (because Paul extended his speech until

509 "Paul's mention of the first day could be motivated more by practical than theological reasons. To wait until the end of the week or of the month to set aside one's contributions or savings is contrary to sound budgetary practices, since by then one finds himself to be with empty pockets and empty hands. On the other hand, if on the first day of the week, before planning any expenditures, one sets aside what he plans to give, the remaining funds will be so distributed as to meet all the basic necessities. While it is difficult at present to determine what economic significance, if any, was attached to Sunday in the pagan world, it is a known fact that no financial computations or transactions were done by the Jews on the Sabbath"; S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, 96.

510 J. Miazek, *Msza Święta pierwszych chrześcijan*, in: *Eucharystia pierwszych chrześcijan. Ojcowie Kościoła nauczają o Eucharystii*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Biblioteka Ojców Kościoła, Kraków 1997, 30–32.

midnight), so it is most likely that it was Saturday just after dark.[511] It seems less possible that Luke uses the Roman way of counting time, according to which another day begins at noon. But even if it is so, it means that Sunday will last until noon the following day. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, the combination of the celebration of Sunday and the Eucharistic celebration is visible, and such a relation is confirmed by *Didache* (14,1).

Justifying the celebration of Sunday, researchers also eagerly refer to Rv 1:10 where for the first time in Christian literature the words "Lord's Day" appear (Gr. *Kyriakē hēmera*).[512] The proposals to see here the reference to the eschatological "day of Yahweh" or the signs of imperial worship in Asia Minor do not have sufficient grounds but it seems unquestionable that Rv 1:9-10 speaks of Church's liturgical gathering on Sunday. This belief seems to be confirmed by the above mentioned comment included in *Didache* ("every Lord's day gather yourselves together"; 14,1), the *Letter to the Magnesians* by St. Ignatius (9,1) and the *Gospel of Peter* (35; 50).[513] The author of the *Apostolic Constitutions* also encourages Christians to meet on Sunday:

> […] assemble yourselves together every day, morning and evening, singing psalms and praying in the Lord's house: in the morning saying the sixty-second Psalm, and in the evening the hundred and fortieth, but principally on the Sabbath day. And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus, and sent Him to us, and condescended to let Him suffer, and raised Him from the dead. (*Const. Ap.* II, 59,3-4).[514]

An important factor in the process of departing the Judeo-Christians from celebrating the Sabbath in favour of Sunday were the persecutions of the Jews by the Romans. After the first Jewish War which finally ended with the destruction of Masada (73/4 AD) and especially after crushing the uprising of Bar Kokhba, the

---

511 S. Bacchiocchi makes an assumption that: "We have reasons to believe that Luke uses consistently in his narrative the Jewish time reckoning. According to such a system, as we mentioned earlier, the first day began on Saturday evening at sunset, the night part of Sunday preceding the day part. The evening of the first day on which the meeting occurred would then correspond to our Saturday night"; *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, 99.

512 R.H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, I, Edinburgh 1920, 23.

513 M. Wojciechowski, *Apokalipsa świętego Jana. Objawienie, a nie tajemnica. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKBNT XX, Częstochowa 2012, 114–115. The author argues that the expression "Lord's day" may refer to the final times (the final judgement or the Parousia) or Sunday but he himself prefers the second option. A different conclusion was reached by S. Bacchiocchi; *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, 116.

514 *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, VII, *Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, 2 Clement, Early Liturgies*, 422–423.

followers of Christ – not wanting to be identified with the Jewish nation hostile to the empire – stopped taking part in the synagogue Sabbath cult. This process had already begun in Rome (already at the time of Claudius), where, as it has been shown earlier, Christians did not want to be associated with Judaism since about the middle of the first century. It must, therefore, be acknowledged that the factor linked to the persecutions of the Jews (which can be called political) had a significant impact on shifting the "holy day" from the Sabbath to Sunday. This process was much faster in Rome and the western parts of the empire than in its eastern provinces.[515] Moreover, since this political factor was combined with a more important theological one (the resurrection of Christ and the Christophany that took place on Sundays), it was in Rome at the time of Pope Sixtus (about 116-126) when the custom of celebrating Easter on Sunday was established, in order to distinguish it from the Jewish Passover.[516] The fact was not without significance for the consolidation of the tradition of Sunday gatherings of the believers of Christ.

Celebrating of Sunday could also strengthen among Christians in relation to the pagan cult of the sun. Researchers show that the cult was one of the strongest in Roman religion already in the first century BC. What is more, the practice of naming the days of the week after the names of planets was already established (the so-called "planetary week").[517] It was confirmed by the Roman historian Dio Cassius (*Hist. rom.* 37,18). In the second century of our era the cult became more intense under the influence of the solar religions present on the eastern boundaries of the Empire.[518] Justin Martyr, who sees the resurrection of Christ from the perspective of the new creation, alludes clearly to "the day of the Sun": "But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead." (*Apol.* 67) Of course, it was impossible for Christians to take part in astral cults, as they were explicitly condemned by the Fathers of the Church, but in the eyes of the Romans the fact of celebrating the "day of the Sun" in some way put the followers of Christ in a favourable position. Much later, the theological motivation for the celebration of Sunday was added, namely that in the New Testament Christ has been called the "the rising Sun [which] has come from on high." This conviction was expressed by the practice of orienting churches towards the East.[519]

---

515 L.T. Geraty, *From Sabbath to Sunday: Why, How and When"*, 259–260.

516 F.F. Bruce, *The Spreading Flame*, Grand Rapids 1958, 157.

517 It was confirmed by archaeological findings in Pompeii, a city covered with lava of Vesuvius in the year 79 AD; L.T. Geraty, *From Sabbath to Sunday: Why, How and When"*, 262; S.D. Waterhouse, *The Planetary Week in the Roman West*, in; *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*, ed. K. Strand, Washington 1982, 308–309.

518 G.H. Halsberghe, *The Cult of Sol Invictus*, Leiden 1972, 26.

519 This custom also comprised everyday prayers. F.A. Regan notices: "A suitable, single example of the pagan influence may have come from an investigation of the Christian custom of turning toward the East, the land of the rising sun, while

In conclusion, it ought to be stated that the custom of celebrating Sunday was not directly established by Jesus but was firmly anchored in the beginnings of the Church's mission. According to W. Linke, it does not mean that the Sabbath was supplanted from life and practice of the Christian community. It functioned at the theological and practical levels in various local churches, with different intensity and at different times and it always reflected the way in which a particular community considered itself to be a part or a successor of the Jewish religious community.[520] Only with time, most likely in the fourth century, the Church moved certain Sabbath practices to Sunday. However, this happened at the time when in many regions the Church did not have almost any bonds with the Synagogue.

Economic Factors

A certain *novum*, though not total, was the appearance of "itinerant teachers," imitating Jesus, who ordered the apostles to abandon the *stabilitas loci* and to preach the gospel to "all nations." (Mt 28:19) According to the missionary speech included in the Gospel according to Matthew (Mt 10), this style of life became a duty for some Christians. *Didache* created at the end of the first century says that if an apostle remains in a city for more than two days, he is a false prophet (*Did.* 11,5).[521] Those who had chosen the life of itinerant preachers of the Good News, often renounced family (cf. Mk 10:29) which was a total departure from the Jewish customs, according to which only in exceptional cases someone studying the Torah remained unmarried.

The common ownership of goods (Ac 2:44-45) and intentional poverty (cf. Mt 6:25-32) characterized lives of many Christians. This style of living also differed from the Jewish tradition in which wealth was an evident sign of the divine blessing. The New Testament and the Talmud (*Pes.* 8,7-9) confirm the practice of begging (especially by sick people) in the society of the time of Jesus (e.g. Mk 1:46; Lk 14:16). Christians, whose attitude to wealth was ambivalent (on the one hand they could exhort the followers to practise poverty, on the other hand they eagerly received support of the wealthy members of community; cf. Lk 8:3; 19:2; Ac 13:1), tried to abolish in the ecclesial community the practice of begging by

offering their prayers… For in the transition from the observance of the Sabbath to the celebration of the Lord's day, the primitive Christians not only substituted the first day of the week for the seventh, but they went even further and changed the traditional Jewish practice of facing toward Jerusalem during their daily period of prayer"; F.A. Regan, *Dies Dominica and Dies Solis: The Begginings of the Lord's day in Christian Antiquity*, Washington 1961, 196.

520 W. Linke, *Od szabatu do niedzieli. Ciągłość i nieciągłość tradycji świętowania*, 1032–1033.

521 G. Theissen, *Czasy Jezusa. Tło społeczne pierwotnego chrześcijaństwa*, trans. F. Wycisk, Kraków 2004, 21.

means of common ownership of goods and raising money for the benefit of the poor. What is more, both the poor and the rich joined Christian communities; the latter supported the former.

An example of such help is the collection organized by Paul for the poor in the Christian community in Jerusalem. The epilogue of 1Co contains the apostle's indications concerning the fund raising that should be made in Corinth (1Co 16:1-5). It seems that the collection was modelled on the temple tax paid by the Jews in the diaspora. Legal regulations specified that every follower of Judaism over the age of twenty should send one didrachm coin for the benefit of the Temple. The aim of the collection which was planned to be organized in the community was helping Christians in Jerusalem. Such help was the expression of unity that should prevail between Christians of pagan descent and Judeo-Christians.

As mentioned above, the fact that the collection should be made "on the first day of the week" confirms Christian custom of celebrating Sunday to commemorate the resurrection of Christ. Collected donations were sent to Jerusalem by representatives of the Corinthian community, along with letters to the Christians of Jerusalem. The Apostle mentions his commitment to organize the collection in Ga 2:10. This declaration was made before the authorities of Jerusalem community. Moreover, the practice of helping the poor became a noble habit of the early Christian groups. A large part of his correspondence with the Corinthians (2 Co 8:1 – 9:15) was devoted by Paul to this issue. This subject appears again in the Letter to the Romans (Rm 15:25-33). Organising a collection for the poor, Paul follows two criteria: donations should be a spontaneous gift of the faithful, and he himself should be beyond any suspicion that he would use the money to help other communities (2Co 8:20-21; 12:17-18).[522]

Pliny the Younger points out that among the followers of Christ there were people of various social status (Latin *omnes ordinis*; *Ep.* 10,96,9). According to the *Shepherd* by Hermas (c. 140 AD) the rich supported financially the poor and the last ones prayed for their benefactors. In Judaism the difference between the rich and the poor was much more evident, without mutual interpenetration of both strata. Such a state of affairs in a natural way stengthened the parting of the ways between Christians and the Jews.

Status of Women in Judaism and in the Early Church

It seems that in comparison with Judaism, Christianity improved the status of women in society and in religious communities. A number of factors contributed to this fact, among which the most important seem to be Jesus' teaching on the dignity of a person, continued by Paul's teaching that in Christ "there can be

522 H. Ordon, *Pawłowa argumentacja na rzecz niesienia pomocy potrzebującym*, VP 16 (1996) 75–83.

neither male nor female," (Ga 3:28)[523] the spread of Christianity in Hellenic cities, where women often gained a higher social status than in Judaism, and a total ban on divorce. In early Christianity, women could be leaders in communities (Ph 4:2-3; Rm 16), deacons (Romans 16:1-2), prophets (Ac 21:9) and missionaries (1Co 16:19; Rm 16:3-4).[524] In the case of Jesus, the novelty was that among His listeners were women who served Him (Mk 15:40-41, Mt 27:55, Lk 8:1-3). Jesus himself treated women with the same respect as men (cf. Jn 4:9.27; Lk 10:38-42).[525]

Such an approach to women and their role in everyday life differed significantly from the point of view presented by the patriarchal Jewish society, which, in turn, strengthened the separation of the Jewish and Christian communities.[526] Although the Old Testament does not contain passages that would explicitly justify the right of men to dominate over women, in practice the situation was quite different.[527] When a boy was born into a family, joy accompanied his birth. This was not always the case in the event of the birth of a girl. Besides, a daughter was treated almost as her father's possession.[528] After all, even in the Decalogue a wife is listed alongside objects and animals (Ex 20:17; Dt 5:21). A woman often addressed her husband, calling him her "owner" and the "lord."

The specific dominance of men over women was reflected in the architecture of the Temple. Women were assigned a special courtyard which they were not allowed to transgress and during the monthly impurity or after childbirth they were not allowed to cross the threshold of even this courtyard. After the end of the period of impurity following childbirth, a woman had to perform a special rite of purification, described by the Jewish Code *Shulchan Aruch*. According to it, a woman had to immerse in water her whole body, together with her hair. During

523 Others explain: "There are no longer male and female elements." Such translation is based not only on the text of Paul, but also refers to Gn 1:27, where the author states that God created man as "male and female."

524 An extensive study on the position of women in early Church was written by Jan Załęski, a professor at UKSW (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University) in Warsaw. Emphasizing the active involvement of women in the life of ecclesial communities, he refers with great scepticism to the opinion according to which the biblical texts clearly speak of woman's diaconate; J. Załęski, *Obraz kobiety w listach Nowego Testamentu*, Ząbki 2005, 444.

525 V. Abrahamsen, *Kobiety*, in: *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, 310–312.

526 M. Crüsemann, *Irredeemably Hostile to Women: Anti-Jewish Elements in the Exegesis of the Dispute About Women's Right to Speak (1 Cor. 14.34-35)*, JSNT 79 (2000) 20; M. Crüsemann, *Unrettbar frauenfeindlich: Der Kampf um das Wort von Frauen in 1 Kor 14 (33b)34-35 im Spiegel antijudaistischer Elemente der Auslegung*, in: *Von der Wurzel getragen: Christlich-feministische Exegese in Auseinandersetzung mit Antijudaismus*, ed. L. Schottroff, M.-T. Wacker, BIS 17, Leiden 1996, 199–200.

527 M. Bednarz, *Biblia na cenzurowanym*, Szczecinek 2006, 304.

528 R. Marcinkowski, *Kobieta i mężczyzna w ujęciu Talmudu*, SJ 5 (2002) 2 – 6 (2003) 1, 29.

the immersion she should not be wearing anything that would separate her body from the water; if it happened the *tewila* was invalid.[529]

Women were appointed a separate place not only in the Temple but also in synagogues (Dt 31:12). According to the Talmud, women are exempt from obeying orders given in the form of "must" or "should," (*Kid.* 1,7) as well as the obligation to say everyday prayers and learn the Law. Women were also under no obligation to take part in the pilgrimage to Jerusalem during the *regalim* – pilgrimage festivals which included Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles. They were also released from the imperative to live in tents during the latter. As a justification for exempting them from many religious duties, rabbis sometimes referred to the amount of work related to running a house and bringing up children.[530]

Philo of Alexandria noted: "Women are best suited to indoor life which never strays from the house…" (*Spec.* 3,169) In *Hypothetica*, he indicates that women should remain in a subservient position to men (7, 3). According to Josephus a woman is "worse" than a man (*Ap.* 02,24). Statements concerning women included in the Talmud express a similar attitude, for example: "What a woman desires the most are ornaments" (*Ket.* 65); "women are lazy" (*Pes.* 1); "women are talkative" (*Ber.* 48); "ten measures of speech were given to the world, and nine of them were allocated to women" (*Kid.* 9); "women are mindless" (*Sab.* 33); "When Rav was taking leave of his uncle and teacher, Rabbi Ḥiyya, […] said to him: May the Merciful One save you from something that is worse than death. Is there anything that is worse than death? He went, examined the sources, and found the following verse: And I find woman is more bitter than death." (*Jew.* 63)

In early phases of Israel's religious development, Jewish men could have relations with pagan women but, with the development of their religiosity, a ban on "cursed women" was introduced. Until the time of the Babylonian exile, the Amorite and the Moabite women were considered to be cursed, and later all women of pagan origin were treated in the same way. Esdras and Nehemiah introduced a total ban on mixed marriages during the reforms carried out after their return from exile (Ezr 9:12). This prohibition became one of the causes of the conflict between the descendants of the exiles and the inhabitants of Samaria. The author of the apocryphal *Book of Jubilees* proposed death penalty for men breaking the

529 The impurity of woman after birth depended on the gender of the infant. After the birth of a boy, the mother could not approach the Temple or touch the objects of worship for forty days but after the birth of a girl – for eighty days. The adequate imperative stated: "If a woman becomes pregnant and gives birth to a boy, she will be unclean for seven days […] and she will wait another thirty-three days for her blood to be purified. She will not touch anything consecrated nor go to the sanctuary until the time of her purification is over" (Lv 12:2–4).

530 A. Cohen, *Talmud. Syntetyczny wykład na temat Talmudu i nauk rabinów dotyczących religii, etyki i prawodawstwa*, 172. According to other rabbis, women should assume the same religious obligations as men; H. Daniel-Rops, *Force in Palestine in times of Christ*, 118.

ban on mixed marriages: "And if there is any man who wishes in Israel to give his daughter or his sister to any man who is of the seed of the Gentiles he shall surely die, and they shall stone him with stones; for he hath wrought shame in Israel; and they shall burn the woman with fire, because she has dishonoured the name of the house of her father." (*Jub.* 30,7)

In the eyes of the Law women and men who committed adulteries were treated differently. Originally, for adultery a woman used to be sentenced to death by stoning; the same was true of a fiancée whose unfaithfulness towards her finance was proven (Dt 22:21.23-24). With time the punishment was softened. In Jesus' time, a woman's adultery most often resulted in a divorce and sometimes a husband was able forgive his wife. A man was punished for adultery only if he violated the law of his neighbour (Dt 22:22; Lv 20:10). In turn, when he committed this transgression with an unmarried woman, he was not punished at all.

The child conceived during the engagement period was considered to be legitimate. The situation of slaves, however, was different. Their master could sell them in the same way as he could sell his daughter (Ex 21:7). He could not sell his wife, even if she was taken as a captive woman (Dt 21:14). When a man intended to get divorced, he had to give to his wife the bill of divorce (Dt 24:1).[531] This law indicates the development of legislative procedures which were more developed and advanced in Israel than in other countries of the ancient Middle East where divorce was granted orally without the need to write a document. After the divorce, a woman retained the partial right to keep the mohar (Jos 15:19; Jg 1:15).

The divorce practice was based on a legal provision: "Suppose a man has taken a wife and consummated the marriage; but she has not pleased him and he has found some impropriety of which to accuse her; he has therefore made out a writ of divorce for her and handed it to her and then dismissed her from his house." (Dt 24:1) Rabbinic schools interpreted the verse Dt 24:1 in various manners, pondering over the interpretation of the words "some impropriety." Hillel's school permitted a divorce in the case of the wife's adultery, and even for more trivial reasons (e.g. general negligence of wife's duties, improper behaviour, or even inappropriate preparation of meals). Shammai taught that the sufficient reason for a divorce was the wife's immorality understood generally, with the sin of adultery in mind. Usually, it was Shammai who was considered to be more conservative than liberal Hillel. Nevertheless, in practice it appears to be exactly the opposite. Hillel, allowing to sue for divorce for trivial reasons, condemns the dismissed wife to neglect and deprives her of the means to survive, thus worsening the already low social status of woman. Shammai, who approaches the divorce law in a more strict manner, defends the wife who, even if she does not meet her husband's expectations, cannot be repudiated for any reason. In this way he stands up for the rights

531 A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 142.

of women.[532] The most liberal views on divorce were presented by Rabbi Akiba's school, according to whom any reason which the husband considered to be sufficient could be the reason for divorce.[533]

Jesus' prohibition of divorces (Mt 5:32; 19:9) becomes the next step distancing the Church from the Synagogue.[534] It is true that some doubt may be cast by the alleged exception concerning divorce ("except for the case of an illicit marriage") but the excerpt should be interpreted correctly in the Jewish context as the Gospel according to Matthew was written by a Jew for Christians of Jewish origin.[535] The

532 Peter J. Tomson notes: "One of the paradoxes is in the configuration of opinions of Shammaites and Hillelites. In principle, it seems simple: the latter allowed divorce in its undiluted patriarchal, ancient near-eastern form, while the former considered it a last resort when marriage has broken down in adultery. The paradox is revealed when we realize that otherwise the Shammaites appeared to be the more conservative, literalist, and rigid, and the Hillelites, innovative, open-minded, and humane. In the area of divorce it somehow works out the opposite, if we consider the position of women. The school of Shammai limits male power and protect the woman, although as stated it is not at all likely that they were motivated by ideas of legal equality. In contrast, the more "enlightened" school of Hillel leave men almost unlimited power to dispose of their women"; P.J. Tomson, *Divorce Halakhah in Paul and the Jesus Tradition*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 326.

533 S. Ruzer, *Mapping the New Testament. Early Christian Writings as a Witness for Jewish Biblical Exegesis*, 138.

534 P.J. Tomson is of a different opinion: „Divorce law did become a conflict area between Jews and Christians"; P.J. Tomson, *Divorce Halakhah in Paul and the Jesus Tradition*, 290. However, it seems that this point of view is to a large extent linked to his confession. As a protestant recognising divorces, he argues that this issue has been the subject of a lively interest only in ecclesiastical circles and this interest was intensified only during the time of the Reformation. In relation to evangelical texts and fragments of Paul's letters, where reference is made to divorces, the author notes: "While these texts did not become a conflict area between Christians and Jews, they did among Christians and, since Reformation, between Catholics and Protestants, as also among modern Catholics"; ibid., 292.

535 M. Czajkowski, *Czy jest antyżydowska Ewangelia najbardziej żydowska?*, CT 64 (1994) 43–44. "On the subject of divorce, the Matthean Jesus has a wholly independent viewpoint that stands alone in the first century. His halakhah against polygamy became the Christian norm, albeit often breached, but did not gain a position of authority in Judaism until the Middle Ages. His view that adultery alone is grounds for divorce was early reinterpreted by Christians. The more rigid the Christian community grew in the abolition of the right of divorce, the more permissive the halakhah became until the Hillelite-'Akiban 'easy divorce' became the Talmudic norm. R. Ammi stands as an example of a strand within Judaism that may have been influenced by Jesus' arguments against polygamy rooted in the order of creation"; P. Sigal, *The Halakhah of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of* Matthew, SBL 18, Atlanta 2007, 191.

Greek *logou porneias* is the literal translation of the Hebrew *erwah dabar* ("something repugnant"). "Harlotry" in the words of Jesus means the same as Hebrew *zanah*, immoral behaviour of an unmarried woman, behaviour about which the bridegroom had not been informed and which came to light after the wedding, and then the husband found it to be "something disgusting" (*erwah dabar*).

This understanding of the exemption mentioned by Jesus is supported by two texts from Qumran. In the first one a recommendation for the father-in-law can be found to inform the bridegroom about "all her [fiancée] deficiencies" (4Q271 1,1,8) and further the same text contains a command: "And any [woman upon whom there is a] bad name in her maidenhood in her father's home, let no man take her." (4Q271 1,1,13) The second text cites the Law: "[And it is] written [in the book of Moses] that you should [not] bring any abomination [into your home]." (4QMMT 81-88) Many interpreters prove that also here reference is made to entering impurity because of bringing home a woman in disgrace. Jesus' "case of an illicit marriage" means concealment of prenuptial sexual immorality which came to light only after the wedding. Therefore the exemption seems not to concern divorce but annulment of marriage invalid from the beginning due to concealment of the truth.[536]

The specific case of separation of spouses is the so-called Pauline privilege (1Co 7:15). It concerns the situation when one of two pagan spouses converts to Christianity. If the other spouse does not want to become the follower of Christ, such a relationship can be resolved. Since the Gospels do not contain definitive commands in this respect, the early Church had to settle such matters on its own.[537] *Privilegium Paulinum* is not in any way contrary to Jesus' teaching about divorce. At the same time, Paul does not encourage men or women to enter new relationships after nullification of marriage on the basis of the privilege mentioned above although it was obviously possible. The lack of such encouragement is a testimony to Paul's departure from the established customs of Judaism where the state of celibacy was not respected. Therefore, the different look on virginity and celibacy also led to the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue.

For Jewish women infertility meant the stigmatization on the part of the community for which childlessness was a sign of God's punishment (Gn 20:18). According to rabbis a childless man was equal to the one who died. When after ten years of marriage a couple remained childless, divorce was almost an obligation.[538]

---

536 Concealment of important facts which could destroy the life of a married couple also today in the Roman Catholic Church constitutes a factor contributing to the annulment of marriage; M. Rucki, *Czy Jezus akceptował rozwód?*, WPT 22 (2014) 1, 83.

537 J. Załęski, *Nierozerwalność małżeństwa według św. Pawła. O tzw. przywileju Pawłowym. 1Kor 7,10-16*, AL 16, Katowice 1992, 2–3.

538 The fact that Zechariah did not divorce Elizabeth despite her childlessness should be regarded as the expression of his noble attitude, which in this case was expressed in the opposition to the deep-rooted tradition.

In the eyes of the Jews, it was obviously the woman who was responsible for the lack of children; infertility of men was not even taken into consideration. However, it must be admitted that in the case of some abuses women were protected by the Law (Dt 21:10-17; 22:13-21.28-29). When an Israelite married a slave and then decided to give her a bill of divorce, he could not sell her as a slave. When he divorced a woman of pagan descent, the procedure followed the same rules as it would in the case of a Jewish woman (Dt 21:10-14). However, if rape was committed on an unmarried woman, the rapist was forced to marry her and was deprived of the right to divorce (Dt 22:28-29).

Josephus himself does not hold a high opinion of women, even if he tries to pay them compliments. He claims that a certain woman from Masada was ahead of other women in terms of skills and brightness (*Bell.* 7,399) but he never compares these skills and quickness of mind with the characteristics of men, as if assuming in advance that they are more intelligent and resourceful. According to him, evidence provided by women does not have any legal value, as they are thoughtless and impudent *(Ant.* 4,219).[539]

When Christianity, rooted in Judaism, expanded into the Greek and Roman world, it entered a culture which treated women in society a little bit differently than in the Jewish world. It should be remembered that Greeks as the first ones began to respect the monogamous character of marriage. Essentially, the aim of marriage was to increase the number of citizens. However, here people got married at an older age than in Palestine. Already Plato commented that:

> "A man shall marry when he is thirty years old and under thirty-five, bearing in mind that this is the way by which the human race, by nature's ordinance, shares in immortality, a thing for which nature has implanted in everyone a keen desire. The desire to win glory, instead of lying in a nameless grave, aims at a like object. […]but he that disobeys and does not marry when thirty-five years old shall pay a yearly fine of such and such an amount, lest he imagine that single life brings him gain and ease." (*Leg.* 4,721)

In reference to the age of girls entering into a marriage the same philosopher states: "The limit of the marriage-age [for a girl] shall be from sixteen to twenty years." (*Leg.* 6,785) As far as the degree of affinity between the spouses is concerned, there were sometimes marriages among the Gentiles between step-siblings from the same father. In the same way as in Judaism, lack of children and infidelity were considered to be a sufficient reason for getting divorced (but in fact only a wife's treachery used to be punished). However, unlike in Jewish communities, a woman could also file for divorce. When a husband decided to get divorced, he sent a woman back home to her father or guardian, returning the dowry. When a

539 F.H. Feldman, *Judaizm palestyński i diaspory w I wieku*, in: *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, 45.

wife filed for divorce, she used to go to the archon of the city and had to provide reasons for her decision in writing. If a husband accepted this decision, divorce was granted immediately; if he had objections, legal proceedings were initiated, which usually concerned the division of their property.[540]

In the Roman society fathers had authority over their families as *patres familias*. Women had to satisfy the following requirements: "[…] A wife ought not therefore to put her trust in her dowry, or family, or beauty, but in matters that more vitally concern her husband, namely, in her disposition and companionableness and complaisance with him, not to make every-day life vexatious or annoying, but harmonious and cheerful and agreeable."[541] After getting married, a woman passed from her father's power under the authority of her husband (*conventio in manum*). However, there were cases when a woman was still under her father's authority (*sine conventione in manum*); then she kept the law of succession, lived in her father's house, and sexual intercourses with her husband took place by mutual agreement.

In the case of *conventio in manum* there were three forms of legal marriage contracts: *coemptio* (the form of "buying" in the presence of five witnesses; however, the sale was symbolic), *usus* (the customary law under which a woman lived with her husband in his house for a year, not being able to leave it for more than three nights; if she did not want to marry the man, she used to leave her husband's house for more than three nights), and *confarreatio* (the official form of getting married, which later displaced the other two).

There were two types of divorce: *repudium*, that is, the break of the marriage by one of the parties, and the *divortium*, made with the consent of the two spouses. In the case of a marriage concluded by *coemptio* or *usus*, the divorce was very simple: a husband openly sent his wife back home to her father, saying words: *tuas res habeto, vade foras* ("take your things and get out"). However, if the marriage was contracted with the use of the solemn procedure (*confarreatio*), all legal formalities had to be completed. It should also be mentioned that women did not have civil rights in Rome (*nulla comitiorum communio*) but they enjoyed more liberties than women in Greece.[542]

In Church community, the attitude towards women was anchored in the conduct and teaching of Jesus, which in the Palestinian environment was new in comparison with Judaism, and which was also well adapted to the Greco-Roman environment.

---

540 L. Winniczuk, *Ludzie, zwyczaje i obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa 2006, 173–193.

541 A fragment from Plutarch; cf. L. Winniczuk, *Ludzie, zwyczaje i obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, 195.

542 According to Columella, an author living in the first century, men were fit for agriculture and public activities, while women were fit for domestic affairs. L. Winniczuk, *Ludzie, zwyczaje i obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, 196.

This brief juxtaposition shows that the perception of women and their role in the ecclesial community differed significantly from the perception of women in Judaism (and in the Greco-Roman world) which naturally might have contributed to the parting the ways between the two religious communities.

The Status of Slaves

The institution of slavery known in the Hellenistic and Judaic environments, in Christianity was also redefined. In the first century AD slavery still thrived in Israel.[543] This fact is certified by the Gospels (Lk 7:1-10; 12:37-46; Mt 26:51; 24:45-51; 25:14-30). The situation of the slaves in Israel was slightly different from the situation of slaves in other countries of the ancient Middle East.[544] This difference was justified theologically: Israel should remember that as a nation it experienced Egyptian captivity and had been wonderfully released thanks to the intervention of God (Ex 22:20; Lv 25:42.55; Dt 15:15).

It seems that the fate of the slaves in Israel was not as heavy as in the neighbouring countries. At least this was the requirement of the Law according to which e.g. the daily working time should not exceed ten hours and work could only be performed during the day. The meticulousness of concessions applied to Jewish slaves ultimately led to the situation when their maintenance cost more than the maintenance of hired workers.[545] However, if the Jews of the first centuries decided to keep slaves, they almost constituted a part of their family. They mainly provided household services and the relations with other family members were similar to those between wife and husband, father and child or a student and a teacher. On the other hand, some of them were sexually abused and despised.[546]

---

543 M. Filipiak, *Problematyka społeczna w Biblii*, Warszawa 1985, 43; A. Kondracki, *Niewolnicy w Starym i Nowym Testamencie*, in: *Życie społeczne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1998, 269; I. Jaruzelska, *Własność w prawie biblijnym*, Warszawa 1999, 66.

544 „Le leggi israeliani sugli schiavi erano particolari riguardo agli altri popoli del Medio-Oriente antico: se qualcuno aveva acquistato uno schiavo ebreo, egli doveva servire per sei anni e nel settimo poteva andarsene libero"; M. Rosik, I. Jaruzelska, *Własność w prawie biblijnym*, Warszawa 1992 [rec.]; ŻK 4 (42) 2003, 95.

545 F. Gryglewicz, *Najemny robotnik w Palestynie za czasów Chrystusa Pana*, Lublin 1951, 103.

546 "In late antiquity most of the slaves owned by Jewish slave owners in Roman Palestine seem to have been domestic slaves. These slaves formed an integral part of the Jewish household and played an important role within the family economy. In a number of respects the master-slave relationship resembled the wife-husband, child-father, and student-teacher relationships, and affectionate bonds between the slave and his master (or nursling) would have an impact on relationships between other members of the family. Master and slave were linked to each other through mutual ties of dependency which counteracted the basic powerlessness of slaves. On the other hand, slaves had to suffer sexual exploitation and were considered

In the Old Covenant times, foreign slaves were acquired as a result of warfare (Nb 31:9; Dt 20:10-18; Jg 5:30; Nb 31:26-47) or in the course of trade exchange (Gn 17:12; 37,28-36). In addition, due to the insolvency of debt, the creditor could make the debtor perform forced labour (Ex 21:2-11; Lv 25:39). At the same time the law imposed death penalty on those who abducted someone to sell him or her as a slave (Ex 21:16).[547] A clear distinction was made between the slaves acquired and those who were born in the master's house (Gn 17:12.23.27; Lv 22:11); the latter automatically became slaves.

All slaves who were at the family's service participated to a certain degree in the life of the family. They should be circumcised but if they failed to meet the demand in the course of one year, they should be sold to the pagans. They were obliged to observe the Sabbath rest (Ex 20:10; Dt 5:14) and to celebrate other feasts (Dt 16:11-14). When their master left an inheritance, they were automatically set free. The same happened when, with the consent of their owner, they were married to a free person. In addition to the slaves working for private owners, in Israel there were also state slaves, some of whom were employed at the royal court, others in the Temple (1K 9:21; Lb 31:25-47; Jos 9:23).

The institutions of the sabbath year and the year of Jubilee were supposed to help establish social equality in Israel. Each seventh year was celebrated as sabbatical (Lv 25:4).[548] With regard to the slaves the legislation ordered: "When you buy a Hebrew slave, his service will last for six years. In the seventh year, he will leave

---

honourless. Rabbinic sources reveal both similarities and differences between Jewish and Graeco-Roman attitudes toward slaves. The Jewish view of the master-slave relationship also served as the basis for its metaphorical use"; C. Hezser, *The Impact of Household Slaves on the Jewish Family in Roman Palestine*, JSJ 34 (2003) 4, 375.

547 T. Hergesel, *Rozumieć Biblię*, I, *Stary Testament. Jahwizm*, Kraków 1992, 305; H. Zmarlicki, *Dekalog dawniej i dziś*, Kraków 2000, 78.

548 This fact indicates that for Israelites the number seven organized not only the time within the week but also over the years; J. Klinkowski, *Aktualizacja biblijnej idei jubileuszów*, in: *Na progu trzeciego tysiąclecia. Refleksja teologiczna w środowisku legnickim*, ed. B. Drożdż, Legnica 2001, 119. In an ancient hymn in honour of Šulga, the King of Ur, Sumer and Akkad (around 2045–2000 BC), the number seven is used with symbolic meaning: "seven winds swallowed the sky"; M. Bielecki, *Zapomniany świat Sumerów*, Warszawa 1996, 151. Josephus, explaining the meaning of the seven-armed candlestick, refers to the belief of the existence of seven planets whose light is reflected in the lights of the menorah (*Ant.* 3,7). A similar idea is reflected in the architectural shape of Babylonian *ziggurats* generally consisting of seven storeys; A. Läpple, *Od Księgi Rodzaju do Ewangelii. Wprowadzenie do lektury Pisma świętego*, trans. J. Zychowicz, Kraków 1983, 136; H. Lempa, *Ojcowska miłość Boga wobec swojego ludu w świetle starotestamentowego prawodawstwa jubileuszowego*, in: *Ojciec – Bóg. Materiały z IV Forum popularyzacji teologii i kultury chrześcijańskiej (Wrocław – Kiełczów, 11. grudnia 1999 r.)*, ed. S. Rosik, Wrocław 2000, 10.

a free man without paying compensation." (Ex 21:2)[549] This order was not always applied in practice. Jeremiah complained about the fact that: "All the chief men and all the people who had entered into the covenant had agreed that everyone should free his slaves, men or women, and no longer keep them as slaves […] Afterwards, however, they changed their minds, recovered the slaves, men and women, whom they had set free, and reduced them to slavery again." (Jr 34:8-11) In addition, it is not known for sure whether at the beginning of this institution, all Israelites celebrated one and the same sabbatical year, or whether each owner appointed his own sacred time. The case is similar with the institution of the year of Jubilee celebrated every fifty years. Actually, there is no clear information on how the law related to this year was applied in practice.

In the light of Christianity, there is no longer any difference between a servant and a free man (Ga 3:28; 1Co 12:13; Col 3:11) although the institution itself was not abolished. The New Testament admonishes slaves not to make use of their new status but to perform their work with care. The masters are reminded to treat their slaves with kindness and benevolence (for example Phm 16-17).[550] The Letter to Philemon is a meaningful testimony of the evolution of the Christian attitude to slaves. The phenomenon was processual in character. Abandoning *de facto* the traditional interpretations of the letter, according to which the slave Onesimus was an escapee from the house of his master Philemon because he had committed a crime, the authors propose a new perspective.

There is not enough evidence in the letter to claim that Onesimus escaped from his master's house or to justify the thesis that he had committed a crime there. It is possible, therefore, that the reasons for the dismissal of Onesimus from Philemon's house should be sought on the spiritual level. Even a cursory reading of the letter shows that Philemon was a Christian strongly involved in the life of the Church (he was the "co-worker" of Paul and Timothy – Phm 1; cf. Phm 5:7). Onesimus, before meeting Paul, had almost certainly been a Gentile (Phm 10). One can assume it was important to a dedicated Christian like Philemon that his whole family (meaning *familia* which also included slaves), for which he felt responsible, should belong to Christ (cf. Ac 11:14; 16:33n; 18:8). The permanent presence in the house of the Gentile who apparently had no intention to convert to Christianity, could jeopardize his authority: not only as the head of a Christian family but probably also as the head of the local Church gathering in his house.[551] There is no reason to

549 C.J.H. Wright, *What Happened Every Seven Years in Israel? Old Testament Sabbatical Institutions for Land, Debt and Slaves*, EvQ 56 (1984) 129–135.

550 W.M. Swartley, *Niewolnictwo*, in: *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, 565–566. For more information on slaves in Judaic environment see: J. Comby [et al.], *Il mondo dove visse Gesù*, II, *La civiltà greco-romana e la civiltà giudaica*, trans. C. Palazzi, Bologna 2005, 99–115.

551 B. Adamczewski, *List do Filemona. List do Kolosan. Wstęp, przekład z oryginały, komentarz*, NKB NT XII, Częstochowa 2006, 37.

reject the presumption that Philemon knew Paul's teachings, according to which one should not harness himself in an uneven team with unbelievers (2Co 6:14-17), and that if so, it is highly probable that he decided to dismiss Onesimus and to take a Christian slave in his place. This practice was known to the first Christians (*1 Clem.* 55,2). Frightened by such a perspective Onesimus could resort to Paul for help. Instead of the expected mediation concerning the return to his master's house, the slave first of all received the gift of faith and then the gift of christening.

A different approach to the institution of slavery in Christianity and Judaism could have become the next breeding ground for the conflict between the two religious communities. To what extent this was the case, it is difficult to assess today because the source material directly related to this issue is not extensive.

Jesus and Judaism – Through the Eyes of Mark the Evangelist

The reflection concerning the relationship between Jesus and Judaism in his writing is made at this point of our study since we follow the traditional view on the dating of Mark's work, i.e. the sixties. Even if we assume that the Gospel had been written earlier, as some researchers suggest, it does not generally affect Mark's understanding of the relationship between Jesus and Judaism. It should be added that, most likely, Mark sees this relationship in the way Peter had shown it to him.

The bishop of Hierapolis named Papias, a student of St. John and a friend of Polycarp, is the author of the letter entitled *Logion Kyriakon exegeseis*, that is the "Explanation of the Sayings of the Lord." The document was written in the first half of the second century. Its author claims that the information and logia of Jesus contained in his work came from people who contacted presbyters, and those in turn had listened to the Lord's disciples. One of those presbyters passed on the tradition suggesting that Mark, being Peter's translator, wrote down all Jesus' speeches, as he remembered them, though not according to the order of their delivery. The Gospel of Mark, regarded as the oldest one, was supposedly created on the basis of the teaching of Peter. It seems that Papias' remark is an attempt to explain why Mark's gospel lacks chronological order in the presentation of the teaching material coming from Jesus.

Mark's Gospel was addressed to Christians living in Rome and the fact is significant for the presentation of the relationship between Jesus and Judaism in Mark's work. We can assume that in the Eternal City a large part of the Christian community descended from Judaism. Consequently, when the evangelist discussed the issue of Jesus' attitude to the religion of his ancestors, for the Judeo-Christians living in Rome the topic seemed extremely vital and applying directly the roots of their religiosity.[552]

552 Wayne-Daniel Berard is the author of an interesting book, containing many

The evangelist puts strong emphasis on showing the relationship of Jesus to the institution of the Temple (although for the Jews in the diaspora this institution was much less important than for the Palestinian Jews). On the one hand, Jesus recognizes the authority of this central religious institution, on the other hand, He shows his supremacy over the tabernacle. The disciples of Jesus should become the new Temple in which He is the "cornerstone." (Mk 12:1-12) Christian community should become the "house of prayer for all nations," and not "a den of thieves" (Mk 11:12-19) as the "Lord of the Temple" himself (Mk 11:1-11) reassures them. Church will be indeed the house of God for all nations when it builds its life on the basis of faith and forgiveness (Mk 11:20-25).

Faith should be expressed through total trust in God, following the example of the widow who got rid of all her possessions (Mk 12:41-44) for the benefit of the Temple. Jesus is not opposed to making offerings in the Temple; on the contrary, He recognizes their value and He himself participates in the *regalim*, i.e. pilgrimage feasts. He only warns against formalism and ritualism which lead to the neglect of inner life (Mk 7:9-13). It is about precedence of ethics over ritual. And though Jesus himself participates in the Temple cult, the announcement of the destruction of the Temple is at the same time the announcement of cessation of the worship in its current form.

Jesus also participates in the synagogue worship on the Sabbath day (Mk 1:21.29; 3:1)[553], although usually this presence is accompanied by controversy with religious leaders of the chosen people (Mk 1:21-28; 2:23-28; 3:1-6). Establishing the rule that "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," (Mk 2:27) Jesus proclaims himself the "master even of the Sabbath." (Mk 2:28) [554] But

---

popularizing elements, entitled *When Christians Were Jews (That Is, Now): Recovering the Lost Jewishness of Christianity with the Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge 2006). As the title suggests, the author encourages contemporary Christians to discover their "Jewishness."

553 Interesting observations on the attitude of Jesus to the Sabbath were made by rabbi B.L. Sherwin from Chicago. He claims that Jewish texts often compare the final Messiah, that is the Messiah son of David, to the seventh day of the week – Saturday, because the messianic era is described as the age of the Sabbath which will come at the end of the history of humanity. The day before Saturday is the sixth day of the week, in Hebrew *Yom ha-Shishi*. In Hebrew every letter is also a number. The Jewish mystical tradition ascribes great importance to numerology, i.e. the numerical value of Hebrew words. The numerical value of *Jom ha-Shishi* is 671. The numerical value of *Jesus ha-Notzri* – Jesus of Nazareth – is also 671. This is the numerological description of Jesus as *praeparatio messianica*; B.L. Sherwin, *„A wy za kogo Mnie uważacie" (Mk 8,29) – odpowiedź żydowska*, CT 63 (1993) 2, 23.

554 "In short, Jesus declared himself Lord of the Sabbath. He consistently rejected man-made Sabbath *halakhah*. He freed the Sabbath from human restrictions and encumbrances and restored it by showing its universal import for all men so that every person can be the beneficiary of the divine intentions and true purposes of Sabbath rest and joy"; G.F. Hasel, *Sabbath*, ABD V, 856; "There is no hint anywhere

Jesus' controversies concern not only the Sabbath rest but also other areas of religious life. These are essentially struggles with scribes who usually represent the Pharisaic current. Already at the very beginning of his public activity, the teaching of Jesus was marked by contrast with the teaching of scribes. It seems the emphasis on the fact that "unlike the scribes, he taught them with authority (Mk 1:22) is Mark's intentional editorial technique. Later the conflict only aggravates: Jesus is accused of blasphemy (Mk 2:7) and of keeping company with sinners (Mk 2:13-17) as well as the acting through the power of Beelzebub (Mk 3:22-28). Contrary to the teaching of scribes, Jesus' teaching is accompanied by "power" which is reflected, among other things, in the authority over the evil spirits (Mk 1:25). [555]

Jesus does not manage to avoid a conflict with other groups of Judaism, either. He refuses to meet the demand of Pharisees to demonstrate a sign (Mk 8:10-13), He warns against their yeast (Mk 8:14-21) and discredits them in the eyes of the witnesses of the debate on paying taxes to the emperor (Mk 12:13-17). To Sadducees, he shows on the basis of the Pentateuch, seen by them as the highest and only authority, that the rejection of the doctrine of the resurrection is groundless (Mk 12:18-27). In controversies with Jesus the supporters of Herod also appear (Mk 3:6; 12:13). Jesus, therefore, in the eyes of Mark, on the one hand is firmly embedded in the religiosity of his ancestors, and on the other hand, He questions some of the customs and traditions.

Mark decided to write a work in which he intended to show that Jesus was the Messiah (Christ) awaited by the Jews but also the Son of God, a figure who the Romans used to associate with the Emperor named *divi filius*. Actually, this is the Gospel about "Jesus Christ, Son of God." (Mk 1:1) In the first part of his work, the evangelist concentrates on gathering arguments in support of the thesis that Jesus is the Messiah – until the confession of Peter near Caesarea Philippi ("You are the Christ"; Mark 8:29)[556]; in the second part, however, he proves that Jesus is the Son of God – up to the confession of the Roman centurion standing in front of the cross ("In truth this man was Son of God; Mk 15:39). Thus, the intention suggested by the title of the work (to show Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God) finds its fulfilment first in Caesarea Philippi, and then in the scene of Christ's death, and

---

in the ministry of Jesus that the first day of the week is to take the character of the Sabbath and replace it"; D.A. Carson, *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, Grand Rapids 1982, 85.

555 On the controversies of Jesus with the scribes in the chronologically first Gospel see the profound study: A. Malina, *Gli scribi nel Vangelo di Marco. Studio del loro ruolo nella sua narrazione e teologia*, Katowice 2002.

556 In the first part of Mark's work a reader encounters the so-called "Messianic Secret:" Jesus commands his followers to maintain silence about His miracles and wants to hide his identity as the Messiah because the messianic idea was understood by the Jews in political terms. Only when at least partially the disciples understand that Jesus is the Messiah in the spiritual dimension, not political one, the "Messianic Secret" disappears from the Gospel.

is finished with a conclusion: "And the veil of the Sanctuary was torn in two from top to bottom." (Mk 15:38)

Some researchers claim that the above statement is the key to the interpretation of Jesus' attitude to Judaism. Why? As we know, the architecture of the Jerusalem Temple resembled concentrically arranged circles. The access to subsequent areas of the interior of the Temple was strictly reserved for particular groups of people: the Gentiles had to stay in the Courtyard of the Gentiles, the Jewish women – in the Women's Courtyard, the Jewish men – in the Men's Courtyard, only the priests and the Levites had access to the Priests' Courtyard, access to the Holy Place was restricted only to the designated priests, and the Most Holy Place could be entered only by the High Priest, only once a year, during the annual celebration of the Day of Atonement. The Israelites believed that God himself lived in the Most Holy Place. It was separated by a curtain from the rest of the Temple complex. Josephus informs us that on the fabric of the curtain a huge image of the whole vault of heaven was shown (*Bell.* 5,5,4). Thus the Most Holy Place (*Debir*) resembled a "little piece of heaven."

The symbol of the tearing of the curtain of the Tabernacle at the time of Christ's death symbolically expresses the truth that from now on God's presence is no longer limited to this most sacred place on earth. Everyone who accepts by faith the salvific fruits of the death of the Son of God has access to the Father – unlike during the entire period of biblical Judaism when only the high priest and only once a year was allowed access to God. The truth was confirmed later by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Under these provisions, priests go regularly into the outer tent to carry out their acts of worship, but the second tent is entered only once a year, and then only by the high priest who takes in the blood to make an offering for his own and the people's faults of inadvertence. By this, the Holy Spirit means us to see that as long as the old tent stands, the way into the holy place is not opened up… [Christ] has entered the sanctuary once and for all, taking with him not the blood of goats and bull calves, but his own blood, having won an eternal redemption." (Heb 9:6-12)

The tearing of the veil of the Tabernacle does not mean that the boundary between the sacred and the profane has been removed; instead, it means that God is not limited in His work to certain holy places, sacred times or rituals, and that man can come into contact with Him in any place and at any time. The tearing up of the curtain of the Tabernacle does not signify the end of worship, either, but only its change – the new cult will no longer be celebrated in the Temple of Jerusalem but in a temple formed by all the faithful led by Christ, the "cornerstone." The new cult will not be based on the principles recorded in the priesthood code but on sacraments emphasizing the primacy of ethics over worship.

Mark the evangelist gives an account of Christ's life, his activities, death and resurrection from the perspective of his own time and community to which his work is addressed. This means that the symbol of the tearing of the curtain of the tabernacle not only shows Jesus' relation to Judaism but also the relation of the Church to the Synagogue. The meaning of this symbol does not only indicate the

end of worship in the form of biblical Judaism[557] but also making access to God available to the Gentiles who, to a large extent, constitute Mark's community.[558] Along with the tearing of the Temple's curtain, the time has come of a Temple "not built by human hands" – the time of the Church open to everyone.[559] Also to the pagan inhabitants of Rome. How could the Romans read the symbol of the tearing of the Tabernacle's curtain? Josephus' description of the triumphal march of Titus entering Rome after the conquest of Jerusalem could be helpful in answering the question. Josephus arrived with his military leader in the capital of the Empire; he related the war procession with the loot in the following way:

> [Spoils] were carried in great plenty. But for those that were taken in the temple of Jerusalem, they made the greatest figure of them all; that is, the golden table, of the weight of many talents; the candlestick also, that was made of gold, though its construction were now changed from that which we made use of; for its middle shaft was fixed upon a basis, and the small branches were produced out of it to a great length, having the likeness of a trident in their position, and had every one a socket made of brass for a lamp at the tops of them. These lamps were in number seven, and represented the dignity of the number seven among the Jews; and the last of all the spoils, was carried the Law of the Jews. […] After these triumphs were over, and after the affairs of the Romans were settled on the surest foundations, Vespasian resolved to build a temple to Peace. […] in this temple were collected and deposited all such rarities as men aforetime used to wander all over the habitable world to see, when they had a desire to see one of them after another; he also laid up therein those golden vessels and instruments that were taken out of the Jewish temple, as ensigns of his glory. But still he gave order that they should lay up their Law, and the purple veils of the holy place, in the royal palace itself, and keep them there (*Bell.* 7, 148-162).

As a spoil of war the curtain of the Tabernacle was also brought to Rome, the same curtain which, according to Mark, had been torn forty years earlier. For Christians living in Rome this was a fact of the utmost importance. It was the Roman centurion who at the moment of Christ's death professed his faith in the Divine Filiation of the convict and witnessed the tearing of the curtain.[560] The fact of cessation of the worship in Jerusalem found its confirmation in the lodgement of the curtain

---

557 F. Watson, *The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme*, JSNT 24 (1985) 57.

558 P.A. Cunningham, *Jesus and the Evangelists. The Ministry of Jesus and Its Portrayal in the Synoptic Gospels*, 39.

559 J.P. Heil, *The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark*, CBQ 59 (1997) 98.

560 I.M. Zeitlin, quoting Bradnon, notes: "[…] the Roman Christians were encouraged to see in the Flavian triumph not a disturbing reminder that they worshipped a Jew executed for sedition against Rome, but inspiring evidence that Rome had fulfilled God's purpose, adumbrated in the rending of the temple veil and centurion confession"; *Jesus and the Judaism of His Time*, 133.

in the emperor's palace. The cult had lost its significance already at the moment of Christ's death.

Jesus' path towards the cross throughout His public activity was characterized by the confrontation of His teaching with the ideas of the religion of the fathers, with the traditions of Judaism and the beliefs of representatives of its various wings. Indeed, Jesus continues the tradition of fathers in many areas of His activity; the continuity is visible in His teaching methods, methods of the interpretation of the Bible or many beliefs expressed in teaching. Sometimes, however, this continuity is interrupted and then the Teacher of Nazareth exposes himself to the charge of blasphemy. Jesus breaks with the tradition of Judaism in those ideas in which they depart from the original will of God (e.g. the issue of divorce); thus he opposes oral *halakhah*, preached mainly by the Pharisees.

Jesus' internalization of moral indications is opposed to Jewish legalism; Jesus' spiritualization of the believers' approach to God is opposed to Jewish ritualism; Jesus' universalism expressed essentially in miracles performed on pagans and in the missionary imperative comprising "all nations" is opposed to Jewish exclusivism. Although in his views Jesus was closest to the Pharisees (not the Sadducees, the Essenes, the Zealots, the Herodians or the Sectarians), yet in the ideas preached by him, the accents are distributed differently than in their teaching, and even more in the Pharisaic praxis. The different accents can be presented schematically (and consequently with some simplification) in the following juxtaposition:

Areas of religiosity	**Pharisean stream**	**Christian stream**
Reference to the Law	Legalism	interiorization
Reference to God	Ritualism	spiritualism
Reference to the Gentiles	Exclusivism	universalism

Jews, Christians and Fire in the Eternal City (64 AD)

When his excellent diplomatic career on the territory of today's Turkey was over, Publius Cornelius Tacitus, a descendant of a high-ranking aristocratic family, pursued his writing aspirations in Rome. *Annales* were created probably in the years 114 – 117. In this work he shows the history of the Empire between 14 and 68 AD. His masterpiece, whose manuscripts are placed today in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence, was based on excellent source material, since Tacitus had direct access to the emperor's archives.

In *Annales* – as it has already been mentioned – Tacitus refers to the name of Christ only once, in connection with the fire of Rome on June 19, 64 AD, a fire that lasted for nine days and destroyed three out of fourteen districts of the capital. The author seems to share Nero's opinion when he writes that the Emperor put the blame for the tragedy on the Christian sect. Earlier, a rumour had spread that the emperor himself ordered to set fire to the town. Tacitus writes: "Therefore, to scotch the rumour, Nero substituted as culprits, and punished with the utmost

refinements of cruelty, a class of men, loathed for their vices, whom the crowd styled Christians. Christus, the founder of the name, had undergone the death penalty in the reign of Tiberius, by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilatus, and the pernicious superstition was checked for a moment, only to break out once more, not merely in Judaea, the home of the disease, but in the capital itself, where all things horrible or shameful in the world collect and find a vogue." (*An.*15,44) Suetonius places the same information in the Life of Nero: "Punishment was inflicted on the Christians, a class of men given to a new and mischievous superstition." (16)

Tacitus' mention of Christ and Christians reflects not only his own attitude towards the "disastrous superstition" but also the negative attitude of the Romans at the time of both Nero and Tacitus himself (the first two decades of the second century). From the historical point of view, the remark is important because it confirms the death of Christ at the time of Pilate and therefore dates it back to the years 26 – 36 of the first century.[561]

When the fire was consuming different districts of Rome, only fifteen years had passed since the infamous edict of Claudius. Tacitus confirms that Christianity was born in Judea. It is very likely that in the year 64 the Jews settled back in Rome and that the inhabitants of the capital city did not necessarily associate them with Christians. At the time when *Annales* were written, Christianity was already clearly separated from Judaism in Rome but it was not so obvious during the reign of Nero. In any case, among the tortured and killed "culprits" of the fire, there could have also been the Judeo-Christians. However, there was already a fundamental difference in the perception of Judeo-Christians in the days of Claudius and in the days of Nero. When Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome, Judeo-Christians were forced to leave the city, too. When Nero accused Christians of starting the fire, only Christians (including probably Judeo-Christians) were punished but the infamy did not encompass all Jews.

It seems therefore that at that time the differences between Christians and Jews were seen more and more clearly.[562] And even though the inhabitants of Rome were aware that Christianity originated in Judea, they did not identify it with the Jews living in the capital of the Empire. This could also result from the fact that the Jews found their supporters at the emperor's court. Nero's favourite and his friend,

561 J. Dickson, *Alla ricerca di Gesù. Le indagini di uno storico*, trans. G. Casella, Cinisello Balsamo 2011, 72–74.

562 For this reason Margaret H. Williams believes that in Rome the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue took place very quickly: "Separation of Christians from Jews, then, must have started extremely early in the imperial capital, if within a generation of the death of Jesus of Nazareth neither the common people nor the authorities had any difficulty in distinguishing between the adherents of those two closely related 'superstitions', as elite Roman writers disparagingly referred to them"; M.H. Williams, *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*, 152.

an actor named Aliturus, was a Jew. Empress Poppea Sabina[563] shared the fascination with Judaism with other women belonging to aristocratic circles.[564] Even Josephus himself, in his autobiography, admitted to having tried to help release his Jewish friends who were imprisoned in Rome:

> And when I had thus escaped, and was come to Dicearchia, which the Italians call Puteoli, I became acquainted with Aliturus, an actor of plays, and much beloved by Nero, but a Jew by birth; and through his interest became known to Poppea, Caesar's wife, and took care, as soon as possible, to entreat her to procure that the priests might be set at liberty. And when, besides this favor, I had obtained many presents from Poppea, I returned home again (*Vita* 16).[565]

The events relating to the city's fire clearly prove that the ways of Church and Synagogue were gradually departing from each other. The fact was recognized not only by Christians and Jews but also by pagan inhabitants of the empire. Looking into the future, we need to add, however, that although the difference between Jews and Christians was becoming more and more obvious, even a few hundred years later some authors used to link the two religions. It is enough to mention the fact that at the beginning of the fifth century Sulpicius Severus reported that Titus had destroyed the Jerusalem Temple in order to do away with the "religion [singular – M. R.]. of Jews and Christians" completely (*Chron.* 2,30). Obviously, Sulpicius himself distinguished between the two religions very well but it means that the outside observers of the empire's religious life were not necessarily fully aware of the differences between them.[566]

The question of certain predilection that some Christians had for the followers of Judaism in the fourth and fifth centuries is another matter. The fact is testified by the homilies *Against the Jews* of John Chrysostom in which he complained that some Christians still attended Jewish ceremonies and observed Jewish customs. It is not known, however, whether these Christians descended from Judaism, or

---

563 Poppea Sabina was initially Nero's mistress but after the emperor's divorce from Octavia, she became his wife. Prompted by her, Nero killed his own mother Agrippina the Younger. Subsequently, Poppea Sabina shared the fate of her mother-in-law: dazed with drugs, Nero beat her to death in the year 65. Poppea had, however, a significant impact on Nero – it concerned mainly nominations to high positions e.g. her protégé was Gessius Florus, prosecutor of Judea; L. Winniczuk, *Ludzie, zwyczaje i obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, 206.

564 M.H. Williams, *Theosebes gar en – The Jewish Tendencies of Poppea Sabina*, JTS 39 (1988) 97–111; T. Gruell, L. Benke, *A Hebrew / Aramaic Graffito and Poppea's Alleged Jewish Sympathy*, JJS 62 (2011) 52–55.

565 M. Starowieyski explains that in spite of antisemitism, widespread in the Mediterranean world, Judaism lured and intrigued the pagans and it reached all social groups, including aristocracy; M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 118.

566 J.D.G. Dunn, *From the Crucifixion to the End of the First Century*, 42.

whether they were pagans who had accepted the faith in Christ and also sympathized with the Synagogue.[567] In any case, in the mid-fourth century, the Council of Laodice ordered to exclude from the Church those who celebrated not only Sunday but also the Sabbath and the Jewish feasts.[568]

Judaism in Qumran and Palestinian Christianity

One of the most important findings of biblical archaeology are undoubtedly the Dead Sea Scrolls. Nowadays, most researchers agree that Qumran writings belonged to the sect called the Essenes, whose life and activities were described by Josephus.[569] Although the Jewish historian does not mention the name of Qumran, he knows the views of people living in the settlement (if actually the identification of the Essenes with Qumranians is right). The Essenes were also known to Philo of Alexandria (*Prob.* 12-13; 75-91), to Pliny the Elder and they are mentioned in *Hypothetica* preserved in Eusebian *Preparatio evangelica* (11,1-18). However, most detailed information about religious beliefs and ways of practising Judaism in Qumran was provided by writings found in the caves near the Dead Sea.[570] The writings were presumably created between the middle of the second century BC and the outbreak of the Jewish War in the year 66 AD. The oldest biblical scrolls found in Qumran come from the third century BC, ergo from the time when the

567 L.I.A. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, New Haven 2005, 294–302. On the attitude of Chrysostom towards the Jews and Christians sympathising with Judaism see: R.L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, Berkeley 1983.

568 F.J.E. Boddens Hosang, *Establishing Boundaries: Christian-Jewish Relations in Early Council Texts and the Writings of Church Fathers*, Leiden 2010, 91–107.

569 F. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, Grand Rapids 1980, 5–7. Of similar opinion is one of the greatest experts in the field of Judaism of the 1st century, J.H. Charlesworth: "I manoscritti del Mar Morto sono direttamente collegati con le rovine di Qumran. Le grotte in cui i rotoli sono stati ritrovati si trovano nei dintorni delle rovine, e le grotte IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX e X sono molto vicine, solo qualche minuto a piedi. I vasi di terracota trovati nelle grotte e quelli rinvenuti tra le rovine del monastero sono pratticamente identici. Tra le rovine è stato portato alla luce un laboratorio per produrre la terracota. Il tipo di scrittura sui manoscritti è simile alla scrittura a mano sui frammenti di terracota trovati fra le rovine; le differenze sono giustificate dalla diversa tecnica di scrittura su terracota rispetto a quella su pergamena o cuoio e dai diversi stili personali di scrittura attestati nei rotoli"; *Gesù nel giudaismo del suo tempo alla luce delle più recenti scoperte*, trans. D. Tomasetto, Torino 1998^2, 88.

570 Polish translations of Qumranian texts were published by P. Muchowski and W. Tyloch: P. Muchowski, *Rękopisy znad Morza Martwego. Qumran – Wadi Murabba'at – Masada – Nachal Cheder*, Kraków 2000; W. Tyloch, *Rękopisy z Qumran nad Morzem Martwym*, Warszawa 2001.

community had not existed yet. The largest group of documents was copied by Qumranians in the middle of the first century BC.[571]

For years researchers have been trying to find links between the Qumran Community and the supporters of John the Baptist and Christians.[572] What is more, Jesus himself was also seen as a personification of the Master of Justice, the superior of Qumran community. Several years after the discoveries A. Dupont-Sommer wrote:

> The Galilean Master [...] appeared as an astonishing reincarnation of the Master of Justice. Like the latter he preached penitence, poverty, humility, love of one's neighbour, chastity. Like him He prescribed the observance of the Law of Moses, the whole Law, but the Law finished and perfected, thanks to His own revelations. Like him He was the Elect and the Messiah of God, the Messiah redeemer of the world. Like Him he was the object of the hostility of the priests ... like him He was condemned and put to death. Like him He pronounced judgement on Jerusalem, which was taken and destroyed by the Romans for having put Him to death. Like him, at the end of time he will be the supreme judge.[573]

A sea of ink has already been spilled over the history, views and customs of the Essenes, examining possible connections of the sect which lived in the region of the Dead Sea with the emerging Christianity. Over the last several decades researchers have carried out thousands of comparative studies, juxtaposing the teaching of the Qumran community with the teaching of Jesus, John the Baptist, or the apostle Paul. In the case of the latter, the study of concordances of Paul's texts with apocryphal scriptures and writings of the Qumran community, drawn by Walter T. Wilson, should be mentioned.[574] However, as surveys show, in the case of Paul many common features result from reference to the same heritage: law, prophets and apocalyptics. Many elements common to Paul and the Essenes result from common tradition of Judaism. However, detailed analysis shows a substantial difference: it is Paul's awareness of the presence of the Holy Spirit as an eschatological gift – the result of coming of the Messiah and of salvation[575] which he brought, or redemption.

---

571 J.P. Meier, *Die Qumran-Essener: die Texte vom Toten Meer*, III, München 1996, 2–4.

572 See the following publications: J. Chmiel, *Chrześcijaństwo a Qumran*, CT 65 (1995) 1, 69–78; S. Mędala, *Znaczenie rękopisów znad Morza Martwego dla studium Nowego Testamentu*, Fil 391 (1989) 225–252; H. Muszyński, *Chrystus – fundament i kamień węgielny Kościoła w świetle tekstów qumrańskich*, Warszawa 1982.

573 A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus présur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris 1950, 121.

574 W.T. Wilson, *Pauline Parallels. A Comprehensive Guide*, Louisville 2009.

575 R. Kempiak, *Paweł i essenizm qumrański*, in: *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testementem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, 282. See also: H.-W. Kuhn, *The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, III, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 153–186.

It cannot be denied that both John the Baptist and Jesus himself were familiar with the Essene movement and used to meet its followers.[576] However, it is not our aim to carry out detailed analyses of possible mutual influences of Essene Judaism and Palestinian Judeo-Christianity but only to outline (or indicate) essential similarities and differences in theses and truths proclaimed by both communities.[577] Making such an outline one should be aware that there are no written documents proving the existence of direct links between both groups. The thesis about finding a passage of the Gospel according to Mark in Qumran, once proposed by J.O'Callaghan, has not been confirmed by researchers.[578]

Inhabitants of the community led in the Judean Desert a life based on the principles derived from the Old Testament and submitted to the community rules. They considered themselves to be an eschatological assembly of priests (1QS 5,2.9) and shared the anticipation of a new eon, a belief common in apocalyptic literature. Waiting for the "future world," they hoped for imminent passing of the present world marked by constant struggle between the forces of light and darkness. The group was led by the Teacher of Righteousness coming from the hereditary line of Zadok (4QpPSs 37,2.16) who was opposed to the "Wicked Priest" (1QpHab 8,8) identified with the archpriest Jonathan (152–143 BC).

---

576 On the similarities between the teaching of John the Baptist as well as the baptism practised by him and and the beliefs and practices of Qumranians, see: J.H. Charlesworth, *John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, III, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 6–10. On possible relation of Jesus with the Essene community, see: R.A. Horsley, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Historical Jesus*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, III, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 37–61. The debate about the relationship has been summarized by the Jerusalem biblical scholar who claimed that manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls had not been written by Christians and for Christians and they did not reveal any affiliation of John the Baptist or Jesus with the Essenes, even though both of them had certainly met the Essenes travelling across Judea, to Jerusalem and its surrounding areas; É. Puech, *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego a Nowy Testament. Mistrzowie i nadzieje*, in: *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testementem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, 202.

577 A similar summary is proposed by S. Benoît; *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 230–233.

578 In 1972 Spanish Jesuit J. O'Callaghan proposed a hypothesis that among the manuscripts found in the seventh cave there were also small fragments of the Gospel according to Mark (Mk 6:52–54). The problem, however, was that the discovered fragment was too small to make the identification of the text explicit. There are 18 – 20 recognizable letters on it, including one entire word (not very representative for the identification of the text): *kai*.

Although the Qumran community did not only consist of priests, they held a special place within it.[579] Until recently, it was thought that celibacy was an obligation in Qumran. Today the opinions of scholars are divided. Many believe that men belonging to the community were not necessarily celibate from the very beginning. Many of them were widowers while others were married but, after the wife's death, they did not enter a new relationship. The fact is that women could not be part of the community but boys – children of the community members – were accepted. There were, however, skeletons of women found in the vicinity of Qumran, which might mean that there were women's communities, subjected to the same or similar rules. This is exactly the picture that Josephus draws for his readers: according to him, the Essenes did not renounce marriage *(Bell.* 2,120-121)[580] but only a few of them had wives (*Bell.* 2,160-161) who did not take part in liturgical gatherings (*Ant.* 18,21).

First of all, it should be noted that nothing in the Gospels indicates that Jesus had any contacts with Qumran in his lifetime. There are too many doctrinal discrepancies between Jesus' teachings and the views of the Essenes to defend such a theory. The residents of the Dead Sea settlement believed that only Jews may have access to the kingdom of God, and only those inhabiting the biblical Promised Land; the Kingdom was closed even to the inhabitants of the diaspora (it is interesting to notice that the Essenes themselves escaped from the Promised Land after the outbreak of the uprising in 66 AD). Such a thesis is contrary to universalism preached by Jesus and its implementation by His disciples.

When the Essenes were closing the scrolls in pitchers and were making their escape, they were still waiting for two Messiahs since Jesus Christ had not been recognized by them as the awaited Messiah. What linked the teaching of Jesus with the views of the Essenes was the Hebrew Bible. If there were any doctrinal links between the teaching of the Master from Nazareth and the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers, they were mainly based on the Old Testament.[581] We cannot, however, accept the statement that there were only convergences between Jesus' teaching and the views of the Qumranians: it is enough to mention radical in their moral significance demands of Jesus included in the Sermon on the

---

579 In 1QS 6,3 there is the entry: "When there arise ten, the man who is a priest [...] shall not depart."

580 Josephus shows the reasons for almost universal bachelorhood among the Essenes in the following way: "They do not abolish marriage, but are convinced women are all licentious and incapable of fidelity to one man" (*Bell.* 2,121).

581 A. Millard thinks that both the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus believed that the prophecies were fulfilled in their lifetime. They both assumed that the vast majority of the contemporary followers of Judaism followed a false path. However, while Jesus softened the rigours of Judaism, the Essenes made them even more restrictive; A. Millard, *Skarby czasów Biblii. Odkrycia archeologiczne rzucają nowe światło na Biblię*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 2000, 273. The last statement does not necessarily have to be accepted.

Mount (Mt 5-7) or the total ban on divorce (approved by Judaism). The statement is true, however, when we take into account the Sabbath law. Let us take a closer look at the similarities and differences..

Jesus' Sermon on the Mount starts with eight short blessings and one more complex (Mt 5:3-12). Blessings written in Hebrew found in the fourth Qumran cave (4Q 525) are exactly the same in terms of structure. The Qumran blessings are sapiential in character and have a clear moral inclination, in the same way as the blessings included in the Sermon on the Mount, but the latter contain more eschatological accents. Following the blessings, Jesus speaks about disciples who are the "light of the world." This term is reminiscent of the Qumran "sons of light."

Much is said about the sons of light in the Rule of Community. Interestingly, the symbol of light is used there to describe God's knowledge which is revealed in His will expressed in the Law. At the same time, in the Gospels, Christ Himself is called the Light. For the Qumranians, knowledge is passed on by the "Spirit of Light" to the "sons of light," i.e. to the inhabitants of the community.[582] Other Israelites are called the "sons of lawlessness." (1QS 5,2) In the Gospels Jesus is called "the light that gives light to everyone," (Jn 1:9) both to the Jews and the Gentiles. In Qumran there is a conviction that the "Spirit of Light" is the "Spirit of Truth," while the evangelists confirm that Christ is the Light, and the Spirit of Truth is a different person, that is the Holy Spirit. While the "truth" for the Qumranians means the Law, in the Gospels it is identified with the Son of God.[583] The same metaphor of light is, therefore, used by the Essene dwellers of the Qumran community in a different way than in the Gospels.[584]

Jesus rejects the possibility of divorce (Mt 5:31-34) "except for the case of an illicit marriage"; the members of the community are almost equally rigorous in this regard (CD 4,19 – 5,1).[585] Although there are a few cases in which divorces are acceptable, the Qumranians are far from the liberal attitude of Hillel or even of more strict Shamai. When it comes to the commandment to love our neighbours, taken to a degree of the love of enemies (Mt 5:38-48), the opinions of Jesus and the Qumranians differ significantly. The guideline mentioned in the Community Rule is clear: to "love all that He has chosen and hate all that he has rejected." (1QS 1,3-4)

---

582 J.H. Charlesworth, *A Study in Shared Symbolism and Language: The Qumran Community and the Johannine Community*, in: *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, III, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, 114–115.

583 D.H. Juel, *The Future of a Religious Past: Qumran and Palestinian Jesus Movement*,67–71.

584 H. Witczyk, *Opozycja „światłość – ciemności" w qumrańskiej Regule Zrzeszenia i w Ewangelii według św. Jana*, in: *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testementem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, 254–255.

585 M. Broshi, *Qumran and the Essenes: Purity and Pollution. Six Categories*, RQ 87 (2006) 467–468.

The author also adds that one "shall judge each man according to his spirit, and shall cause [...] to his lot in the Council of God; and that they hate all the sons of darkness, each according to his fault in the vengeance of God." (1QS 1,9-10) Jesus' imperative to love one's neighbours encompasses all people, while for the majority of Jews a neighbour is only a member of the chosen nation, excluding even the Samaritans.[586]

Jesus is much milder than the Essenes as far as strict observance of the Sabbath rest is concerned. Let one episode of the Gospel be used as an example. After healing a man suffering from edema, he asks his adversaries a rhetorical question: "Which of you here, if his son falls into a well, or his ox, will not pull him out on a Sabbath day without any hesitation?" (Lk 14:6) This means that even the Pharisees used to break the Sabbath law in this regard. Nevertheless in the *Damascus Document* we read: "No one is to foal a beast on the Sabbath day. Even if it drops its young into a cistern or a pit, he is not to lift it out on the Sabbath [...]. If a human being falls into a place where there is water or fire, one may bring him up by means of a ladder or a rope or some other instrument." (CD 11,13-14)

The Qumranians like Jesus performed exorcisms. Calling the name of God, they sang psalms over the possessed person (11Q 27,9-10).[587] The Essenes – according to Josephus – were considered to be healers (*Bell.* 2,136) and during the healing ministry, they also called the name of God as the only Lord of life and death. But exorcisms and healings performed by Jesus resulted from His own authority as the Son of God who addressed God as *Abba* (Mk 14:36; Lk 11:2; 22:42; 23:34; Mt 26:39). The disciples of Christ, in turn, performing exorcisms and healings, always hailed the name of Jesus. The innovation introduced by Jesus and sustained by his disciples, which consisted in replacing the tetragrammaton with a personal command and (in the case of disciples) the name of Jesus, deviated from the practice of the Qumranians to such an extent that the witnesses of the events said, "Here is a teaching that is new, and with authority behind it." (Mk 1:27) The fact that Jesus ordered His disciples to drive out evil spirits in His name confirms nothing less than His consciousness of His own mission. The new formula cannot have been the product of early Christianity. None of the Jews would have dared to make such a change in the formula of an exorcism because that would have automatically meant the exclusion from the

586 É. Puech, *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego a Nowy Testament. Nowy Mojżesz czyli o kilku praktykach Prawa*, in: *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testementem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, 208.

587 É. Puech, *Les Psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme (11Q 11)*, in: *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of International Organization for Qumran Studies. Oslo 1998*, ed. D. Falk, F. García Martínez, E. Schuller, STDJ 35, Leiden – Boston – Köln 2000, 160–181.

Synagogue. This change refers the readers of the Gospel to Jesus himself and gives them insight into *ipsissima verba Jesu*.[588]

As far as the first Christians in Palestine are concerned, it is not difficult to notice also other convergences between their practices and practices of the Essenes. They concern several issues like common ownership of goods, common meals similar to love feasts (agape) combined with the Eucharist celebration or avoiding oaths. The candidate for the Qumran community offered to it all his property and pledged to obey the rules and the superiors. The transfer of material goods was combined with the transfer of the property rights to the community and waiving any further claims to the profits. At first, possessions were placed on the candidate's personal account and in the case of death or withdrawal from the community during the three-year trial period they had to be returned. After the trial period the community became the legal owner of the property. This practice is similar to the practice of selling property and donating money to the apostles (Ac 2:44-45).

In Qumran, as in the early Church, excommunication was practiced. It replaced death penalty although it was often interpreted as being worse than death. It sometimes had the form of a curse which was always pronounced against apostates at the time of admission of new community members and during the rite of renewal of the covenant. The punishment provided for the offenders was exclusion from the community for the period of between ten days to two years.[589] For minor offences meals were reduced (1QS 6,25). Some similarities can also be seen between the Qumranians and the Essenes in the ways of defying the Temple. While Christians did not bring offerings and treated the Temple only as a place of prayer and teaching, the supporters of Essenism recognized the role of the Temple but, because of the different calendar (solar, in contrast to the lunar calendar used by the priests), they did not participate in the public worship but only sent their representatives to Jerusalem so as not to completely lose contact with the most important institution of biblical Judaism.

The first conclusion which can be drawn from the above considerations is that the Dead Sea manuscripts were written neither by Christians nor for Christians. On their basis, it is not possible to confirm the affiliation of John the Baptist and even less of Jesus with the Essene community. One can only look at some similarities between the Essene movement and the movement of Jesus (similarities which are at the same time different from the practices or the beliefs of other Judaic movements) and see the vitality of both communities. This vitality results more from the common Old Testament roots than from the possible mutual impact, if any such interaction took place at all.

---

588 É. Puech, *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego a Nowy Testament. Nowy Mojżesz czyli o kilku praktykach Prawa*, 213–214.

589 M. Wróbel, *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, 167.

First Jewish Revolt Against the Roman Empire (66–70/74 AD)

The beginning of the first Jewish uprising against the Roman authorities was rather inconspicuous. It started with the prosecutor Florus who took seventeen talents from the Temple of Jerusalem to purportedly settle tax arrears. This act was no greater injustice than the actions of his predecessors but public sentiments were already very tense. In response to taking money from the treasurer of the Temple, Eleazar, the son of archpriest Ananias, ordered to suspend the offerings for the well-being of the Emperor, and the interdict resulted in a war. The Sicarii led by a certain Menahem entered Jerusalem and directed the blades of their swords not only against the Romans but also against Jewish aristocracy. After the death of Nero, Vespasian realized that his appointment as commander had expired, which meant that he had to end the warfare. Not long afterwards, however, he proclaimed himself emperor, took over the power in Rome and entrusted the campaign in Judea to Titus.[590]

The fact that the revolt took place may seem surprising if we look at it from a historical perspective. At the time when the revolt erupted, the Jews enjoyed many privileges: they did not have to accommodate soldiers, they were exempt from military service, they were not obliged to pay tribute to the emperor, they had the right to organize congregations and even their taxes were reduced. Despite this, their dissatisfaction was growing, although economically many of them were prosperous. The introduction of a tax on property ownership in Judea is usually considered to be one of the direct causes of the uprising.[591] Unemployment of many men who until the year 64 had been hired at the rebuilding and decoration of the Temple, expanded on an unprecedented scale by Herod the Great, and finally the enrichment of the few elites of the Jewish society can also be added to the list. The very violent reaction of the Romans to the outbreak of the uprising could have been reinforced by the fact that they were afraid of Jewish large-scale proselytism.[592]

Obviously, the reasons for the uprising were much more complex. It is no longer possible to advocate the theory suggesting that it was initiated by some organized groups of one anti-Roman current of Judaism. In literature the Sicarii were usually linked to the extreme wing of Zealots and identified with *lēstai*,"bandits." Three

590 S.J.D. Cohen, M. Satlow, *Dominacja rzymska. Powstanie żydowskie i zburzenie drugiej świątyni*, 416–421. On general models of national liberation revolts in the Roman Empire, see the following: S.L. Dyson, *Native Revolts in the Roman Empire*, Historia 20 (1971) 239–274; S.L. Dyson, *Native Revolt Patterns in the Roman Empire*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II/3, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin 1975, 138–175.

591 *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, 31–35.

592 W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, I, New York[2] 1952, 370–372.

fundamentally different trends, however, should be distinguished here. Not all the Sicarii belonged to the Zealots, and *lēstai* directed their operations not only against the Romans but also against affluent Jews. The "looters," or "robbers," coming from impoverished peasant environments, rather than against the Roman occupant rebelled against the social order which led to dramatic economic discrepancies between the wealthier layer of society and the poor classes experiencing overpopulation and unemployment.[593] The fact that they also joined the uprising was probably motivated more by their hope for the improvement of their standard of living than by political convictions and patriotic tendencies.

The Sicarii, in turn, were not numerous enough to even dream about defeating the Romans in military terms. Thus, the assumption that they directly led to the outbreak of the uprising must also be honestly verified. They adopted another tactic: they took action against the members of their own people in an effort to push the inhabitants of Judea to initiate a revolt.[594]

The uprising against the Romans, which started in the year 66 and finally ended probably in the spring of 74 with the conquest of Masada – the insurgents' last fortress – constitutes an extremely important caesura in the history of the chosen nation since in the year 70 the Temple was destroyed, thus marking in a symbolic way the end of the period of biblical Judaism.[595] The Temple, situated on Mount Moria (Zion) where Abraham intended to sacrifice Isaac (Gn 22:2 K 3:1), and built on the former floor of Jebusite Arauna on which David was punished for carrying out population census (2Sm 24:16), was for the Jews a symbolic pledge of God's blessing.[596] Even for the inhabitants of the Qumran community who opposed the Jerusalem priesthood, the Temple was the only relevant religious centre.[597]

Location of the Temple on the highest hill in the city unambiguously emphasized the idea of God's reign over Israel. The historical sequence of events associated with the Temple stresses its importance for the religiosity of Israel:

---

593 R.A. Horsley, *Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66-70*, CBQ 43 (1981) 412.

594 M. Byra, *Powstanie w Judei. 66-74 n.e.,* Bitwy / Taktyka 34, Zabrze 2011, 19–24.

595 Referring to the *Bell.* 6,299, where Josephus describes a mysterious rumble and movement in the internal courtyard of the Temple during the Pentecost in 66, Benedict XVI states: "Whatever exactly may have happened, one thing is clear: in the final years before the dramatic events of the year 70, the Temple was enveloped in a mysterious premonition that its end was approaching."; *Jezus z Nazaretu*, II, 37. Cf.: C.C. Hill, *The Jerusalem Church*, 52.

596 U. Szwarc, *Świątynia jerozolimska*, 79; G. Witaszek, *Teologia świątyni*, 93.

597 "The Temple was an essential feature of the religion of the Qumran community. The rank or order of the community members was organized according to levels of purity or holiness which approximated those of the Temple in Jerusalem. In its organization and self-understanding, Qumran replicated the Temple"; J.A. Overman, W. Scott Green, *Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*, 1039; L. Schiffman, *The Halakha at Qumran*, Leiden 1975, 60.

(1) Solomon ensured that the dedication was held at the time of the general national assembly (1K 8);
(2) in the era of the kings, the Temple was a symbol of religious worship and political power;
(3) prophets (Is 1:11-17; Jr 6:20) criticized superficiality of the worship performed there; an announcement of destruction of the Tabernacle was the symbol of God's future punishment (Mi 3:12; Jr 7:12-15, Ezk 9-10);
(4) strong attachment to the Temple bordered on superstition when a magically understood phrase was repeated: "This is Yahweh's sanctuary, Yahweh's sanctuary, Yahweh's sanctuary!" (Jr 7:4);
(5) religious reforms of Hezekiah emphasized the importance of the Temple (2K 18:4; 2Ch 29-31);
(6) Josiah implemented the thought of one shrine (2K 23:4-27);
(7) Isaiah prophesied about the centre of worship for the entire humanity (Is 2O1-4);
(8) The Jews returning from captivity ensured, above all, the reconstruction of the Temple (Ezr 3-6);
(9) After profanation made by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the Jews joined the uprising under the Maccabees' command in order to re-consecrate the Tabernacle and renew the cult after victory (1M 4:36-43).

The symbol of theocracy and divine reign over the nation did not survive the military attack of the army of Titus. The siege of Jerusalem by the future Emperor was described by Josephus in dramatic words:

> So all hope of escaping was now cut off from the Jews, together with their liberty of going out of the city. Then did the famine widen its progress, and devoured the people by whole houses and families; the upper rooms were full of women and children that were dying by famine, and the lanes of the city were full of the dead bodies of the aged; the children also and the young men wandered about the market-places like shadows, all swelled with the famine, and fell down dead, wheresoever their misery seized them. As for burying them, those that were sick themselves were not able to do it (*Bell.* 5,12,3).[598]

In the history of Israel, the year 70 constitutes a caesura probably as important as the Shoah. With the fall of the Temple – the nation's glory and God's dwelling, biblical Judaism came to an end. The Temple was a visible sign of monotheism: "There ought also to be but One Temple for One God: for likeness is the constant foundation of agreement. This temple ought to be common to all men, because he is

598 Josephus claimed that the Temple was not burned on Titus' order but Sulpicius Sever expressed an opposite view. He wrote in his Chronicle: "At contra alii et Titus ipse evertendum in primis templum censebat, quo plenius Judaeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur" (2,30).

the common God." (*Ant.* 3,6)[599] Along with the burning Tabernacle, the hope for independence disappeared. With the robbery of the menorah, represented plastically on the Titus arch in Rome[600], the light over Israel had gone out.[601] Josephus continued his account of the siege of the Holy City in dramatic words:

> Those that were hearty and well were deterred from doing it by the great multitude of those dead bodies, and by the uncertainty there was how soon they should die themselves; for many died as they were burying others, and many went to their coffins before that fatal hour was come. Nor was there any lamentations made under these calamities, nor were heard any mournful complaints; but the famine confounded all natural passions; for those who were just going to die looked upon those that were gone to rest before them with dry eyes and open mouths. A deep silence also, and a kind of deadly night… Now the seditious at first gave orders that the dead should be buried out of the public treasury, as not enduring the stench of their dead bodies. But afterwards, when they could not do that, they had them cast down from the walls into the valleys beneath (*Bell.* 5,12,3).

Destruction of the central institution of Judaism brought to the minds of believing Jews a lot of theological questions.[602] It is true that already the Old Testament

---

599 The significance of the Temple and its cult has been discussed in detail in the following works: H. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1978; A.B. Levine, *In the Presence of the Lord*, Leiden 1974; J. Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*, Leiden 1983; M. Mikołajczak, *Teologia świątyni w dwudziele św. Łukasza*, Lublin 2000.

600 Christians in Rome must have been aware of the miserable failure of the Jewish uprising against the Romans because they witnessed the construction of the Titus arch and the triumphant entry of the leader into the capital of the empire; F. Millar, *Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome*, in: *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, J. Rivers, Oxford 2005, 102. The magnitude of Jewish defeat and the Roman celebrations of the victory are illustrated by the fact of minting coins with the inscription IUDAEA CAPTA; M.H. Williams, *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*, 159–160; M. Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem. 300 Years of Roman-Judean Relations*, London 2001, 169; S. Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament*, 197.

601 In Rome, in addition to the Arch of Titus, the second arch was also put up – a triumphal arch celebrating the victory over Jerusalem. This arch was destroyed in the 14th or in the 15th century. The inscription which announced the victory read: "The Roman Senate and People (dedicate this arch) to the divine Titus Vespasianus Augustus, who following the advice and direction of his father, subdued the Jewish people and destroyed Jerusalem, something which all other generals, kings and peoples before him had not even attempted or had failed to accomplish."; N. Lewis, R. Meyer, *Roman Weaves Sourcebook*, II, *the Empire*, New York 1966, 92; S.J.D. Cohen, M. Satlow, *Dominacja rzymska. Powstanie żydowskie i zburzenie drugiej świątyni*, 423.

602 It is difficult to determine precisely what the immediate reactions to the destruction of the Temple among the Jews living in the diaspora were, as it seems that up to

prophets announced this tragic event but in entirely different circumstances. Micah cried: "That is why, thanks to you, Zion will become ploughland, Jerusalem a heap of rubble and the Temple Mount a wooded height." (Mi 3:12; cf. Jr 7:14; 26:6) The prophet referred, however, to the punishment which was supposed to meet the leaders of the nation at his time. The author of the Book of Tobit ensured: "A census will be taken of our brothers living in the land of Israel and they will be exiled far from their own fair country. The entire territory of Israel will become a desert, and Samaria and Jerusalem will become a desert, and the house of God, for a time, will be laid waste and burnt." (Tb 14:4) A similar announcement can be found in the apocalyptic *Book of Enoch* (Ethiopian): "And I stood up to see till they folded up that old house; and carried off all the pillars and all the beams and ornaments of the house were at the same time folded up with (fire)." (90,28) Although the vision does not distinguish clearly between the city and the Tabernacle, the context points at both.

Shortly before the outbreak of the uprising it was announced by a certain villager but no one believed him: "[…] there was one Jesus, the son of Ananus, a plebeian and a husbandman, who, four years before the war began, and at a time when the city was in very great peace and prosperity, came to that feast whereon it is our custom for everyone to make tabernacles to God in the temple, began on a sudden to cry aloud: 'A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the holy house, a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides, and a voice against this whole people!' This was his cry, as he went about by day and by night, in all the lanes of the city." (*Bell.* 6,300-302)

According to Rabbi Ishmael the destruction of the Temple was present in God's plans already at the time of its consecration: "Said Rabbi Ishmael, 'The very night that Solomon completed the construction of the Temple in Jerusalem, he married Pharaoh's daughter, and the people of Jerusalem attended both celebrations, going from one to the other. The rejoicing at the wedding ball was greater than the rejoicing in celebration of the completion of the Temple. At that time a thought came before the Almighty to destroy the Temple. "Yes, from the day when this city was built until today, it has been such cause of anger and wrath to me that I mean to remove it from my sight (Jr 32:31)."[603] The tractate entitled *Yoma* presents real human attitudes which lay behind the destruction: "Why was the First Temple destroyed? Because of three things: idolatry, immorality, and bloodshed. However, considering that the people during the Second Temple period were engaged in Torah study, observance of mitzvot, and acts of kindness; […] why was the Second

---

the third century we only have two testimonies of two Pharisees of the diaspora on the subject, namely Saul of Tarsus and Josephus Flavius; M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, 28–29.

603 R. Pacifici, *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, 140.

Temple destroyed? It was destroyed due to the fact that there was wanton hatred during that period. This comes to teach you that the sin of wanton hatred is equivalent to the three severe transgressions: idol worship, forbidden sexual relations and bloodshed."[604]

Reactions to the destruction of the Temple varied.[605] Seemingly, already forty years prior to its fall there had appeared direct signs anticipating the destruction. The Talmud enumerates some of them: "the lot for God did not arise in the High Priest's right hand at all. So too, the strip of crimson wool that was tied to the head of the goat that was sent to Azazel did not turn white, and the westernmost lamp of the candelabrum did not burn continually (i.e., *Yom.* 39a-b; 43c).[606] At the end of the first century, in order to come to terms with the idea of the destructed Tabernacle, the author of the *Sibylline Oracles* was trying to prove that the very idea of the temple (not only Jewish) was incorrect and he waited with hope for the days when those structures made of silent stones would no longer be useful (*OrSib* 4,24-30). These words bring to mind Stephen's speech before Sanhedrin (Ac 6:8 – 7:53; especially the emphasis: "[…] the Most High does not live in a house that human hands have built" in Ac 7:48a).

The fact is that after the destruction of the Temple and burning of Jerusalem a lot of Jews lost their lives, others were imprisoned. Some of them passed through the Roman Forum as prisoners of war and then were forced to work at the construction of the Colosseum. It is possible that some managed to settle in various parts of Italy where they created diaspora communities. Archaeologists brought to light, inter alia, Hebrew inscriptions from the ruins of Pompeii and Herculaneum, flooded by volcanic lava in 79.[607]

For the Jews, the end of the Temple meant the end of the previous form of their religion, whose very existence was threatened. To preserve the memory of the destruction from sinking into oblivion, each year on the ninth day of the month of Av, the Jews lamented over Jerusalem: "Rabbi Akiba says, He who does any work on the ninth of Av will never see even a sign of blessing. The sages say, [who] does any work on that day and does not lament over Jerusalem will never see her joy; for it is said: 'Rejoice with Jerusalem, be glad for her, all you who love her! Rejoice,

604 The tractate *Berakhot* in the following way shows the effects of the destruction of the Temple: "from the day the Temple was destroyed, the sages began to be like scribes, scribes like synagogue-attendants, synagogue-attendants like common people, and the common people became more and more debased. And nobody seeks. Upon whom shall we depend? Upon our father who is in heaven"; R. Pacifici, *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, 191.

605 J. Maier, *Beobachtungen zum Konfliktpotential in neutestamentlichen Aussagen über den Tempel*, 172–175.

606 A.J. Palla, *Skarby świątyni*, Rybnik 1999, 196.

607 J.H. Charlesworth, *Chrześcijanie i Żydzi w pierwszych sześciu wiekach*, in: *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, 506.

rejoice with her, all you who mourned her! (Is 66:10) Hence the theme was taken to believe: Rejoice, Jerusalem, and be glad for her, all you who love her… all you who mourned her…,' which means that all who mourn the loss of her grandeur and one-time glory will see the restoration of her former splendour."[608]

But even in the eyes of some Gentiles, the destruction of the Temple was recognized as divine punishment for the killing of Jesus of Nazareth. In a fragment of a letter written by a pagan named Mara bar Serapion to his son, the sender encourages his offspring to constantly search for wisdom. First of all, he notes that in this world, full of violence and deception, wise people are oppressed but wisdom is everlasting. Mara gives three examples of wise men: Socrates, Pythagoras and Jesus.[609] Then he poses to his son a rhetorical question about benefits which the Athenians derived from condemning Socrates. And he answers the question himself: nothing except for disaster. He continues his reasoning: "What advantage did the men of Samos gain from burning Pythagoras? In a moment their land was covered with sand. What advantage did the Jews gain from executing their wise king? It was just after that their kingdom was abolished. God justly avenged these three wise men: the Athenians died of hunger; the Samians were overwhelmed by the sea and the Jews, desolate and driven from their own kingdom, live in complete dispersion. But Socrates is not dead, because of Plato; neither is Pythagoras, because of the statue of Juno; nor is the wise king, because of the New Law he laid down."[610]

It is also worth mentioning that three years after the fall of the Temple in Jerusalem, the temple in Leontopolis in Egypt was closed.[611] The mere fact of its existence is ambiguous. Although the Law clearly designated one central religious institution in Jerusalem, the Jews (even those living in Palestine) did not express

608 In another midrash sages proclaimed the need to keep the memory of Jerusalem by neglecting splendour and ornaments: if you want to apply plaster to walls, leave a small part unplastered; if you throw a party, neglect something in the preparations; if a woman wants to dress up, she should leave out some ornaments because it had been said, 'If I forget you, O Jerusalem, Let my right hand forget its skill!' (Ps 137,5-6). All those who mourn Jerusalem will merit witnessing its restoration. As the verse says, 'Rejoice with Jerusalem, be glad for her, all you who love her! Rejoice, rejoice with her, all you who mourned her! (Is 66:10)"; R. Pacifici, *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, 191–192.

609 It may be assumed that Mara met Christians in Syria. He might have been acquainted with the Gospel according to Matthew; A. Paciorek, *Jesus z Nazaretu. Czasy i wydarzenia*, 53.

610 F. Schultess, *Der Brief des Mara bar Serapion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, ZDMG 51(1897) 371–371; J. Dickson, *Alla ricerca di Gesù. Le indagini di uno storico*, 87–88.

611 R. Kraft, A. Luijendijk, *Christianity's Rise After Judaism's Demise in Early Egypt*, 182–183; A. Kerkeslager, *The Jews in Egypt and Cyrenaica, 66-c. 235*, in: *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, IV, ed. S.T. Katz, Cambridge 2006, 53–67.

any violent opposition to the construction of a sanctuary in the diaspora. The temple was erected there in the sixties of the second century BC. At the time of its construction, the Palestinian Jews were busy defending their identity against Antiochus IV Epiphanes, so it is no wonder that they did not pay much attention to the Egyptian diaspora. Even rabbis expressed considerable understanding as far as the idea of building a temple in the diaspora was concerned.

Josephus, however, expressed less understanding. He accused Onias IV, the son of Onias III, murdered by Menelaus around 172 BC, of impure intentions. Onias IV found refuge in Egypt, and the temple erected in Leontopolis was commonly perceived as a building in the "land of Onias." According to Josephus, Onias IV allegedly wanted to compete with Jerusalem Jews, for whom he felt a deep aversion because of his exile (*Bell.* 7,431). The real reason for closing down the temple institution in Egypt was probably that those who had escaped the uprising of the Jews against the Romans and had taken refuge near Leontopolis could find there a bridgehead for stirring up revolts against the invaders.[612]

For Christians, the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem meant fulfilment of Christ's announcement that not one stone would be left standing in the Tabernacle, and also a confirmation of the truth generally accepted in the Church that the sacrifice of Christ had replaced the sacrifices prescribed in the Torah. Prior to the triumphant entry into Jerusalem to undertake the Passion and Death, Jesus announced to His disciples: "You see these great buildings? Not a single stone will be left on another; everything will be pulled down." (Mk 13:2b; cf. Mt 24:1-4; Lk 21:5-8)

In the eyes of many exegetes, the sign of the Temple curtain torn in two at the moment of Christ's death on the cross (Mk 15:38-39) was also the sign of the demolition of the Temple.[613] The curtain which, according to Josephus, depicted the heavenly vault (*Bell.* 5,211-212), was, in the view of Christians, torn in two to announce the opening of heaven to anyone who believed in the saving act on the cross.[614] The act in a symbolic way showed that the access to God was regained

---

612 J. Warzecha, *Z dziejów diaspory aleksandryjskiej*, in: *Pieśniami dla mnie Twoje przykazania. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza profesora Janusza Frankowskiego w 50. rocznicę święceń kapłańskich i 75. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2003, 357.

613 D. Ulansey, *The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark's Cosmic 'Inclusio'*, JBL 110 (1991) 1, 123; G. Aichele, *Fantasy and Myth in the Death of Jesus*, Cross Currents 44 (1994) 94. The motif of tearing of the veil of the Tabernacle is sometimes juxtaposed by exegetes in comparative studies with the opening of the heavens during Christ's baptism in Jordan. The event at the time of baptism was seen as an announcement of the tearing of the Tabernacle's curtains; M. Rosik, *Ku radykalizmowi ewangelii. Studium nad wspólnymi logiami Jezusa w ewangeliach według św. Mateusza i św. Marka*, Wrocław 2000, 92.

614 „L'apertura dei cieli nella scena sulla riva del Giordano preannunzia apertura dei cieli per tutti i credenti in Gesù come il figlio di Dio. E questo fatto viene mostrato in modo simbolico dallo squarciarsi del velo del tempio. Dopo la morte redentrice di

for everyone who believed in the death of Christ on the cross. God is no longer "locked up" behind the curtain of the Temple in the Most Holy Place which could be accessed only once a year – on the Day of Reconciliation – by the highest priest. Everyone who accepts the [new] faith in the death of Jesus on the cross and its saving fruit can have access to God "in Spirit and truth" (Jn 4:23) and will not have to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to meet Him there. It will be possible to meet God in every place and at any time because the prerogatives of the Temple and the Jewish holidays (especially the Day of Reconciliation) were taken over by Jesus Christ.[615] At the moment of Christ's death, the time of the Temple (The Second Temple) was over. This conviction was expressed clearly by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Under these provisions, priests go regularly into the outer tent to carry out their acts of worship, but the second tent is entered only once a year, and then only by the high priest who takes in the blood to make an offering for his own and the people's faults of inadvertence. By this, the Holy Spirit means us to see that as long as the old tent stands, the way into the holy place is not opened up… [Christ] has entered the sanctuary once and for all, taking with him not the blood of goats and bull calves, but his own blood, having won an eternal redemption." (Heb 9:6-12)

The author of the letter refers to the ritual of the Day of Reconciliation which settled in the liturgy of Israel after Babylonian exile. It was an annual feast, during which the Jews asked God to purify them of sins ("for this is the day on which the rite of expiation will be performed for you to purify you"; Lv 16:30).[616] At the time of Christ, the Day of Reconciliation was called "the largest of the feasts." (*Spec*, 2,193) According to the Mishnah the high priest should say then the following prayer: "O Lord! I have done wrong, I have transgressed, I have sinned before thee, I and my house. O Lord! Forgive the wrongdoings, the transgressions, the sins which I have committed and transgressed and sinned before thee, I and my house, as it is written in the Torah of Moses thy servant: for on this day shall atonement be made for you [to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before The Lord]." (*Yom.* 3,8) The goat, which was led to the Bet Hadud cliff (or according to another nomenclature Bet Harudun) over the Kidron valley, six kilometres from

Gesù ogni uomo può trovare l'accesso al cielo. Il tempo del primo tempio è finito"; M. Rosik, *Gesù e il giudaismo. Passando oltre il confine*, Serramazzoni 2000, 75.

615 M. Jackson, *The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross*, NTS 33 (1987) 23–31.

616 F. Thiele, *Święta religijne żydów, chrześcijan i muzułmanów*, Warszawa 1995, 15. The beginnings of the feast can be traced back to God's order given to Moses (Lv 16:34; 23:26). Specific provisions concerning the celebration of the feast were created during and after Babylonian captivity in priestly circles. This was also when the theological thought related to the importance of the feast developed (Leviticus 16:1-34; 23:26-32; Lb 29:7-11).

Jerusalem, and was driven out "for Azazel"[617] into the desert, was supposed to remove people's sins, earlier put on it with a symbolic gesture, and a second goat was offered as an atoning sacrifice for the sins (Lv 16:16). This sacrifice, above all, was replaced by the sacrifice of Christ.

With such understanding of the theology of the Temple and the Day of Reconciliation which developed in the Church immediately after the death of Christ, it became clear that Christians would not engage in the armed struggle in the war against the Romans.[618] Usually, it is assumed that the majority of them left Jerusalem and went through Samaria to Pella, in today's Jordan: "But the people of the church in Jerusalem had been commanded by a revelation, vouchsafed to approved men there before the war, to leave the city and to dwell in a certain town of Perea called Pella." (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Hist.* 3,5; cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29,8)[619] The ruins that have survived in the vicinity of the village of Chirbat Fahil testify to the former greatness of the town called Pella. In the Roman period, it was one of the most important cities of Decapolis (Mt 4:25; Mk 5:20). The fact that it was an important commercial centre has been confirmed by the discovery on Rhodes of pitcher handles on which the name of Pella was mentioned.

The question of the alleged escape of Christians to Pella still remains debatable.[620] If it really took place, it was an evident sign that the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue was in progress. Archaeological research carried out in recent years in ancient Pella allows a more balanced assessment of the presence of the Christian community in the area from the late sixties

---

617 According to Jewish beliefs, demons live in desert places (Is 13:21; 34:11-14; Tb 8:3; Mt 12:43).

618 Until recently, the theory has been treated as a historical axiom but today it is becoming increasingly questionable: "What was the impact of the 70 catastrophe on the Jerusalem community of believers-in-Jesus itself? That is probably the most critical issue in this discussion. Apart from anything else, we have no idea whether the Jerusalem disciples were at all involved in the revolt and how their attitude to the revolt affected their relation to fellow Jesus"; J.D.G. Dunn, *From the Crucifixion to the End of the First Century*, 43.

619 Eusebius places Pella in Perea, while Epiphanius hesitates between Perea and Decapolis.

620 P. Watson, *The Christian Flight to Pella? The Archaeological Picture*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 73; J. Bourgel, *The Jewish Christians' Move from Jerusalem as a Pragmatic Choice*, in: *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. D. Jaffé, Leiden 2010, 107–108; B. Van Elderen, *Early Christianity in Transjordan*, TynBul 45 (1994) 1, 97–117; G. Lüdemann, *The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella-Tradition*, in: *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, I, ed. E.P. Sanders, Philadelphia 1980, 161–173; J. Verheyden, *The Flight of the Christians to Pella*, ETL 66 (1990) 368–384; C. Koester, *The Origin and Significance of the Flight to Pella Tradition*, CBQ 51 (1989) 90–106.

of the first century on. The researchers discovered in Pella caverns called "grottos of refugees" which were probably inhabited in the second half of the first century AD. However, no artefacts can be identified as typically Christian, so one must abstain from the final verdict as to whether the inhabitants were indeed followers of Christ, who had left Jerusalem.[621]

If it had been as Eusebius has it, the escape of Judeo-Christians from Jerusalem to Pella could have been one of the most important factors on the path of the separation of Church and Synagogue, not only in the sense that the Jerusalem Church did not support the struggle to defend the Temple but it also lost its residence in the city from which the Good News had begun to spread. In this situation, when the ecclesial community of Jerusalem lost its importance, it was easier for ethno-Christians to assert their dominance in the growing movement of Jesus.[622]

In any case, it is significant that Luke, for whom Jerusalem and the Temple is the *locus theologicus*, hardly mentions making offerings by Christians after the death of Christ, although he often mentions in his dual work the presence of the Saviour's followers in the Temple. Luke's Gospel begins with the description of the scene which takes place in the Jerusalem Temple: Zechariah receives a revelation about the birth of John the Baptist (Lk 1:5-25). The Gospel also ends with a scene in the Temple: the disciples are praying (Lk 24:52-53). In this bracket, fastening the whole work together, Luke includes the most important events of Jesus' life, inscribing them in the pattern of a journey. The basic geographical axis of the third Gospel is: Jerusalem – Galilea – Jerusalem.

Neither the final remark of the Gospel nor all references to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles contain information on making offerings by Christians. They were aware that Christ's sacrifice had replaced the sacrifices of the old Law and that the time of the Temple had passed away. It had fulfilled its role. The fight (especially life threatening armed struggle) for its survival seemed to be pointless. The lack of involvement of Christ's followers in the first Jewish uprising, whose decisive moment was the fall of the Temple and which ended after the conquest of Masada, made the process of defining the separate identities of Church and Synagogue even more profound.

The Letter to the Hebrews and Theology of Substitution

There is no doubt that the Letter to the Hebrews is one of the fundamental writings of the New Testament. It discusses the issue of mutual references between Christians (Judeo-Christians) and other Jews. Roman Bogacz states that it is dedicated to the mission of Christ in its various aspects realized throughout the history of salvation, and especially the issue of the New Covenant in relation to the Old

621 P. Watson, *The Christian Flight to Pella? The Archaeological Picture*, 86.
622 A.Y. Reed, A.H. Becker, *Introduction. Traditional Models and New Directions*, 4.

one.[623] On the basis of this writing by an anonymous author[624], the theology of substitution according to which Church "replaced" Israel[625] has been developed. The author of the letter focuses on three important issues concerning mutual relations between [Judeo]-Christians and other Jews. Firstly, he interprets Jesus' life and death using the sacrificial nomenclature of Judaism of the first century and applying metaphors which from the logical point of view seem to be quite problematic: Christ is a priest and, at the same time[626], the sacrifice and the veil that separated the Holy of Holies from the rest of the Temple complex. Secondly, the author reflects in his letter the lively discussion within the Church of the first century about whether anyone who has left the Christian faith can adhere to it again. Thirdly and finally, when discussing the old and the new covenants, he suggests that Christianity is the fullest form of Judaism.[627]

The fact that the author of the letter quotes one of the most important announcements of the New Covenant, written on the pages of the Book of Jeremiah (Jr 31:31-34), in the version LXX and not according to the Hebrew text, seems to be a stumbling stone for the Jews.[628] The difference is essential. The new covenant in the Hebrew Bible is shown by Jeremiah in contrast to the old covenant.[629] Exegetes claim almost unanimously that Jr 31:31-34 is a separate literary

---

623 R. Bogacz, *Dzieło zbawienia w ludzkiej krwi Jezusa według Listu do Hebrajczyków*, List do Hebrajczyków 3, Kraków 2007, 25.

624 After a very detailed examination of terminology of the letter and confronting it with the terminology of the speech of St. Stephen (Ac 1:7-53) R. Bogacz comes to the conclusion that both texts could have been written by the same author; R. Bogacz, *Problem autorstwa*, List do Hebrajczyków 1, Kraków 2006, 1887–188.

625 J. Harrington, *What Are They Saying About Hebrew?*, New York 2005, 2–4. What is more, some authors ask directly if this is the Epistle to the Hebrews or against the Hebrews; W. Klassen, *To the Hebrews or Against the Hebrews? Anti-Judaism and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, in: *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, II, *Separation and Polemic*, ed. S.G. Wilson, Waterloo 1986, 1–16.

626 Some researchers even believe that the Letter to the Hebrews may have been written as a voice in the polemic with Essenism which rejected Jerusalem priesthood as contrary to the Law; K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 172–173.

627 J. Svartvik, *Leggere la Lettera agli Ebrei senza presupporre la teologia della sostituzione*, w: *Gesù Cristo e il popolo ebraico: Inerrogativi per la teologia di oggi*, ed. P.A. Cunningham, J. Sievers, M.C. Boys, H.H. Henrix, J. Svartvik, Roma 2012, 112–114.

628 An in-depth study of the role of the Septuagint in the Epistle to the Hebrews was presented by R. Gheorgita; *The Roles of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38*, Tübingen 2003.

629 For discussion on the oracle of Jeremiah see: A. Schenker, *Der nie augehobene Bund. Exegetische Beobachtungen zu Jer 31,31-34*, in: *Der Neue Bund im Alten. Studien zur Bundestheologie der Beide Testamente*, ed. E. Zenger, 85–112; J. Krašovec, *Vergebung und neuer Bund nach Jer 31,31-34*, 428–444.

unit, easily separated from the context in which it was included. The covenant announced by Jeremiah is characterized by a "novelty" that the prophet defines by contraposition with the covenant made "with ancestors." (Jr 31:32a)

The moment of entering the Old Covenant Jeremiah sees not in the revelation on Mount Sinai (Dt 5:2-5) and not in the events taking place during Israel's pilgrimage across the desert (Dt 32:10-14; Jr 2:2-3) but in the very liberation from under the Egyptian yoke: "I took them by the hand to bring them out of Egypt." (Jr 31:32a; cf. 7:22; 11:4.7; 34:13) The phrase "take by the hand" combined with *obiectum personale* means "to support," "to assist," "to provide assistance" and "to give help." (Is 41:13; 51:18; Jb 8:20) God is depicted as the father leading his son.[630] The breaking of the covenant is indicated by Jeremiah by means of a brief statement: "a covenant which they broke." (Jr 31:32b)

The phrase "to break the covenant" is often described in the Bible as a formal act of breaking Israel's tie with God, a tie established under oath (Gn 17:14; Lv 26:15; Dt 31:16.20; Is 24:5). This act is always performed because of Israel's fault and it never concerns an occasional exceeding of the covenant's commandments but its complete cancellation (Jr 11:9-10). But Yahweh himself always remains faithful to the conditions of the covenant (Lv 26:44; Jg 2:1) of which He is the initiator. The breakdown of the covenant between God and His people draws before Israel an image of the punishing face of Yahweh. But the wrath is not His last word because in the promise of the new covenant there is hope for forgiveness.

Optics of contraposition between the old and the new covenant makes us see in the Law an element inscribed in our hearts which corresponds to the Israelites' exodus from Egypt. On Horeb the Law was written on the stone tablets (Ex 31:18; 34,1-4). The stone was meant to ensure the durability of the record. However, this material did not occur to be sustainable, as Israel was not faithful to the words of the Law. It is different with what had been engraved upon "hearts." The Israelites no longer need to write out the words of the Law on the door posts of their houses or tie them to their hands or place them between their eyes (Dt 6:4-9) because human memory is in the heart.[631] Another aspect of the new covenant relates to getting to know the Lord ("There will be no further need for everyone to teach neighbour or brother, saying, 'Learn to know Yahweh!' "; Jr 31:34b). The "external" teacher of

---

630 This metaphor returns frequently in prophets' utterances: Hosea says that Israel is a child to be taught to walk (Hos 11:1.3); Ezekiel evokes the scene of abandoning a baby (Ezk 16:4-5); the Deuteronomist recalls that God carried Israel across the desert, "as a man supports his son" (Dt 1:31). In some cases, the meaning of the phrase "take by hand" is enriched with a shade of juridical recognition or choice which is politically equivalent to the investiture of a vassal (Is 42:6; 45:1; Ps 73:23).

631 B. Couroyer, *La tablette du coeur*, RB 90 (1983) 416–434; A. Schenker, *Die Tafel des Herzens. Eine Studie über Anthropologie und Gnade im Denken des Propheten Jeremia im Zusammenhang mit Jer 31,31-34*, in: *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, ed. A. Schenker, OBO 103, Freiburg – Göttingen 1991, 68–81.

the Law is no longer necessary because the knowledge stems from the very fact of having the Law inscribed in the hearts. Yahweh's "cognition" is marked by the perspective of universalism: "from the smallest to the largest." (cf. Jr 6:13; Jon 3:5; Ps 115:13; Est 1:5.20; 2K 34:30) The last aspect of the New Covenant is the gift of the forgiveness of sins (Jr 31:34b).

The fundamental difference between the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint in Jeremiah announcement is included in Jr 31:32b. The Hebrew text reads: "they broke My covenant, although I was a lord over them" while in the Greek version we read: "because they did not continue in my covenant, and I did not regard them." The author of the Letter to the Hebrews follows the LXX (Heb 8:9b) and the conclusion might be that God does no longer care about the Israeli nation but He has now placed his liking in the Church which is to replace the nation of the old broken covenant. Why is there such a difference in translation? There seem to be two ways of explaining this discrepancy. The first is based on the fact that the Hebrew text contains the term *bāal*, meaning "to be a master," "to be a ruler." It is possible, however, that the author of the Letter to the Hebrews may have used another *Vorlage* of the Masoretic text, where instead of *bāal* the term *gāal* appeared, meaning "not to care," "to leave." The term is not only homophonic but it is also written in a similar way due to the visual similarity of the Hebrew consonants "b" and "g." The other possibility to explain the discrepancies between the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint is the intentional change made by the author.[632] If we accept this possibility, it means that the change was made for theological reasons, and then the meaning of the whole letter acquires the character of clear opposition to the Jews who did not recognize Christ.

Regardless of whether the version of Jr 31:32b in Heb 8:9b is based on the Hebrew text containing the verb *gāal*, or whether it is the author's conscious editorial operation, it becomes clear that his conclusion is filled with ostracism towards the Jewish nation that rejected Christ. Summing up his argument about the new covenant, the author of the letter notes: "By speaking of a new covenant, he [God] implies that the first one is old. And anything old and ageing is ready to disappear." (Heb 8:13) From the same perspective, supporters of the theology of substitution interpret the contraposition between the first Tabernacle and the new Temple in Heb 9-10. In the "the old tent" (Heb 9:8) they see Judaism and the cult celebrated in the Temple of Jerusalem while in the image of the Holy of Holies and in the statement that "the way into the holy place is not opened up," (Heb 9:8) they see Christianity. In other words, the time of the Temple cult in Jerusalem had come to an end, and now the new cult is practiced in the heavens by the Archpriest of the New Covenant, Jesus Christ.

In recent years, the theology of substitution, found by many in the Letter to the Hebrews, has been subjected to considerable criticism which ultimately changes

632 J. Svartvik, *Leggere la Lettera agli Ebrei senza presupporre la teologia della sostituzione*, 134–136.

the view of the whole epistle, as well as the image of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity that emerges from it.[633] The proposed new interpretation consists in shifting the accent from the opposition between Judaism and Christianity to the opposition between the "present time" (Heb 9:9) and the time to come. The author of the letter is supposed to point out that not all the conditions of the New Covenant announced by Jeremiah have been met.

Not all Christians, after all, have "hearts of flesh," but some act as if they still had the "hearts of stone." Not all Christians do not need further instruction. Not all men have fully come to know the Lord. The heart of flesh, the lack of necessity to be taught and deep knowledge of Christ are the determinants of the future world we are pursuing here on earth. Hence "the old tent" (Heb 9:8) still exists in mortal life; this is confirmed by the author of the letter when he notices: "it is a symbol for this present time." (Heb 9:9)[634] Consequently, if one read the entire letter from the eschatological perspective proposed here[635], then the polemic between Christianity and Judaism found in the epistle by the supporters of the theology of substitution would lose its sharpness.[636] And it should be added that this approach to reading of the Letter to the Hebrews, which departs from traditional patterns, is certainly legitimate.[637]

633 K. Bardski notices that a simple consequence of the theory of substitution is looking at judaizm, which survived after the demolition of the Temple, as at an accidental and insignificant meander of history. The text of the New Testament, however, does not express such a view; K. Bardski, *Izrael i nawrócenie narodów pogańskich w symbolach biblijnego starożytnego chrześcijanstwa*, VV 10 (2006) 160.

634 J. Svartvik, *Leggere la Lettera agli Ebrei senza presupporre la teologia della sostituzione*, 136–142.

635 Such reading is proposed by W.G. Johnson; *The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews*, JBL 97 (1978) 2, 239–251.

636 J.D.G. Dunn, *From the Crucifixion to the End of the First Century*, 49–51.

637 B. Chilton and J. Neusner are of the opinion that the letter to Hebrews constitutes a specific turning point in the development of Christianity. Along with its creation, "original" Christianity was transformed into an "early Christianity": "Primitive Christianity here becomes, before the reader's eyes, early Christianity. After Hebrews, it will be apparent to Christians that any loyalty to Judaism is a throwback, to be tolerated or not, but always off the centre of the religious system. Before Hebrews, there were Christian Judaisms; after Hebrews, the appearance of any institution of Judaism within the Church was seen to be a form of Jewish Christianity"; *Judaism in the New Testament. Practices and Belief…s*, 188.

Part II Difficult Parting – The Beginnings (71–135 AD)

> What, therefore, will there be after these things for? If you destroy your city, and deliver up your land to those that hate us, how shall the name of Israel be again remembered?
>
> *The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (3,5)*

I Until the Foundation of Jabneh Academy (71–89 AD)

The period between the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in the year 70 and the creation of the Academy of Jabneh (c. 90) and even the second Jewish uprising (132 – 135 AD) is a transitional period for Judaism. Let us add – a period which is not abundant in literary sources.[638] Biblical Judaism came to an end and rabbinic Judaism was shaped. Most historians believe that the rabbinic period begins in the year 70 AD, and that the transition from the Judaism of the Second Temple (before the destruction of the Temple) to rabbinic Judaism was a change of monumental significance.[639] This change, however, does not mean – as it can be deduced from some articles and books describing the events which took place in Jerusalem in the year 70 – that living the Jewish way ended in the capital of Judea. Despite the absence of the Temple as an architectural complex, Judaism in Jerusalem was still continuing, a bit like religious life in other Jewish cities. After all, Jerusalem was not the only Jewish centre in Judea at that time. Josephus relates:

> In the limits of Samaria and Judea lies the village Anuath, which is also named Borceos. This is the northern boundary of Judea. The southern parts of Judea, if they be measured lengthways, are bounded by a Village adjoining to the confines of Arabia; the Jews that dwell there call it Jordan. However, its breadth is extended from the river Jordan to Joppa. The city Jerusalem is situated in the very middle; on which account some have, with sagacity enough, called that city the Navel of the country. Nor indeed is Judea destitute of such delights as come from the sea, since its maritime places extend as far as Ptolemais: it was parted into eleven portions, of which the royal city Jerusalem was the supreme, and presided over all the neighbouring country, as the head does over the body. As to the other cities that were inferior to it, they presided over their several toparchies; Gophna was the second of those cities, and next to that Acrabatta, after them Thamna, and Lydda, and Emmaus, and Pella, and Idumea, and Engaddi, and Herodium, and Jericho; and after them came Jamnia and Joppa, as presiding over the neighbouring people; and besides these there was the region of Gamala, and Gaulonitis, and Batanea, and Trachonitis, which are also parts of the kingdom of Agrippa (*Bell.* 3,51-56).[640]

638 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 159.

639 F.H. Feldman, *Judaizm palestyński i diaspory w I wieku*, 42.

640 J. Taylor, *Parting in Palestine*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 87.

In all the cities and lands mentioned above, religious life of the Jews continued just as it used to before the fall of the Temple. Their inhabitants did not have direct contact with the central religious institution of Judaism on a daily basis[641] and lived a religious life away from the Temple. Preserving customs and concern for the observance of religious regulations remained unchanged. What altered was the awareness of the Jews because they had lost their point of reference in the shape of the Tabernacle.

The fall of the Temple was such a dramatic event for the Jews and it so much changed their religious optics[642] that in a sense the relation to Christians receded into the background. But only "in a sense." Jabneh (Jamnia) was not only a response to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple but also a Jewish response to Christianity growing stronger. First of all, it was necessary to save Judaism, rabbis thought, and to give it a new shape. Such was the aim of their efforts focused first on the newly established academy in Jabneh in the Mediterranean Sea, and then in Galilean cities such as Bethsaida and Sepphoris where rabbinic centres were created one after the other. The Babylonian diaspora was also becoming more and more prominent and gradually it took priority in setting the directions regarding the interpretation of the Law. The attempts concerning the new form of Judaism, however, only "in a sense," as it has been mentioned above, pushed the question of the relation of the Jews to Christians to the background. This was because handling of Christianity constituted part of the struggle, and it was not easy at all.

Christianity developed primarily in the environment of the Greek language[643] because the community of the Jerusalem followers of Christ most probably ceased

641 The practice of Jewish customs not directly connected with the Temple is evidenced by archaeological excavations in Judea, during which the structures of mikvehs used continuously until the year 135 were unveiled; Miller, *Stepped Pools, Stone Vessels and Other Identity Markers of 'Complex Common Judaism'*, JSJ 41 (2010) 214–243; D. Amit, Y. Adler, *The Observance of Ritual Purity after 70 CE: A Reevaluation of the Evidence in Light of Recent Archaeological Discoveries*, in: *'Follow the Wise': Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honour of Lee I. Levine*, ed. Z. Weiss, O. Irshai, J. Magness, S. Schwartz, Winona Lake 2010, 121–143. Works of archaeologists proved that in Judea Jewish burials took place in the years 70- 135 after Christ; M. Aviam, D. Zion, *Jewish Ossilegium in Galilee*, in: *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish and Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Forster*, ed. L.V. Rutgers, Leuven 2002, 151–187.

642 L.I.A. Levine, *Judaism from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the End of the Second Jewish Revolt: 70 – 135 C.E.*, in: *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2011, 139.

643 According to P. J. Tomson, after the year 70, "the break with the synagogue ensued, an independent gentile Church developed, and the various Judaeo-Christian groups continued to have a shadowy existence"; P.J. Tomson, *Halakhah in the New Testament: A Research Overview*, 192.

to exist.[644] It was focused not only on the mission among the Gentiles but also on the endeavour to achieve the clarity of teaching. As the consciousness of Christ's deity was more and more grounded in the young Church, there appeared erroneous teaching, verging on gnosis, which had to be categorically opposed to. Already St John had to convince his readers that Jesus Christ came in human body (1Jn 4:2B). Christians themselves were, therefore, not much interested in contacts with representatives of the Synagogue, since they were preoccupied with other issues.

The problem faced by the researchers dealing with the relationship between Christianity and Judaism in the years 71–135 AD is related to sources. Josephus essentially finished describing the history of the Jews with the fall of the first uprising. After the account of the destruction of Jerusalem, he focused only on the conquest by the Romans of three fortresses in which the insurgents still defended themselves (*Bell.* 7,163-209. 252-407). Historical sources describing the history of the Jews in a comprehensive and fairly complete manner do not exist. Information has to be drawn from few references of classical writers and Church historians as well as from the few inscriptions and data coming from archaeological excavations, among which particular attention should be paid to the inscriptions and images on coins. Rabbinic literature concerning this period was written much later and is not devoid of errors of historical nature, including chronological errors, thus it needs to be used with great caution.[645] The limited number of sources and the fact that they provide only rudimentary information make any hypotheses formulated about the relationship between Church and Synagogue in this period quite unverifiable. It seems that it is advisable to limit oneself to mere citation of facts and their very cautious interpretation.

Increasing Openness of Church to Non-Jews

After the demolition of the Temple of Jerusalem by Titus' troops, when Sadducees, Essenes, Zealots and Sicarii who defended Masada disappeared, the religious leadership in Judaism was gradually taken over by the successors of the former Pharisees – *chachamim*, called rabbis. Their attitude towards Judeo-Christians was characterized by growing dislike and, over time, even hostility. It could be assumed that some Jews who approved of the rabbinic ideology no longer considered the Judeo-Christians as fellow believers (Judaism itself, deprived of one of its pillars – the Temple – was in the process of gradual transformation), and this state of affairs was intensified by the conclusions of the debates at Jabneh.

The situation of the young Church consisting of ethno-Christians was related to another sensitive issue of political nature which also had an impact on the conflict

644 M.A. Jackson-McCabe, *What's in a Name? The Problem of 'Jewish-Christianity'*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 12.

645 J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, Bitwy / Taktyka 23, Zabrze 2008, 13–14.

with Judaism. In accordance with the teaching of Jesus himself (see the question of the tax for the benefit of the empire: Mt 22:15-21), Christians were not involved in the fight against the Roman regime. *De facto* opposition to Rome would impede the evangelizing on the territory of the empire and, as we know, the mission developed there and was quite successful.[646] At the same time, national liberation tendencies among those Jews who wanted to establish a theocratic kingdom of God on earth were not only alive but also intensified their activities, leading to an open conflict with the Roman authorities. This difference in approach to authority between Christians and the Jews can be illustrated by the fact that some ethno-Christians served in the Roman army since they did not see anything contrary to their new religion in the act. For the Jews this was of course unthinkable because military service in the Roman army would be equal to the betrayal of one's own nation.

The Gospel According to Matthew and the Jewish Tradition

Most exegetes advocate the creation of Matthew's Gospel after the year 70. The adoption of such a date turns Jesus' announcement of the destruction of the Temple into nothing more than a *vaticinium post eventum* but it seems that denying Jesus the possibility of uttering a prophecy in which He foretold the destruction of the Tabernacle is quite bizarre (cf. Mt 22:7). If the same exegetes are able to recognize in Jesus a healer and a miracle worker, and they postpone the date of creation of Matthew's Gospel to the time after the Temple had been destroyed, putting into the mouth of Jesus a prophecy that had already come true, there is certain inconsistency in such an approach. If He could perform exorcisms, heal the sick and resurrect the dead, could He not have predicted the siege and the destruction of the Temple? If Matthew's work was really written after the year 70, it is very surprising that the evangelist did not explicitly state that Jesus' prophecy was fulfiled. This would be another argument confirming His messianic mission. In any event, the prophecy concerning the destruction of the Temple is not the only argument for a later dating of Matthew's work. Arguments for the earlier dating (before the destruction of the Temple) were presented by J.A.T. Robinson[647] although many exegetes managed to undermine them significantly.[648]

---

646 This was also the attitude of the authors of the Gospels. The evangelists, writing for readers brought up in Greco-Roman culture, were well aware of the fact that they could not present Roman authorities in an unfavourable light as this would discourage readers who showed a lively interest in what Jesus had to say; J.-P. Isbouts, *Wspólne korzenie. Od Mojżesza do Mahometa*, trans. J. Korpanty, Warszawa 2009, 251.

647 J.A.T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1976.

648 H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70–312)*, 266.

Much more interesting than the date of creation of the Gospel according to Matthew is its theology. It is largely marked by the fact that its author was a Jew and its addressees were Judeo-Christians, most probably living in the Syrian diaspora[649]. Its purpose is to a certain extent apologetic: the author would like to reassure the addressees that Jesus was the expected Messiah and the Son of God and to make them realize how many (if not all) Old Testament prophecies found in Him their fulfilment. [650] At the same time, the book, read by a follower of Judaism who did not accept Christ, could serve as a collection of arguments supporting Christianity.[651] The author himself is of Jewish descent although some researchers do not agree with this view.[652] However, many facts speak in favour of the author's Jewish origin: he looks positively at the Law (Mt 5:17-20); he emphasizes the fulfilment in Jesus of the Jewish Messianic expectations; he prefers to show Jesus' mission only in Israel and the universalistic aspect can be found only in the last part of the work in line with Jesus' command not to go to the Gentiles (Mt 10:5-6); he seems to continue the observance of the Sabbath.[653]

The thesis that Matthew's work was created in at least two stages seems quite acceptable. The original version of the Gospel is characterized by the Palestinian and, one could say, pro-Judaic colouring, which is expressed in the Semitic way of presenting the content and composition of the work. This layer includes, for example, numerous Semitisms: *raka* (Mt 5:22), Beelzebub (Mt 10:25), bind and loose (Mt 16:19), flesh and blood (Mt 16:17), mentions of offerings (Mt 5:23), phylacteries (Mt 23:5), whitening of tombs (Mt 23:27) etc. The symbolism of numbers (especially two, three, five and seven) is also important here.[654]

The second stage of the creation of Matthew's work is connected with the final editing which took place when it became clear that most of the Jews had rejected the faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and Church began to fill its ranks

649 J. Lemański, *Żydzi w oczach ewangelisty Mateusza*, RBL 2 (2004) 117.

650 W.D. Davies, *The Jewish Sources of Matthew's Messianism*, in: *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, 494–495.

651 W. Carter, *Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 155.

652 Thus: R.E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York 1997, 210. The pagan authorship of the work would be supported by criticism of Jewish ritualism and formalism as well as frequent allusions to universalistic opening regarding the proclamation of the Good News (Mt 18:18; 12:18-21; 21:43-45; 22:1-14; 24:14; 25:32; 26:13; 28:18-20).

653 J. Lemański, *Żydzi w oczach ewangelisty Mateusza*, 118–119.

654 J. Kozyra, *Nowy Testament a Żydzi na podstawie dokumentu Papieskiej Komisji Biblijnej (2001)*, in: *Pieśniami dla mnie Twoje przykazania. Księga pamiątkowa dl Księdza profesora Janusza Frankowskiego w 50. rocznicę święceń kapłańskich i 75. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2003, 149.

with faithful believers of pagan descent. This is how the prophecies of Jesus began to come true: "And I tell you that many will come from east and west and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob at the feast in the kingdom of Heaven; but the children of the kingdom will be thrown out." (Mt 8:11) The children thrown out of the kingdom are, according to the author, the Jews who did not accept Christ.

Matthew desires to prove to the Judeo-Christians (and possibly to the Jews who do not know Christ) that Jesus is the new Moses (Legislator), and that the biblical history of salvation reached its climax in the coming of Christ (the Messiah), in his passion, death, resurrection and ascension. He shows it clearly both in the Gospel of Infancy (Mt 1-2) and in the entire structure of his work. In the Gospel of Infancy, the author refers to the story of Moses and, against this background, he outlines the story of Jesus' birth and the escape of the Holy Family to Egypt.

According to the Book of Exodus, the pharaoh, alerted by the growth of the Hebrew population, ordered to kill all male descendants of Israelites (Ex 1:22). Moses was saved only because he was put as an infant by his mother in a basket floating in the waters of the Nile and was found by the pharaoh's daughter (Ex 2:5). When, as an adult, he killed an Egyptian in defence of a Hebrew, for fear of revenge he had to hide in the land of Midian (Ex 2:11-22). The story of Jesus' childhood presented by Matthew contains many analogies to the story of Moses. Some of the similarities can be presented as follows:

Story of Jesus	**Story of Moses**
Mt 2:1314: Herod is looking for the Child to kill him so Joseph takes the Mother and Jesus and flees.	Ex 2:15: Pharaoh intends to kill Moses, so he flees.
Mt 2:16: Herod sends soldiers to Bethlehem to exterminate all children up to the age of two.	Ex 1:22: Pharaoh orders to drown every newborn Hebrew boy in the waters of the Nile.
Mt 2:19: Herod dies.	Ex 2:23: Pharaoh dies.
Mt 02:1920: The angel of the Lord orders Joseph to return to the land of Israel because those lying in wait for the life of the Child have died.	Ex 4:19: The Lord orders Moses to return to Egypt because those lying in wait for his life have died.
Mt 02:21: Joseph with Jesus and His mother comes back to Israel.	Ex 4:20: Moses with his wife and children returns to Egypt.

Already in this part of the Gospel, the division between the Jews and the Gentiles is clearly visible. The former have essentially rejected Christ, the latter are characterized by openness towards the economy of salvation: pagan wanderers from the East pay homage to Jesus, while the leaders of the chosen people are looking for an opportunity to kill the Child.

The analogy of the stories of Moses and Jesus plays an important role in the presentation of the logic of the story of salvation in the evangelist's theology. As Moses was the saviour of the Hebrews from Egyptian captivity, chosen and prepared by God, so Jesus is the Saviour from the bondage of sin and death of all people who believe in Him. At the same time, there is also an announcement of the theme of the new Law, which would be developed by the evangelist later, especially in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5 –7). As the Decalogue was passed on to the chosen nation by Moses, so the new Law would be revealed by Jesus. All these measures were intended to help Matthew show Jesus as the Lawgiver and Liberator in the image of Moses. These arguments were supposed to appeal to Judeo-Christian readers and to potential Jewish readers, too.

What is more, the parallel plots in the lives of Moses and Jesus are contained in Mt 2-7: Moses and Jesus as children are miraculously saved in Egypt; they both have the experience of entering water (the Red Sea and the Jordan respectively) and the act introduces all their later activities; they both experience evil in the desert; they both climb up the mountain (Sinai and Mount of the Beatitudes respectively) where the proclamation of the Law takes place.[655]

The intention to show the doctrine of Jesus as the new Torah is even more clearly accentuated in the structure of Matthew's work. It is not only a matter of integrating the five great discourses of Jesus into it – based on the pattern of the Pentateuch – but also of their deliberate sequence. The speeches of Jesus presented in Matthew's work include in turn: the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5 – 7), the Missionary Discourse (Mt 10), the Parabolic Discourse (Mt 13), the Discourse on the Church (Matthew 18), and the Discourse on End Times (Mt 23 – 25). The fact that such a structure of the Gospel was deliberately intended by its author is evidenced by the occurrence of the structure-creating formula: "Jesus had now finished what he wanted to say." (cf. Mt 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1) The gospel is thus the new Torah for the Church.

Further, as it has already been mentioned, the goal of the evangelist is the desire to present within the meticulously devised framework of his work the story of Jesus as the story of Israel. The five subsequent discourses correspond to five stages or critical moments in the history of the chosen nation. Jesus ascending up the mountain (Mt 5:1) and proclaiming the commandment to love God and one's neighbours, including the commandment to love one's enemies (Mt 5:43-45), reminds of Moses at Mount Sinai who brings the Decalogue to the awaiting Israelites. The choice and sending of the Twelve to missions in Galilee (Mt 10:1-10) with a clear recommendation to omit the Gentiles (Mt 10:5) alludes to the conquest of Canaan by Joshua exactly from the side of Galilee. There is no doubt that the number of the apostles in this case refers to the twelve tribes inhabiting the Promised Land. The centrally situated Parabolic Discourse (Mt 13), whose main theme is the kingdom of God, is immediately associated in the readers' minds (both Judeo-Christian and Jewish)

655 A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 3.

with the golden age of the Kingdom of Israel – the reign of David and Solomon. The small number of exiles who returned to Jerusalem after the edict of Cyrus (539 BC) to create a new community focused on the common work of rebuilding the Temple may be a situation parallel to the formation of the community of the Church, in which life is governed by the principles presented in the Discourse on the Church (Mt 18). The last two centuries before the coming of Christ had been marked by the emergence of apocalyptic literature in Israel's writing culture and religiosity. For this reason, the Discourse on End Times (Mt 23 – 25) is placed at the end of Matthew's work.[656] History of the chosen people "reflected" in the life of Jesus can be shown schematically as follows:

History of Israel	**Teaching of Jesus**
Moses at Sinai	the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5–7)
taking over Canaan	the Missionary Discourse (Mt 10)
the Kingdom of David and Solomon	the Parabolic Discourse (Mt 13)
the reconstruction of the Temple	the Discourse on the Church (Mt 18)
apocalyptic literature	the Discourse on End Times (Mt 23–25)

From Matthew's point of view, the whole history of Israel is summarized in the mission of Jesus. Jesus Christ is the central figure. A new stage of history starts with Him. Jesus acts as Moses and thus the Church is encompassed within God's election.

Matthew eagerly uses quotations and allusions to the Old Testament to show Israel's continuation in the nascent Church. Researchers see in the use of these quotations apologetic tendencies towards the Synagogue. The author of the Gospel seems to prove in this way that Jesus and his entire work constituted the next step in the history of salvation, precisely planned by God and announced by the prophets. It is worth noticing the educational value of the quotations: their aim is to instruct the readers and show the roots of Christianity. Their most basic list is as follows:

Mt 1:22-23: quotation from Is 7:14
Mt 2:5b6: quotation from Mic 5:1 and 2S 5:2
Mt 2:15b: quotation from Hos 11:1
Mt 2:1718: quotation from Jr 31:5

656 It is also worth drawing attention to the symmetry of the speeches of Jesus. The first and the last ones are the longest since they contain three chapters (5 - 7; 23 - 25), others contain one chapter (10,13,18). The first and the last ones are directed to the crowds in the presence of the disciples (5:1-2; 23,1), the second and the fourth speeches are addresses to the disciples (10:1; 18:1), and the central one to the crowds (13:1). This symmetrical distribution of the material around the speech in Chapter 13 indicates that the central theological theme of Jesus' preaching is the announcement and coming of the kingdom of God.

Mt 2:23b: quotation from Is 4:3 and Jg 16:17
Mt 3:3: quotation from Is 40:3
Mt 4:1416: quotation after Is 8:239:1
Mt 8:17: quotation from Is 53:4
Mt 12:1721: quotation from Is 42:14
Mt 13:1415: quotation from Is 6:910
Mt 13:35: quotation from Ps 78(77):2
Mt 21:45: quotation from Is 62:11 and Zc 9:9
Mt 26:56 the introductory phrase without a quote
Mt 27:910: quotation from Zc 11:1213 and a reference to Jr 32:615; 18:23.

The above list clearly indicates a large accumulation of quotations (or at least formulas introducing a quotation) in the Gospel of Infancy. Out of the fourteen quotations in Matthew's entire work, as many as five were included in the first two chapters. Why? Perhaps among the early Christians, the Gospel of Jesus' Infancy needed a deeper embedding in the Old Covenant than, for example, the description of the Messiah's passion and death. Here, the associations appeared naturally in the minds of Hebrew readers; no intervention on the part of the evangelist was required. In any case, the researchers are not in agreement as to whether quotations in the Gospel of Infancy were added by Matthew to the material taken over from tradition, or whether the quotations themselves had given rise to the story about the circumstances of conception, birth and the first years of Jesus' life. They may have constituted a certain literary skeleton and determined the reference points on which the evangelist based the very limited traditional material concerning the childhood of Jesus. Today the first proposal seems to be more probable.

On the other hand, one can carry out an experiment consisting in reading fragments of Mt 1:18-25 and 2:13-23 and omitting introducing formulas (1:22-23; 2:15 b; 2:17-18; 2:23b). Then, the whole narration becomes clearer and gains dynamism.[657] Regardless of which of the hypotheses better reflects the actual process of shaping the story of Jesus' childhood, the evangelist's effort to set the story in the Old Testament reality can clearly be seen.

As the above reflections show, Matthew interprets the history of the chosen nation through the prism of the "event of Jesus Christ." This interpretation could not be accepted by those of the Jews who did not accept Christ. Matthew consciously revealed a different reaction to the figure of Jesus in the final part of the work, where he juxtaposed the description of two types of reaction to the fact of the empty tomb (Mt 28:1-15).[658] After the appearance of the angel to "Maria

---

657 A thorough analysis of the OT citations in the Gospel of Matthew is presented by R.E. Brown (*The Birth of The Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*, 96121).

658 G.N. Stanton, *Matthew's Christology and the Parting of the Ways*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 115.

Magdalene and the second Mary," the subsequent events are experienced through "words." (Mt 28:5-10) This is the word of the message which is first delivered by an angel (Mt 28:5-7) and then by Jesus himself (Mt 28:9-10). The two utterances are extremely consistent in their content. The lines of terminological parallelism can be thus drawn:

Angel	**Jesus**
"There is no need for you to be afraid."	"Do not be afraid"
"Then go quickly"	"Go ..."
"tell his disciples"	"tell my brothers"
"he is going ... to Galilee"	"must leave for Galilee"
"that is where you will see him"	"there they will see me"

The words of the message combine the traditions of the Old and the New Covenant. In Old Testament times, God often spoke to His people through angels; "but in our time, the final days, he has spoken to us in the person of his Son." (Heb 1:1-2) The juxtaposition of the angel's words with the words of the Risen is intended to show that the messianic promises of old times are being fulfilled in Jesus. The leaders of the chosen people react to the empty grave quite differently. The high priests order the guards to propagate false news of the stealing of Jesus' body (Mt 28:11-15). The contrast between the descriptions of these two reactions is Matthew's conscious editorial operation, a procedure aimed at emphasizing the tension that arose between Judeo-Christians and other Jews. At the same time, this example suggests that in Matthew's entire work one can expect other passages reflecting the polemic between Judeo-Christians and the Jews. These certainly include passages in which Jesus is accused of magic (contact with evil powers) and of deceiving people.

Accusations suggesting that Jesus exorcizes evil spirits with the power of the prince of darkness appear in Mt 9:34[659]; 10:25 and 12:24.27. Jesus' exorcism became an opportunity to discuss the powers that made it possible to cast out evil spirits. According to the religious leaders of Israel, Jesus cast out demons in the name of Beelzebul. In 1K 8:12 and Is 63:15 the expression *beit zebul* indicates the place of God's presence or dwelling. A confirmation of such an interpretation a reader can find in Qumran literature and the Talmudic treatise on holiday celebrations. In turn, the very name of Baal (Lord) refers to the deity worshipped in Canaan before

659 Very interesting is the fact that this verse is omitted in the Codex Bezae, two ancient Latin manuscripts (*a* and *k*, known as *Codex Bobbiensis*), the Syrian Sinai palimpsest and in the writings of Hilary of Poitiers. The attempt to explain the lack of Mt 9:34 in some ancient manuscripts was made by J. N. Birdsall; *A Note on the Textual Evidence for the Omission of Matthew 9:34*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 117–122.

the Hebrews settled here. Although they fought against Baal's idolatrous cult, the name returned in various names, as evidenced by numerous biblical references.

Thus, the name Beelzebul indicates the "Lord of the house" or the "Owner of the Lofty Abode (Habitation)" that is the Temple. The allegation of Pharisees: "He casts out demons by Beelzebul, the ruler of the demons" has an ironic tone. Jesus pointed at himself when he spoke: "Now here, I tell you, is something greater than the Temple." (Mt 12:6) The adversaries call Him ironically the Lord but not of the Temple but of the demons; Jesus in His response shows the inner inconsistency of their claims, because the kingdom internally divided cannot be preserved.

Matthew looks at the whole matter differently. Jesus' dispute is an opportunity to reveal the proper significance of exorcisms: "But if it is through the finger of God that I drive devils out, then the kingdom of God has indeed caught you unawares." (Lk 11:20; Mt 12:28) Therefore, exorcisms are the sign of the coming of the kingdom of God. Some manuscripts speak of Beelzebub instead of Beelzebul (Vlg and Syrian versions). Exegetes derive Beelzebub's name from the Philistine deity of Baal Zebub, the Lord of Flies, who was supposed to provide protection against diseases spread by flies. The flies floating over the carcasses or animals intended for sacrifice in the Temple of Jerusalem were identified with demons. Ahaziah sought help from Beelzebub, the god of the Ekron (2K 1:2-16). It is easy to associate this term with a statue of Baal with flies famous in the ancient Semitic world and analogous to Mesopotamian Nint. Similarities can also be found in Greek mythology where Zeus is referred to as "swatting flies." (Pausanias, *Graec. Des.* V 14,1) The accusation against Jesus in such an interpretation is tantamount to saying that Jesus puts people under the authority of demons (identified with flies) rather than frees them from their disastrous influence.

In another place, the evangelist cites a charge against Jesus accusing Him of being the deceiver of people (Mt 27:63-64). The issue concerns Jesus' predictions of the resurrection which are regarded by the high priests and Pharisees as deceptive. However, the spiritual leaders of the chosen people are aware of their own lie because they have heard earlier the announcements of resurrection from the dead (Mt 27:63).[660] The fact that the rumour of stealing the body of Jesus from the tomb lasts "until today" (Mt 28:15) only confirms the state of separation of Matthew's community from other Jews.

660 This time - in contrast to the polemic concerning the question of the source of Jesus' power to exorcize demons - Matthew does not explain the absurdity of the charge: "He takes great pains to convince the reader that the resurrection of Jesus from the tomb in which he was buried was not the 'final deception', but he simply lets the Jewish leaders' critical comments stand. Presumably he is convinced that readers of his gospel will readily agree that the claim of the Jewish leaders that Jesus is a 'deceiver' is monstrous; perhaps the closing verses of the gospel (28.18—20) were intended to prove the point"; G.N. Stanton, *Matthew's Christology and the Parting of the Ways*, 107.

The edge of the polemic with the Jews is also present in the first part of the Eschatological Discourse (Mt 23).[661] Closer research shows, however, that Matthew aims his criticism not against all the Jews who have not accepted Christ but against the spiritual leaders of the nation, who come from the Pharisaic circles. They are fit for hell (Mt 23:15), they are blind and foolish (Mt 23:17), like blind guides who sieve a mosquito and swallow a camel (Mt 23:24); they are also full of hypocrisy and iniquity (Mt 23,28) like snakes and vipers (Mt 23:33).[662] At this stage this is still a debate within Judaism. This polemical attitude towards the leaders does not mean that individual members of the nation are rejected. Criticism of Israel, perhaps most clearly visible at the time of Jesus' trial before Pilate (Mt 27:15-26), does not concern each of its members separately. Matthew refers to the tendency dominating among the Jews but does not exclude Israel from among those to whom the Gospel is directed.[663]

Matthew's conviction that Jesus has the absolute power over heaven and earth, the power received from God, is also inscribed in the context of the polemic with the Jews. Most exegets share the view that the last pericope of Matthew's Gospel, in which the words of Jesus were written, the words uttered just before his ascension (Mt 28:16-30), refers to the Gospel of Infancy (Mt 1 – 2). Parallelisms (sometimes opposite) are numerous and cannot be overlooked.[664]

The Gospel of Infancy	**Last order**
1:1: "The Book of beginning"	28:20: "even unto the end of the world"
1:23: "God is with us"	28:20: "I am with you always"
2:11: wise men "see" Jesus	28:17: disciples "see" Jesus
2:11: proskynesis of sages	28:17: proskynesis of disciples
2:19-23: Jesus in Galilee	28:16: Jesus in Galilee

The last pericope of Matthew's Gospel is, at the same time, a summary of the entire work. It was expressed by the term *exousia*. It seems that the whole of Matthew's material was woven around this term. The first chapters (Mt 1-4) prepare the readers for the revelation of Jesus' authority through the proclaimed word. The authority can be fully shown in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7). The following chapters present Jesus' power expressed in action, especially through the thaumaturgical activity (Mt 8-9). Then this power (authority) is given to the

---

661 M. Wróbel, *Lektura Ewangelii św. Mateusza w kontekście prześladowanej wspólnoty*, in: *„Bóg jest miłością" (1J 4,16). Studia dla Księdza Profesora Józefa Kudasiewicza w 80. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, RSB 25, Warszawa 2006, 438; R.D. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, Cambridge 1967, 3–18.

662 E.A. Russell, *„Antisemitism" in the Gospel of Matthew*, IBS 8 (1986) 183–196.

663 J. Lemański, *Żydzi w oczach ewangelisty Mateusza*, 123.

664 Compilation after: J. Kudasiewicz, *Ewangelie synoptyczne dzisiaj*, Ząbki 1999, 341.

disciples (Mt 10-12), which is most evident in the Missionary Discourse. From chapter 13, the Gospel speaks of authority among God's people: in the kingdom of God (the Parabolic Discourse; Mt 13), in true Israel which means in the Church (Mt 14-17), in particular communities (Mt 18). The authority of Jesus is to be exercised by the disciples although some of them prove to be false disciples (Mt 19-25). After the passion, death and resurrection (Mt 24-28) in which the divine *exousia* is most fully manifested, it is finally given to the disciples in a missionary mandate to make new disciples (Mt 28,16-20).[665]

In the words of this mandate, it is easy to find the echoes of the vision of the Son of Man outlined by Daniel: "On him was conferred rule, honour and kingship, and all peoples, nations and languages became his servants. His rule is an everlasting rule which will never pass away, and his kingship will never come to an end." (Dn 7:14)[666] The prophet's vision is fulfilled in the person of Jesus: to Him the Eternal God passes all the authority, royal in character and everlasting. His authority is not limited because it embraces "the heaven and the earth," and this phrase in the Old Testament means the whole of the created world. The authority was announced by the earthly activity of Jesus: He spoke like the one who had an authority (Mt 7:20); he had the power to forgive sins (Mt 9:6) and the power over demons (Mt 12:28); He passed the same power to his disciples (Mt 10:1-4).

To sum up, it should be added that in spite of its strong anchoring in biblical Judaism, Matthew's Gospel was interpreted in the period of our interest as a voice against the Jews.[667] The most evident passage in this respect is, of course, the description of the judgement over Jesus. When Pilate washes his hands, proclaiming that he is not guilty of the blood of "that innocent," the Jewish crowds cry out: "Let his blood be on us and on our children!" (Mt 27:25)[668] That cry alone was enough for some Christians to put the blame for the death of Christ on the entire Jewish nation, not only its the then members but also their successors. However, in certain copies, anti-Jewish tendencies go even further.[669] In the original text of Mt 27:26b there appears the following phrase concerning Pilate: "After having Jesus scourged he handed him over to be crucified." It is known that crucifixion was executed by

---

665 Such a structure of Matthew's work, based on the distribution of moments stressing the authority of Jesus and his disciples, shows, inter alia, P.E. Ellis in his book *Matthew: His Mind and His Message*, Collegeville 1974.

666 J. Kudasiewicz, *Odkrywanie Ducha Świętego. Medytacje biblijne*, Kielce 1998, 262.

667 W.A. Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians. Selected Essays*, 127–131.

668 A.-J. Levine is convinced that this scene is not anchored in real events, but is an editorial interjection. She begins her reasoning with the words: "From the perspective of history, the entire scene depicted in Matthew 27 is suspected"; *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 100.

669 In the context of the Gospel of Matthew the call is more anti-Pharisee than anti-Jewish and even less anti-Semitic: "Matt 27:25 was one of the two texts cited at the beginning as having provided one of the most active roots of anti-Semitism. And it has probably been used more than any other NT text to legitimate anti-Semitism.

Roman soldiers. And yet, in some old manuscripts, including the famous Sinai Code, this phrase was slightly modified: "he handed Jesus over to them to be crucified." The implied subject in this sentence are the "Jews." Thus, the anti-Jewish attitude of one of the copyists seems to have been voiced here.[670]

Matthew's use of the phrase "their synagogues" (4:23; 23; 9:35; 13:54) may be a testimony of the existing and increasing distance or even hostility between Church and Synagogue at the time of the final edition of the Gospel; these are synagogues of Jews who rejected Jesus.[671] It is possible that highlighting the separation between Judaism and Christianity was motivated by parenetic and evangelistic goals: Matthew wanted the Jews to understand their guilt and to convert by accepting the way of salvation delineated by Jesus.[672]

Fiscus Iudaicus

After the fall of the first Jewish uprising (66–70/73 AD), the Romans generally did not perform any acts of religious repression against the rebels. Such behaviour of the occupant resulted not only from the attitude of Romans towards all conquered people but also the awareness of the sensitivity of Abraham's descendants as far as religious matters were concerned. The sole consequence in this respect (apart from the seizure of land) was the replacement of the tax paid for the Temple of Jerusalem (which was now ruined) with a tax for the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (worshipped also as Jupiter) known as *Fiscus Iudaicus*.[673] The tax was introduced by Vespasian, the founder of Flavian dynasty. Yosef ben Matityahu, who owed the surname of Flavius to Vespasian, describes the introduction of the tax in the following words:

That text apart, however, Matthew appears to be much more virulently anti-Pharisaic (as we shall see in a moment) than anti-Jewish, far less anti-Semitic"; J.G.D. Dunn, *The Question of Anti-Semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 203.

670 B.D. Ehrman, *Przeinaczanie Jezusa. Kto i dlaczego zmieniał Biblię*, trans. M. Chowaniec, Warszawa 2009, 244.

671 J.G.D. Dunn, *The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period*, 206. In spite of this, however, Warren Carter prefers to say that Matthew's Gospel represents "Christian Judaism" rather than "Jewish Christianity": "I will suggest that Matthew's interaction with the rest of first-century Judaism is more aptly named Christian Judaism than Jewish Christianity, but that neither term is especially adequate for the Gospel"; W. Carter, *Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?*, 155.

672 A. Läpple, *Od egzegezy do katechezy*, II, *Nowy Testament*, trans. B. Białecki, Warszawa 1986, 76.

673 M. Rosik, *Czy* Fiscus Iudaicus *w latach 70/71-98 po Chr. wpłynął na rozejście się dróg judaizmu i chrześcijaństwa? Studium historyczno-teologiczne*, CT 83 (2013) 1, 71–92.

> About the same time it was that Caesar sent a letter to Bassus, and to Liberius Maximus, who was the procurator [of Judea], and gave order that all Judea should be exposed to sale for he did not found any city there, but reserved the country for himself. However, he assigned a place for eight hundred men only, whom he had dismissed from his army, which he gave them for their habitation; it is called Emmaus, (13) and is distant from Jerusalem threescore furlongs. He also laid a tribute upon the Jews wheresoever they were, and enjoined every one of them to bring two drachmae every year into the Capitol, as they used to pay the same to the temple at Jerusalem. And this was the state of the Jewish affairs at this time (Bell. 7, 218; cf. Dio Cassius, Hist. rom. 65,7,2).[674]

The temple on *Mons Capitolinus*, one of the seven historic hills of Rome, burnt during the reign of Vespasian in 69 and needed to be rebuilt. *Templum Iovis Optimi Maximi* was not only the pride of the capital of the empire but also a kind of museum where the most valuable votive gifts were stored. The fire gave the emperor an opportunity to change the tax policy, which Jews had to observe. Until then, the Jews had to pay a temple tax for the sanctuary in Jerusalem in accordance with the Law ("half a shekel after the shekel of the temple," in compliance with the pattern kept in the Temple; Ex 30:13).[675] The introduction of *Fiscus Iudaicus* was not meant as an attack on Jewish religiosity; it was introduced by the Roman empire for economic and political reasons.

What is more, there are no documents or sources directly stating that Jews were forbidden to rebuild the Temple after its fall in 70 AD. On the contrary, according to rabbinic literature, the followers of Judaism could freely access the Temple hill (*Ber.* 3,1). Hence it is difficult to explain why no attempt were made to rebuild the Tabernacle. Maybe the reason was solely financial or there was no leader who would inspire the nation and undertake such a task. There could also be a religious reason – Roman soldiers were quartered in Jerusalem and pagans could raise there their own places of worship there so whole city could be considered impure.[676]

The new tax paid not for the Temple in Jerusalem but the one in Rome amounted to two drachmas and was collected by a clerk named *procurator ad capitularia Iudaeorum*. While the earlier temple tax was paid only by men between twenty and fifty years of age, the tax introduced by Vespasian was supposed to be paid by all Jews including women and children.[677] What is more, even slaves were obliged to contribute. There is evidence that this tax was already paid by the Jews in Egyptian diaspora in 71-72 AD, a short time after the destruction of the Temple. The inscription on the ostracon from Edfu implies that in Egypt all the Jews had to pay the

---

674 At the end of the first Jewish uprising there was not any change in the legal status of the Jews in the Empire; J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, Bitwy / Taktyka 23, Zabrze 2008, 22.

675 Half of a shekel is the equivalent of two Roman denarii or Attic two-drachma.

676 J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, 25.

677 M. Heemstra, *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the*

tax until they were 62 years of age.[678] It did not change during the two-year reign of Titus (79-81 AD).

Source material allows to presume that Judeo-Christians were also obliged to pay *Fiscus Iudaicus*. After the fall of the uprising, the ruined Temple was perceived by them as the fulfilment of Christ's prophecy and a fair punishment imposed by God on the nation that rejected the Messiah.[679] Despite such an attitude towards the Temple, after the year 70 Judeo-Christians as the followers of the religion of Moses were also supposed to pay *Fiscus Iudaicus* for the purpose of rebuilding a temple of Jupiter, a charge which replaced the tax for the Temple of Jerusalem, a place they did not feel affiliated with any more. Imposing this tax on Judeo-Christians was related to the Roman perception of the followers of Christ of Jewish provenance. On the one hand, Judeo-Christians were still seen by the Romans as Jews and circumcision was among other things the sign of affiliation with Judaism. On the other hand, although Judeo-Christians abandoned many Jewish traditions and did not associate themselves with the Synagogue, they did not cut the bond off completely.

Therefore, it can be assumed that the tax was imposed on all Judeo-Christians and maybe even some ethno-Christians, at least in the communities where all Christians (both of Jewish and of pagan descent) were seen as Jews. This is what already happened twenty years earlier when Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome. As it has already been noticed before, Suetonius stated that this affected the Jews who stirred trouble due to some Chrestos (*De vita caes.* 5, 25, 4).[680] The emperor's decree had an impact not only on the followers of Judaism, including Judeo-Christians, but presumably also on at least some ethno-Christians associated with Judaism, as the phenomenon of Jewish proselytism was well known.[681]

Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context, Groningen 2009, 14. According to some authors the tax applies to every Jew aged between three and sixty; M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways. A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, Grand Rapids 1999, 30.

678 M. Stern, *Fiscus Judaicus*, in: *Encyclopedia Judaica*, VII, ed. F. Skolnik, M. Berenbaum, Detroit – New York – San Francisco – New Haven – Waterville – London 2007, 57.

679 A. Oppenheimer, *Messianismus in römischer Zeit. Zur Pluralität eines Begriffes bei Juden und Christen*, in: *Between Rome and Babylon. Studies in Jewish Leadership and Society*, Tübingen 2005, 265.

680 Josephus confirms the attitude of Claudius to the Jews when he quotes his decree: "It will therefore be fit to permit the Jews, who are in all the world under us, to keep their ancient customs without being hindered so to do. And I do charge them also to use this my kindness to them with moderation, and not to show a contempt of the superstitious observances of other nations, but to keep their own laws only" (*Ant.* 19,290). Suetonius, informed that there were disputes over Christ among the Jews, supposedly assumed that Christ was in Rome at that time; F.F. Bruce, *Wiarygodność pism Nowego Testamentu*, [there is no a translator], Katowice 2003, 152.

681 R. Penna, *Les Juifs a Rome au temps de l'apôtre Paul*, NTS 28 (1982) 328.

The Acts of the Apostles confirm that also the Gentiles attended synagogues. For instance, in Antioch of Pisidia, not only the Jews but also "God-fearers" (Gr. *theosebeis* or *foboumenoi ton Theon*; Ac 13:16.26) listened to Paul in the synagogue. It was the same in Athens where Paul debated in a synagogue with Jews as well as with pagans (Ac 17:17) and in Corinth where there were also "Greeks" among his listeners (Ac 18:4). As it is known, the apostle of the nations was of the view that pagans who would like to follow Christian religion did not have to abide by the Jewish traditions and undergo circumcision – it was enough to abandon idolatry (1Th 1:9). It might be thus assumed that during the reign of Vespasian and Titus, the *Fiscus Iudaicus* was imposed on all Jews, including Judeo-Christians, and presumably also some on the followers of Christ of pagan descent.

Domitian, the successor of Titus, extended the circle of those obliged to pay the tax including in it proselytes as well as people adhering to Jewish traditions (*qui … improfessi Iudaicam viverent vitam*) even if formally they did not consider themselves to be the followers of Judaism. This group included also the "God-fearers" who were the followers of monotheism though they did not become proselytes. Suetonius claims that even men as old as ninety years of age were examined to check if they were circumcised.[682] As can be seen from the above, it seems that the tax could have been imposed on people who were not the followers of Judaism but were in some way connected with the religion. Those were pagans characterized by at least one of the following features:

(1) they respected Jewish religiosity;
(2) they recognized the power of God the Jews believed in;
(3) they were the beneficiaries or friends of the Jews;
(4) they observed at least one of the customs characteristic of the Jews;
(5) they joined Jewish communities as converts.

Many ethno-Christians could be successfully categorized as members of one of the above groups. Where were Christians in all this? During Domitian's reign, as at the time of Vespasian and Titus, Judeo-Christians who lived east of the capital of the empire were considered by the authorities as the followers of Judaism, and consequently were obliged to pay the tax. The followers of Christ of pagan descent were also urged to pay the tax since they were categorized as those living the Jewish way. Although there are no source-based arguments which would irrefutably support the thesis, it seems to be highly probable.[683]

682 M. Heemstra, *The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways*, Tübingen 2010, 14.
683 M. Heemstra, *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context*, 37–38.

Anyway, it is likely that Peter who wrote the letter to Christians of pagan descent living in Rome referred to the *Fiscus Iudaicus* when he encouraged his addressees to pay it. "For the sake of the Lord, accept the authority of every human institution: the emperor, as the supreme authority, and the governors as commissioned by him to punish criminals and praise those who do good. It is God's will that by your good deeds you should silence the ignorant talk of fools. You are slaves of no one except God, so behave like free people, and never use your freedom as a cover for wickedness. Have respect for everyone and love for your fellow-believers; fear God and honour the emperor." (1P 2:13-17)

Alleged allusions to the *Fiscus Iudaicus* in the letter would be possible only if we accept that it was created after the year 70, i.e. after the death of the apostle. However, traditional dating rather indicates the years 63 – 64. Is it possible that Peter's letter was written after the introduction of the *Fiscus Iudaicus*? It seems probable. A few arguments support the assumption.

The first one is the fact that Christianity was widely spread in different provinces of Asia Minor. The author mentions among the recipients of the letter the inhabitants of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (1P 1:1). The apostle Paul conducted missionary activities in the fifties on the territories inhabited by some of the addressees of the letter but this activity did not include Pontus, Bithynia or Cappadocia. Some time must have passed before Christianity spread in those provinces.

The second argument speaking in favour of the late dating of the letter is the fact that Rome is described in it as "Babylon," and the name was used in reference to the capital of the empire after the destruction of the Temple, i.e. after the year 70.[684]

The third argument is the subject of the epistle; it is no longer the question of disputes within the Church (as in Paul's letters) but of relation between Christians and the Gentiles who were becoming a threat. Christian terminology is also developed: the term *christianos* appears (1P4:16), which has not been used by Paul but is present in the Acts of the Apostles created after the year 70.[685] It therefore seems reasonable to assume that the letter was written after Peter's death and after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple.

Terminus ad quem, however, constitutes for sure the year 95 when the *First Letter of Clement of Rome to the Ephesians* was written, based on the First Letter

684 The description of Rome as Babylon also appears in the Revelation (14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2.10.21), the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (11:1; 67:7; 77:12.17) and in the *Fourth book of Ezra* (3:1; 28:31).

685 S. Hałas, *Pierwszy List św. Piotra. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKB NT XVII, Częstochowa 2007, 31. cf. also: D.G. Horrell, *The Product of Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1. Peter*, JSNT 86 (2002) 29–30; J. Prasad, *Foundations of the Christian Way of Life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25. An Exegetico-Theological Study*, AnBib 146, Roma 2000, 8.

from St Peter.[686] It even seems that *terminus ad quem* can be shifted back about ten years to the year 85 because the persecution of Christians was probably intensified at that time and in 1P the situation of the followers of Christ does not seem to be very dramatic yet.[687] It worsened considerably after Domitian had come to power, i.e. in 85 AD. With these arguments in mind, it seems reasonable to assume that the appeal of the author of the letter to be obedient to any authority, cited above, may allude to the *Fiscus Iudaicus*.

The allusion to Jewish tax is even more likely in the context of reference to the suffering of other Christians than the addressees of the letter: "it is the same kind of suffering that the community of your brothers throughout the world is undergoing." (1P 5:9) The author of the letter suggests that "the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren who are in the world." The term *epiteleisthai* sometimes refers to the imposition of taxes. Adopting this interpretation of meaning, the verse should be translated as follows: "you know that your brothers throughout the world are paying the same tax of suffering."[688] On the basis of the present state of the art, it cannot be unequivocally stated whether in 1P 5:9 there is an allusion to the *Fiscus Iudaicus*. If the answer to this question was affirmative, it would mean that at the time of the creation of the letter taxes could be used as means of persecution of not only Judeo-Christians but also the followers of Christ of pagan descent.

In conclusion, it should be noted that although we do not have sources which would directly show the attitude of Christians to the *Fiscus Iudaicus*, it is easy to guess how ethno-Christians reacted to the obligation to pay it. Prior to conversion to Christianity, Judaism had been unknown to them. They did not know its principles and did not identify themselves with its followers in any way. What is more, Jewish communities were already at that time hostile towards Christians. The latter abandoned many Jewish customs; above all, celebrating the Sabbath, circumcision and eating kosher food. Even if they knew that the faith in Christ originated from Judaism, they did not identify with the Jews. It is therefore natural that they did not want and probably often did not pay the tax imposed by the Roman authorities on the Jews.

Nevertheless, at the time of Domitian, the Roman authorities demanded the tax from Judeo-Christians (and probably other Jews considered as apostates) because, in their eyes, Christians descended from Judaism still belonged to the Jewish nation (although there is some inconsistency here because in the case of the fire of Rome during the rule of Nero, Christians were clearly distinguished from the

686 E. Bosetti, *Cristo e la Chiesa nella Prima Lettera di Pietro*, Bologna 1990, 287–289.

687 M. Heemstra, *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context*, 108.

688 J.H. Elliott, *1 Peter. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York 2000, 861–862.

Jews). Circumcision was still considered as a distinctive factor. Further, pagan Christians were also forced to pay *Fiscus Iudaicus* because they were perceived to be "living the Jewish way."[689] Although there are no written testimonies concerning this topic, it is not difficult to imagine that Christians might have considered this state of affairs as deeply unjust. In practice, the paths of Church and Synagogue had already been divided, both communities had little in common and treated each other with hostility, and at the same time the Roman authorities forced Christians to pay the "Jewish" tax.[690]

The situation changed after the death of Domitian (96 AD). Nerva limited the obligation to pay the tax to the Jews practising the Sabbath and observing other customs of their fathers.[691] He probably wanted to gain popularity among the inhabitants of the empire, mitigating the unpopular decisions of his predecessor. The new definition of the Jews, introduced at that time, as those who cherish the customs of their fathers was no longer extended to Judeo-Christians because they had departed from the practices of Judaism. Therefore, the definition of Jewishness focused more on the religious than on the ethnic aspect. The Gentiles also began

---

689 M. Heemstra notes: "There was not yet a persecution of Christians for being Christians, but Jewish Christians could be persecuted as Jewish tax evaders, which could lead to the confiscation of their property, and non-Jewish Christians could be persecuted on the charge of 'living a Jewish life', which could cost them their lives because they were regarded as 'illegal atheists' "; *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context*, 226.

690 M. Heemstra suggests that the allusion to *Fiscus Iudaicus* can also be found in Rv 2:9 and 3:9 where people from "the synagogue of Satan" are mentioned who pretended to be Jews but were not. Possibly, the hostility towards Christians was manifested among them by denouncing to the Roman authorities those followers of Christ who did not pay the tax. Argumentation of Heemstra is not fully convincing as it is based on very many assumptions; *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context*, 136–140.

691 It is not known exactly when the tax was removed. Possibly, it was at the end of the 2nd century; L.H. Feldman, *The Jews and the Gentiles in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton 1993, 100. For more on the issue see: F. Millar, *The Fiscus in the first two centuries*, JRS 53 (1963) 29–42; P.A. Burnt, *The 'Fiscus' and its Developement*, JRS 56 (1966) 75–91; A. Carlebach, *Rabbinic References to Fiscus Iudaicus*, JQR 64 (1975) 57–61; M. Goodman, *The Fiscus Judaicus and Gentile Attitude to Judaism in Flavian Rome*, in: *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, J. Rives, Offord 2005, 167–177; M. Goodman, *The Meaning of 'Fisci Judaici Calumnia Sublata' on the Coinage of Nerva*, in: *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism*, ed. S.J.D. Cohen, J.J. Schartz, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 67, Leiden – Boston 2007, 81–89.

to perceive Christians as those who not only abandoned the cult of the Greek and Roman gods but also separated themselves from Judaism.

Just over a century later, Origen in *Contra Celsum* ascribes to his adversary words directed to Christians: "I shall ask them whence they come, and whom they regard as the originator of their ancestral customs. They will reply, No one, because they spring from the same source as the Jews themselves, and derive their instruction and superintendence from no other quarter, and notwithstanding they have revolted from the Jews" (5,33). In another place of the same work the Jewish opponent levelled a number of similar charges against the Christians: "How is it that you take the beginning of your system from our worship, and when you have made some progress you treat it with disrespect, although you have no other foundation to show for your doctrines than our law?" (2,4) At the time of Origen then both the Jews and the Gentiles perceived Christians as those who had already lost contact with the Synagogue.

Going back to the rule of Nerva, it is worth noticing that coins minted by him bore the inscription: FISCI IUDAICI CALUMNIA SUBLATA.[692] The exact meaning of this inscription is still the subject of an ongoing debate among researchers but many of them agree that it oscillates somewhere between the claim that "*Fiscus Iudaicus* has been cleared of accusations" and "the disgrace of the Jewish tax has been removed."[693] The effect of the tax reform introduced by Nerva was that the believers in Christ stopped to be regarded as the Jews by the Roman authorities. Their situation, however, did not improve. Earlier, in the event of refusal to pay the *Fiscus Iudaicus*, Christians risked confiscation of their property: believers coming from Judaism because in the eyes of the authorities they were Jewish and those who descended from paganism because they lived in a Jewish way. After the year 96, recognized by some researchers as the official date of the separation of Church and Synagogue[694], the authorities of the empire no longer considered

---

692 "Nerva had probably connived in Domitian's murder and thus had a strong interest in winning popular support in Rome by countermanding his predecessor's unpopular actions. His coins proclaim FISCI IUDAICI CALUMNIA SUBLATA. The precise translation of this phrase is uncertain, but its most likely meaning is 'the malicious accusation with regard to the Jewish tax has been removed'. It is reasonable to surmise that from now on those who wished to deny their Jewishness could do so"; M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, 33. cf. also: R.S. Kraemer, *On the Meaning of the Term „Jew" in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions*, HTR 82 (1989) 35–53.

693 M. Goodman, *The Meaning of 'Fisci Iudaici Calumnia Sublata' on the Coinage of Nerva*, 81–90; M. Whittaker, *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views*, Cambridge 1984, 105.

694 I.A.F. Bruce, *Nerva and the Fiscus Iudaicus*, Palestine Exploration Quarterly 96 (1964) 34–45; M. Goodman, *Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity*, JRS 79 (1989) 40–44. „After A.D. 96, then, the definition of Jew by the Roman state was, for the purpose of the tax, a religious one. For Romans, Jews were those who worshipped

Judeo-Christians to be Jews (hence they no longer had to pay the *Fiscus Iudaicus*) but they were considered as those practising the *religio illicita* which led directly to persecution. It was the second wave of persecution by the Roman authorities but this time it was much more global in character (the extermination of Christians by Nero was limited to the capital of the empire).

Christians (including Judeo-Christians) neither before the rule of Nerva nor after its beginning intended to pay taxes for the temple of a pagan god for one more reason: in their eyes it would be tantamount to committing the sin of idolatry. This fact alone is sufficient to assume that the followers of Christ, even if they were identified with the tradition of Judaism by the Roman authorities up to the year 96, could never agree to a tax which would support the pagan cult of Jupiter Capitolinus. It seems that in some pagan writings the year 96 constitutes a caesura separating Christians and the Jews. This distinction is first visible in Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 10,96): since Christians do not pay the Jewish tax, they are not considered as Jews. The definition of Jewishness in the eyes of the Roman authorities was then completed in the following way: the Jews are those who worship God once venerated in the Jerusalem Temple and refuse to honour the Roman idols.[695]

Summing up, we come to the conclusion that after the introduction by Vespasian of the tax for the reconstruction of the Jupiter Capitolinus temple in Rome, both the Jews and Christians were obliged to pay it until the year 96. There was a different basis for paying tax by Judeo-Christians and by the believers in Christ coming from pagan environments. The first ones were directly recognized as Jews, the other ones at first (during the reign of Vespasian and Titus) could have been identified with the Jewish community (as they were at the time of Claudius in Rome) and since the time of Domitian they were perceived as "living the Jewish way." It seems that following the Nerva tax reform Roman authorities began to treat the two communities separately. Jews still had to pay the tax while Christians were suspected of practising forbidden superstition (Latin *superstitio)* which exposed them to persecution. The issue of the *Fiscus Iudaicus* had thus become another element of separation between Church and Synagogue.[696]

---

the divinity whose temple had been destroyed in Jerusalem and who refused worship to the other gods"; M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, 34.

695 M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, 34.

696 C. O'Quin attempts to analyse the issue from the point of view of social psychology: "consider what must have gone through the minds of Gentile believers who were new to the Messianic faith, and who, up to this time, had never felt any identification with the Jews. Not only did they lack a natural affinity for thing Jewish, but were finding themselves the recipients of a growing anti-Gentile polemic within the traditional Jewish communities" (*The Growing Split between Synagogue and Church in the 1st Century*; www.torahresource.com/ EnglishArticles/Fiscus%20 Judaicus.pdf).

Dual Work of Luke

Discussion on the relations between Church and Synagogue as reflected on the pages of the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles at this point of our presentation is justified by the adoption of the traditional dating of the two books: after the year 70 or even at the end of the first century. It should be taken into account, however, that this dating is not certain at all, as several strong arguments speak against it. Let us enumerate only three.

Firstly, as in the case of Matthew's Gospel, it is not known on what basis it has been assumed that the prophecy in Lk 21:20 about the destruction of the Temple could not have been made before its fall. Accepting this announcement as a *vaticinium post eventum* is synonymous with denying Jesus the ability to foresee the fall. It is clear that the prophetic trait of Jesus' activity is constituted by speaking in the name of God, not foretelling the future; however, if anyone accepts the fact that Jesus was the Son of God, he cannot refuse Him the charisma to predict future events. Besides, it seems that if the Gospel of Luke had been written after the destruction of the Temple, the author would have carefully marked it to show that the words of Jesus came true. Since there is no mention of this fact, many researchers accept that this work was created before the destruction of Jerusalem.

Secondly, since the Acts of the Apostles end with the story of Paul's Roman imprisonment and there is no mention of the death of the apostle of nations, and since the Acts were written after the Gospel of Luke (Ac 1:1-2), it seems reasonable to assume that the Gospel had been created before the destruction of the Temple and even before Paul's death. There is no clear reason why Luke would have omitted descriptions of the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, if he created his double work after these events.[697]

Finally, it is worth considering the argument resulting from 1Tm 5:18 where we read: "As scripture says: 'You must not muzzle an ox when it is treading out the corn'; and again: 'The worker deserves his wages.' " The first citation is from Dt 25:4, and the second one from Lk 10:7. According to a traditional dating, the 1Tm was written in the years 63–67 AD and its author must have known the content of the Gospel according to Luke. Each of these arguments is certainly disputable but they should be taken into account. Regardless, however, of the dating of the dual work of Luke, the presentation of the relationship between Church and Synagogue in it is extremely important, mainly because Luke did not come from Palestine.

697 The argument that Luke omitted the descriptions of the deaths of Peter and Paul because he did not want to expose himself to the Romans who had brought about these deaths, does not seem to be very convincing. Luke's writings were intended for Christians, whose relations with Romans were already tense (regardless of adopted dating of both books), so there was no reason to conceal such significant facts from co-believers in the name of incorrectly understood irenicism.

Let us look first at the fragment whose omission in certain manuscripts is ascribed by many researchers directly to the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. This is the scene which took place during the crucifixion of Christ: "When they reached the place called The Skull, there they crucified him and the two criminals, one on his right, the other on his left. Jesus said: 'Father, forgive them; they do not know what they are doing.' " (Lk 23:33-34) The prayer of Jesus for forgiveness (Lk 23:34a) is absent in P^{75}, B, D*, W, $it^{a,d}$, syr^{s} and several other important manuscript witnesses.[698] It is present though in the Sinai Code and in many important medieval manuscripts.[699] It is logical that two possibilities need to be considered: the prayer was either added by copyists to a text which previously had not contained it, or it was removed by them from the original text.

The reasons for attaching or removing the words of Jesus pronounced from the cross can be connected not only with the relationship between Judaism and Christianity but may also result from the dating of this Gospel. If Luke's work had been written before the year 70, before the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem, which was seen by Christians as God's punishment put on Jews for the rejection of the Messiah, then it would mean that the prayer of Jesus for forgiveness for the perpetrators of his death had not been heard. The copyist could not take the liberty of leaving in the text of the Gospel the Master's words of prayer which had been left unheard, so he skilfully removed them. Such a train of thought does not have to be true though because, interpreting the prayer of Jesus, one can assume that He begged for forgiveness for direct perpetrators of His death – the Roman soldiers – and not the Jews.

Even if the original text of the Gospel contained the words of Jesus' prayer, one could certainly leave them in the text even after the Temple had been destroyed, claiming that the prayer referred to the Romans and not to the Jews. On the other hand, however, the thesis that Jesus' prayer was in early Christianity so commonly linked to the Jewish nation that it was no longer possible to interpret it differently (referring it only to Roman soldiers) should not be rejected. Different reading would be contrary to the official interpretation of the Church, already established by the oral tradition and disseminated after the final edition of Luke's work.

The other tendency assumes that Jesus' prayer was added to the original text because, when the same Luke described Stephen's martyrdom, he put into his mouth a prayer: "Lord, do not hold this sin against them." (Ac 7:60) It was not

698 According to B. M. Metzger, "the logion, though probably not part of the original Gospel of Luke, bears self-evident tokens of its dominical origin, and was retained, within double square brackets, in its traditional place where it had been incorporated by an unknown copyist relatively early in the transmission of the Third Gospel"; B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart 1994^{2}, 154.

699 B.D. Ehrman, *Przeinaczanie Jezusa. Kto i dlaczego zmieniał Biblię*, 221.

suitable for Stephen to be more merciful than Jesus Himself so a copyist put a parallel prayer into the mouth of Jesus. This argument would have been more accurate if the parallel had been literal but the terminology used in Jesus' prayer is far from the one used in Stephan's prayer. Since the harmonization of the two prayers is not precise, it is easier to assume the opposite direction. Which? First of all, it is necessary to realize that Luke depicted the events in the lives of the disciples in the Acts of the Apostles according to the pattern used to describe the life of Jesus. At the beginning of Jesus' earthly mission, the Holy Spirit descends upon Him; when the apostles begin their mission, they also receive the Holy Spirit. Anointed with the Holy Spirit, Jesus preaches the Good News; the disciples do the same. Jesus is persecuted; his disciples experience persecutions as well. There are countless parallels. If so, it is easy to imagine that to the original prayer of Jesus uttered from the cross, Luke "assigned" the prayer of Stephen uttered during the stoning.

"There are other reasons to suspect that Jesus' prayer is an original part of the Luke gospel. After all, its author, here and in the Acts emphasizes that Jesus was innocent (like the disciples) and that those who acted against Him did so out of ignorance – Peter in Ac 3:17 says: 'Now I know, brothers, that neither you nor your leaders had any idea what you were really doing.' "[700] Jesus' phrase "they do not know what they are doing" sounds similar. There are therefore more arguments in favour of the view that Jesus' prayer belongs to the original work of Luke and, therefore, its omission by some copyists might prove that in the opinion of Christians it referred only to the Jews; since their Temple had been destroyed, it was a punishment for the rejection of the Messiah and a sign that God did not forgive the chosen nation. Since Jesus' prayer had not been heard, it had to be omitted in order not to put Jesus in an unflattering light. This interpretation is also supported by excerpts taken from the writings of the Fathers of the Church. Here, Origen's ascertainment recorded in the *Contra Celsum* is worth mentioning: "It accordingly behooved that city where Jesus underwent these sufferings to perish utterly, and the Jewish nation to be overthrown, and the invitation to happiness offered them by God to pass to others." (4,22)

Essentially, the content of the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles are characterized by openness to the universalism of salvation but Luke does not ignore the Jewish roots of Christianity. Its beginnings are closely related to Israel. The Gospel of Infancy (Lk 1-2) shows Israel, with Jerusalem in the forefront, as the place of salvific events and the addressee of the message of salvation. Jesus is after all "a light of revelation for the gentiles and glory for your people Israel" but at the same time "a sign that is opposed." (Lk 2:34) So already in the prophecy of Simeon one can notice the first hint about the rejection of Jesus' mission. Jesus is not only the son of Abraham (the first Jew) but also of Adam (the first man). John the Baptist's mission is addressed not only to the

700 B.D. Ehrman, *Przeinaczanie Jezusa. Kto i dlaczego zmieniał Biblię*, 222.

Jews but also to the Gentiles (Lk 3:6). When Jesus as a prophet interprets in the synagogue of Nazareth the prophecy of Isaiah in the form of a targum (Is 61:1-2; 58:6), He speaks of the Gentiles open to God's saving gifts, and this arouses indignation of the Jewish listeners (Lk 4:16-30).

The role of the Old Testament prophets, among whom Jesus continuing their mission should also be placed, is considerable. Prophets should be listened to (Lk 16:29-31; Ac 3:22; 26:27) for God Himself speaks through them (Ac 3:18-26) and all they say is fulfiled (Ac 13:29). Those were prophets who announced the death and the resurrection of Christ (Lk 18:31-33; 20:17; 22:37; 22:69; 24:25.27.44; Ac 3:18) and who explained the meaning of the events in the history of salvation (cf. Lk 3:4; 4:17; 7:26-27; 8:10; 19:45; 23:30; Ac 2:16-21.25-35; 7:48-50; 8:28-35; 13:40-41; 15:15-17; 28:25-28). The Jews are heirs of the prophets (Ac 3:25) and as such they have the possibility of accepting Christ's salvific message as first.[701] In this context, the image of the person of Jesus depicted with the quill of the evangelist evidently acquires prophetic characteristics. Jesus fulfils His mission as a prophet anointed by Yahweh. Like His antecedents, He is rejected by a significant part of his own nation in accordance with the principle that no prophet is ever accepted in his own country.[702]

According to Luke, Christianity understood as "the Way" (Ac 9:2) is a continuation of former Israel. For that reason the attitude of the Jews, even those sceptical to Christians, is not initially hostile. An example can be the statement by Gamaliel who believes that if this new current of Judaism "is of human origin it will break up of its own accord, but if it does in fact come from God," (Ac 5:38-39) it cannot be destroyed. The evangelist interprets the Jewish Law in a specific way. He departs from the legalistic approach in favour of mercy whose need is strongly emphasized in both books (it is enough to mention the parables of mercy – about the Samaritan and the prodigal son). The typically Pharisean legalistic approach does not concern pagano-Christians, as evidenced by the provisions of the so-called Jerusalem Council already discussed above (Ac 15). According to Luke, Christianity is a new universal religious and moral way of life. The Acts of the Apostles emphasize the difference between Christians and the Jews. In the stories about Paul's activities, Jews are presented as his main opponents, against whom he directs his fervent rhetoric (e.g. Ac 22:1-21). The fact that the Jews did not accept the message of

701 R.F. O'Toole, *L'unità della teologia di Luca. Un'analisi del Vangelo di Luca e degli Atti*, Torino 1994, 21.

702 Jesus predicts the reaction of his listeners, recalling the saying: "Physician, heal yourself," (4,23) which he describes as a "parable." Its Arabic equivalent mentions a doctor who treats others but he is sick himself. According to the Coptic version contained in the apocryphal *Gospel According to Thomas*, no doctor can heal those who know him; J. Nolland, *Classical and Rabbinic Parallels to 'Physician, Heal Yourself' (Luke 4,23)*, NT 21 (1979) 199.

Paul worried Luke very much but he comforted himself by recalling the prophets' predictions of such a course of events (Ac 28:26-27).[703]

Luke seems to be making an effort to help pagano-Christians find their identity: it cannot be defined without a reference to the Jewish religion. At the same time, this effort is aimed at finding references to universal history, not directly connected with Judaism (Lk 2:1-2; 3:1-2). On the one hand, the evangelist emphasizes the anchoring of Christianity in the religion of the descendants of Abraham and Moses; on the other hand, emphasizing the differences between the two religions, he distances himself from the Jewish separatist and nationalistic tendencies, which was particularly important after the year 66. The episodes described in the Acts of the Apostles, which might suggest that Roman authorities looked favourably at Christ's followers, are meant to depict the distance between Judaism and Christianity (Ac 16:35-40; 18:12-15; 26:32).

Summing up the outline presenting mutual relations between Judaism and Christianity in Luke's dual work, one must agree with the position of J. Kozyra who claims that Luke expressed his deep respect for the Jewish world which played a leading role in God's plan of salvation. Nevertheless, Luke points out at serious tensions between Jesus, and then his followers, and other Jews. His Gospel aims at soothing the polemical tones of other synoptics (especially of Matthew). Of course, Luke cannot and does not want to hide the fact that Jesus met with radical opposition of the authorities of his own people. Later, the apostles – preachers of the Gospel – found themselves in a similar position. But the restrained coverage of the signs of undeniable Jewish opposition against Jesus and His followers can hardly be seen as anti-Judaism.[704]

703 H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70-312)*, 270. On relation of Luke to Judaism see: R.L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, SBLMS 33, Atlanta 1987; J.T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts*, Philadelphia 1987.

704 J. Kozyra, *Nowy Testament a Żydzi na podstawie dokumentu Papieskiej Komisji Biblijnej (2001)*, 154–155.

II Until the Outbreak of Bar Kokhba Revolt (90–131 AD)

The events that took place in Palestine after the outbreak of the first Jewish revolt against the Romans finally reduced the number of different movements of Judaism present on the religious scene in the middle of the first century to only two: Pharisaism and Christianity growing from Jewish roots.[705] After the year 64, Sadducees or Essenes were not heard of any more but the zealotic movement coalesced with Pharisaism so that within the latter various orientations appeared. Some of them meant to coexist peacefully with the Roman invader, while others – invigorated by the messianic tendencies – oscillated towards nationalism, which not only resulted in the first uprising but also led to numerous revolts in the diaspora (from 116 to 117) and eventually to the revolt of Bar Kokhba (132–135 AD).

Judeo-Christians, convinced that the sacrifice of Christ on the cross had replaced the offerings of the Old Law, were not interested in defending Jerusalem and the Temple at all costs as it became for them only one of the many places of prayer and not a place of offering sacrifice. There is much evidence that, in order to avoid the storm of war, a large number of Judeo-Christians sought refuge in Pella, while other Jews, fuelled by national liberation slogans, stood up for the Holy City. After the fall of the Temple (and a few years later, the fall of Masada, which meant the definitive end of the uprising), the Jews needed two decades to overcome the shock of this event and to attempt to reorganize their religiosity. And this was when rabbis, former Pharisees, appeared on the stage of religious life and began to set the tone for new forms of religiosity. It does not mean that they immediately became the dominant religious force of Judaism. This process took more than a century.[706]

One of the factors which contributed to the fact that Pharisaism dominated Judeo-Christianity was the opening of the latter to the pagan world. Over time, it may have been the Judeo-Christians (at least in some communities) who felt somewhat confused. They considered themselves to be legitimate Jews who believed in Jesus as the Messiah but the opening of the Church's gateway to the Gentiles

705 Although Josephus speaks of "three philosophies" present in Judaism of the first century, rabbinic literature mentions twenty-four currents. It seems, however, that this number was created artificially to juxtapose these currents with twenty four priestly divisions; G. Vermes, *The Jewish Jesus Movement*, 3.

706 "Only in the third century can one begin to talk of a 'triumph of Rabbinism,' and even then only in carefully considered terms. The triumph was initially only in Palestine. From there Rabbinism was transplanted to the diaspora, notably to Babylonia. Its spread was gradual"; P.S. Alexander, *„The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism*, 21.

pushed them even further away from the faith of their fathers. If we add to this lack of interest in the national liberation movement, it is no wonder that the rabbinic movement gained greater sympathy among the Jewish population in Palestine at the turn of the second century.[707]

At the same time, one more important factor can be observed in the process of separating Church from Synagogue, the factor related to the emergence of religious literature. Whereas almost until the end of the first century the literature was rather focused on intra-community polemic, from the beginning of the second century onwards the tips of Christ believer's quills were directed against the followers of Judaism, and vice versa – in the early rabbinic literature one can notice the beginnings of anti-Christian polemic.[708]

The present state of art does not enable us to clearly answer the question of whether the crucial split occured between Christianity as a whole (Judeo- and ethno-Christians)[709] and rabbinic Judaism or rather between Judeo-Christians and Judaism although the second possibility is more probable. Both hypotheses are nevertheless still vivid among researchers. The supporters of the first one take a more traditional view; the advocates of the second possibility think that the specific "suspension" of Judeo-Christians between ethno-Christians and the rabbinic movement, combined with the rapid growth of Christian communities filled with believers of pagan descent, meant that the followers of Christ anchored in Judaism were absorbed by the communities in which the majority of members descended from paganism.

One more comment seems necessary before moving on to the analyses of the material presented in this chapter. After the year 90, the synagogues in majority became hostile places for Judeo-Christians although this tendency had been strengthening already in the second half of the first century. It turns out, however, that the researchers of the discussed subject matter succumbed to a kind of anachronism: the events that happened in the second century were retrojected back

---

707 K. Pilarczyk, *Religia Izraela*, in: *Religie starożytnego Bliskiego Wschodu*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, J. Drabina, Kraków 2008, 426.

708 "Certainly, there were clashes with synagogues over the messianic significance of Jesus, but these can be well understood as inner-Jewish conflicts. As from the late first century, however, we observe a different phenomenon. Christian writings began to affirm Christianity over against Judaism, and this development became overwhelming over the course of the second century"; P.J. Tomson, *The Wars against Rome, the Rise of Rabbinic Judaism and of Apostolic Gentile Christianity, and the Judaeo-Christians: Elements for a Synthesis*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 6.

709 The main anti-Jewish texts coming from the first half of the second century were written by ethno-Christians which was distinctly shown in the book *Die christliechen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches Umfeld* (I, Frankfurt 1982) by Heinz Schreckenberg.

on the research concerning the first century. Many authors wrongly accepted the thesis (which they did not justify) that immediately after the death of Christ the members of synagogue communities were very reluctant towards Judeo-Christians who were not welcome members of the prayer gatherings on Saturdays.

This vision does not match research results. In the first decades after Christ's death and resurrection, the Good News was often the subject matter of synagogue sermons, as the Acts of the Apostles confirm many times. Also the policy adopted by Paul, who founded churches among the Gentiles, consisted in preaching the gospel in synagogues first. It is true that he often met with hostility there but it cannot be denied that synagogues were the first environment in which the Good News of salvation was proclaimed. This situation changed after the establishment of the Jabneh academy, as evidenced by the results of a large-scale project concerning ancient synagogues carried out by three scholars: Anders Runesson, Donald D. Binder and Birger Olsson.[710]

In other words, one can speak of strong polarization of Church and Synagogue as two hostile environments only at the end of the first century. Moreover, the authors notice that synagogues of the first century were generally led by priests, and they were often considered to be teachers of Israel, while rabbis from among Pharisees circles took over the role of synagogue leaders in the second century.[711] The role of priests as teachers is evidenced by biblical texts (2K 19:5-11; Si 45:17;1Mch 14:44) and by Josephus (Ant. 9,4).

The famous inscription of Theodotus, who erected the synagogue in Jerusalem, enumerates three generations of priests who had presided over synagogues: "Theodotus, son of Vettanos, a priest and an *archisynagogos*, son of an *archisynagogos*, grandson of an *archisynagogos*, built the synagogue for the reading of Torah and for teaching the commandments; furthermore, the hostel, and the rooms, and the water installation for lodging needy strangers."[712] The inscription was discovered by a team of French archaeologists carrying out excavation works in the southern part of the Old Town, in the City of David, in 1914. The

710 According to them, the term 'synagogue' "has always, from the first century onwards, referred to an institution separate from the 'church.' Thus attitudes that developed in the second century and later among elite non-Jewish Christians have been retrojected back onto the first century. This has resulted in scholarly misconceptions about first-century synagogues, perpetuating the view of 'synagogue' and 'church' as binary opposites in constant conflict"; A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, Leiden – Boston 2008, 3.

711 A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, Leiden – Boston 2008, 4; D.D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*, SBLDS 169, Atlanta 1999, 355–357; L.I.A. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, 519–529.

712 Inscription cited after: H.C. Kee, *Defining the First-Century CE Synagogue: Problems and Progress*, NTS 41 (1995) 484. [Trans. by K. C. Hanson & Douglas E. Oakman].

transformation consisting in the fact that the role of the leaders of the synagogues was taken over from priests by rabbis of Pharisee provenance has not been noticed by many authors who would like to see the Pharisees as the leaders of the Sabbath prayer gatherings in the first century.

Academy of Jabneh (c. 90 AD)

After the fall of the Temple of Jerusalem, two out of "three philosophies" mentioned by Josephus, namely Sadducees and Essenes, disappeared from the political and religious arena of Palestine.[713] The Pharisees survived in the greatest number and with time they laid the foundations for rabbinic Judaism. The Greek term *farisaios* is a transcription of an Aramaic word created from the verb with the same root p-r-š, meaning "to separate." Although in Aramaic this term never refers to a name of a group, it very well reflects the crux of the matter: the Pharisees "separated" themselves from the rest of society by the pressure they put on the Law of the Old Covenant. According to Josephus, "the Pharisees, […] have the reputation of being unrivalled experts in their country's laws." *(Bell.* 2,126)[714]

Scholars do not always agree on the impact that the group had on society in the first half of the first century.[715] In our times, there are two opposing opinions. According to the first one, Pharisees influenced religious and social life in Palestine in a significant way: they propagated the oral tradition and shaped the conduct of priests who had to lead Temple rites in accordance with their suggestions. Supposedly, they also influenced the shape of synagogue services. Scribes as well as those who were responsible for copying sacred books came from among their circles. As experts on legal regulations, they used to sit at tribunals. Schools were subjected to them as well. The opposite opinion states that their impact on the

713 "There are three kinds of philosophy practised by Jews: the followers of one of them are Pharisees, the other are called Sadducees and the third one are called Essenes. The latter have the reputation of being saintly" (*Bell.* 2'119). Josephus also mentioned the "fourth philosophy" (*Ant.* 18,4-10.23-25; *Bell.* 2,117), but he regarded it as unorthodox; J. Klawans, *Heresy Without Orthodoxy: Josephus and Rabbis on the Dangers of Illegitimate Jewish Beliefs*, JJMJS 1 (2014) 100.

714 R. Deines, *The Social Profile of the Pharisees*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 123–125.

715 K. Hedner Zetterholm, *Alternate Visions of Judaism and Their Impact on the Formation of Rabbinic Judaism*, JJMJS 1 (2014) 127; M. Goodman, *Sadducees and Essenes After 70 CE*, w: *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, ed. S. E. Porter [et al.], Leiden 1994, 347–56; A. Y. Reed, *Rabbis, 'Jewish Christians,' and Other Late Antique Jews: Reflections on the Fate of Judaism(s) After 70 C.E.*, in: *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*, ed. I. H. Henderson, G. S. Oegma, München 2006, 323–46.

social and religious life was rather limited.[716] This view, it seems, results from the scarcity of information concerning Pharisees in the source material and as an argument – *ex silentio* – is not very convincing. The sheer fact that Pharisees were those who set the tone for Judaism after the destruction of the Temple is an argument supporting the first opinion.

The time was marked by the twilight of previous authorities. When the Temple was in ruins, priesthood lost its importance. It had been anyway frequently defied even earlier (especially after the Maccabean Revolt) and the radical example of this fact may be found in the views of the Qumranians. The Sanhedrin also lost its significance, contrary to rabbis who gained in importance. At this point, it is appropriate to draw attention to the fact that researchers are now departing from the theory that rabbis were direct descendants of Pharisees. Pharisaism and rabbinism cannot be directly identified although there are obvious relations between them. It seems that rabbinic literature cannot be indiscriminately used in order to learn the views and beliefs of Pharisees and Pharisean traditions described in the literature have to be cautiously selected.[717]

The logion attributed to Jesus and quoted on the pages of Matthew's Gospel addressed to Christians of Jewish descent may be a trace of emerging rabbinism. In all the Gospels (except for the Gospel of Luke) the title of "rabbi" appears and it is used to address Jesus (Mk 9:5; 11:21; 14:45; Mt 26:25.49; J 1:49; 3:2; 4:31; 6:25; 9:2; 11:8).[718] However, Matthew notices that Jesus – commenting on the attitude of the Pharisees- instructs his disciples: "[They want to be] greeted respectfully in the market squares and [have] people call them Rabbi. 'You, however, must not allow yourselves to be called Rabbi, since you have only one Master, and you are all brothers." (Mt 23:7-8) In Judaism, the title 'rabbi' began to be used to describe official teachers since the time of Johanan ben Zakkai and his successor Gamaliel although informally it had already been used in relation to Jewish scholars a little earlier. Thus, Jesus' logion is most probably the sign of the polemic of Christians with emerging rabbinic Judaism.[719]

The programme of rabbinic Judaism formulated at the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second century can be perfectly expressed by the words assigned to the Great Assembly: "Moses received the Thorah from Sinai, and he delivered it to Jehoshua', and Jehoshua' to the elders, and the elders to

716 M. Rosik, *Judaizm u początków ery chrześcijańskiej*, Bibliotheca Biblica, Wrocław 2008, 141–142.

717 M. Pesce, *Centrum duchowości hebrajskiej u progu naszej ery w Palestynie*, in *Duchowość Nowego Testamentu*, II, ed. R. Fabris, trans. K. Stopa, Kraków 2003, 17–18; E. Rivkin, *Defining the Pharisees: the Tannaic Sources*, HUCA 40–41 (1969–1970) 205–249.

718 P. Sigal, *The Halakhah of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of Matthew,* 35.

719 P.J. Tomson, *The Wars against Rome, the Rise of Rabbinic Judaism and of Apostolic Gentile Christianity, and the Judaeo-Christians: Elements for a Synthesis*, 13.

the prophets, and the prophets delivered it to the men of the Great Synagogue. They said three things: Be deliberate in judgment; and raise up many disciples; and make a fence to the Torah." *(Pir. ab.*1,1) Speaking of caution regarding judgement, the members of the Great Assembly refer to judicial activity in a strict sense of the word. The roots of the spirituality of rabbinic Judaism can be seen even more clearly in the words attributed to Simon the Righteous, a member of the Great Assembly. He was supposed to say: "The world stands on three things: On the Torah, on works (*avoda* can mean labour, or prayer or sacrificial offerings), and on kindness to others." *(Pir. ab.*1,2)

The reflection of Jewish sages at the turn of the first and second centuries oscillated around three issues: the Torah, the Temple and the works of mercy. The second component of this triad, the Temple, may come as a surprise; perhaps the hope for its reconstruction did not die in all of them yet. The first and the third element of the triad add dynamism to everyday life. Commenting on the Torah and performing works of mercy based on it was a living proof of the spiritual desire to discover and realize the will of the Creator.[720] It has to be sincerely admitted that there is little evidence of the almost universally accepted opinion that rabbis were only concerned with fulfiling external practices and implementing the Law, without paying attention to what in theology has been called the "spirit of the Law."

Rabbis were widely appreciated by the poor, mainly because they did not require fees for teaching the Torah: "Rabban Gamliel the son of Rabbi Jehudah ha-Nasi would say: Beautiful is the study of Torah with the way of the world, for the toil of them both causes sin to be forgotten. Ultimately, all Torah study that is not accompanied with work is destined to cease and to cause sin. Those who work for the community should do so for the sake of Heaven; for the merit of their ancestors shall aid them, and their righteousness shall endure forever. And you, I shall credit you with great reward as if you have achieved it." (*Pir. ab.* 2,2)[721]

Rabbinic Judaism was born in the Jabneh academy, led by Johanan ben Zakkai who – as a semi-legendary account has it – was miraculously saved (carried out in a coffin) from burning Jerusalem in the year 69.[722] He obtained the permission of Roman authorities and established the Torah academy in Jabneh (Jamnia, Yavneh). The first fact is all the more important because, since the beginning of Roman domination (63 BC), Pharisees were not very much involved in political life. There were only a few political episodes in which the members of the Pharisee faction were directly involved: the conspiracy against Herod, for which the king severely

720 A.R.E. Agus, *Das Judentum in seiner Entstehung – Grundzüge rabbinisch-biblischer Religiosität*, Judentum und Christentum, Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln 2001, 33–67.

721 K. Pilarczyk, *Rabinizacja judaizmu we wczesnym okresie pobiblijnym*, 292–293.

722 I. Gafni, *The Historical Background*, in: *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT 2/II, Assen 1984, 29.

punished the culprits *(Ant.* 17,43), the removal of the emblem of an eagle hanging over the entrance to the Temple *(Bell.* 1,648), or supporting by some Pharisees the conspiracy of Judas of Galilee *(Ant.* 18,23). Twenty years after the fall of the Temple, the situation forced the Pharisees (under the leadership of Johanan ben Zakkai) to reach an agreement with the Roman authorities in order to obtain permission to establish the academy.

It is not certain whether the assembly of Jewish scholars, called the council of Jabneh, really took place there.[723] Daniel Boyarin of the University of California, Berkeley, does not seem to contradict the thesis about the council itself but believes that researchers interpret the "Jabneh effect" incorrectly.[724] In his opinion, rabbinic sources refer to the academy in Jabneh, thus constructing the myth of the origin of rabbinic Judaism, and in fact it is exactly the opposite: Jabneh was the result of rabbinic debates that looked for historical justification of how the fates of Judaism continued after the fall of the Temple, and not the beginning of a new way.[725] In the debates the academy was ascribed a role which in fact it never performed. According to the Jewish researcher, the Jabneh question should be subjected to demythologization, and then it would come to light that rabbinic Judaism did not have a simple beginning in a small town on the Mediterranean Sea but was a result of complex, often very complicated processes within the womb of biblical Judaism.[726] Boyarin seems to go too far in his theses because the role of the academy was emphasized not only by rabbinic sources (some of them were

723 P. Schäfer, *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums,* Judaica 31, Leiden 1975, 45–46; G. Stemberger, *Die sogenannte „Synode von Jabne" und das frühe Christentum*, Kairos 19 (1997) 14–21.

724 "All of the institutions of rabbinic Judaism are projected in rabbinic narrative to an origin called Yavneh. Yavneh, seen in this way, is the effect, not the cause"; D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 48.

725 The author admits that after the destruction of the Temple, there was a shift of emphasis in understanding religiosity in Judaism; however, the nature of this change must be thoroughly examined: "There was a significant shift from Second Temple Judaism to the rabbinic formation. The nature of that shift, it seems, still requires further specification"; D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 45.

726 The author states inter alia: "Thus, where traditional scholarly historiography refers to Yavneh as a founding council that restored Judaism and established the rabbinic form as hegemonic following the disaster of the destruction of the Temple, I am more inclined to see it as a narrative whose purpose is to shore up the attempt at predominance on the part of the Rabbis (and especially the Patriarchate) in the wake of the greater debacle following the Fall of Betar in 138"; D. Boyarin, *Justin Martyr Invents Judaism*, CH 70 (2001) 3, 428. Stephen G. Wilson is of the same opinion: "The influence of the Yavnean sages on Jewish thought and practice between 70 and 135 C.E. and beyond should not be overestimated. Their decisions were not imposed overnight, nor were they felt uniformly across all Jewish communities"; S.G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70-170 C.E.*, Minneapolis 1995, 181.

created shortly after the academy was founded). Therefore, many scholars reject the opinion of the Californian researcher as extreme.[727]

From the Mishnaic tractate *Yadaim*, we know about the discussion held at Jabneh on whether the book of the Song on Songs and Qoheleth can be included in the canon of the Bible of Judaism. In Christian literature, the terms "canon" and "canonical books" were used for the first time in the fourth century but their Jewish equivalents appeared in Jewish literature in Jabneh circles as "holy books" and books which "defile the hands." It should be noted that the formation of the canon was a lengthy process, completed in the second century. First, the books of the Torah were considered as sacred, and this happened at the time of Hezekiah and Josiah in connection with religious reforms carried out by those kings. It was decided that nothing must be changed in the content of the five books of Moses (Dt 4:2; 13:1). The second important moment of shaping the canon of the Jewish Bible were the reforms carried out by Ezra after the return from Babylonian exile (Ezr 7:14.25-26).[728] The rabbinic discussions at the Jabneh academy constituted another important stage. It should be added that in the middle of the first century AD in the Alexandrian environment, the books of Baruch, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) and the two Books of Maccabees were included into the canon. The Palestinian canon rejected them for various reasons.

At Jabneh the order of prayers that Jews should say was also established. In this way rabbinic Judaism was born, whose product was literature including the Mishnah, the Palestinian and Babylonian Gemara, the Tosefta and midrashim.[729] When there was no Temple, only the Torah remained in the centre of Judaism, first written, contained in the Tanakh, and then oral, contained in the commentaries and interpretations on the holy books.[730] The sign of fidelity of the Jews to God's covenant were no longer sacrifices but carefully observed provisions of the Torah.[731] The primary source of information about early rabbinic Judaism is the

---

727 Thus: J. Neusner, *The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100*, in: *Principat: Religion*, ed. W. Haase, Aufstieg and Niedergang der Römischen Welt, Berlin 1979, 3–42.

728 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 96.

729 E. Gugenheim, *Il giudaismo dopo la rivolta di Bar-Kokheba*, in: *Storia dell'ebraismo*, ed. H.-C. Puech, trans. M.N. Pierini, Roma - Bari 1993, 185–190.

730 H.W. Basser, *The Gospels and Rabbinic Literature*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 78–80; G. Nativ, *Jewish and Christian Bible Reading*, RT 57 (2015) 4, 508; S. Simonsohn, *The Jews of Italy. Antiquity*, 269.

731 A. di Nola, *Ebraismo e giudaismo*, 189. S.J.D. Cohen and M. Stalow notice that the ending of the sacrificial worship did not mean being separated from God because He could be worshiped by good deeds, prayers, obeying commandments and studying the Torah. Synagogues can replace the Temple and rabbis may take the place of the priests; *Dominacja rzymska. Powstanie żydowskie i zburzenie drugiej*

Mishnah whose final editing probably dates back to the end of the second century but its origins should have been sought several centuries earlier. Its creation was inspired by the environment of the scholars of Jabneh.[732]

From the linguistic point of view, the Mishnah is a document in which specific phrases and expressions typical of the Hebrew language can be noticed; this form of language was called Mishnaic Hebrew within whose framework we can distinguish Mishnaic Rabbinic Hebrew consisting of Tannaitic Hebrew and Amoraic Hebrew.[733] The characteristics of this variety of the Hebrew language in the period of its formation (i.e. in the period of pre-rabbinic Judaism) are known mainly from the publication of manuscripts from Murabba'at and the Copper Scroll from the third Qumran cave. Also other Qumran documents may show characteristics of the Mishnaic Hebrew: *The Great Isaiah Scroll* (1QIs), *The Temple Scroll* (11QT), *Some of the Commandments of the Law* (4QMMT), the calendar texts of *Mishmarot* (4Q322,4Q323 and 4Q324), three manuscripts from Nahal Hever (5/6Hev 44-46) and Ostracon Eshel from Qumran. The very fact of the creation of a new variety of the Hebrew language, used by the creators of the Mishnah, is a sign of the departure of the Synagogue from the Church whose language became essentially Greek in the *koine dialektos* version.

Gamaliel II rendered considerable services to rabbinic Judaism. It was thanks to him that the Jabneh academy took over the role of the former Sanhedrin and became an institution of considerable religious and moral authority. Gamaliel had been its leader for some time but was soon dismissed due to his domineering

---

świątyni, in: *Starożytny Izrael. Od Abrahama do zburzenia świątyni jerozolimskiej przez Rzymian*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2007, 427.

732 J.A. Overman and W. Scott state that: "The Mishna's Judaism emerged in the aftermath of the Temple's destruction in 70 and addressed the problem of how to sanctify the life of the people Israel in the absence of a cult. The Mishnaic answer is the promulgation of a Levitical religion, which transformed priestly behavior and extended it to the life of the entire people in the natural and social world. The Mishna's piety consisted of a host of behaviors - food, purity, and kinship taboos; observance of Sabbath, holy days, and festivals; prayer - that promulgated Levitical categories"; *Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*, in: *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, III, ed. D.N. Freedmann, New York – London – Toronto – Sydney - Auckland 1992, 1047; H. von Glasenaap, *Judaizm*, in: *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, trans. S. Łypacewicz, Kraków 1990, 26; G. Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim*, I, 83–92; G. Vermes, *Jezus Żyd. Ewangelia w oczach historyka*, trans. M. Romanek, Kraków 2003, 13; G. Stemberger, *Dating Rabbinic Traditions*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 82.

733 P. Muchowski, *Nowe dane w kwestii misznaickiego w II wieku n.e.*, in: *Pan moim światłem. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Jerzego Chmiela w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, 274–275; E.Y. Kutscher, *The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study*, Scripta Hierosolymitana 4 (1858) 1–35.

personality and was replaced by Eleazar ben Azariah. When the conflict had been defused, Gamaliel was reinstated and Eleazar served as his assistant. It is Gamaliel to whom the tradition attributes the establishment of the canon of the Hebrew Bible, resolution of a number of legal dilemmas, transformation of the ritual of prayer, creation of the final version of the Eighteen Benedictions and exclusion of the apostates from the Synagogue.

The ideology of rabbinic Judaism was based on the idea of legalism which was supposed to apply to the whole of Israel, and which found its expression in the Law, the doctrine and morality. The rabbinic ideology was grounded on three aspects. The first one was the conviction that Moses had received a twofold type of the Torah from God: the written Torah and the oral Torah.[734] The latter had been passed down in oral tradition for centuries but the time to write it down had come. The Torah was handed over in two forms for a clearly defined reason: "God gave the Israelites two [Torahs] - the Written and the Oral. He gave them the written [Torah] with its 613 ordinances to fill them with commandments and cause them to be virtuous […]. And he gave them the Oral [Torah] to make them distinguished from the other nations. It was not given in writing so that the other nations should not falsify it as they had done with the written Law, and say that they are the true Israel." (*NumRab.* 14,10) "The other nations" are of course Christians.[735]

The second pillar of rabbinic ideology was "rabbinization" of the Bible and sacralization of history. New principles of interpretation of the Bible had been worked out, allowing for anachronisms depicting Moses or Abraham reading holy books in a rabbinic manner.[736] Moreover, not only the written or oral interpretation of the Bible but also the behaviour of rabbis constituted a method of approaching the text. The statement that a respectable teacher acted in a certain way was an important argument in the discussion. Rabbis were treated with greater respect than parents "because parents bring you into this world while teachers give you entrance to the world to come." (JT, *Baw. mec.* 2,11)

The third aspect of rabbinic ideology was the belief that the teachers of the Torah guided people to the kingdom of heaven. This belief contains a missionary imperative in reference to all the Jews to make all of them teachers and thus eliminate divisions in Israel. Rabbis belonged to the intellectual elite of Judaism and served as spiritual leaders although they never dominated the Jewish community. It was up to them to discuss what belonged to the Torah and how it should be

734 According to H. Freedman, it is not certain if the Pharisees from the very beginning believed that their oral traditions were given to Moses at Sinai, or if this idea was born later and became popular because it legitimized their point of view; H. Freedman, *Talmud. Biografia*, 24.

735 A. Cohen, *Talmud. Syntetyczny wykład na temat Talmudu i nauk rabinów dotyczących religii, etyki i prawodawstwa*, trans. R. Gromacka, Warszawa 1997, 161.

736 Even God himself in heaven was supposed to study the Torah (*Bawa metzia* 86a; *Gitt.* 68a).

interpreted.[737] With time, the form of religiosity proposed by them began to be considered as normative Judaism.[738]

Are Christians Jewish? Rabbinic Perspective

The new form of Judaism shaped in the Jabneh environment put emphasis on the issue of the identity of the Jewish community. The rabbinic halakha, viewing the problem from the legal point of view, makes it clear that a Jew is someone who was born a Jew or has become one by conversion. By birth, Jewish is the one who has a Jewish mother; the father's identity does not count here. This was confirmed by references in the Mishnah (*Kid.* 3,12) and the Tosefta (*Kid.* 4,6).[739] The conversion, on the other hand, must be recognized by the rabbinic authority and includes four aspects: knowledge of the Torah, circumcision of men, ritual immersion and sacrifices. The one who is a Jew never ceases to be one. The principle is expressed in a concise way in the Talmud: "Even if he sins, an Israelite remains an Israelite." (*Sanh.* 44a) In practice, this means that the one who was born a Jew, and then he renounced the faith of his fathers and became an apostate, and then wants to return to Judaism, is accepted without any conversion procedure. "Sin," according to the above principle, also comprised accepting a different religion. If a Jew converted to Greco-Roman polytheism in the first century, he still remained a Jew. This does not mean that his sin was taken lightly. The apostate from the faith of his fathers remained *de jure* a Jew but in fact he stayed outside the religious community. Moreover, in the end times, his Jewish identity may not have any significance as it may occur that he will not participate in the life to come.[740]

The method of establishing Jewish identity in this way was shaped by rabbinic Judaism; it is however difficult to determine today when exactly the normative principle of coming from the Jewish mother mentioned above was adopted.[741] It

---

737 W. Szczerbiński, *Obcy wśród Żydów. Od partykularyzmu do uniwersalizmu*, in: *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Waldemara Chrostowskiego w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, III, ed. B. Strzałkowska, Warszawa 2011, 1398.

738 K. Pilarczyk, *Rabinizacja judaizmu we wczesnym okresie pobiblijnym*, 297–300; K. Pilarczyk, *Talmud i jego drukarze w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej. Z dziejów przekazu religijnego w judaizmie*, Kraków 1998, 46–48.

739 The Babylonian Talmud contains the following information: "Your son who comes from a Jewish woman is called your son, but your son who comes from a gentile woman is not called your son but her son" (*Jev.* 2,6). For this reason Josephus calls Herod a "half Jew" (*Ant.* 14,403), since only his father was Jewish.

740 P.S. Alexander, *„The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism*, 4–5.

741 For more information on defining Jewish identity see: S. Langston, *Dividing It Right. Who Is a Jew and What is a Christian*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 125–134.

is possible that at the turn of the first and second centuries it was one – but not only – method of defining Jewish identity. If so, from the rabbinic point of view, pagano-Christians were never Jews and were not governed by the Noahide Laws while Judeo-Christians were fully Jewish and were bound by the Sinai covenant.

Although both groups considered themselves to be Abraham's sons in faith, for rabbis only Judeo-Christians constituted a problem. The rabbis used different terms to indicate the apostates from the faith of their fathers: *minim* ("heretics"), *hitzonim* ("being outside"), "the Samaritans" or "star-worshippers." In reference to Christians, the terms *minim* or *notzerim* were probably most often used although the meaning of the former remains problematic. It was this term which appeared in the so-called blessing of heretics, shaped in the Jabneh environment, and which became a milestone in the final division between Church and Synagogue.

Question of *Birkat ha-minim* and the Lord's Prayer

Two episodes rooted in anti-Christian attitudes are associated with the academy of Jabneh. Since the ways of Synagogue and Church were increasingly diverging, mutual reluctance was growing, too. In Jabneh its first manifestation was the introduction of the twelfth blessing to the prayer called *Shemone Esre* ("Eighteen Blessings") obligatorily uttered by all followers of Judaism.[742] The first three blessings of the prayer, known in a slightly shortened version already at the time of Jesus and Paul, were a subject of a debate between the schools of Shammai and Hillel. In its entirety, the text of the Eighteen Blessings is as follows:

I. Blessed art thou, O Lord, Our God and God of our fathers,
God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob, Great, mighty, and awesome God,
God Most High, creator of heaven and earth, Our shield and shield of our fathers,
Our refuge in every generation.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, shield of Abraham.
II. Thou art mighty—humbling the haughty, powerful— (calling the arrogant to judgment),
Eternal—reviving the dead,

742 W. Horbury, *The Benediction of the Minim and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy*, JTS 33 (1982) 19–20. However - as we will see below - many researchers question the thesis that the twelfth blessing introduced at Jabneh referred to Christians at that time. Some are inclined to believe that *birkat ha-minim* started to be related to the followers of Christ only in the 3rd century. This opinion is shared by e.g. Boyarin: "Once the evidence of and for a so-called "blessing of the heretics" before the third century is removed from the picture, there is no warrant at all to assume an early Palestinian curse directed at any Christians. I am not claiming to know that there was no such thing, but rather that we cannot know at all, and that it is certain, therefore, that we cannot build upon such a weak foundation an edifice of Jewish-Christian parting of the ways"; D. Boyarin, *Justin Martyr Invents Judaism*, 434.

Causing the wind to blow and the dew to fall,
Sustaining the living, resurrecting the dead—O cause our salvation to sprout in the twinkling of an eye!
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who revivest the dead.
III. Thou art holy and thy name is awesome and there is no god beside thee.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Holy God.
IV. Graciously favor us, our Father, with understanding from thee, And discernment and insight out of thy Torah
Blessed art thou, O Lord, gracious bestower of understanding.
V. Turn us to thee, O Lord, and we shall return, Restore our days as of old
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who desirest repentance.
VI. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned against thee,
Erase and blot out our transgressions from before thine eyes,
(For thou art abundantly compassionate).
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who forgivest readily.
VII. Behold our afflictions and defend our cause, and redeem us for thy name's sake.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, Redeemer of Israel.
VIII. Heal us, O Lord our God, of the pain in our hearts, remove grief and sighing from us
And cause our wounds to be healed
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who healest the sick of Israel thy people.
IX. Bless this year for us, O Lord our God,
(And may its harvest be abundant. Hasten the time of our deliverance),
(Provide dew and rain for the earth), And satiate thy world from thy storehouses of goodness,
(And bestow a blessing upon the work of our hands).
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessest the years.
Blow a blast upon the great shofar for our freedom and raise a banner
for the ingathering of our exiles.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest the dispersed of thy people Israel.
XI. Restore our judges as of old, And our leaders as in days of yore, and reign over us—thou alone.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, Lover of justice.
XII. May there be no hope for the apostates,
And speedily uproot the kingdom of arrogance in our own day.
(May the Nazarenes and the sectarians perish in an instant).
May "they be blotted out of the book of living, and may they not be written with the righteous"
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who subduest the arrogant.
XIII. Show abundant compassion to the righteous converts,
And give us a good reward together with those who do thy will.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, Stay of the righteous.
XIV. Have compassion, O Lord, our God,
in thine abundant mercy, On Israel thy people,

And on Jerusalem thy city, And Zion, the abode of thy glory,
And upon the royal seed of David, thy justly anointed.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, God of David, Rebuilder of Jerusalem.
XV. Hear, O Lord, our God, the voice of our prayers, (and have compassion upon us),
For thou art a gracious and compassionate God.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer.
XVI. May it be thy will, O Lord, our God, to dwell in Zion,
And may thy servants worship thee in Jerusalem.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, whom we worship with reverence.
XVII. We thank thee, Our God and God of our fathers,
For all of the goodness, the loving kindness, and the mercies With which thou hast requited us,
and our fathers before us. For when we say, "our foot slips"
Thy mercy, O Lord, holds us up.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, to whom it is good to give thanks.
XVIII. Bestow thy peace Upon Israel thy people,
(And upon thy city, And upon thine inheritance),
And bless us all, together.
Blessed art thou, O Lord, Maker of peace.[743]

Some scholars claim that during the Second Temple period, just before its fall, all blessings of *Shemone Esre* were already known. Benedictions 1-3 and 16-18 were to be recited by the priests while others were to be recited by the faithful gathered in the Temple[744]. The commandment to recite *Shemone Esre* every day was created in the community of Jewish scholars at the Jabneh academy.[745] The twelfth blessing of the prayer, called the *birkat ha-minim* ("the blessing of vicious," improperly also referred to as "the blessing of heretics")[746], is extremely important in demonstrating the process of breaking of the bonds between Church the Synagogue.[747]

An example of the great significance that rabbis attached to their twelfth benediction can be a fragment of the Babylonian Talmud which shows that while reciting all the other blessings mistakes were admissible but it was not possible to be mistaken while saying *birkat ha-minim* without being exposed to the suspicion of heresy: "Our Rabbis taught: Simeon ha-Pakuli arranged the eighteen benedictions in order before Rabban Gamaliel in Jabneh. Said Rabban Gamaliel

743 S. Schechter, *Genizah Specimens*, JQR O.S. 10 (1898), 656–8.
744 G. Stemberger, *Dating Rabbinic Traditions*, 93–94.
745 According to some editions of the Babylon Talmud, the tractate *Berachot* contains the record that "the sages in Jabneh added 'o *minim*' to the prayer" (18,4).
746 S.J.D. Cohen, *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 230.
747 S.J. Joubert, *A Bone of Contention in Recent Scholarship: The 'Birkat ha-Minim' and the Separation of Church and Synagogue in the First Century AD*, Neotestamentica 27 (1993) 2, 351–363.

to the Sages: Can anyone among you frame a benediction relating to the *minim*? Samuel ha-Katan arose and composed it. The next year he forgot it and he tried for two or three hours to recall it, but they did not remove him. Why did they not remove him, seeing that Rab Judah has said in the name of Rab: 'If a reader made a mistake in any of the other benedictions, they do not remove him, but if in the benediction of the *minim*, he is removed, because we suspect him of being a *min* - Samuel ha-Katan is different, because he composed it." 28,2-29.1)[748]

It may be assumed that *birkat ha-minim* has its prototype in Ben Sira (Si 36,1-17), particularly in some parts of the text:

> "Take pity on us, Master, Lord of the universe, look at us, spread fear of yourself throughout all other nations. Raise your hand against the foreign nations and let them see your might. […]Rouse your fury, pour out your rage, destroy the opponent, annihilate the enemy. […] Let fiery wrath swallow up the survivor, and destruction overtake those who oppress your people. Crush the heads of hostile rulers who say, 'There is no one else but us!' "

The oldest echoes of the prayer concerning immoral people or apostates can also be seen in the *Psalms of Solomon*. The author of the apocrypha originating from the first century AD[749] puts the following words into the king's mouth: "Let God remove those that live in hypocrisy in the company of the pious, (even) the life of such a one with corruption of his flesh and penury. Let God reveal the deeds of the men-pleasers, the deeds of such a one with laughter and derision." (*PsSal* 4,6-7) It can be presumed that the first part of the cited prayer is a quotation (not necessarily an accurate one) from the first version of the later *birkat ha-minim*. This assumption is based on the literary criterion: the text of the *Psalms of Solomon* unexpectedly changes into the grammatical plural (*PsSal* 4,6).

In dating of the original version of the blessing, the expression "kingdom of force" can also be helpful. It appears in the oldest (a copy coming from the tenth century) version of *Shemone Esre* found in the Cairo Genizah. Exactly the same term was used by rabbi Jose ben Halafta with regard to the Kingdom of the Hasmoneans in the second half of the second century (TB *Av. zar.* 8b). Combining the data, it may be assumed that the original version of *birkat ha-minim* was formed at the time of Hasmoneans.

In spite of several decades of research on *birkat ha-minim* scholars have failed to give the final precise answer to the question about the meaning of the term *minim*. The range of meanings proposed by the researchers is impressive: neither

---

748 M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, Lublin 2013, 147. See also: M. Wróbel, *Znaczenie formuły Birkat ha-Minim w procesie rozdziału Synagogi od Kościoła*, CT 78 (2008) 2, 65–80.

749 A. Paciorek, *Psalmy Salomona*, in: *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 1999, 110. Translation from Greek and Syriac manuscripts by G. Buchanan Gray in R. H. Charles

Judeo-Christians nor Christians in general[750]; Jews breaking the Law but not heretics; Jews the Gnostics; Jews the heretics; the Sadducees, the Essenes and the collaborators with the Jewish authorities[751]; Judeo-Christians; Christians in general (including ethno-Christians); followers of polytheism. Generally speaking, these findings lead to two conclusions:

(1) the oldest testimony to the use of the term in writing comes from the Mishnah and therefore from c. 200 AD. It is not known, however, when it began to be used in spoken language;
(2) the meaning of the term evolved: it took on different meanings in different epochs / periods and had different meanings in different geographical locations (this refers mostly to possible differences in the use of the term in Palestine and in the diaspora, especially Babylonian).

Birkat ha-minim has two versions: Babylonian and Palestinian. The Babylonian version reads after J. Mann as follows[752]:

> For the apostates let there be no hope.
> And let the arrogant government be speedily uprooted in our days.
> Let the notzerim [Nazarenes] and the minim [heretics] be destroyed in a moment.
> And let them be blotted out of the Book of Life and not be inscribed together with the righteous.
> Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant.[753]

Here, two terms occur: "apostates" and "the wicked" (*minim*). The first term comes from the *š-m-r* core ("make someone violate the law") and indicates the Jews who abandoned full orthodoxy and did not faithfully obey the Mosaic Law.[754] It is much more difficult to understand the term minim from which the whole blessing takes

750 Thus, the editors of the entry *Minim*, in: *Nowy leksykon judaistyczny*, ed. J.H. Schoeps [et al.]; trans. S. Lisiecka, Warszawa 2007, 555.

751 "The term *minim* refers to heretics or, better, members of parties in opposition to the rabbinic view"; A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 106.

752 J. Mann, *Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service*, Hebrew Union College Annual 2 (1925) 306.

753 K. Siwek, *Historyczny wymiar „Mowy o chlebie życia" (J 6,22-71)*, Seminare 20 (2004), 21–22. The text of the prayer was reconstructed in a slightly different manner by G. Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1898, 300–303). The translation may be as follows: "For the apostates let there be no hope. And all the *minim* shall be destroyed in one moment, and the kingdom of violence shall be promptly eradicated and destroyed in our days. Blessed are you God, who destroys your enemies and humiliates the bold ones."

754 L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm, *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, ed. P. Dec, II, Warszawa 2008, 525.

its name. Above all, we must not overlook the fact that it may have been understood differently in different epochs. Etymologically, it probably originates from the core of *min* and it meant a person going beyond, "outside" (*min*)[755] the Law. In the original meaning, it would be almost a synonym of the term "apostate." The synonym was used, though, to refer to concrete people or groups.[756] Since, the term arose in Pharisaic circles (the faction was established about 160 BC), it seems understandable that it related to:

(1) Jews who shared Pharisaic convictions but violated the Law and did not preserve the tradition of the elders[757] or
(2) opponents of Pharisees (the Sadducees, the Essenes and the collaborators with Roman authorities).

In the first case is does not literally refer to "apostates" or "heretics" but to those Jews whose behaviour went beyond the commandments of the Torah. In the latter case, it indicated the Jewish opponents of Pharisees.[758] They were primarily Sadducees as Josephus testifies: "What I would now explain is this, that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the laws of Moses; and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them, and say that we are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers. And concerning these things it is that great disputes and differences have arisen among them, while the Sadducees are able to persuade none but the rich, and have not the populace obsequious to them, but the Pharisees have the multitude on their side." (*Ant.* 13,297)

The Mishnah's fragment of the tractate *Sanhedrin* also points at Sadducees: "These have no share in the World to Come: One who says that [the belief of] resurrection of the dead is not from the Torah, [one who says that] that the Torah is not from Heaven, and one who denigrates the Torah [epicureans]." (*Sanh.* 10,1) This short fragment depicts three basic beliefs which distinguished Pharisees from Sadducees: faith in the resurrection, faith in the divine origin of the Pentateuch and oral traditions as well as the faith in God's Providence, especially in the **truth**

755 F. Brown, S. Driver, C. Briggs, *The Brown – Driver – Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*, Peabody 1996², 577–579.
756 G. Bohak, *Magical Means for Handling* Minim *in Rabbinic Literature*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 267–276.
757 R.T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, London 1903, s. 361–397.
758 S.J.D. Cohen believes that "as rabbis used the term 'Gentiles' (*goim)* to determine all non-Jews, whether because of their ethnic origin, theological beliefs or rituals, the term 'heretics' (*minim*) was used to indicate a wide range of the Jews whose theology or rituals seemed to them offensive"; S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 343.

that God rewards good done on earth and sends punishment for the sins (this possibility was rejected by the epicureans).[759] The Sadducees acknowledged the divine origins of the Torah but rejected the oral tradition created around it, hence it should be assumed that when the "Torah" which did not come from heaven was referred to, the authors of the tractate had the oral Torah in mind. The mention of the epicureans evokes the thought of the Jews rejecting the idea of eternal life (like the Sadducees) because the epicurean school rejected the idea of the individual survival of a soul after death.[760]

Another fragment of the rabbinic tradition also points out the Sadducees as those who are "excluded": "The daughters of the Sadducees, when they are accustomed to follow the ways of their fathers, are like Samaritan women. If they separated themselves to follow the paths of Israel, they are like Israelites. Rabbi Yose says: 'They are always considered like Israel unless they separate themselves so as to follow the paths of their fathers." *(Nid.* 4,2)[761] The implications that result from this passage are based on the opposition between the "ways of the Sadducees" and the "ways of Israel." Those who follow the "path of the Sadducees" no longer belong to Israel.[762]

In the eyes of the Pharisees, the Essenes were also dissenters from the faith. The group perfectly fitted for the name *minim*. Their opinions differed from the beliefs of the Pharisees, in particular those regarding the messianic expectations and temple worship, to such an extent that the Pharisees could describe the Essenes as "transgressors."[763] The term *minim* could be used with reference to all those who cooperated with the Roman occupant as well. As a result, Josephus, who

759 S.J.D. Cohen, *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, 220; D.M. Grossberg, *Orthopraxy in Tannaitic Literature*, SJS 41 (2010) 517–561; S.J.D. Cohen, *The Significance of Yavneh*, HUCA 55 (1984) 27–53.

760 D. Boyarin, *Justin Martyr Invents Judaism*, 443–444.

761 "In this text, women's bodies and sexuality are made an instrument in the struggle for power between the men of the rabbinic group and their rivals (the fathers of the Sadducean women). Other Jews, presumably behaving in accordance with ancient Jewish practice or with the ways of their fathers – a highly positively coded term when it is "our" fathers who are being invoked – are read out of Israel because they refuse the control of the rabbinic party"; D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 62.

762 C. Fonrobert, *When Women Walk in the Way of Their Fathers: On Gendering the Rabbinic Claim for Authority*, JHS 10 (2001) 3–4, 409–410.

763 H. Stegemann, in: *Esseńczycy z Qumran, Jan Chrzciciel i Jezus*, 195–204. "The community understood itself as the *true* Temple, and ordered its life to accord with its tradition of how the Temple in Jerusalem should be run. In the view of the Qumran community, false priests now control the Temple; but soon God would intervene and restore the true priests, and true People of God (cf. War Scroll 3) - the Qumran community itself - to the Temple in Jerusalem"; see. J.A. Overman, W. Scott Green, *Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*, 1043.

surrendered his insurrectional group to the Romans, could also be counted among the *minim* by the Pharisees.[764]

In the present state of research, it is not possible to clearly specify when the shift in emphasis in the meaning of the term *minim* came about from the indication of the Jews who did not observe the Law and traditions of the elders albeit sharing Pharisee beliefs to the designation of the Sadducees, the Essenes and the collaborators with the Roman authorities.

Nevertheless, the most important question is whether the term referred Christians. To answer it, we have to point out that the literary use of this neologism was first confirmed in the Mishnah, i.e. around the year 200. At that time, it probably referred to the Jews who were opposed to rabbinic Judaism.[765] It does not mean that the term was used in colloquial speech already in in the first century when Christianity was developing. If so, the term *minim* could refer to Christians at a time when they were considered to be the Jews of Pharisean descent, who did not observe the Law and violated the traditions of the elders.[766] Christians were the "wicked ones" not only because of their religious practices but also because of the fact that they could be considered by the Pharisees as silent collaborators with the Roman authorities.[767] It is possible that this term also referred to ethno-Christians.[768] For the sake of research reliability, we should also mention the unlikely hypothesis that the term *minim* is an acronym of the phrase "believer in Jesus Christ." In Hebrew it would sound: *ma'amin be-Jeshu ha-Notzri*. Letters „m" (from *ma'amin*), "i" (i.e. "j"; from *"be-Jeshu*") as well as "n" (from *ha-Notzri*) would create a word *min*, explicitly indicating Christians.[769]

The term *minim* appears repeatedly in the Mishnah. In the Megillah 4,8, it refers to Jewish groups: "He who says, 'I am not going to pass before the ark wearing coloured clothes' also in white ones should not pass before the ark. [He who says]: 'In a sandal I am not going to pass before the ark' – also wearing shoes he should not pass before the ark. He who makes his phylactery round – it is a source of danger

764 J.H. Charlesworth, *Jesus, Early Jewish Literature, and Archeology*,189–192.

765 S.T. Katz, *Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C.E.: A Reconsideration*, JBL 103 (1984) 73.

766 R.T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 361–397.

767 M. Wróbel claims that Judeo-Christians, professing faith in the Messiah, were not involved in any messianic movements in Palestine and were thus suspected of supporting the policy of Roman authorities; see: *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, Kielce 2002, 191.

768 M. Simon, *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire Romain (135-425)*, Paris 1948, 238; H. Hirschberg, *Allusions to the Apostle Paul in the Talmud*, JBL 62 (1943) 73–87.

769 S.C. Mimouni, *Les Nazoréens. Recherche étymologique et historique*, RB 105 (1998) 242.

and [still] does not fulfil a religious requirement. [If] he put it on his forehead or on the palm of his hand, this is the way of heresy (*minut*)."[770]

In the tractate *Hullin* (2,20-21; 22-24), the term almost certainly refers to Judeo-Christians. The *Hullin* 2,22-24 prohibits being treated by *minim* and in the Talmud presumably Jesus is recognized as a healer an a magician (*Sanh.* 43b). The tractate was most probably created before the revolt of Bar Kokhba.[771] In the same tractate, however, the term *minim* refers to the Gentiles who offer animal meat as sacrifice: "They do not slaughter [in such a way that the blood falls] into a hole, but one makes a hole in his house, so that the blood will flow down into it. And in the market one may not do so that one will not imitate the minim [in their ways]." *(Hull.* 2,9)

In the tractate *Berakhot* the term *minim* certainly refers to Sadducees who rejected faith in eternal life: "All that ended the blessings when they were in the Temple would say, 'From the world.' When the heretics [minim] corrupted [matters] and said, 'there is no world but this one,' they corrected this so that they should say, 'From the world and until the [next] world." (*Ber.* 9,5) The Mishnah itself never mentions the "Eighteen Benedictions" prayer. Such a mention is made in the Tosefta but only once: "the Eighteen Benedictions according to the sages are the equivalent of God's eighteen names in *Ascribe to Yahweh, O sons of God* (Ps 29). One incorporates [the benediction] concerning the *minim* into [the benediction] concerning the (*perushim)* and [the benediction] the proselytes into [the benediction] concerning the elders, [the benediction] concerning David into [the benediction] "Builder of Jerusalem." If he recited each of them separately he has fulfilled his obligation." (Tosefta, *Ber.* 3,25)

The sentence beginning this passage is an attempt to justify the number of benedictions. Of course, this number was freely associated with the eighteen names of God, which the psalmist mentions. The benedictions were also randomly combined in pairs (the heretics and separating, proselytes and the elders, David and the builder of Jerusalem). It is probably only a matter of emphasizing that the prayer should be uttered as a whole and not each particular blessing separately. From the point of view of current research, the first juxtaposition is interesting: the heretics and the separators. The present research on this fragment of the Tosefta leads to the conclusion that the separating Jews are the Jews who left Judea at the time of military conflict with the Romans while the heretics are the Jews who go "beyond" (*min*) rabbinic Judaism in their beliefs.[772]

---

770 M. Wróbel, Birkat ha-Minim *and the Process of Separation between Judaism and Christianity*, PJBR 5 (2006) 2, 108; S. Simonsohn, *The Jews of Italy. Antiquity*, 298–301.

771 L.H. Schiffman, *Who was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*, Hoboken 1985, 65–67.

772 D. Flusser, *4QMMT and the Benediction against the Minim*, in: *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, I, *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, Grand Rapids 2007, 70–118; S.J.D. Cohen, *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, 228.

When the ways between Church and Synagogue definitely parted, i.e. when Christians were not considered to be Jewish, the term which was associated with them was *notzrim* (at least in Palestine). This term is difficult to explain from the etymological point of view. The fact that today in modern Hebrew it refers to Christians does not explain the beginnings of its use to describe the followers of Christ. It may be derived from the verb that means "to guard," "to supervise," or from a noun meaning "a shoot," "a bough," or "a branch." In Isaiah this term means the same as "carrion": "but you have been thrown away, unburied, like a loathsome branch, covered with heaps of the slain pierced by the sword who fall on the rocks of the abyss like trampled carrion." (Is 14:19) From here, it is close to negative connotations. However, in the light of the New Testament, one should rather see here a reference to Nazareth.[773]

The term *notzrim* appeared in the Palestinian version of *birkat ha-minim*. Its author or editor was supposedly Samuel the Younger, working on Gamaliel II orders.[774] *Berakhot* 28,2 speaks about the role of Samuel the Younger in the creation of the prayer. The verb derived from the root *t-q* is used there and it means "to establish," "to organize," or "to formulate." Samuel the Younger is not therefore, in the strict sense, the author of the twelfth blessing but only the person who adapted its content to the new religious conditions after the Temple had been destroyed. It was he who combined two pre-existing blessings: against *minim* and against the "kingdom of violence."[775] After S. Schechter one can quote a Palestinian review of the twelfth blessing in the following wording[776]:

> For apostates let there be no hope
> And the dominion of arrogance of Thou speedily root out in our days;
> And let Christians [ha-notzrim] and minim perish in a moment
> Let them be blotted out of the book of the living
> And let them not be written with the righteous.[777]

Researchers generally agree that the term *notzrim* refers to the followers of Jesus of Nazareth and is based on two phrases from the New Testament: "He will be called a Nazarene," (Mt 2:23) and "the Nazarene sect." (Ac 24:5)[778] Scientists wonder

---

773 A. Mrozek, *Chrześcijaństwo jako herezja judaizmu*, PJAC 5 (2013) 2, 21.

774 M. Wróbel, *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, s. 181–182; D. Flusser, *The World History of the Jewish People*, Jerusalem 1977, 23–24.

775 D. Flusser, *The World History of the Jewish People*, 23–24.

776 S. Schechter, *Genizah Specimens*, The Jewish Quarterly Review 10 (1898), 657–659.

777 After: M. Wróbel, *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, 185; cf. C. Rowland, *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism*, Cambridge 1985, s. 300. Different translation is proposed by H. Lempa (*Modlitwa codzienna w judaizmie*, 55).

778 The term *notzrim* refers to Christians in certain (later) writings of the followers of Christ: Epiphanius (*Anakephalaiosis* 29,9.1; the author refers to the Judaizing

whether the term refers only to Judeo-Christians or to ethno-Christians, too, and also whether it was introduced by Samuel the Younger or, as some would like it, in the second half of the second century. In the case of the first question, most researchers are in favour of the first hypothesis[779], in the second case, they mostly support the second option.[780]

Taking into account the data mentioned above and their analysis, one can attempt to formulate a cautious hypothesis about the understanding of the term *minim*. The hypothesis will still require verification. The meaning of the term evolved over time and depended on the geographical location where it was used. And thus:

(1) Since the first literary use of the term *minim* comes from circa the year 200 AD, it should be assumed that it was previously used in everyday speech. If the term was used in the first half of the 1st century (or earlier), it meant those Jews who, descending from the Pharisean movement, went "beyond" the rules of this trend of Judaism;
(2) the meaning of the term was quickly extended to include not only the Jews associated with Pharisaism but also the Sadducees, the Essenes and the collaborators with the Roman authorities. The Judeo-Christians who did not join the uprising in the year 66 could also be included in the latter group;
(3) after the exclusion of Christians from Synagogue, probably in the second half of the second century, the term *notzrim* was used in relation to them but in some environments (especially in Babylonia, where the Church was not yet well-established) the term *minim* was still used;
(4) the meaning of the term evolved over time to such an extent that in the Babylonian Talmud (VI c.) it sometimes means goys (non-Jews). As a result, it may be assumed that also ethno-Christians should be included in the group.

As can be seen from the above, the understanding of the term *minim* expanded to such a degree that it also comprised polytheists although initially it meant only the Jews, and only those who – although they were anchored in the Pharisaic tradition – went "beyond" (*min*) it. With such a varied semantic field of the term *minim*,

---

Christian group) and Jerome (*In Amos* 1,11-12; *In Esaiam* 5,18-19;49,7;52,4-6; *Letters to Augustine* 112,31).

779 P. Schäfer, *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums*, 48; J. Jocz, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*, London 1949, 51–52.

780 C. Thoma, *Die Christen in rabbinischer Optik: Heiden, Häretiker oder Fromme?*, in: *Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in der ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Hamburg 1990, 38; R. Kimelman, *Birkat Ha-Minim and the lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity*, in: *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. E.P. Sanders, II, London 1981, 233.

it seems likely that in Jewish tradition the term *notzrim* was adopted, as it could be used to refer to both Judeo- and ethno-Christians.[781]

The question remains to be answered as to how the rabbinic form of *birkat ha-minim* was introduced into the synagogue liturgy. After all, rabbis were not the owners of synagogues, nor were the synagogues directly dependent on them. As descendants of the Pharisees, they were one of the currents of Judaism but there was no direct correlation between the rabbinic institution and the synagogue institution. The leaders of synagogues (gr. *archisynagogoi*) and responsible for them did not have to be rabbis.[782]

It seems that the simplest answer to this question oscillates around the structure of the synagogue service. The leader of the synagogue on the Sabbath asked somebody to read particular passages of the Bible intended for the given day and he recited individual prayers. When a rabbi was asked to come to the pulpit, he could successfully recite his version of the blessings. Since this prayer was not yet fully formed, a slight deviation from the customary version was not greatly surprising for the participants. It was surprising, however, how seriously the blessing against *minim* was treated, what was confirmed by the already mentioned passage of the Talmud: "If a reader makes a mistake in any of the other benedictions, they do not remove him, but if it is in *Birkat ha Minim*, he is removed, because we suspect him of being a *min*." (*Ber.* 29,1)[783]

Besides, we must remember that it was not only the "blessing of heretics" which bothered Judeo-Christians but also other blessings diverged from the beliefs of the followers of Christ. They did not feel like praying for the coming of the Messiah (unless it meant Parousia) or for the reconstruction of the Temple, and such requests were included in *Shemone Esre*. The Palestinian version of the "Eighteen Blessings" (found in the Cairo Genizah) was easier to accept for the followers of Christ than the Babylonian version, characterized by a more nationalistic bias.[784]

---

781 In this context, reference should be made to the official statement of the Pontifical Biblical Commission in this matter: "Gradually, probably from the beginning of the second century, a formula of "blessing" denouncing heretics or deviants of different sorts was composed to exclude Christians, and much later, it referred only to them. Everywhere, by the end of the second century, the lines of demarcation and division were sharply drawn between Christians and the Jews who did not believe in Jesus"; *The Jewish People and their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible* (69).

782 M.D. Swartz, *Sage, Priest, and Poet. Typologies of Religious Leadership in the Ancient Synagogue*, *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 89.

783 P.S. Alexander, *„The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism*, 10.

784 It should be emphasized that the versions of *birkat ha-minim* recited in today's synagogues do not mention Christians. A.-J. Levine cites the contemporary version of the blessing: "Let there be no hope for slanderers, and let all wickedness perish in an instant. May all Your enemies quickly be cut down, and may You soon in our

It seems, however, that Judeo-Christians could successfully say the Lord's Prayer in synagogues, because it did not contradict the theology of Judaism.[785] What is more, some scholars prove that the Lord's Prayer is nothing else than an abridged version of the "Eighteen Benedictions."[786] During the formation of rabbinic Judaism, in the synagogue service there was space for individual prayer[787], in which the "Our Father" could successfully be included – a prayer very strongly anchored in Judaism.[788]

The structure of this prayer is typically Jewish: an invocation and seven requests. The invocation, "Our Father," in Judaism indicated God as the Father of the whole chosen nation (Ps 103:13; Pr 3:12; Nb 11:12; Ex 4:22; Dt 32:6.18; Hos 11:1; Is 1:2; Jr 31:9); in Christianity, this call was treated more individually. The exact parallel of the entire invocation is included in the Mishnah, in the tractate *Yoma*: *Abinu she-ba-shammaim* ("Our Father, who art in heaven"; *Yom.* 8,9).[789] Subsequently, the invocation and the first three requests of the Lord's Prayer constitute a very harmonious reflection of the prayer known as the *Kaddish*. Although the *Kaddish*, in a literary form, was not created until the Talmudic times[790], it had previously been said and passed down in the form of oral tradition, although there are not enough arguments to confirm its existence at the time of the edition of the Gospels.

It is very easy to notice the parallel requests of the Lord's Prayer and the *Kaddish*, which can be summarized as follows[791]:

---

day uproot, crush, cast down and humble the dominion of arrogance. Blessed are You, O Lord, who smashes enemies and humbles the arrogant"; *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 108.

785 Amy-Jill Levine, a Jewish authoress, has no doubts: "Although scholars have argued and will continue to argue over which lines are original to Jesus, which translation is closer to the hypothesized construction of the Aramaic tradition, which verses were adapted to church needs, and so on, all versions of the prayer fit within a Jewish context"; A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 42.

786 "The Lord's Prayer appears to be an abstract of the Eighteen. […] It was used in the early Church in the same way as the Eighteen – i.e., they prayed it three times, standing, and used it as an outline for a longer prayer"; D. Instone-Brewer, *Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament*, I, *Prayer and Agriculture*, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 2004, 55; G. Stemberger, *Dating Rabbinic Traditions*, 94.

787 J. Heinemann, J.J. Petuchowski, *The Literature of the Synagogue*, New York 1975, 47–51.

788 M. Rosik, *Judaistyczne tło Modlitwy Pańskiej (Mt 6,9-13)*, Zeszyty Naukowe Centrum Badań im. Edyty Stein 4 (2008) 41–50.

789 Cf. Mekhilta to Ex 20,25; *Sotah* 9,15; *Berakoth* 5,1; *Aboth* 5,20.

790 M. Bendowska, R. Żebrowski, *Kadysz*, in: *Słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, I, Warszawa 2003, 734–735.

791 D. Flusser argues that the prayer "Our Father" originates from liturgical old-Hebrew text on the basis of which also the *Kaddish* was created; *Chrześcijaństwo religią żydowską. Esseńczycy a chrześcijaństwo*, 57.

Kaddish	**Lord's Prayer**
"From the Father [of Israel] who is in heaven…"	"Our Father who art in heaven"
"May His great name be exalted and sanctified"	"hallowed be thy name"
"In the world which He created according to His will"	"Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven"
"May He establish His kingdom"	"Thy kingdom come"

Despite the verbal similarities between these prayers, the ideas contained therein were understood differently in the Christian community and in a different way in Judaism. While the kingdom of God was associated by the Jews with a theocratic state, for Christians, it had a spiritual dimension. The followers of Christ expressed the same request for the coming of the kingdom of God (understood according to the teaching of Jesus) in a brief prayer *Marana tha!* – "Come, O Lord!" In the teaching of Jesus the idea of the kingdom of God was spiritualized. The emphasis was shifted from the idea of theocracy to the spiritual dimension of the kingdom of God. The phrase "on earth as it is in heaven" finds an almost exact parallel in the Judaic thought included in the First Book of Maccabees: "Whatever be the will of Heaven, he will perform it." (1M 3:60) This Book was not included in the canon of the Hebrew Bible because it was written in Greek. The prayer of Rabbi Eliezer (first century AD), written in the Tosefta, sounds similar: "May your will be done in heaven above, grant peace of mind to those who fear you [below], and do what seems best to you." (*Ber.* 3,7)

Prayer for daily bread for the Jews is a request for everything that is necessary or even essential for life. This is how Christians understood this request but with time it was interpreted more spiritually. Some of the Fathers of the Church extended the interpretation of the request for bread in the Lord's Prayer to the Eucharist, arguing that by praying for bread, Christians asked God to be able to participate in the Eucharist.

The next request of the Lord's Prayer found its equivalent in *Shemone Esre.* The sixth blessing begins with the words: "Forgive us, our Father, for we have erred; pardon us, our King, for we have wilfully sinned."[792] In the liturgy of *Yom Kippur* in turn there is a call indicating that there is a relation between God's forgiveness and the forgiveness to others: "[Forgive us our sins,] as I hereby forgive all who have hurt me, all who have done me wrong."

The last request of the Lord's Prayer also refers directly to the traditions of Judaism, albeit not Palestinian but of Judaism in the diaspora. The author of the Book of Wisdom written in Greek sees God as a Saviour: "And by such means you proved to our enemies that you are the one who delivers from every evil." (Wis

792 C. di Sante, *Jewish Prayer. The Origins of Christian Liturgy*, New York 1991, 19–23.

16:8) In this request the term *poneros* ("evil") appears, which can be understood in two ways: either as difficulties or misfortunes people experience or as personified evil (Satan). This second possibility of interpretation also corresponds to Jewish tradition, as the words of Rabbi Chijja ben-Abba's prayer written in the Talmud sound very similar: "Let the merciful shall deliver us from the tempter." (*Kid.* 81a)[793] As it can be seen, the prayer "Our Father" is firmly anchored in Judaism; however, some of the ideas contained in it have been interpreted differently by the followers of Judaism, and in a different way by the followers of Christ. It could have been successfully recited by Judeo-Christians attending synagogues, in contrast to the prayer *Shemone Esre* directed against the Judeo-Christian people.

At this point we can formulate a hypothesis that over time the Lord's Prayer (although in its content it corresponds to Jewish theology) may have become a factor separating both religious communities. In the introduction to the Lord's Prayer, Matthew quotes the words of Jesus: "In your prayers do not babble as the gentiles do." (Mt 6:7) The remark concerning the pagans may have sounded awkward in the ears of pagan Christians. It seems that this fact was the reason for changes in some manuscripts which instead of "pagans" speak of "hypocrites."[794] The term "hypocrites" is used by Matthew in relation to the Pharisees, and by Christians at the beginning of the second century it might have been understood as referring to rabbis as the successors of the Pharisees.[795] As a result, the warning "Do not heap up empty phrases like the hypocrites" could therefore have been read by Christians as Jesus' criticism of the Pharisees.

Greek Bible in the Hands of Jews and Christians

The Academy of Jabneh gave a stimulus to followers of Judaism to turn even more to the inspired books of the Scripture. Although the essential criterion of canonicity was the language (the canon of the Hebrew Bible comprised only books written in Hebrew), the Jews in the diaspora who did not understand the language of Hosea and Isaiah needed a Greek translation of the Bible.[796] The Septuagint had been functioning among them already for about three centuries. What is more, it was very popular in the environment of the diaspora.[797] Josephus and Philo used

793 D.H. Stern, *Komentarz żydowski do Nowego Testamentu*, trans. A. Czwojdrak, Warszawa 2004, 42.

794 A similar lesson is contained in *Didache*: "Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord hath commanded in his gospel so pray ye" (8,2).

795 P.J. Tomson, *The Wars against Rome, the Rise of Rabbinic Judaism and of Apostolic Gentile Christianity, and the Judaeo-Christians: Elements for a Synthesis*, 9.

796 C. Dohmen, G. Stemberger, *Hermeneutyka Biblii żydowskiej i Starego Testamentu*, 73–74.

797 S. Jędrzejewski, *Septuaginta – Biblia helleńskiego judaizmu*, RBL 58 (2005) 4, 245.

this translation profusely. Philo most likely did not know Hebrew so he was confined to the LXX.[798] What is more, even the Palestinian Greek-speaking Jews used the LXX and the language of their prayers was Greek in the *koine* version. There is evidence that in synagogues of the coastal cities of Palestine the prayer *Shema Israel* was recited in Greek.[799]

The Jewish problem with the Septuagint was that it had become the Bible of Christians.[800] The vast majority of Old Testament quotes in the New Testament had been derived from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew Bible. Christians developing their mission in the territories where the Greek language in its *koine* version was spoken used mostly the translation described in the *Letter of (pseudo-) Aristeas* (*The Letter of Aristeas or Letter to Philocrats* 50,273)[801] repeated in turn profusely by Josephus (*Ant.* 12,11-118).[802] The translation was supposedly made for Ptolemy II Philadelphus (282-246 BC) by seventy-two elders (six from each tribe) who were sent to Alexandria by the high priest of Jerusalem. Philo does not mention the number of translators; he only remarks that the high priest assigned this task to the most eminent scholars who not only knew the Hebrew Bible perfectly but were also familiar with the works of Greek literature (*Mosis* 2,32). The fact that the translation was made at that time is indisputable because Demetrius, writing at the time of Ptolemy IV Philopator, uses it in his writings. The number of seventy-two (according to another tradition – seventy) translators was probably derived from Nb 11:24.26.[803]

---

798 S. Jędrzejewski, *Judaizm diaspory w okresie Drugiej Świątyni*, Seminare 27 (2010) 21.

799 S.J.D. Cohen, *The Place of the Rabbi in the Jewish Society of the Second Century*, in: *Galilee in Late Antiquity. Cambridge History of Judaism*, III, *The Early Roman Period*, ed. W. Horbury i in., Cambridge 1999, 953.

800 J. Slawik, *Stary Testament / Tanach w chrześcijańskiej Biblii*, 409–410; S. Szymik, *Biblijna ekumenia hermeneutyk. Pytanie o specyfikę wczesnochrześcijańskiej egzegezy biblijnej*, RT 57 (2015) 4, 431.

801 The letter was sent to Philosrates living in Jerusalem. Its content consists of four parts: preparation for the translation of the Bible, description of Palestine, explanation of unusual events accompanying the translation and an account of the return of the Jewish scholars to the Holy City. Although the author is primarily interested in Jewish history, he also looks favourably on Greek culture. That is confirmed by references to such persons as Demetrius of Phalerum, Hecataeus of Abdera, Theopompus or Theodecus.

802 Moreover, the differences between the HB and the LXX in such passages as Gn 49:10; Nb 23:21; 24:7.17 made Christians choose the version of the LXX because it was much more suitable for Christological interpretation than the Hebrew version; J.J. Collins, *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture. Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*, 80–81.

803 M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways. A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, Grand Rapids 1999, 39.

The legend about the creation of the Septuagint was mentioned several times, sometimes in slightly reworked or extended versions, by early Christian writers. Paradoxically, these descriptions led to the "spiritualisation" of the process of the creation of the Septuagint, and at some point almost to the transferring of inspiration from the HB to the LXX. This is perfectly evident on the example of Is 7:14, a prophecy interpreted by Justin, which will be discussed in the next section. However, let us only mention at this point that the legend of the Septuagint can be found in works by Justin (*Dial.* 68,7; 71,1; 84,3; 120,4 and others), Pseudo-Justinian (*Coh. Grae.* 1,78), Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 3,21,2 = Eusebius, *Hist.* 5,8,11-14), Clement of Alexandria (*Stromr.* 1,148), and Tertullian (*Apologeticum* 18,5-9). To see how Christian writers intervened in the legend recorded in the *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas*, it is enough to look at the additions introduced by Irenaeus in order to improve the translation:

> "For before the Romans possessed their kingdom, while as yet the Macedonians held Asia, Ptolemy the son of Lagus, being anxious to adorn the library which he had founded in Alexandria, with a collection of the writings of all men, which were [works] of merit, made request to the people of Jerusalem, that they should have their Scriptures translated into the Greek language. And they— for at that time they were still subject to the Macedonians— sent to Ptolemy seventy of their elders, who were thoroughly skilled in the Scriptures and in both the languages, to carry out what he had desired. But he, wishing to test them individually, and fearing lest they might perchance, by taking counsel together, conceal the truth in the Scriptures, by their interpretation, separated them from each other, and commanded them all to write the same translation. He did this with respect to all the books. But when they came together in the same place before Ptolemy, and each of them compared his own interpretation with that of every other, God was indeed glorified, and the Scriptures were acknowledged as truly divine. For all of them read out the common translation [which they had prepared] in the very same words and the very same names, from beginning to end, so that even the Gentiles present perceived that the Scriptures had been interpreted by the inspiration of God." (*Hear.* 3,21,2)

There are elements here which were not present in the original version of the legend written down in the *Letter of Pseudo-Artisteas*: Ptolemy's fear that the true content of the letter would be concealed; the motif of separation of translators; emphasizing that the separation of translators concerned all the books; the statement concerning the unanimous and identical nature of the translation regarding individual words and their meanings; the statement concerning God's inspiration. On the basis of such "spiritualisation" of the legend, Christians of the first centuries referred to the translation of the Septuagint with utmost respect. The question of its inspiration, however, has not been solved explicitly yet.

The whole process seems to be understandable and in a sense even necessary. At the time when Christians no longer knew Hebrew, since the Church became the Church of the Greek language (over time also of Latin), the absence of reference to the LXX could even lead to the rejection of the Old Testament, as it happened

in the case of Marcion.[804] It is worth noting that, for example, in the *Dialogue with Trypho* by Justin Martyr we can find constant references to the LXX but only to those books which were recognized by the Jews. What is more, he refers to those copies of the LXX text which were in use before the appearance of the copyists orienting their works a little more towards the original Hebrew text. Justin missed quotations or even references to other Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible.

Justin does not once mention Aquila's translation which was a kind of Greek "Targum" known both in Palestine and in the diaspora. Aquila was a proselyte from Pontus and Rabbi Akiba's disciple at the same time. His translation is literal, sometimes word-to-word, and thus it loses the spirit of the Greek language, but it makes it easier to discover the Hebrew original in the places where it is doubtful.[805] What is more, Justin intentionally rejects other translations and gives his reasons: "But I am far from putting reliance in your teachers, who refuse to admit that the interpretation made by the seventy elders who were with Ptolemy [king] of the Egyptians is a correct one; and they attempt to frame another." (*Dial.* 71,1) Only Irenaeus mentions translations by Theodotion and Aquila (Adv. *Haer.* 3,21,1 while the mentions of Symmachus' translation appear in Christian writers only in the fourth century.[806] Theodotion of Ephesus, like Aquila, was also a proselyte. His translation saw the light of the day at the end of the second century AD.[807]

Although scholars have not reached agreement on whether the whole Biblical canon was actually established at Jabneh, it is beyond doubt that the Septuagint

804 The process that led to the attribution to the LXX even greater significance than to the HB was presented by M. Hengel who writes: "This made it possible to transfer the already familiar notion of the prophetic inspiration of Holy Scripture to its Greek translation as well, and to ascribe to that translation the same, indeed, under certain circumstances an even higher dignity than to the Hebrew original. The inspired translators on the one hand, and the Spirit-filled apostles who used the LXX on the other, mutually confirm one another. At the same time, they provided the foundation for the charge of scriptural falsification toward Jewish dialogue partners. This act of violence was, however, historically understandable, and in a certain sense even necessary; because a re- turn to the original Hebrew text was (at least initially) impossible, the alternative would have been a complete rejection of the Old Testament writings, as was indeed the case with Marcion and many gnostics"; M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen*, 82.

805 Aquila went a long way of conversion; first he was a Gentile, then he accepted Christianity and finally became a follower of Judaism. Hence, his translation is polemical in relation to the LXX and also in relation to the New Testament. Some sentences can only be understood by those who have mastered the Hebrew language because the translation was based on the Semitic syntax.

806 M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen*, 49.

807 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 109.

was rejected there as an inspired book (although the author of the apocryphal *Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas* considered it as such)[808] because, as it has been said, one of the criteria of canonicity was the creation of a holy text in Hebrew.[809] So it was in Palestine. There are nevertheless reasons to believe that in Alexandria the Septuagint was considered to be inspired also in the books which were created in the Greek language.[810] However, not all researchers are convinced of the existence of an Alexandrian canon. Some of them claim that the Alexandrian community accepted only the five Books of Moses as the collection of inspired writings. Their translation constituted an improvement on the LXX, made in such a way as to reconcile it with the teaching of the rabbis.

Theodotion's interventions appeared mainly in those places of the Septuagint where it was based on a different Hebrew text than the one considered to be original by the rabbis. Shortly afterwards, one more Greek translation of the Old Testament was created. The translator was a Samaritan named Symmachus. His style was elegant, sometimes even pompous. It is interesting to note that all three translators of the Hebrew Bible into Greek were Jews or proselytes (Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus), which proves that Judaism of the first centuries was also developing in the Hellenistic world and that the Hebrew Bible was not the only version of the Bible on the basis of which Judaic beliefs were interpreted.

The Jabneh rabbis made every effort to place not only Palestine but also the diaspora, including Egypt, under their jurisdiction. Gamaliel II, the grandson of Johanan ben Zakkai, was able to make the Jews from the diaspora come to Jabneh to consult there the principles of confessing and practising Judaism. In this way, at least partly, the authority of the Palestinian rabbis was extended to the diaspora. It must have been reflected in the diminished role of the Septuagint in the non-Palestinian Jewish communities.[811]

At that time the LXX was already the Bible used by Christians to a much larger extent than the Hebrew Bible.[812] This was due to the missionary development of the Church which had already demonstrated its presence in almost the whole

---

808 J. Frankowski, *List Arysteasza czyli legenda o powstaniu Septuaginty*, RBL 1 (1972) 12–22.

809 Whereas in *Megillah* (9,1) rabbis say that the translators of the Hebrew Bible into Greek were under God's inspiration, in *Soferim* (1,7) they compare the day of the Septuagint's creation to the day of idolatrous cult of a calf in the desert; L.H. Feldman, *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*, SJSJ 107, Leiden – Boston 2006, 68.

810 W. Chrostowski, *Wokół kwestii natchnienia Biblii Greckiej*, in: *Żywe jest słowo Boże i skuteczne. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Ks. Prof. Bernarda Wodeckiego SVD w 50. rocznicę święceń kapłańskich*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2001, 93.

811 S. Sandmel, *Judaism and Christian Beginnings*, New York 1978, 245–247; G. Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.)*, 119–131.

812 W. Chrostowski emphasizes that the LXX was created within Judaic environment and is a thoroughly Jewish book; *Żydowskie tradycje interpretacyjne pomocą w zrozumieniu Biblii*, CT 66 (1996) 1, 46.

Mediterranean region and probably in India where ancient Greek dominated as *linqua franca*. The LXX is not only a translation of the HB but in some copies it was enriched with books which had not been originally created in Hebrew.[813] It includes Greek translations of thirty-nine books of the Hebrew canon[814], the so-called protocanonical books, Greek translation of books which were not included in the Hebrew canon (1Mch, Tb, Jdt, Ba, Si) and books written in Greek (Wis, 2Mch, appendices in Dn 3:24-90; 13-14 and Est 10:4-16:24 according to the Vulgate). Among them there were also books which did not belong to the Christian canon (*3-4 Macc, 3 Esdras = 1 Esdras* from LXX, *Ps 151* and the *Prayer of Manasseh*).[815] Christians read the Septuagint from the Christological perspective. In the same way, they interpreted the books of the Greek Bible that had been written directly in Greek and were not translations from Hebrew or Aramaic. The authors of the New Testament and the Fathers of the Church in the first three centuries drew quotations for their works extensively from the Septuagint, and not from the Hebrew Bible.[816]

The Palestinian Jews, and after some time also the diaspora Jews distanced themselves from the Septuagint soon after it had become the Christian Bible. In the case of the diaspora, this process took place later for a number of reasons. Firstly, the Jews in the diaspora essentially spoke Greek. Their Hebrew was not good enough or they did not speak the language at all. However, the rabbis did not try to translate their teaching into the Greek language. "Thus, there was a serious linguistic barrier between the Jews of the Roman diaspora and the rabbis in the Land of Israel, and there was little interest or ability on the part of these rabbis (at least in the second and third centuries) to become involved in the religious life of the Jewish diaspora. Diaspora Jews attended their synagogues; prayed and read the Torah; observed the Sabbath, holidays, food laws; believed in one God who created heaven and earth and chose Israel to be his people; obeyed (or did not obey) their traditional authority figures - all, however, without the help of the lettered elite that was emerging in Palestine."[817]

Secondly, the diaspora Jews did not look for support from the Palestinian rabbis. Jewish inscriptions of this time originating in the diaspora do not mention rabbis at

---

813 C. Dohmen, G. Stemberger, *Hermeneutyka Biblii żydowskiej i Starego Testamentu*, trans. M. Szczepaniak, Kraków 2008, s. 73–74; M. Wojciechowski, *Apokryfy z Biblii greckiej*, RSB 8, Warszawa 2001, 10.

814 According to the older method of counting there were twenty-four of them.

815 M. Wojciechowski, *Apokryfy z Biblii greckiej*, 10. In 3*Ezr* there are parallel to 2Ch 35,1-36,23; Ezr 1,1-11; 2,1-4,5; 5,1-10,44; Ne 7,72-8,13a.

816 Thus until this day certain incomprehensible duality in the Christian exegesis can be observed. While the inspired authors of the New Covenant and the Fathers of the Church quoted and interpreted the Septuagint, present commentators take as the basis for their analyses the *veritas hebraica*, which often leads to different conclusions.

817 S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 338.

all.[818] Thirdly, the rabbis themselves did not attempt to reach out with the teaching to the co-believers living outside Palestine. The situation was slightly different in the case of the Babylonian diaspora. Babylonian Jews spoke Aramaic, therefore exchange between Palestine and Babylonia in terms of religiosity, practices and Jewish beliefs was much more intensive.

Why did the Palestinian Jews distance themselves from the Greek translation? The reason was not only the Greek language but also different possibilities of the translation of Hebrew terms into Greek. The point of contention also became some additions that appeared in the LXX and which were not included in the HB. Christianity which was spreading in the regions where Greek was used adopted the Septuagint as its Bible. It was this translation that paved the way for Christian missions among the people living in the Roman Empire. What is more, the *koine* language affected to a considerable degree the Greek language of the New Testament. This version of Greek had already begun to take shape in the fifth century BC when Ionian dialect had been mixed with the Attic dialect. At the time of Alexander the Great it became almost universal up to the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea. But this does not mean that the Greek language of the New Testament was completely devoid of Semitisms. On the contrary, many calques from Hebrew which appeared in the books of the New Covenant could not have been used by authors not knowing the Septuagint, especially its religious and cultic terminology.[819]

Jews rejected the LXX because of the fact that some modifications to the Hebrew text could be seen in the translation. Translators – of Jewish descent after all – tried to explain incomprehensible phrases, to eliminate inconvenient words or to adapt the meaning of particular fragments to the new situation of the Jewish community. Following the same course, the first Christians displayed a similar approach towards the LXX. Sometimes, when quoting a Greek translation, they made changes to better integrate the quoted passage into the context (e.g. in Lk 7:27, the evangelist made changes in Ml 3:1 from "I will send my angel before My face" to "in front of You" and in Luke 2:11, instead of *Christos Kyriou* there appears *Christos Kyrios*).[820]

This approach was unacceptable to the Jews who counted every single letter of the holy text. Hence, the issue of the Septuagint reinforced the process of separation between the Christian and Jewish communities. It should also be noted that the Hebrew Bible was not yet vocalized, so in the Jabneh environment it was possible to successfully reread some words differently than in the previous Jewish tradition, changing at the same time the meaning of whole sentences. It may have

818 S.J.D. Cohen, *Epigraphical Rabbis*, JQR 72 (1981) 15–16.

819 F. Blass, A. Debrunner, *Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento*, trans. U. Mattioli, G. Pisi, Brescia 1982, 55–58.

820 M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, 267.

happened that the reading of a word commonly accepted in Judaism, a word translated in the Septuagint according to the previous tradition, was rejected in the Jabneh environment and was changed through adoption of different vocalization.

Rabbis changed the text especially in those places which constituted the basis of Christian theology. What is more, they censored the Septuagint itself, removing elements crucial for the development of Christian thought[821], and introducing elements of rabbinic exegesis, typical of midrash.[822] This process intensified along with the tension increasing between the Jewish and Christian communities, and resulted in the total rejection of the Greek Bible by the rabbis.[823]

As it has already been mentioned, the turn of the century and the beginning of the second century was the formation period for the canon of the Hebrew Bible. The rabbis, somewhat paradoxically, after the destruction of the Temple were in a comfortable position since in the bosom of Judaism there were no opponents to their proposals. The Jabneh environment consisted almost exclusively of heirs to the Pharisaic tradition, who seemed to disregard the views of the Jews living in the diaspora. And indeed there were Jewish scholars in the diaspora, though not very numerous, who knew Hebrew or Aramaic and at the same time the Septuagint was highly respected among Palestinian Jews (most likely in Galilee, where the Jewish population was mixed up with the pagans, as well as in Qumran, as evidenced by the Greek Bible manuscripts found there).[824]

Eventually, the Jews not only rejected the Septuagint which became the Christian Bible but also had a very negative attitude (which is understandable) to the first sacred writings which were entirely written by Christians and in which numerous quotations from the Septuagint appeared.[825] In the Tosefta, there is a passage that most probably speaks of the Gospels and is a result of the distortion of the Greek term *euaggelion* into Aramaic *awen gilayon*: "The Gilyonim and the [Biblical] books of the "Minim" (Judeo-Christians?) do not render the hands unclean." *(Yad.* 02,13) According to the Jewish Law, if anything "makes hands unclean," it means that it causes ritual impurity, which must be wiped out by washing hands (*netilat yadaim*). After using the holy or inspired books, you should wash your hands. Since the Gospels do not "make hands unclean," this means that they are not considered to be inspired books in rabbinic tradition. In addition, they are considered to be the books related to magic: "Their (*minim*) books are books of sorcerers." (Tosefta, *Hul.* 2,21)[826]

---

821 W. Chrostowski, *Wokół kwestii natchnienia Biblii Greckiej*, 99.

822 R. Rubinkiewicz, *Midrasz jako zjawisko egzegetyczne*, CT 63 (1993) 3, 11–26.

823 W. Chrostowski, *Literatura targumiczna a Septuaginta*, CT 63 (1993) 3, 61–62.

824 W. Chrostowski, *Wokół kwestii natchnienia Biblii Greckiej*, 101.

825 J. Neusner, *Contexts of Comparison: Reciprocally Reading Gospels' and Rabbis' Parables*, in: *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston – Leiden 2002, 45–46.

826 D. Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, 57.

Part of the tractate *Tosefta Yadayim* speaks clearly about the link between "defiling the hands" and divine inspiration: "The Song of Songs renders the hands unclean because it was composed under divine inspiration (*be-ruah ha-qodesz*). Qoheleth does not render the hands unclean because it is the wisdom of Solomon." (2,14) The answer to the question about the Song of Songs was not explicit, firstly because the book does not mention God even once[827]; secondly, because the book celebrates physical love of a man and a woman, and it seemed to some rabbis to be indecent.[828] Eventually, it was included in the canon of holy books and, with the time, was considered to be the most sacred one.

Two texts by rabbis testify to how precious the Song of Songs became to the chosen people: "Adam's fall caused it to retire from earth to the first heaven. Cain drove it, by his misdeeds, further into the second, the generation of Enos further still, and the generation of the flood again to the fourth. The generation of the Tower, the Sodomites and the Egyptians of Abraham's time finally drove the Shechinah into the seventh heaven." (*GenRabba* 19,13) According to *Zohar Terumah* God returned to the earth on the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel (143-144a). And Rabbi Akiba added: "The whole world is not worth the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel; For all the writings are holy, the Song of Songs is the holiest of the holy." (*Yad.* 3,5) This sentence sealed the inclusion of the Songs of Songs in the canon because Akiba was regarded as one of greatest sages of Israel and his opinion certainly had to be taken into account.[829]

Reading other passages of the Talmud shows that only those copies of the Torah "defile hands" which were written for liturgical use, in the square script on the scroll. So if somebody copied the Torah not for liturgical purposes but e.g. for private study, if he used a different type of script than the one envisaged by the Talmud, or if he wrote the text in the form of a code (and not a scroll), then such a copy would not "defile the hands." Scrolls of the Torah prepared for public use and written in square script by Judeo-Christians were not allowed for the use during synagogue liturgy either.[830] This is proved in the Talmudic record: "The

827 The expression "a flame of Yahweh himself" in 8,6 cannot be regarded as a reference to God; it is a form of superlative used in Hebrew poetry: the fire of the Lord is a fire of immense power.

828 It is interesting to note that when the Song of Songs was included into the Christian canon, Jerome set the order of Biblical books according to which, in his opinion, women should read the contents of the Scripture. The Song of Songs was placed at the very end with the note that virgins should not read it at all.

829 H. Freedman, *Talmud. Biografia*, 33.

830 "Torah Scrolls written by Christian scribes were declared unfit (*pasul*) for public worship presumably on the grounds that their origin puts them under suspicion. The implications of this ruling are far reaching. It could have put Christian Torah scribes out of business, and made it impossible for a congregation obeying this ruling to make use of their services"; P.S. Alexander, *"The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism*, 14.

'Gilyon[im]' and the [Biblical] books of the 'Minim' (Judeo-Christians?) are not saved [on Shabbat] from fire" (*Git.* 45b).

It follows that the issue of the Septuagint as the Greek Bible significantly influenced the quality of Christian-Jewish relations. The followers of Christ used the Greek Bible profusely and proclaimed the new faith with the Septuagint in their hands, while the rabbis cut themselves off from such an excellent translation of their sacred writings focusing only on the Hebrew text. Christian message reached both the Jews and the Gentiles living in almost the entire Mediterranean, while the rabbis prevented hundreds of thousands of their co-believers who did not know Hebrew from using the inspired text. The fact that the knowledge of the Jewish religion spread among the Gentiles thanks to Christian missionaries who used the Septuagint, a book which was the transmitter of God's revelation to the Jews, can be seen as a certain *iocus historiae*.

Excursus: Palestinian (Galilean) Aramaic and Targumic Aramaic as a Separation Factor?

While Christians with the Septuagint in their hands became more and more engaged in Greek and Hellenic culture, the rabbis from Palestine and Babylonia confined the manifestation of their religiosity to the circles of Semitic, Hebrew and Aramaic languages. It is worth noting that the Aramaic language was going through a kind of transformation at that time.[831] Thousands of pages of rabbinic works had been

831 Linguists do not agree as far as the origins of the Aramaic language are concerned. Aramaic was the main language in the Persian empire. It was also used by the Jews in Babylonian exile. Jesus spoke it (although He may have also used Greek to some extent). More recent studies show that the knowledge of Greek in Palestine in the first century was better than it had previously been thought; G. Scott Gleaves, *Did Jesus Speak Greek? The Emerging Evidence of Greek in First-Century Palestine*, Eugene 2015, 2–3. The author questions the so-called Aramaic hypothesis. His objections result from the following difficulties: if Aramaic was the dominant language in Palestine in the first century, why were all the books of the New Testament written in Greek? Why was Greek the *lingua franca*? Why was the vast majority of the monuments of literature, architecture and culture of that time created in Greek? If Aramaic is at the heart of the New Testament, why do almost all the books seem to have been originally written in Greek and they are not translations of Aramaic texts? Why did many cities have Greek names (Ptolemais, Scythopolis)? Similarly, names of the regions (Decapolis, Edom [Idumea])? Why did the Jews take Greek names (Andrew, Philip, Theophil, Nicodemus)? If Aramaic was the dominant language in Palestine, why are many Jewish inscriptions on the ossuaries written in Greek?; ibid., XXIII-XXIV. See also: A. Tresham, *The Languages Spoken by Jesus*, TMSJ 20 (2009) 1, 71–94; J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Languages of Palestine in First Century AD*, in: *The Languages of the New Testament: Classic Essays*, JSNTSup 60, ed. S.E. Porter, Sheffield 1991, 126–162; S.E. Porter, *Jesus and the Use of Greek in Galilee*, in: *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, New

written down in Aramaic. This is the language which conveyed many great literary monuments. It turns out that an attempt to look at many passages of the Gospels reveals their Aramaic background. Some of the evangelical pericopes which might be difficult to understand when read in Greek turn out to be more comprehensible when we take into account their Aramaic linguistic background.

Even in the Greek text of the Gospel, some phrases were written directly as they had been spoken by Jesus. The most common word is *amen*, sometimes translated as "truly." Raising Jira's daughter from the dead, Jesus turned to her in Aramaic (Mk 5:41). Mark translated the phrase *talitha kum* as "Little girl, I tell you to get up." Providing translation, the evangelist expands it with an introductory formula "I tell you to." This means that the statement of Jesus, preserved in early tradition, was not treated as a magical formula. If it were a magical formula in the form of a "spell," it would not be possible to quote it in another language, nor would one use any translation additions. Healing the deaf and dumb, Jesus turns to him with the call of *Effatha!*, "open up!" (Mk 7:34). Dying on the cross, Jesus prayed: "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (Mk 15:34)

The content of Jesus' cry is quoted by the evangelist in the Aramaic language, what emphasizes the sublimity of the moment and introduces mysterious tension concerning what is to come: *Eli, Eli, lama sabaqtani*. If it had been Hebrew, Jesus would have directly quoted the words of a psalmist: *Eli, Eli, lama azabtani*. It means that Jesus made the targum. These are the first words of Psalm 22. This Psalm is one of the individual lament songs (cf. Ps 6; 7; 38; 87; 102; 142), in which the praying believer complains to God because of his tragically difficult situation: a deadly illness, a false accusation, a betrayal by friends, loneliness and persecution. The most painful is the feeling of being forsaken by God. The phonetic similarity of Elijah's name and the noun "God" (in the *status constructus*) with a possessive pronoun (in Hebrew and Aramaic with the suffix) "my" causes some of the witnesses of the Crucifixion to misinterpret the cry as a cry directed to the prophet Elijah: "Wait! And see if Elijah will come to take him down." (Mk 15:36)[832]

In addition to those places in the Gospels in which the authors directly recite the Aramaic words, there are also phrases whose interpretation becomes clearer when we look at their Aramaic equivalents. Here are some of them.

Matthew begins the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7) with the words: "Seeing the crowds, he went onto the mountain. And when he was seated his disciples came to him." (Mt 5;1) In Luke the same speech is introduced in an entirely different way: "He then came down with them and stopped at a piece of level ground where there was a large gathering of his disciples, with a great crowd

---

Testament Tools and Studies 19, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, Leiden 1994, 123–154; S.E. Porter, *Did Jesus Ever Teach in Greek?*, Tyndale Bulletin 44 (1993) 2, 224–233; J. Ciecieląg, *Kogo uważano za Żyda w starożytności?*, 40.

832 Apart from the Gospels, in the letters of the New Testament, there appear the noun *Abba*, "Father" (Rm 8:15; Ga 4:6), and *Maranatha!*, "O Lord, come!" (1Co 16:22).

of people from all parts of Judea and Jerusalem and the coastal region of Tyre and Sidon." (Lk 6:17)

The discrepancy concerning the location of the speech has had many interpretations in the history of exegesis. The two most common refer to the sociological context of Jesus' time and theological context of the works of the evangelists. According to the first interpretation, the discrepancy simply results from the custom of itinerant teachers to repeat the same lessons in different circumstances. So it can be successfully assumed that Jesus repeated the blessings and other words contained in his speech not only on the mountain or plain but also in houses, synagogues and temples. The second hypothesis emphasizes the theological feature. Matthew's intention was to show Jesus as a new Moses; therefore, since Moses went up the mountain to bring the Decalogue to the chosen nation, the Law of the old covenant (Ex 20:1-17), so Jesus, as a new Moses, goes up the mountain to offer new Law to the people of the new covenant, to the emerging Church – the commandment to love one's neighbours to the point of loving one's enemies (Mt 5:43-48).[833]

Exploration of the Aramaic background of this speech brings another interesting suggestion of how to explain the discrepancies in the location between Matthew and Luke. In the Aramaic language, "mountain" is described by the word *taura*. In the Galilean dialect, this word is pronounced as *taurah* and means both the "mountain" and the "field." Since Jesus used the Galilean dialect (similarly to Peter; Mt 26:73), it seems that this term was at the basis of both translations.

Terminology, and especially two words: "father" and "trespasses," indicates Aramaic as the original language of the Lord's Prayer. The second term which in Greek takes on the meaning of "debt" and in Aramaic it also means "guilt" and "sin,"[834] would be incomprehensible in the context of the prayer.[835] In the text of the prayer *crux exegetarum* is constituted by the term *epiousios* in reference to the "daily bread." This term appears in Greek only twice – precisely in the Lord's Prayer in Matthew's and Luke's versions.[836] The meaning of *epiousios* is not sufficiently clear. Arndt and Gingrich suggest at least four options of its meaning: (1)

---

833 D.A. Carson, *Matthew*, in: *The Expositors Bible Commentary with The New International Version*, ed. F.E. Gaebelein, VIII, Grand Rapids 1984, 129. The author admits, however, that there is no major difference between Matthew's "mountain" and Luke's "plain," since Matthew might mean a mountainous area, similarly to Luke.

834 A. Paciorek points out that in the literal translation God is asked to forgive „debts". The phrase can be easily understood if we remember that Aramaic *hoba'* means both „debts" and „trespasses"; *Jezus z Nazaretu. Czasy i wydarzenia*, 154.

835 J. Czerski, *Modlitwa „Ojcze nasz" w wersji Mt 6,9-13*, in: *Służcie Panu z weselem. Księga Jubileuszowa ku czci kard. Henryka Gulbinowicza z okazji 50-lecia kapłaństwa, 30-lecia biskupstwa, 25-lecia posługi w archidiecezji wrocławskiej i 15-lecia kardynalatu*, II, *W służbie teologii*, ed. I. Dec, Wrocław 2000, 29.

836 In the third century, difficulties in finding the precise meaning of the word led Origen to propose a thesis that it was coined by Matthew or Luke.

necessary to exist; (2) present; (3) for the following day; (4) for the future.[837] The authors, however, do not indicate interpretative preferences. A new shade of the meaning of this wording can be found when its Aramaic equivalent is taken into consideration. It seems that it may have been created on the basis of the Aramaic word *tsorak* which means "to be poor," "to need." The intention of the praying person would be, therefore, a request for an amount of bread sufficient for the poor or a request for the "bread of our needs," necessary for modest but decent existence.

A very illustrative logion of Jesus written by Matthew in the Sermon on the Mount reads: "Do not give dogs what is holy; and do not throw your pearls in front of pigs, or they may trample them and then turn on you and tear you to pieces." (Mt 7:6) In the first part of this statement we are dealing with a typical Semitic parallelism, which would serve as one of the mnemotechnic methods used by Jesus.[838] However, this parallelism gives rise to some difficulties because it is not accurate. "Dogs" from the first segment corresponds to "pigs" in the second part; "what is holy" from the first part should correspond to "pearls" in the second one. While the juxtaposition taken from the world of fauna does not raise any objections, the holiness juxtaposed with pearls is no longer a precise parallelism. This difficulty disappears completely when we reach for the Aramaic background of the logion. In Aramaic, the term *talah* (here used as *tetlun*) means "to throw" and "to hang" while *gudsha* means both "holiness" and "earrings" (*earrings* and *nose rings*). The first part of Jesus' logion in Aramaic can therefore be translated as "Do not hang the earrings on dogs and don't throw pearls in front of pigs."[839] In this case, we have equivalents: "dogs" – "pigs" and "earrings" – "pearls," which makes the parallelism precise; in the first pair, we are dealing with fauna, in the second one with jewellery.

Jesus' logion, which is a call for intense moral effort, is confirmed doubly in ancient manuscripts. Among the reproaches directed at members of his own nation, there appear words recorded by Luke: "Try your hardest to enter by the

837 W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Chicago 1979, 279. Many interpretive possibilities of the terms were given by J. Carmignac in his work *Recherches sur le „Notre Père"*, Paris 1969, 214–220.

838 The Scandinavian school, represented by such scholars as H. Riesenfeldt and B. Gerhardsson, brings the mnemotechnic methods, used by Jesus, closer to contemporary readers. There are mainly four of them: (1) a permanent structure of the sentence, as in the case of the blessings; (2) a permanent structure of longer statements, as in the case of the so-called antithesis; (3) short proverbs built on the principle of contrast, such as "Physician, cure yourself"; (4) utterances using synthetic, antithetical and synonymic parallelisms.; J.M. Rist, *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*, Cambridge 1976, 127–129.

839 A. Paciorek proposes „rings" instead of "earrings"; *Ewangelia według świętego Mateusza. Rozdziały 1 – 13. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKB I/1, Częstochowa 2005, 307s.

narrow door, because, I tell you, many will try to enter and will not succeed." (Lk 13:24) The oldest Greek manuscripts are not consistent – the word used here is either *pylēs* ("gateway")[840] or *thyra* ("door").[841] The inconsistency arises probably due to the fact that the Aramaic term *taara* has two meanings.[842] The argument behind the thesis that at the basis of Jesus' logion lies the noun *taara* is the fact that this sentence finds its parallel in the apocryphal *Fourth Book of Ezra* whose original version was written in the Semitic language, i.e. probably in the Aramaic language.[843]

The author of the work, most likely of Pharisaic provenance and working at the end of the first century in Palestine (what points to the Aramaic language), wrote: "[...] A city is built, and set upon a broad field, and is full of all good things: the entrance thereof is narrow, and is set in a dangerous place to fall, like as if there were a fire on the right hand, and on the left a deep water: And one only path between them both, even between the fire and the water, so small that there could but one man go there at once. If this city now were given unto a man for an inheritance, if he never shall pass the danger set before it, how shall he receive this inheritance?" (*4 Ezr* 7:6-9)[844]

Immediately after Peter's confession of Jesus' messianic mission, a confession that took place in Caesarea Philippi, Jesus had to rebuke the first among his disciples: "Get behind me, Satan! You are an obstacle in my path, because you are thinking not as God thinks but as human beings do." (Mt 16:23) This sharp reprimand was bestowed upon Peter after he had tried to dissuade Jesus from his planned journey to Jerusalem, where the redemptive events were to take place. It should be assumed that Jesus uttered these words in Aramaic where the term *satanah* means "adversary" or "opponent."[845] So Jesus reprimanded Peter using the words: "Get behind me (literally "leave me"), my adversary." The evangelists writing in Greek preferred, however, to preserve the Aramaic wording of the term in order to accentuate the spiritual nature of Peter's objection: by dissuading Jesus from his travel plan to Jerusalem, Peter no longer behaved like an ordinary

840 Thus: A W Ψ f^{13}, after: Nestle – Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart 1993[27], 206.

841 Thus, most of other manuscripts.

842 P. Reymond, *Dizionario di ebraico e aramaico biblici*, ed. J.A. Soggin, F. Bianchi, M. Cimosa, G. Deiana, D. Garrone, A. Spreafico, Roma 1995, 496; cf. P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, Warszawa 1999[2], 423; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm, *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, II, transl. A. Gawliczek, Warszawa 2001, 902.

843 A.P. Hayman, *The Problem of Pseudonymity in the Ezra Apocalypse*, JSJ 6 (1975) 47–48; M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, 61.

844 cf. J.B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT, Grand Rapids – Cambridge 1997, 529–530.

845 F. Brown, S.R. Driver, A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon. With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*, Peabody 1996[2], 966.

adversary or opponent of his Master's plans but played the role similar to that of Satan, opposing God's plan of salvation. From a historical point of view, therefore, it must be acknowledged that Jesus' original reprimand of Peter was not as harsh as the Greek text of the Gospel suggests.

In a dialogue with a certain scribe, Jesus quotes a passage from the Law in answering the question about the greatest commandment: "You must love your neighbour as yourself." (Mt 22:39; cf. Lv 19:18) In Aramaic this commandment sounds: *tirkam le-magirak ke-garmak*. The noun "neighbour" comes from the root *m-g-r*, whereas the pronoun "self" – from the root *g-r-m*. The phonetic similarity of both words with similar roots makes it easier to remember the whole phrase.

In the parable of a faithful and lazy servant, there seems to be a striking disproportion between the offence and the administered punishment. For the failure to perform his duties, the servant is sentenced to death by cutting to pieces. In numerous translations we can read: "Then he [the master] will cut him to pieces and assign him a place with the hypocrites." (Mt 24:51) Greek term standing for "quartering" or "cutting to pieces" (literally: "cutting in two") is *dichotomeō*. The term *n-t-h* in Aramaic can be read in two ways: *Nittah* – "to quarter" or *nattah* – "to disconnect." If we assume that the original verb used in the text is *nattah*, then the parable contains an announcement of excommunication practice. It was practiced by the early Christians, as it is testified by St Paul in the letter to the Corinthians (1Co 5:4-5).

The understanding of the Aramaic term as "separate" and not "cut in half" is also supported by use of it in the *Community Rule* (the document is also referred to as the *Manual of Discipline*)[846] in the sense of excommunication, that is to say exclusion from the community: "Anyone who refuses to enter the (ideal) society of God and persists in walking in the stubbornness of his heart shall not be admitted *(nattah*) to this community of God's truth" (1QS 8,21-22; cf. 1QS 2, 16 and 1QS 6,24).[847] Accepting the thesis that behind the Greek term *dichotomeō* there is the Aramaic verb *nattah* meaning "to separate" makes the text logical and eliminates the problem of a penalty disproportionate to the offence.

Describing the scene of Jesus' capture, Matthew puts in His mouth a sentence, whose second part probably has a proverbial character: "Jesus then said, 'Put your sword back, for all who draw the sword will die by the sword." (Mt 26:52) The proverbial tone of the logion is evidenced by its use in Jr 15:2 and Rev 13:10. In the context of Jesus' native language, the statement becomes ambiguous, what enriches the understanding of its content. In Aramaic the term *saiif* stands for both

846 M. Rosik, I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, 91.

847 P. Muchowski, *Rękopisy znad Morza Martwego. Qumran – Wadi Murabba'at – Masada – Nachal Chewer*, Biblioteka Zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 5, Kraków 2000, 34.

"a sword" and "an end." Jesus' logion *kal d-nsab saiif b-saiif yimuthun* can be translated as: "for all who draw the sword will die."

During Jesus' dispute with the Jews who take pride in being Abraham's children, the Teacher of Nazareth formulates a principle: "Jesus replied: In all truth I tell you, everyone who commits sin is a slave." (Jn 8:34) The term *abad* has two meanings in Aramaic: verbal "to do," "to commit," and nominal: "a slave"[848]; hence, in Jesus' logion there is a play on words serving mnemonic purposes.

Talking to Andrew and Philip, who decided to make it easier for the Greeks coming to Jerusalem for the Passover to meet the Galilean Teacher, Jesus, conscious of the closeness of the upcoming death, explains: "unless a wheat grain falls into the earth and dies, it remains only a single grain; but if it dies it yields a rich harvest." (Jn 12:24) A Greek term standing for "grain" here is *kokkos*. In Hebrew the term *bar* stands for "seed"[849] but in Aramaic it stands for "a son."[850] When Jesus uttered these words in Aramaic, He might have been consciously guiding His Jewish listeners to read the truth about His divine sonship. One can see here a play on words: "unless a Son dies, he remains single; but if he dies he yields a rich harvest." This would be an allusion to the saving death and funeral of Jesus, the Son of God. The image of the seed was also used by Paul to explain the mystery of the resurrection (1Co 15:35-44).[851]

From the above examples of reading some passages of the Gospel with the awareness of their original Aramaic context, essentially two conclusions can be drawn:

(1) many Aramaic terms have at least two meanings; the Greek text of the Gospel sometimes becomes more comprehensible when we reach for the meaning of the Aramaic term which is different from the one chosen by the evangelists;

---

848 F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, Wiesbaden 1961, 96; P. Reymond, *Dizionario di ebraico e aramaico biblici*, 483; P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, 409; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm, *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, II, 840–841.

849 Cf. Jr 23,28; F. Brown, S.R. Driver, A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon. With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*, 135; P. Reymond, *Dizionario di ebraico e aramaico biblici*, 77; *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, 64; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm, *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, I, 145.

850 F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 84; P. Reymond, *Dizionario di ebraico e aramaico biblici*, 463; P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, 395; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, J.J. Stamm, *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, II, 475–476.

851 R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, HThK NT 4, II, Freiburg im Breisgau 1984, 480–481.

(2) among Christians who translated the message of Jesus from Aramaic to Greek (still at the stage of oral tradition or at the time of the final edition of the Gospel) the tendency to radicalize this message can be noticed (e.g. "cutting to pieces" instead of "disconnecting" or "Satan" instead of "opponent").

The basic works of the Jewish tradition were created in Aramaic. These include the Mishna, the Gemara, the Tosefta, the Talmud and subsequent rabbinic writings. In the second century, Aramaic underwent transformations, giving rise to the Syriac language. Very early, Syriac became the language of a large Christian community. In terms of grammar and syntactic structures, Syriac retained remarkable resemblance to Aramaic. With time, numerous borrowings from Arabic began to appear in it, and eventually it was absorbed by this language. It is worth noting, however, that in the Syrian translations of the Gospel few sentences written in Aramaic survived, and different than in the Greek text. This means that they may be a faithful record of Jesus' words in His everyday language.[852]

The balanced assessment of whether and, if so, to what extent the use of the Aramaic language could have influenced the gradual process of separation of Church from Synagogue at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century is extremely complicated, if not impossible. While the vehicle of Christian ideas in almost the entire Mediterranean region became at that time the Greek language in its *koine* variety[853], Judeo-Christians living in Palestine and the potential followers of Christ in the Babylonian diaspora used the Aramaic language. The situation was similar in Syria, although the Christians living there descended from other beliefs than Judaism. Perhaps, therefore, the borderline was initially more clearly drawn between Christians of the Greek language and the Jews together with Christians of the Aramaic language (both Judeo- and ethno-Christians) than between Christians and the Jews.

852 One should keep in mind that the Aramaic in its Galilean form was ridiculed by the Jews in Judea. In the Talmud there is an anecdote, according to which a Galilean appeared on the market in Jerusalem to buy something called *amar*. He was ridiculed by merchants: "You stupid Galilean, do you want something to ride on [*hammar* means 'donkey']? Or something to drink? [*hamar*: 'wine'] Or some clothing? [amar: 'wool'] Or something for a sacrifice [*immar:* 'lamb'?" G. Vermes, *Jesus Żyd Ewangelia w oczach historyka*, 53.

853 Members of the Palestinian city elites spoke Greek rather well in the first and second centuries. The peasants from Galilee heard the Greek in the mouths of the Gentiles and the Hellenized Jews; J. L. Reed, *The Harper Collins Visual Guide to the New Testament*, New York 2007, 71. R.W. Funk, analysing the parables of Jesus, comes to the conclusion that many of them originally were said in Greek, and this leads him to the conclusion that Jesus was bilingual; R.W. Funk, *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millenium*, San Francisco 1997, 79. M. Casey argues that these parables were directly written in Greek; M. Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching*, London 2010, 108–119.

The Issue of Is 7:14b

The Christian belief in the virginity of Mary, the Mother of Jesus, is based on the prophecy which Isaiah uttered to King Ahaz in the context of the Syro-Ephraimite War (Is 7:10-25). A few centuries later, in the Greek translation of this text, the Jewish tradition expressed the conviction that the prophecy speaks of a virgin. With time, the idea of Mary's virginity *ante partum, in partu et post partum* appeared in the Church. Among other things, this idea served as a theological justification for the celibacy of men and women as one of the ways of life in the Church, the way rejected by Judaism.[854]

The Jews, and more precisely the LXX translators at the turn of the third and second centuries BC, understood the text of Isaiah's prophecy announcing that "the young woman is with child and will give birth to a son" (Is 7:14b) unambiguously and without hesitation they translated in the LXX the Hebrew word *almāh* into Greek *parthenos*, the "virgin." However, when Christians shaped the teaching of Mary's virginity, the Jews decided to abandon their centuries-old tradition.[855] In this way, the Mariological question became another point of contention between Church and Synagogue. As a preliminary remark for further reflection, let us observe that the Jewish tradition was perfectly familiar with the motif of the "miraculous conception" of a child as a result of God's intervention.[856] The debate did not therefore question the possibility of such conception but of the fact that it concerned Jesus.

Problems with Isaiah's prophecy started when Christians began to proclaim with insistence that Mary, the mother of Jesus of Nazareth, conceived the Child in her virgin womb. The matter began to be cumbersome to the extent that in the second century AD, Jewish teachers "erased" the term *parthenos* from their Greek Bibles, and replaced it with *neanis,* "a young woman." This noun appeared in Isaiah's prophecy in three other Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible created after the establishment of the Jabneh academy. So the Jews broke with their own tradition of interpreting the biblical text.[857]

The term *neanis* appeared in the translations by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. Aquila was a proselyte from Pontus and a resolute listener of the teachings of Rabbi Akiba. His translation of the Hebrew Bible is literal to the extent

854 W. Chrostowski, *Żydzi i religia żydowska a Maryja Matka Jezusa*, 224.

855 W. Chrostowski, *Żydowskie tradycje interpretacyjne pomocą w zrozumieniu Biblii*, 46–47.

856 See the Old Testament stories about the conception of Isaac (Gn 18:9; 21:1-3), Samson (Jg 13:2-7) and Samuel (1S 2:21); R. Boustan, *Rabbi Ishmael's miraculous conception. Jewish Redemption History in Anti-Christian Polemic*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 309.

857 W. Chrostowski, *Żydowskie tradycje interpretacyjne pomocą w zrozumieniu Bibli*, 46–47.

that he often loses the spirit of the Greek language and some sentences do not seem to make sense. Still, Akiba's pupil decided not to miss a single word from the Hebrew text, even at the cost of its misunderstanding in the Greek environment. The translator himself had followed an interesting path in his religious journeys. At first he was a pagan, later he accepted Christianity, and eventually he converted to Judaism. His choice of the noun *neanis* instead of *parthenos* could not have been accidental. After all, he knew the Christian interpretation of Isaiah's text.

Theodotion of Ephesus, as mentioned earlier, was also a proselyte. He translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek at the end of the second century when the ways of Christianity and Judaism had already gone very far from each other. In fact, he made amendments to the Septuagint text. Corrections were made to harmonize the text with the teaching of rabbis. In essence, he intervened in places where the Septuagint's translators had followed a different version of the text than the one adopted by the rabbis.

Finally, the term *neanis* also appeared in a translation made by a Samaritan named Symmachus. The translator certainly considered himself to be an inheritor of Moses' religion although Jews tended to see in him an apostate. After all, as the well-known saying had it, to eat Samaritan bread was like eating pork for a Jewish man. Symmachus' translation was too loose to be accepted.[858]

Some researchers have attempted to justify the thesis that the Christian interpretation of the virgin conception of Jesus was created under the influence of the diaspora Jews who used the Septuagint. Honest research proves, however, that such a thesis is rather unfounded, and most probably it is quite the opposite: through the prism of the doctrine of the virgin conception, the followers of Christ interpreted in a messianic way the fragment of Is 7:14b.[859] It is equally difficult to justify the thesis that it was the teaching of the Philo of Alexandria on the subject of the formation of virtues in human souls that gave rise to beliefs about the virgin conception. The relationship between Philo's remarks and Christian teaching in this respect has not been sufficiently verified yet.[860]

What exactly did the process look like? The thought of Mary's virginity appears in the Gospels of Infancy. Matthew (1:18-22) and Luke (1:26-38) claim that Mary was

858 Jewish interpretation of Isaiah' prophecy was not confined to the change of the term *parthenos* into a noun *neanis*. The rabbis went further. Not only did they reject the virginity of Mary but they also saw her as an indecent woman. Traces of such a perception of the Mother of Christ had been transferred onto the pages of the Talmud (*Sanh.* 67,1); K. Bardski, *Teksty z tradycji hebrajskich dotyczących Jezusa*, in: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Ewangelie apokryficzne*, I, *Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, 163–169.

859 R.E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Auckland 1993, 521–524.

860 A. Paciorek, *Ewangelia według świętego Mateusza. Rozdziały 1-13. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, 101.

a virgin when Jesus was conceived in her. This fact is confirmed by naming Jesus the "son of Mary." (Mk 3:6) The Jews called the son referring to his father, and not to his mother. Naming someone by reference to the mother's name indicated his or her bastardry. For Christians, however, the reference of Jesus' name to Mary testified to His virginal conception.[861] Some ancient codes (sy^{c}, it^{b}) also contain the singular number in John's prologue in the sentence: "who was (instead of: were) born not from human stock or human desire or human will but from God himself." (Jn 1:13)[862] This change testifies to the Christian belief in the virginal conception of the Messiah, shaped on the basis of the Isaiah prophecy (Is 7:14b) and referred to Christ.

Everyone who knows the prophecy directed at Ahaz during the Syro-Ephraim War can easily read the analogy between the texts of Isaiah and Matthew. God announced to King Ahaz: "the young woman is with child and will give birth to a son whom she will call Immanuel" (Is 7:14).[863] The Hebrew word "young woman" used here is the aforementioned word *almāh*. The noun *almāh de facto* has two meanings: "a young woman" and "a virgin." Therefore, Isaiah's prophecy can be translated in two ways: "The young woman is with child and will give birth to a son" or "the virgin shall conceive and will give birth to a son." The first version does not indicate a religious miracle; the second one demands God's direct intervention.

Christians supported their conviction of the virginity of Mary also referring to Luke's statement "full of grace" used with reference to the Mother of Jesus. Grace is the first gift that Mary receives from God. The gift finds its confirmation in the words of the Angel: "Mary, do not be afraid; you have won God's favour," (Lk 1:30) and even more fully in the word *kecharitōmenē*, which was not very accurately translated into Polish, as the one "full of grace" (Luke 1:28) based certainty on the Latin *gratia plena*, taken from the Vulgate.[864] A more suitable term is included in some old Latin translations – *gratificata*.[865] This Greek participle originate from the

---

861 H.K. McArthur, *Son of Mary*, NT 15 (1973) 57.

862 I. de la Potterie, *Marie dans le Mystère de l'Alliance*, Paris 1988, 127–150. More about the idea of virginal conception in non-Christian religions see: J. Hasenfuss, *Die Jungfrauengeburt in der Religionsgeschichte*, in: *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute*, Mariologische Studien IV, Essen 1969, 11–23.

863 The quote in Matthew (1:23) almost exactly corresponds to the LXX. The only difference is the use of the plural ("give") instead of the singular ("gives"). Probably the evangelist wanted to show that Joseph participated in giving the name as well; A. Paciorek, *Ewangelia według świętego Mateusza. Rozdziały 1-13. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKBNT I/1, Częstochowa 2005,95.

864 The expresion *gratia plena* was probably borrowed from a Syrian texts, especially from *Diatessaronu*. In the Syriac language there is no exact equivalent of the Greek *kecharitōmenē*; neither is in Hebrew. In the latter language the expression *eset hen*, i.e. "work of grace" would be the closest; J. Łach, *Dziecię nam się narodziło. W kręgu teologii dziecięctwa Jezusa*, Częstochowa 2001, 125.

865 Also in two other codes: Palatine and Q, *kecharitōmenē* was rendered as *gratificata*. Despite the fact that this form is a precise grammatical reflection of the Greek

verb *charitoō* which appears in the Bible only three (some researchers claim that four) times.[866]

In accordance with the basic exegetical principle, in order to discover the proper meaning of a given term, it is necessary to investigate all (or at least the most important) texts in which the term appears. The verb *charitoō*, present in the New Testament only in Luke 1:28 and Ep 1:6, means to transform someone through grace, making him kind-hearted and graceful.[867] Greek verbs ending with – *oō* belong to the group of causative verbs, and they always indicate such action of the subject that results in a change in the object of the action. For example *leukoō* means "to whiten," "to make something white"; *douloō* – "to make someone become a servant." According to the meaning of the root of the given word from which a noun is created, in the verb form the term indicates a change in the subject of the action. Since the root of the verb *charitoō* is *charis*, that is "grace," hence the *kecharitōmenē* indicates a single activity performed in the past and related to bestowing grace in such a way that it brought about an essential change in the object of the action.

The whole work of salvation aims after all at such a change. For this reason in Luke the noun "grace" takes on a specific meaning: it embraces the whole Gospel, the Good News of salvation brought in Christ (cf. Lk 4:22; Ac 20:24.32). It can be concluded, therefore, that the universal work of salvation had previously individually affected the person of Mary as the one who was *kecharitōmenē*. What is more, in order to emphasize the privileges of Mary resulting from God's choice, Christians began to see in the call "full of grace" the proper name of the Mother of Christ.

One of the formal elements of stories about the commissioning into service or entrusting with a mission is directly addressing the people to whom the mission is entrusted by their names.[868] The juxtaposition of the story of annunciation with the

---

participle, it was not accepted in ecclesial terminology, probably because in ancient Latin literature the secular aspects of the meaning were emphasized; e.g. in Lactantius, Livius or Cicero the term meant " to be polite", "to do a favour", "to give pleasure." In religious meaning the verb was used by Augustine: " to be favourable", "to be kind", " to bestow"; S. Bzowski, *Gratia plena czy gratificata?*, RBL 1 (1973) 48–49; J. Kozyra, *Modlitwy Maryjne w Nowym Testamencie*, SS 7 (2003) 154.

866 Sir 18:17; Lk 1:18; Ep 1:6.

867 J.H. Thayer, *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers*, Peabody 1996, 667. Sometimes, the following meaning is proposed: "to bestow grace" or "fill with grace"; R. Popowski, *Wielki słownik grecko-polski Nowego Testamentu*, Warszawa 1955, 652.

868 This was the case with Moses who approached a burning bush: "When Yahweh saw him going across to look, God called to him from the middle of the bush. 'Moses, Moses!'" (Ex 3:4). It is also true about Samuel: "Yahweh then came and stood by, calling as he had done before, 'Samuel! Samuel!' Samuel answered, 'Speak, Yahweh; for your servant is listening' " (1S 3:10). The case was similar with prophets.

accounts of commissioning into service and entrustment of a mission suggests that *kecharitōmenē* was used by Luke as Mary's proper name.[869] This statement can be illustrated by the results of the comparative study of the narrative of annunciation with the commissioning scene of Gideon (Jg 6:11-24).[870] There, in place of Gideon's name, there is a call: "brave warrior." Biblical scholars almost unanimously admit that the Old Testament pericope provided Luke with the necessary structure on which he could build the scene of the annunciation. The similarities between both descriptions are striking:

Gideon (Jg 6:11-24)	**Mary (Lk 1:26-38)**
revelation of the angel (6:11)	revelation of the angel (1:26)
"the Lord is with you" (6:12)	"the Lord is with you" (1:28)
instead of the name: "brave warrior" (6:12)	instead of the name: *kecharitōmenē* (1:28)
an angel message (6:14)	an angel message (1:30-33)
doubt (6:15)	doubt (1:34)
explanations (6:16-24)	explanations (1:35-37)

Both descriptions refer to the assurance of God's assistance and the sign (Jg 6:16-17; Lk 1:35-37). Thus, if in both stories the proper name was replaced by a different formula, it is worth remembering the Hebrew understanding of the name. In Semitic mentality, a name means a person, his or her deepest nature.[871] This

869 The participle *kecharitōmenē* replaces Mary's name in the greeting of the angel; this means that God's loving kindness to Mary is an essential characteristic of Her person. Full of Lord's grace - this is Mary's proper name. Only few characters in the history of salvation enjoyed such kindness of God: Noah (Gn 6:8), Moses (Ex 33:17), David (Ac 7:46). Mary also belongs to the greatest in history; J. Kudasiewicz, *Matka Odkupiciela*, Kielce 1991, 34.

870 Other descriptions of commissioning have a similar structure. Jeremiah's mission is anchored in the vocation scene described by the prophet at the beginning of his book (1:4-8). The narration, which takes the form of Jeremiah's dialogue with God (similarly Is 6 and Ezr 1-3) is concise and very dramatic. Its structure seems clear. It comprises three elements: the introductory formula (v. 4) is followed by the choice, commissioning and entrustment of the mission (vv. 5-6), then by (2) the objections of the appointed one (v. 7) and the assurance of God's assistance (v. 8). Stories about the calling of other charismatic leaders of Israel are structured according to the same pattern: Moses (Ex 3-4), Gideon (6:11-17) and Saul (1S 9:17-10:7).

871 F. Rienecker, G. Maier, *Leksykon biblijny*, ed. W. Chrostowski, trans. D. Irmińska, Warszawa 2001, 284.

was true about all Semitic peoples.[872] It was believed that the name influenced a person's fate, in a way determined it.[873] The name's etymology was often used to guess what the future might hold for a new-born child.[874]

Raymond E. Brown is looking in Luke's text for arguments supporting the virginity of Mary not by referring to Is 7:14 but in the analogies between the depiction of the figure of Jesus and John the Baptist. There is no doubt that the evangelist consciously builds such analogies. The comparison of these two figures serves the theological purposes of the evangelist who wanted to depict John as the predecessor of Jesus. The annunciation of the birth of John is portrayed in contrast to the annunciation of the birth of Jesus. In the first case, the news is brought to the father of the child which is about to be born, in the second case to the child's

872 An Egyptian legend tells the story of the Goddess Isida who before agreeing to heal the God Ra, bitten by a snake, demanded that he revealed to her his name as it was meant to be the source of his power.

873 Midrash Tanchuma states that every time a person performs good deeds, they earn themselves a new name. "There are three names by which a person is called: one which their parents call them, one which people call them, and one which they earn for themselves. The last is the best one of all. [Translation by Hillel and Panim], (*Wajiqal* 121,2). P. Kyle McCarter claims that personal names of patriarchs (and geographical names) are the key to the interpretation of the early history of the Israelites; *Okres patriarchów. Abraham, Izaak i Jakub*, in: *Starożytny Izrael. Od czasów Abrahama do zburzenia Jerozolimy przez Rzymian*, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1994, 47.

874 The Old Testament contains names whose meaning reflected the actual historical situation: Eve – "with the help of the Lord I have brought forth a man" (Gn 4:1); Samuel – "God listened" (1 Sm 1:20); Gershom - "foreigner" (Ex 2:22). The actual circumstances of the birth are described by the names of Esau and Jacob: "The first to be born was red, altogether like a hairy cloak; so they named him Esau. Then his brother was born, with his hand grasping Esau's heel; so they named him Jacob" (Gn 25:25-26). Sometimes names were chosen that were names of animals (Rachel - "sheep", Deborah - "bee", Caleb - "dog", Nahash - "snake") or of plants (Tamar - "palm", Elon - "oak", Zetan - "olive"). This was done if, for example, during the delivery the mother looked at an animal or a plant or if some animal's trait was being symbolically referred to (for example, the bee symbolised industriousness). Of the greatest significance were theophoric names in which (often in an abbreviated form) God's name appeared. Examples of these are: Nathan, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Jerubbal or Jesus. In Israel's earlier history theophoric names were used more commonly. Biblical onomastics contains about forty names which refer to divine parentage and contain the morpheme *ab*. Apart from personal names, references to God as the Father were avoided in Israel (the only exceptions appear to be Ps 2:7; 89:27; 1 Co 28:6). On the theophory of names which stress God's parentage see: A. Tronina, *Ojcostwo Boga w świetle onomastyki izraelskiej*, in: *Stworzył Bóg człowieka na swój obraz. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Biskupa Profesora Mariana Gołębiewskiego w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2002, 418–427.

mother. Zechariah cannot accept God's message with faith; Mary pronounces her humble "let it be done to me." John's mother will be aging Elizabeth, the mother of Jesus is young Mary. John's birth is celebrated in an atmosphere of joyful expectation, in the presence of neighbours and relatives; Christ's birth takes place in poor conditions, away from the place of permanent residence of Joseph and Mary.

Circumcision, performed on the eighth day after birth, was associated with the rite of giving the name. In both cases the name had been revealed earlier. Hymns of prayer, the canticles of Zechariah and Simeon, were uttered under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Luke gradually reveals the superiority of Jesus over John the Baptist. John is "great in the eyes of the Lord," (Lk 1:15) Jesus is simply "great" (Lk 1:32); John is "filled with the Holy Spirit already in the womb of his mother," (Lk 1:15 c) and in the case of Jesus, his conception itself is the result of the descent of the Holy Spirit (Lk 1:35b); John is to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord," (Lk 1:17) and Jesus will "reign over the house of Jacob forever, and His reign will be without end." (Lk 1:33)

To make the analogy complete, it would be strange if John had been conceived through God's intervention and Jesus in a natural way. It seems understandable that if John's conception had been linked to God's intervention in the life of Elizabeth and Zechariah, it may be expected that the conception of Jesus should have been even more unique.[875] The virgin conception thus completes the picture of the analogy in the presentation of the figures of John the Baptist and Jesus.

Another scriptural argument used in support of the thesis about virginal conception is based on the way of presenting the annunciation of the birth of both characters. In the case of John, there is information about both parents. The Angel said in the Temple: "Zechariah, do not be afraid. Your wife Elizabeth is to bear you a son and you shall name him John (Lk 1:13). Zechariah raises objections: "How can I know this? I am an old man and my wife is getting on in years." (Lk 1:18) In the case of Jesus, it is only Mary who is mentioned (Lk 1:31.35.38). The question which she is asking also applies only to Her (Lk 1:34). So if the analogy between the two scenes of annunciation is to be accurate, it can be concluded that Mary shall conceive a Son without the participation of a man. Consequently, it is added later that Jesus was "the son, as it was thought, of Joseph son of Heli." (Lk 3:23) When the idea of virgin conception is rejected, the remark makes no sense.

875 The author in the following way argues in favour of the virgin conception: "Now this build-up of the superiority of Jesus would fail completely if John the Baptist was conceived in an extraordinary manner and Jesus in a natural manner. But it would be continued perfectly if Jesus was virginally conceived, since this would be something completely unattested in previous manifestations of God's power. It is to the virginal conception rather than to a natural conception that Elizabeth refers when she says of Mary: 'Fortunate is she who believed that the Lord's words to her would find fulfilment' (1:45). No belief would really be required if Mary was to conceive as any other young girl would conceive"; R.E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, 300–301.

In the history of exegesis, there were voices that the verses written in Lk 1:34-35[876], on which the Church's teaching of virginal conception is largely based, are a later addition to the scene of annunciation.[877] In this respect, there were two assumptions. According to the first one, the supplement would come from a post-Luke editor or scribe; according to the second, the author was Luke himself. The first hypothesis does not stand up to internal criticism because the language of both verses is typical of Luke. The second one does not stand scrutiny because if in the original version of the story about the annunciation the above mentioned vv. 34-35 were omitted, the pattern of biblical narration about the announcement of the birth would not be preserved, and thus the parallelism with the heralding of John's birth would not be complete. This pattern appears in the Bible a number of times and it applies to: Ishmael (Gn) 16:7-12, Isaac (Gn 17:1-21; 18:1-15), Samson (Jg) 13:3-21, John the Baptist (Lk 1:11-20) and Jesus (Lk 1:26-37; Mt 1:20-21). It consists of five elements[878]:

1. The appearance of an angel of the Lord
2. Fear or proskynesis of the person confronted with the supernatural presence
3. The divine message:
   a. addressing the person by name
   b. a phrase describing the person to whom the message is addressed
   c. encouragement to overcome fear
   d. the announcement of birth
   e. revelation of the child's name
   f. interpretation of the etymology of the name
   g. future mission of the child
4. Objections raised by the person and request for a sign
5. Announcement of a sign confirming the vision.

If the aforementioned vv. 34-35 had been added by Luke at a later stage, it would mean that the original version of the story did not contain elements 4 and 5 of the pattern, which seems to be unlikely. It should be assumed, therefore, that both Mary's question and the announcement of the sign belonged to the original structure of the pericope.

---

876 "Mary said to the angel, 'But how can this come about, since I have no knowledge of man?' The angel answered, 'The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will cover you with its shadow. And so the child will be holy and will be called Son of God."

877 Such proposals were made by e.g. H. Usener (*Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen I: Das Weihnachfest*, Bonn 1889) and J. Hillmann (*Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas kritisch untersucht*, Jahrbuch für Protestantische Theologie 17 (1891) 53–57).

878 A similar scheme can be found in: R.E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, 156.

In later centuries, while justifying the faith in virginal conception, the Fathers of the Church also referred to the interpretation of the question posed to the angel by Mary: "But how can this come about?" (Lk 1:34) The question itself would make no sense if Mary – already married to Joseph but not yet living with him – was to take up an ordinary marriage relationship. Since this question arose, the Fathers say, it may be testimony to Mary's decision to remain a virgin. For this reason, the text was sometimes used as an argument for virginity *post partum*. Early Christian traditions which follow this interpretative direction show Joseph as an elderly man. The author of the apocryphal *Protoevangelium of James* puts the following words into the mouth of her husband: "I have children, and I am an old man, and she is a young girl." (9,2) Joseph, marrying Mary, was supposedly already a widower.[879]

Looking a little further forward, it should be noted that the question of Is 7:14 was widely discussed in Justin's *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho*. After long deliberations and refuting of arguments, Justin was convinced that he had proved that the Isaiah prophecy concerned Christ and he presented his proof as an argument supporting the fact that the Jews should acknowledge the mistakes they made when translating the HB with the intention to contradict the LXX. In other words, he is in favour of the LXX as a proper interpretation of the HB:

> If therefore, I shall show that this prophecy of Isaiah refers to our Christ, and not to Hezekiah, as you say, shall I not in this matter, too, compel you not to believe your teachers, who venture to assert that the explanation which your seventy elders that were with Ptolemy the king of the Egyptians gave, is untrue in certain respects? For some statements in the Scriptures, which appear explicitly to convict them of a foolish and vain opinion, these they venture to assert have not been so written (*Dial.* 68,5).[880]

---

879 Some researchers as an argument for the virginal conception cited as a reference the custom of remaining unmarried in the Qumran sect. The members of the sect thought highly of celibacy and virginity. Mary and Joseph, sharing their convictions, presumably intentionally resigned from sexual intercourse. The conviction that all members of the community were bound to celibacy has become quite common. There are three reasons for this belief: the Essenes went to the congregation houses three times a day but they did so without women and children; they remained unmarried until at least 20 years of age, while their peers had already had their own families for several years; they could have one and only wife. Taking into account the fact that men married women who were only about twelve years old and most of them had children every year, took care of the family, helped on the farm, then supposedly the mortality rate among women was very high. Indeed, many of them did not reach 25 years of age; the deaths were caused by perinatal complications, infectious diseases or general exhaustion of the body. According to Josephus, the Essenes did not renounce marriage (*Bell.* 2,120-121) but only a few had wives (*Bell.* 2,160-161) who did not participate, however, in liturgical gatherings (*Ant.* 18,21).

880 M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen*, 53. Justin assumed that Trypho and his

It is interesting to note that Justin probably had to prove Mary's virginity not only to Jews, but also to some Judeo-Christians and Gnostics. Apocryphal texts may serve as testimonies here (*ProtEwJ*, *Wnieb. Is.* 11,2; *Epistula apostolorum* 3; *Dz. P.* 8; *OrSib.* 8,456). Of course, in this respect, Justin opposed Marcion who generally rejected scriptural arguments. In the *Dialogue* he even mentioned heretics who cursed God the Creator and Christ whose coming had been proclaimed by the prophets. Among those heretics the first place was held by Marcionites (*Dial.* 35,5).

As can be seen from the fragment of the *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho* quoted above, Justin knew the Judaic interpretation of Isaiah's prophecy. The Jews, at the time of the proclamation of the prophecy (the Syro-Ephraimite War, c. 734 BC) could not have referred it to the figure of the Messiah understood in the same way as at the time of Christ because this form of messianism which speaks of one royal descendant had not been known yet. What is more, the presence of the defined article in front of *almāh* confirms that Isaiah meant a specific known person, i.e. most probably Hezekiah.[881]

Therefore, the Hebrew text does not suggest virgin conception of the future king of Israel who will turn out to be the Messiah. Hence Justin refers to the LXX. The Greek text is explicit: the son has not been conceived yet. But it does not mean virginal conception. When the translator of the LXX writes that the virgin will conceive a son, it means a woman who is now a virgin will conceive and give birth to her son in the future. The conception will happen in a natural way. The son born of a woman who is now a virgin will of course be her first-born son. Neither the author of the HB nor the translator of the LXX focus on the method of conception but on the sign itself which will be the birth of the announced child. Christians, however, read the LXX text as a confirmation of the way of conceiving Jesus, Justin claims. This does not mean that on the basis of this prophecy they coined the doctrine of the virgin conception of Jesus but vice versa, knowing the doctrine of such conception, they reread Is 7:14b.

The virgin conception of Christ was known not only to Justin among the early Christian writers. One should also mention Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian, who regarded the idea of virginal conception as the article of faith.[882] Nevertheless, it is necessary to be aware of the specific differences

companions, although they had come from Palestine (*Dial.* 1,3), would base their reflections on the LXX, and not on newer translations of the Hebrew text.

881 The idea that the text refers to the prophet's wife, the "prophetess", mentioned in Is 8:3, is not convincing, especially that the prophet had already had a son (Is 7:3); R.E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, 148.

882 M. Maciołka, *Dziewictwo Maryi*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, IV, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1983, 612–613; J.M. Alonso, P. Schoonenberg, *La concepción virginal de Jésus, historia o legenda? Un diálogo teológico*, Ephemerides Mariologicae 21 (1971) 161–216; T. Boslooper, *The Virgin Birth*, Philadelphia 1962; R.E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, New York 1973, 47–53; R.H. Fuller, *The Virgin Birth: Historical Fact or Kerygmatic Truth?*,

in the reception of Christian beliefs in the second century, a differentiation which was of a geographical character and depended on the vitality of individual communities. In practice, this means that some of the convictions and beliefs considered as a deposit of faith and fully accepted in one community did not have to be regarded as such in another one, and that the truth that was universally believed in Church in one part of the empire had still to be established in another, and that required time.[883]

It seems that the Gnostic and Judeo-Christian groups had most doubts about the virginal conception. This does not mean that they rejected it altogether but it cannot be said that the truth was accepted in the Church in the first and second centuries *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*.[884] Justin himself already noticed the disagreement in this regard between ethno-Christians and Christ's followers descending from Judaism although it seems that he did not regard as heretics those who rejected or doubted the truth about the virgin conception of Jesus *(Dial.* 48,4). Soon after Origen notices: "These are the twofold sect of Ebionites, who either acknowledge with us that Jesus was born of a virgin, or deny this, and maintain that He was begotten like other human beings." (*Cels.* 2,1; 5,61)[885] Ignatius of Antioch is clearly in favour of virginal conception of Jesus (*Eph.* 19:1; *Smyr.* 1,1).[886]

This naturally short outline showing the strengthening in Christianity of the belief in Mary's virginity, the truth which was theologically interpreted on the basis of Is 7:14b, expresses the growing tension not only between Christians and the followers of Judaism but also the polemics which existed within Christianity itself. Ultimately, this truth was accepted by all followers of Christ (especially after Matthew's and Luke's Gospels were universally recognized as authoritative) and definitely rejected by the Jews. The next step towards the final separation of the ways between Church and Synagogue was thus made.

Biblical Research 1 (1956) 1–8; J. Michl, *Die Jungfrauengeburt im Neuen Testament*, Mariologische Studien 4 (1969) 145–184; O.A. Piper, *The Virgin Birth: The Meaning of the Gospel Accounts*, Interpretation 18 (1964) 131–148; E. Vallauri, *L'esegesi moderna di fronte alla verginità di Maria*, Laurentianum 14 (1973) 445–480.

883 R.E. Brown, *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, 47.

884 H. von Campenhausen, *The Virgin Birth in the Theology of Early Church*, London 1964, 22.

885 H. Lichtenberg, *Syncretistic Features in Jewish and Jewish-Christian Baptism Movements*, in: *Jews and Christians; The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, Wiessenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 66, Tübingen 1992, 89. Some researchers make more detailed distinction among believers of Christ derived from Judaism, dividing them into orthodox and heterodox. Ebionites are classified as the second group; K.Baus, *Von der Urgemeinde zur frühchristlichen Grosskirche*, HK 1, Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1963, 180 1963; M.A. Jackson-McCabe, *Ebionites and Nazoraeans: Christians or Jews?*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 187–188.

886 J.R. Longsdorf, *The Virgin Birth. Mystery or Myth?*, Bloomington 2004, 36.

Anti-Judaism of Johannine Writings and Exclusion from Synagogue

Five New Testament writings which belong to the tradition of John are relatively late; they were presumably created at the end of the first century. Our goal is neither to discuss the date of creation of individual writings nor to address the problem of their authorship (especially to determine whether they come directly from John the Apostle or belong to the so-called Johnannine school). There is no doubt that John the Apostle was the youngest among the disciples. The hypothesis that John was not yet thirteen years old at the time when Jesus was dying on the cross can however be questioned.

The main argument in support of the thesis is that only John remained under the cross. According to a Jewish custom, if the teacher was persecuted, his supporters could also be oppressed. Since Jesus had been sentenced to death, it is no wonder that in fear of sharing the Master's destiny, the apostles scattered. Except for John. If he did not undergo his *bar mitzva* yet, he was not in any danger. After all, he was a child. It is only after the public reading of the Torah that the boy becomes the "son of the commandment" and all the regulations recorded in the Torah apply to him.

The hypothesis is bizarre since it assumes that John was about ten years old when he became an apostle. However, there is much in favour of such a possibility. First of all, he had an older brother James who could look after him. Secondly, education in synagogue schools was divided into two stages: boys from five to ten years of age learned the Law, and for the next three years – its interpretation derived from oral tradition. The second stage of his education John could have spent in the school of Jesus who was also a "teacher" (rabbi). Thirdly, much of the public activity of Jesus took place in Galilee so John did not have to leave his family for a long time.[887]

Putting aside the speculations concerning John's age, below we will only concentrate on showing the references of the author(s) of the writings called Johannine to Judaism. These references are important because they reflect the situation that arose between Christians and the followers of Judaism after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem; although exegetes still discuss the dating of the Gospel, the Apocalypse, and the three letters attributed to John, no one doubts that they were written after the year 70, i.e. after the destruction of the Temple.

The Gospel of John is considered by many researchers to be the most anti-Jewish writing in the New Testament.[888] Other writings belonging to Johannine tradition

887 On the other hand, the argument that he certainly was a young man since he ran well in front of Peter in the race to the tomb of Jesus is rather humorous but not completely devoid of persuasive power.

888 W.A. Meeks, *In Search of the Early Christians. Selected Essays*, 116–123.

are also marked by the same feature.[889] They reflect relations between Christians and Jews at the moment of their creation although the Gospel itself describes the activities of Jesus (Jn 1:12) which led to his Passion and Death (Jn 13:21). There is no doubt that the process of formation of the community which gave rise to the Gospel of John lasted for several decades and consisted of several stages. In the history of exegesis attempts to reconstruct this process were undertaken.[890]

The reconstruction was based on an examination of the text of the Gospel itself and of the other writings attributed to John as well as on the theological conclusions which result from this analysis. The fourth Gospel shows a picture of various religious groups emerging outside the Johannine community. To those who did not believe in Jesus belong: "the world," "the Jews," and some followers of John the Baptist. Those who accept the faith in Jesus include: "hidden" Christians, Judeo-Christians and Christians descending from among the Samaritans and the Gentiles[891]. Some of the followers of Jesus did not persevere in His teaching, leaning towards the Gnostic and heretical doctrines. It seems that the process of formation of the community which gave rise to Johannine writings involved five stages:

(1) the disciples of John the Baptist join Jesus[892];
(2) the Good News is accepted by the inhabitants of Samaria[893];
(3) Christians are excluded from the official structures of Judaism[894];

---

889 F. Mickiewicz, *Świadkowie zbawczego posłannictwa oraz mesjańskiej i boskiej godności Jezusa w pismach św. Łukasza i św. Jana*, Ząbki 2003, 40–45.

890 The reconstruction was undertaken among others by R.E. Brown (*The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*, XXXV), L. Stachowiak (*Ewangelia według św. Jana. Wstęp – przekład – komentarz*, Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu IV, Poznań 1975, 43–47), W.E. Hull (*John*, The Broadman Bible Commentary 9, Londres 1970, VIII-IX), C.D. Boer (*Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*, Kampen 1996) i M. Hengel (*The Johannine Question*, London-Philadelphia 1989).

891 A. Hakola, *The Johannine Community as Jewish Christians? Some Problems in Current Scholarly Consensus*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 181–183.

892 S. Mędala, *Chrystologia Ewangelii św. Jana*, Kraków 2001, 352; T. Hergesel, M. Rosik, *„Posłany, aby zaświadczyć o światłości" (J 1,8). Postać Jana Chrzciciela we współczesnej literaturze egzegetycznej*, RBL 2 (2002) 146.

893 "The Johannine community had already taken a significant step outside Judaism in accepting Samaritans who proclaimed Jesus as 'the Savior of the world' (4:42), and in promoting a worship in Spirit and truth rather than on Garizim or in Jerusalem (4:21–24). The struggle with the synagogue had led Johannine Christians to insist that entry into the kingdom was not based on human descent (birth of the flesh) but on being begotten by God (3:3,5) and that those who accept Jesus are the true children of God (1:12)"; R.E. Bown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*, 56.

894 J.L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, New York 1979, 150; A. Paciorek, *Ewangelia umiłowanego ucznia*, Lublin 2000, 60.

(4) the community opens to the followers of Christ coming from pagan environment[895];
(5) those who incorporated some elements of Gnosticism, Docetism or Montanism into their beliefs are excluded from the community of the faithful.[896]

This process began in the 40s of the first century and ended at the beginning of the second century AD. [897] In the Gospel of John, the term "Jews" (Gr. *Ioudaioi*) appears seventy two times and it is not explicit. It sometimes takes on regional meaning in relation to Judea[898], another time it is used in relation to the inhabitants of Judea[899], sometimes it takes on a neutral meaning with regard to persons, feasts and Jewish customs[900], still another time it has clearly negative connotations.[901] From the perspective of this study the last group of texts seems to be most interesting.

The negative connotations of the term *Ioudaioi* are linked to the hostility of the "Jews" towards Jesus and his followers. Of course, it does not refer to all the Jews but to a certain group whose hostility towards Jesus and his disciples was so strong that John often speaks of the "fear of the Jews." (Jn 7:13; 19:38; 20:19)[902] What is more, J.S. Spong puts forward a thesis that since the name of Judas (Juda),

---

895 H. Strathmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Göttingen 1951, 188; C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism*, London 1975, 18; M. Wróbel, *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*, 235; cf. K. Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus. Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu einer Interpretation*, Neukirchen 1981, 28–31.

896 See the entry "gnosticism" in: F.L. Cross, E.A. Livingstone, *Encyklopedia Kościoła*, I, trans. T. Mieszkowski, Warszawa 2004, 782–784. In the second century, some doctrines of docetism proclaimed that Jesus had miraculously avoided death, and instead of him Judas Iscariot or Simon of Cyrene suffered the death; A. Orbe, *Cristologia gnóstica: Introducción a la soteriologia de los silos II y III*, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 384, Madrid 1976, 380–412.

897 A lot of authors - after Brown - adopt a four stage way: (1) preevangelical period in which the disciples of John the Baptist become the disciples of Jesus, among them there was the "beloved disciple"; (2) inclusion the Greeks to the community, which added a universal element to it; (3) division in the community caused by supporters of gnosis; (4) acceptance of the community theology by the whole Church; M. Bednarz, *Pisma św. Jana*, Academica, Tarnów 1997, 32–33.

898 Jn 3:22; 4:3.47.54; 7:1.3; 11:7-8.54.

899 Jn 10:19; 11:19.31.33.36.45; 12:9.11; 19:20.

900 Jn 2:6.13; 3:1.25; 4:9.22; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2; 11:55; 18:20.33.35.39; 19:3.19.21.40.42.

901 Jn 1:19; 2:18.20; 5:10.15.16.18; 6:41.52; 7:1.11.13.15.35; 8:22.31.48.52.57; 9:18.22; 10:24.31.33; 11:8; 13:33; 18:12.14.31.36.38; 19:7.12.14.31.38; 20:19.

902 The texts are thoroughly analysed by M. Wróbel in his work; *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*, Lublin 2005, 79–92. See also: M. Wróbel, *Polemika Jezusa z „Żydami" w Ewangelii Janowej*, SDR 7 (2005) 221–228; M. Wróbel, *„Żydzi" Janowi jako klucz interpretacyjny w głębszym rozumieniu historii i teologii czwartej Ewangelii*, in: *Żydzi i judaizm we współczesnych badaniach polskich*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, Kraków 2010, 47–61.

the greatest traitor in the eyes of Christians, is the same name as the name of the whole kingdom of Judah, Judas may not be an apostle at all but a collective name comprising all Jews who rejected Jesus.[903] He argues this hypothesis by analyzing Judas's betrayal and by reference to two Old Testament themes.

It seems strange that Judas betrayed Jesus by kissing him, and that everything took place after a common paschal feast. It would be quite enough to point at Him with a finger or say: "This is the One." J.S. Spong sees here a reference to the behaviour of Ahithophel, who betrayed King David just after the meal; immediately after the betrayal he took his life by hanging. The second episode is an image of Joab kissing Amass just before piercing his insides with a hidden dagger. In other words, the evangelists, in order to blame the nation of Israel for the betrayal of Jesus, referred to the scenes of betrayal known from the Old Testament. That Judas would be a literary figure symbolising Jews, and not a historical figure, may be – according to the author of the hypothesis – confirmed by the fact that Paul seems unaware of who betrayed Jesus. He never mentions Judas and, describing Christophanies, he refers to twelve (and not eleven) apostles.[904]

Let us go back to John's work. The so-called "anti-Judaist texts" in John's Gospel are usually divided into three groups. The first one includes the polemical dialogues of Jesus with the Jews, the second one – hostility and strong controversies between them, and the third one – texts concerning the role of the Jews in the description of Christ's Passion. The polemical dialogues of Jesus and the Jews were included by John in the so-called Book of Signs (Jn 1-12). They comprise six fragments: the polemic after expulsion of vendors from the Temple (Jn 2:13-22), the conflict in Galilee (Jn 6:22-59), the dispute during the Feast of Tents (Jn 7:14-44), the polemic in the Temple (Jn 8:12-30), the dispute with the Jews who rejected the faith in Him (Jn 8:31-59) and the conflict during the Feast of the Consecration of the Temple (Jn 10:22-39).

In the polemic which arose after the expulsion of traders from the Temple, Jesus did not reject the demands of the Jews to show the sign; on the contrary, He announced that this sign would be the newly erected Temple (Jn 2:19).[905] Even the disciples of Jesus did not understand this statement at that time. It became clear only in the post-paschal perspective: "But he was speaking of the Temple that was

---

903 B. Bruce, *Jezus. Dowody zbrodni*, trans. J. Mastalerz, Warszawa 2011, 120–122.

904 Spong notices that, as the Gospels reconstruct the chronology of events, Judas is becoming worse and worse. He notes that every aspect of the story of the betrayal of Jesus can be found in the Old Testament. For example, in Genesis there is the story of the twelve sons of Jacob who sold their brother Joseph into a life of slavery and in the lead there was their brother named Judah (which is a form of the name Judas); B. Bruce, *Jezus. Dowdy zbrodni*, 230.

905 This event at the beginning of Jesus' public activity is a signal that John intends to develop specific theology of the temple in his work; J. McHugh, *„In Him was Life": John's Gospel and Parting of the Ways*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 126.

his body." (Jn 2:21) Much ink has been spilled over the interpretation of Jesus' gesture of expelling merchants from the Temple (Jn 2:13-17). Different explanations of this act have been proposed. Four of them have been discussed most extensively in exegetic literature.

Some thought that Jesus was opposed to trade on the Temple ground but such an interpretation seems to have no justification either in the text or in historical and religious conditions. It is clear that the Temple was primarily a place of offering sacrifices, and not only of prayer itself.[906] And if so, the sacrifice animals had to be sold near the temple, most likely in the courtyard of the Gentiles.[907] Josephus confirms this practice: "and those that could get them into their hands had the whole nation under their power, for without the command of them it was not possible to offer their sacrifices; and to think of leaving off those sacrifices is to every Jew plainly impossible, who are still more ready to lose their lives than to leave off that divine worship which they have been wont to pay unto God." (*Ant.* 15,248) Besides, if the courtyard of the Gentiles could be visited by worshippers of foreign gods who were not connected with the worship of Israel so all the more it was possible to make there preparations for offering cult sacrifices.

Other scholars speculated that Jesus opposed not so much the selling of sacrificial animals as bankers exchanging money. Such a thesis, however, is unsustainable because those who came from non-Palestinian territories were forced to exchange the currency; they could not pay the temple tax with coins on which the image of the emperor appeared.[908] It would have been a desecration of the Temple, and not the fulfilment of a religious duty. In any case, it does not seem logical in John's text to separate the first hypothesis (the protest against trade) from the

---

906 E.P. Sanders explains the mistake of those who see the Temple as the place of prayer gatherings during the feast days or weekdays: "Those who write about Jesus' desire to return the temple to its 'original', 'true' purpose, the 'pure' worship of God, seem to forget that the principal function of any temple is to serve as a place for sacrifice, and that sacrifices *require* the supply of suitable animals. This had always been true of the temple in Jerusalem. In the times of Jesus, the temple had long been the only place in Israel at which sacrifices could be offered, and this means that suitable animals and birds must have been in supply at the temple site"; E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 63.

907 J. Maier, *Beobachtungen zum Konfliktpotential in neutestamentlichen Aussagen über den Tempel*, in: *Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz*, ed. I. Broer, Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln 1992, 186–187. Some believe that the trade could also take place outside the temple area, in an area adjacent to the walls and stretching along the Mount of Olives. However, it is impossible to locate the event described by John there because in fact this area did not belong to the Temple. According to V. Eppstein, archpriest Caiaphas in the year 30 introduced trading in The Court of the Gentiles; *The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple*, ZNW 65 (1964) 42–58.

908 J.D. Crossan, *Kto zabił Jezusa. Korzenie antysemityzmu w ewangelicznych relacjach o śmierci Jezusa*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 1998, 91.

second one (the protest against currency exchange) because the evangelist clearly states that the whip of Jesus was directed against both merchants and bankers.

Still other authors commit to the thesis that the protest of Jesus was directed not so much against merchants or bankers but against the temple hierarchy – priests who allowed the trade in animals and the exchange of currency. Criticism of the hierarchical priesthood at the time of Jesus was intensified, as it is evidenced not only by Qumran documents (1QpHab 12,8, 1QpHab 12,10, CD 5,6-8) but also by an apocryphal record.

> In secret places underground their iniquities (were committed) to provoke (Him) to anger; They wrought confusion, son with mother and father with daughter; They committed adultery, every man with his neighbour's wife. They concluded covenants with one another with an oath touching these things; They plundered the sanctuary of God, as though there was no avenger. They trod the altar of the Lord, (coming straight) from all manner of uncleanness; And with menstrual blood they defiled the sacrifices, as (though these were) common flesh (*PsSol* 8,9-13).

The lack of clear and direct internal testimonies in John's Gospel leads us to exclude this possibility, too. In any case, it seems too complicated: to protest against the personnel of the Temple, Jesus directed his whip at those who did not belong to the personnel but merely benefited from the privilege or permission granted by the priests. The fourth interpretation remains, then: in the symbolic gesture, Jesus announces the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, and at the same time the end of the form of worship associated with the Temple. Such a radical gesture includes the announcement of a new form of religion – a religion without a temple and bloody sacrifices.[909] Thus, it is a kind of *gestum propheticum*, announcing a radical change in the form of Jewish religiousness.[910]

John's explanation "But he was speaking of the Temple that was his body" (Jn 2:21) indicates that the prerogatives of the Temple were transferred to the person of Jesus. There are researchers who believe that the meaning of Jewish feasts is, according to John, no longer focused on Jerusalem but on Jesus. Since his body is a Temple, the whole cult of the New Covenant, including the celebration of feasts, is

---

909 J. Gnilka interprets Jesus' act similarly to His attitude to the Law, the Sabbath and other institutions of Judaism; *Jezus z Nazaretu. Orędzie i dzieje*, Teologia żywa, trans. J. Zychowicz, Warsaw 1997, 334; see also: J. Rollof, *Das Kerygma und der historische Jesus*, Göttingen 1970, 96.

910 The act of Jesus has symbolic meaning and can be compared to the known from history removal of an eagle from the walls of the temple complex by the fervent patriots. The image symbolized the reign of the emperor. The destruction of the image did not overthrow the authority of the occupant, nor did the reversal of the bankers' tables destroy the Temple, but the symbolism of both gestures remains significant; M. Rosik, *Jezus a judaizm w świetle Ewangelii według św. Marka*, 94.

focused on Him.[911] Moreover, John interprets Old Testament revelation differently from rabbis: it is Christ who is the culmination of revelation, and not the Law, as rabbinic Judaism assumed. The Law bears witness to Christ (Jn 1:45; 5:39.46). Rabbis identified the Law with wisdom (Si 24:23.25; Ba 3:36-4.4); Christians transferred the attributes of wisdom onto the person of Christ.[912] John protests against deification of the Law; rabbis protest against the recognition of divinity of Christ (Jn 5:18).

Jesus' conflict with the Jews in Galilee, and more precisely in Capernaum, was described by John in the discourse called Eucharistic (Jn 6:22-59). It seems that the evangelist intentionally referred here to the Old Testament theme of sending manna during the pilgrimage of Israelites across the Sinai Desert (Ex 16:2-12). During the journey, Israelites were "complaining" about Moses (Ex 16:2.7.8.12); now the Jews "complain" about Jesus (Jn 6:41.43; cf. 6:61; 7:32). John uses here the same term (Gr. *goggydzō*) that appears in the Septuagint. This similarity is intended not only to highlight the rebellion of Jesus' adversaries against Him but also to indirectly indicate His divine prerogatives. Jesus' entire speech is not intended to push the listeners away but, on the contrary, it is intended to encourage people to live according to God's will: "It is my Father's will that whoever sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life, and that I should raise that person up on the last day." (Jn 6:40)

For the understanding of who Jews are in John's view, it is extremely interesting to have a look at the dispute between Jesus and *Ioudaioi* during the Feast of the Tents (Jn 7:14-44).[913] John distinguishes the crowd (*ochlos*) and the residents of Jerusalem (*tines ek tōn Hierosolymitōn*) from *Ioudaioi*. The crowd (Jn 7:20.31.40) and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (Jn 7:25) are surprised at the intention of the Jews to kill Jesus (Jn 7:20.25). What is more, many from among the crowd believe in Jesus (Jn 7:31). And so, here the Jews are identified with the leaders, the Pharisees and priests (Jn 7:26.32). But in the same dialogue the term "the Jews" bears not only negative connotations (Jn 7:14-15.31.35.47.52). This ambivalence in the use of the term by John constitutes a sufficient reason to believe that the aim of Jesus' reasoning is not an attack on the chosen nation but a dispute on His divine prerogatives.

During the Feast of Tabernacles, a polemic in the Temple of Jerusalem develops (Jn 8:12-30). Adversaries of Jesus are once called Pharisees (Jn 8:13), another time the Jews (Jn 8:22). In this case John equates both terms.[914] Hostility between the

911 S. Mędala, *Ewangelia według św. Jana. Rozdziały 1-12. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKB IV/1, Częstochowa 2010, 179.

912 According to the Palestinian Targum to Dt 30,12-14 the Law is the source of living water; in the same way John the evangelist spoke of Christ (Jn 4:10); S. Mędala, *Ewangelia według św. Jana. Rozdziały 1-12. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, 183.

913 J. McHugh, *„In Him was Life": John's Gospel and Parting of the Ways*, 140–142.

914 J. Ashton, *The Identity and Function of the Ioudaioi in the Fourth Gospel*, NT 27 (1985) 61.

two parties is emphasized by the use of the contrast "I – you." This contrast is continued in the next pericope in which Jesus' conversationalists are already only those *Ioudaioi* who believed in Him (Jn 8:31-59).[915] The main theme under discussion is paternity: first, the paternity of Abraham, and then the paternity of God. Jesus not only questions the Abrahamic paternity of his adversaries but calls them the children of "the father of lies." (Jn 8:41-44)[916]

On another occasion – on the Feast of Dedication of the Temple – another conflict between Jesus and the Jews arises (Jn 10:22-39). This time the subject of the dispute is His messianic mission. Jesus does not respond directly to the question about his messianic identity (consciousness) but he emphasizes his unity with the Father, which in the eyes of the Jews sounds like blasphemy and therefore they demand the punishment of stoning. Jesus as the Messiah preaching in the portico bearing the name of Solomon, the king who was the first to celebrate the consecration of the Temple (1 K 8:63b-64), wishes to bring all the Jews to faith. The faith is to be expressed, inter alia, through the recognition of His unity with the Father. Although the words sound like an extremely severe reprimand, their addressees are not all *Ioudaioi* again. In all the above-mentioned dialogues, the fierce polemic is supposed to lead to the conversion of the Jews.

These dialogues and disputes resemble the form of the *rîb* used by the prophets, whose aim was not to set at variance but to reconcile both sides.[917] Such disputes were led by God with his people through Jeremiah and Hosea. Jeremiah relates the breaking of the covenant "with the ancestors," (Jr 31:31) announces the realisation of a new relationship between Yahweh and Israel (Jr 31:31-34) and the liberation from fear, liberation that ultimately leads to salvation (Jr 30:5-11). Hosea, using the metaphor of marriage, announces a covenant in the form of a marriage between God and His bride, the chosen people (Hos 2:4-25). The intention of the *rîb* between Yahweh and Israel is to bring about reconciliation between the parties and to form a new, different covenant. John's descriptions of Jesus' disputes with the Jews can be interpreted in a similar way.

In the second group of texts mentioned above and included in the Gospel of John, the question of relations between Jesus and the Jews looks different. The group of texts describing the hostility and controversy includes four fragments or thematic blocks covering several passages: the remark in the prologue about the rejection of Jesus by "them," (Jn 1:11) the persecution of Jesus and the disciples, the hostile intentions of the Jews regarding Jesus, and Jesus' charge against the Jews

915 For thorough analysis of the excerpt see, in: M. Wróbel, *The Polemic in Jn 8:31-59 in the Context of Jewish and Christian Literature*, Roczniki Biblijne 57 (2010) 2, 15–26.

916 J. McHugh, *„In Him was Life": John's Gospel and Parting of the Ways*, 143; A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, 102–104.

917 B. Gemser, *The rîb- or Controversy Pattern in Hebrew Mentality*, in: *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, VT.S 3, Leiden 1955, 120; P. Beauchamp, *Propositions sur l'alliance de l'Ancien Testament comme structure centrale*, RSR 58 (1970) 161–163.

that their father was the devil (Jn 8:44). The statement that Jesus came "to them" (Gr. *eis ta idia*) and was not accepted (Jn 1:11) should be closely connected with the earlier statement that "the world" (Gr. *cosmos*) did not recognize Jesus (Jn 1:10).

In some Johannine texts, the correlation between the world and the Jews who represent it is clearly visible (Jn 7:1-7, 15:18-24). They are the ones who did not accept the incarnate Word of God.[918] A lot of Johannine texts directly mention the persecution of Jesus (e.g., Jn 5:18; 7:1.20.30.32.44; 8:6,20.48.52; 10:24.31; 11:8; 18:12; 19:1.18.24). The persecution is carried out in various ways: accusations, threats, murmuring, as well as concrete actions leading ultimately to the conviction of Jesus. Jesus himself, on the other hand, foretells persecution of his disciples, i.e. the Church that is to be founded (Jn 15:20).

In this context, the phrase "fear of the Jews" appears (Jn 7:13; 9:22; 19:38; 20:19). It probably refers to the remark included in the Book of Esther: "Similarly, in every province and city to which the king's decree and authority reached there was joy and gladness for the Jews, as well as feasting and holiday. Many of the non-Jews claimed to be Jewish, because they had become afraid of the Jews." (Est 8:17) It is highly probable that John, in the final edition of his Gospel, has consciously referred to this sentence.[919] Given that the Book of Esther was attached to the Jewish canon at about the same time when the final editing of the Gospel took place[920], one may conclude that the work of John is a Christian response to the efforts of the rabbis at Jabneh.[921]

---

918 M. Wróbel states that the image of Jesus who comes to his own people and is rejected anticipates the subsequent narration where Jesus is confronted with Jewish authorities who clearly express the intention to kill Him; *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*,164. The rejection of Jesus by Israel is even more clearly highlighted by J.W. Pryor: "So in 1:10-11 John begins by lightening the irony of the situation: the Logos, by whom the world was made, came into that world and was unknown. When it comes to being more specific, to detailing where and how the Logos was in the world and yet not known, reference is made to Israel and its people"; *Jesus and Israel in the Forth Gospel – John 1:11*, NT 32 (1990) 3, 218.

919 L. Devillers, *La fête de l'Envoyé. La section johannique de la fête des Tentes (Jean 7,1-10,21) et la christologie*, Paris 2002, 266.

920 "After Herod's Temple fell in 70 A.D. whatever popular favour the Book of Esther had enjoyed before, the new establishment represented by Gamaliel II and Akiba now gave it whole-hearted approval"; J. Bowman, *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews. A Study in R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John*, Pittsburgh 1975, 141.

921 The issue was analysed in detail by F. Manns: *L'Évangile de Jean, réponse chrétienne aux decisions de Jabne*, LA 30 (1980) 47–92; F. Manns, *L'Évangile de Jean, réponse chrétienne aux decisions de Jabne. Note complémentaire*, LA 32 (1982) 85–108; F. Manns, *John and Jamnia: How the Break Occured Between Jews and Christians c. 80-100 A.D.*, Jerusalem 1988.

John also reveals the hostile intentions of the Jews directed against Jesus. There are different reasons why the opponents intend to kill the Teacher of Nazareth: violation of the law of sabbatical rest (Jn 5:18; cf. 7,1), accusing them of not obeying the Law (Jn 7:19) and of rejecting His doctrine (Jn 8:37) as well as questioning the links with Abraham (Jn 8:40). The intentions are turned into action: first into an attempt to stone Jesus (Jn 8:59; 10:31; 11:8), then bringing about His trial (Jn 18:19). Again, not all *Ioudaioi* are responsible for this state of affairs but the leaders (Gr. *archontes*; Jn 7:25-26).

Jn 8:44 is often regarded as *locus classicus* of John's anti-Judaism: Jesus accuses the Jews of being the sons of the devil.[922] However, extensive study of this text and its context indicate that Jesus directs this statement not only to the Jews themselves but to all the people who reject his teaching and oppose his messianic mission. This statement is much better understood in the light of the ethical and apocalyptic duality of that time, also reflected in such writings as the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Its purpose is not to condemn but to shock the listeners (addressees) to bring them to change their way of thinking and behaviour.[923]

The third group of "anti-Jewish" texts in the Gospel of John includes fragments of the description of Passion: Jesus' arrest (Jn 18:1-11), Jesus before the Jewish authority (Jn 18:12-27), the trial before Pilate (Jn 18:28 – 19:16) and the crucifixion, death and funeral. (Jn 19:17-42). In the description of Jesus' arrest (John 18:1-11), Judas is shown, accompanied by a cohort at the command of the chief priests and Pharisees, i.e. again the Jews. The trial scene before the Jewish authorities (Jn 18:12-27) is shown by the evangelist in such a way that the reader gets the impression that it is Jesus who judges the world represented by the Jews.

The reader is left with a similar impression while reading the subsequent scene, the judgement before Pilate who represents the Roman authorities (Jn 18:28-19:16): it seems that it is not Jesus but *Ioudaioi* who are judged. The innocence of the convict is emphasized by John also in the description of the passion and death of Jesus: He is being killed at the moment when lambs without flaw are being slaughtered in the Temple during the Holy Passover. Jesus' bones are not broken after his death because He is "the lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world." (Jn 1:29) This description contains anti-archpriestly rather than anti-Judaist elements. The fact that John does not remove but emphasizes the elements that testify to the Roman responsibility for the death of Jesus indicates that the evangelist's goal is not so much the emphasis of anti-Jewish accents but of theological motives. What is more, in the description of the passion and death of

922 M. Wróbel, *Who Is the Liar in Jn 8:44*, in: *Żyjemy dla Pana. Księga Pamiątkowa dedykowana S. Profesor Ewie Józefie Jezierskiej OSU w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. M. Rosik, Wrocław 2005, 751–758.

923 M. Wróbel, *„Żydzi", którzy uwierzyli Jezusowi*, VV 5 (2004) 124.

Christ, John emphasizes the positive role of some Jews (like Joseph of Arimathea or Nicodemus).

The specificity of John's Gospel is revealed in the use of the term *aposynagōgos* which indicates exclusion from the Synagogue (Jn 9:22; 12:42; 16:4).[924] The motif of exclusion from the Synagogue should be considered against a much broader background and in three fundamental aspects: in the Old Testament, in Qumran writings and in rabbinic literature. Since each of these texts was written at a different time, one can observe certain chronological development of the idea of exclusion of the Jews from their religious community. In the Old Testament, expulsion from the religious community was connected with a curse or an anathema. Anathematizing a person involved simultaneously their exclusion from the society they belonged to. This understanding of the practice is indicated by the Hebrew term derived from the *a-r-r* core ("to swear").[925] The curse was not used in private disputes but was always uttered by a person endowed with authority and for this reason it had the form of an official act.

The same applies to another form of a curse which is described by a term created from the *a-l-h* root ("to curse," "to swear falsely").[926] In both cases, the curse is uttered as a consequence of crimes in the sphere of cult, social life or sexuality. Every time it is linked to a breach of the covenant with Yahweh. The category of covenant is one of the most important, defining God's relationship with His people. The exclusion of someone from Israel's community, that is from the circle of God's people, is always the result of breaking of the covenant and is expressed in the ban on participation in worship. The Deuteronomy (Dt 27-28) enumerates detailed rules in this respect. At the time after Babylonian captivity, Israelis in mixed relationships with the Gentiles were most likely to be excluded from the community of Israel.

Among the texts found in the 40s and 50s of the last century in the Judah Desert, the most important information about exclusion from the community is included in legal and doctrinal texts, namely the *Rule of the Congregation*, the *Damascene Document*, the *Rule of War* and the *Temple Scroll.*[927] First of all, certain continuity

924 P. Landesmann, *Anti-Judaism on the Way from Judaism to Christianity*, 86–89. "John 9:22–23, 12:42–43 and 16:2–3 are bound together by the very uncommon word *aposynagōgos*, not attested in Greek texts before the Gospel of John and without any clear correspondence in Hebrew or Aramaic. It is a good Greek construction, an adjective derived from a preposition phrase "; A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, 43; A.-J. Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*,104–105.

925 P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, 45.

926 P. Briks, *Podręczny słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, 32.

927 In a sense, the mere fact of moving of Jewish ascetics to the Qumran desert was equal to a kind of self-exclusion from the community of Judaism in its official form. The case was similar with Christians at the end of the first century; M. Wróbel, *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, 170–171.

can be observed with the Old Testament tradition: both in Qumran documents and in the Old Testament, expulsion from the community is combined with the practice of the curse.

Curses against the apostates were expressed within the rite of acceptance of new members into the sect and within the covenant renewal rites. Breaching the rules regulating the life of the community was punished by expulsion lasting from ten days up to two years. For example, for lies with reference to property or lack of respect for the superiors, a penalty of one year exclusion was applied. Seven years of expulsion from the community were a punishment for profanation of the Sabbath or other public feasts. Intentional violation of the Law was punished severely by total exclusion from the community. The Court of Justice consisting of twelve people had the final word in this matter and its judgement was not subject to an appeal. Exclusion from the Qumran community was equivalent to the exclusion from the eschatological community of the Sons of Light. It should be remembered, however, that the idea of exclusion or separation did not have only negative connotations among the members of the community, as they consciously separated themselves from the mainstream of Judaism in order to create "true Israel" in the desert.

In the literature of rabbis who continued the Pharisaic thought, there were references to various forms of excommunication: a reprimand, temporary exclusion and definitive exclusion from the community of God's people. Its first degree was a reprimand. It was imposed by the leader of a particular community, often the synagogue head. In Palestine a reprimand lasted for seven days, in the diaspora for one day. The reprimanded person was excluded from public life, and if the reprimand met someone for insulting another person, it was advisable to avoid any contact with the offended person. Abolition of the reprimand was not connected with any official ceremony of apology or the need to express one's sorrow orally.

The penalty of temporary exclusion from the community was the most common. It was described by the term *nidduj*. In Palestine, *nidduj* was in force for thirty days. A person excluded from public life had to withdraw any unorthodox views and express their regret. The cancellation of the penalty was fortified with an official formula. The penalty was imposed not only for views regarded as heretical but also for ridiculing the provisions of the Law or orally transmitted tradition. Initially, only the Sanhedrin had the right to impose *nidduj*; later, it was extended to scribes and ultimately to every Jewish believer. With time, even an obligation to impose *nidduj* was introduced. Whoever, for example, heard a person uttering the name of God and did not impose this type of punishment on them, he himself was subject to excommunication.

If, after the imposed *nidduj*, the excommunicated person did not show remorse, the custom was to stone their coffin after death. It was a sign of definitive exclusion from the Jewish community. If, on the other hand, the person expressed remorse, they were obliged to do it through external signs. Such a person could not cut their hair, clean their clothes, take baths or wear sandals. Other members of the community did not greet the excommunicated one. After two applications of *nidduj*,

or after sixty days, if the culprit still persisted in his stubbornness, a punishment called *herem* was used, which was a complete exclusion from the Synagogue. Members of the community were forbidden to have economic contacts with the excluded, while he himself was totally prohibited from teaching. The opinions of scholars regarding the consequences of *herem* are divided: some think that the punishment was exclusion from the synagogue community but the excluded one continued to be a Jew while others believe that *herem* was of a definitive character and that a punished person was considered to be dead.[928]

Against this background, the message of John's remarks concerning exclusion from the Synagogue is more clear (Jn 9:22; 12:42; 16:4). The parents of the man blind from his birth and healed by Jesus are afraid that he who regards Jesus as the Messiah will be excluded from Israel's religious community (Jn 9:22). Also the Jewish leaders, for fear of exclusion, do not recognize the Messiah in Jesus (Jn 12:42). Jesus Himself warns His disciples that they will be persecuted and expelled from the religious community of Israel (Jn 16:4). This punishment was a drastic sanction for the Jewish followers of Christianity. It was linked to the threat of persecution. It seems that the entire Johannine community was punished with such a sanction. No wonder that the practice of *herem* contributed to acceleration of the process of the split between Christianity and Judaism.[929]

To a much lesser extent, the anti-Jewish elements were contained in other writings belonging to the Johannine tradition, i.e. in the three letters[930] assigned to John and in the Revelation. The first of the letters, which refers to the Gospel mostly in respect to the style and subject matter, contains encouragement and explanation of the true doctrine of Christ's deity in face of the emerging gnosis. Cerinthus, contemporary of John, taught that Jesus was only a man, and that Christ dwelt in him at the moment of his baptism in Jordan and stayed until the beginning of the torment. During his death on the cross, God left Jesus, and he was dying like an ordinary man. Christ never rose from the dead.[931] According to Cerinthus, the creator of the world was supposedly not God but a spirit that did not know God at all.

---

928 For more information on the exclusion from the Synagogue see: M. Wróbel, *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, 151–222.

929 Of a different opinion is J.G.D. Dunn. The author claims that at the moment of the final edition of John's Gospel, the members of Johannine community still considered themselves to be Jews within Judaism although tensions with the Jews rejecting Christ reached their zenith; J. G. D. Dunn, *The Question of Anti-Semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period*, 210.

930 J.L. Houlden, *Ewangelia według św. Jana*, in: *Słownik hermeneutyki biblijnej*, ed. R.J. Coggins, J.L. Houlden, Polsih ed. W. Chrostowski, trans. B. Widła, Warszawa 2005, 181–182.

931 R.M. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, London 1958, 104–108. Irenaeus informs about the views of Cerinthus (*Haer.* I, 26.2).

Cerinthus was a Jew of Alexandria where he received excellent education. He was circumcised, he continued to observe the Sabbath although he and his followers called themselves Christians. *De facto*, however, he was a disappointed Jew who could not accept the destruction of the Temple.[932] He proclaimed the eternal continuance of the Law of Moses and Israel's destiny to rule over the world. He was also opposed to Peter because of his acceptance of Cornelius and pagan people into the Church. He ordered the converted Christians to fully observe the Law, and he called the Galatians to renounce their obedience to Paul. He also rejected the writings of the apostle of the nations. His views are known not only from Irenaeus' writings but also from the Hippolytus of Rome and Epiphanius.[933] The views of Cerinthus were related to those of the Ebionites, which will be discussed further in this work.

In the face of such and similar ideas, John was focused on the explanation of proper teaching, and not on anti-Jewish themes. A similar warning against a false doctrine also appeared in 2Jn 7-11 (3Jn contains a moral message). At the time when the Temple did not exist anymore, John stressed that Jesus "is the sacrifice to expiate our sins, and not only ours, but also those of the whole world." (1Jn 2:2) The following words may refer to the Jews who rejected Christ: "Who is the liar, if not one who claims that Jesus is not the Christ?" (1Jn 2:22a) Similarly as in the Gospel, the motif of the world was linked to the motif of cognition: "The reason why the world does not acknowledge us is that it did not acknowledge him." (1Jn 3:1b)

Two issues need to be addressed in this context: the understanding of the term "world" (cosmos) and the issue of "cognition" (*ginōsko*). By the term "the world," John understands all people who rejected the redemptive message of Christ.[934] The world is subjected to the ruler of darkness. Jesus has come to save the world (Jn 3:17; 4:42; 6:33.51; 12:47) but the sad fate of condemnation will not be avoided by those who reject the redemptive message (Jn 9:39). Those who have received the redeeming message of the Son of God are no longer part of the world (Jn 15:19; 17:6.11.14.16); moreover, they experience the hatred of the world (Jn 15:18-19; 17:14). John states with all clarity: "We are well aware that we are from God, and the whole world is in the power of the Evil One." (1Jn 5:19) He calls believers not to love the world or what is in the world (1Jn 2:15) and not to be surprised that the

---

932 According to W.H. Carroll, Cerinthus and his supporters lived in the shadow of this catastrophe and hated the new, emerging world; *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, 459. According to Irenaeus, when one day John the evangelist entered the Ephesian baths and met Cerinthus, he ran out of the building with a cry: "Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within" (*Haer.* III, 3,4).

933 J. Misiurek, H. Paprocki, *Cerynt*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, III, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1979, 24–25; J. Munck, *Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times*, NTS 6 (1959–1960) 103–116; M. Black, *The Patristic Accounts of Jewish Sectarianism*, BJRL 41 (1959) 285–303.

934 S. Gądecki, *Wstęp do pism Janowych*, Gniezno 1991, 86.

world hates them (1Jn 3:13) because the sin belongs to this world and should be the enemy of all Christians (1Jn 2:16-17).[935]

In the phrase "[the world] did not acknowledge him" the verb "acknowledge" is used in the aorist which means the historical moment of rejection of Jesus' teachings by the Jews to whom the Gospel was proclaimed. Since they were unable to recognize the Messiah in Jesus, they are now unable to recognize Christians. Just like before the hatred of the world was directed against Jesus, it is now directed against His disciples (Jn 15:18-19; 1J 3:13). Ultimately, however, Jesus has defeated the world ("In the world you have tribulation; but take courage: I have conquered the world"; Jn 16:33) and such victory is achieved by Christians through faith: "because every child of God overcomes the world. And this is the victory that has overcome the world - our faith." (1Jn 5:4) The faith will lead to seeing Christ (1Jn 3:2b).[936]

The last book of the New Testament, Jewish in character, The Revelation, also belongs to Johannine tradition.[937] Two fragments of the Revelation may reflect local conflicts with the Jews although some authors intend to refer to the Jews all the fragments of the book referring to Babylon.[938] The Church in Smyrna may have experienced distress from the Jewish community since Jesus confesses with the

935 L. Ryken, J.C. Wilhoit, T. Longman III, *Słownik symboliki biblijnej. Obrazy, symbole, motywy, metafory, figury stylistyczne i gatunki literackie w Piśmie Świętym*, trans. Z. Kościuk, Warszawa 1998, 983.

936 Christians are already children of God but it is only in the mystery of seeing Christ after the Parousia that they will become fully similar to Him. The purpose of seeing Christ is therefore to become like Him. In some currents of Greek thought, human nature became similar to deity through the contemplation of divine matters. Ancient philosophers, e.g. Plato, believed that they made this change thanks to the power of the mind, not through sensual knowledge. Philo shared the view that man could see God only through a mystical experience because he believed that God was transcendent. He believed that God had bestowed upon Israel, and especially upon the prophets, visions that had to be accompanied by virtue and purity of the soul, and that was to be fulfiled at the moment of attainment of perfection. This thought also appeared in some Palestinian Jewish texts, especially in the circles of mysticism. Perhaps more important here is the fact that seeing God was often combined with the end times, and in certain currents of Jewish apocalyptic thought, the vision of God's glory was to lead to the transformation of man; C.S. Keener, *Komentarz historyczno-kulturowy do Nowego Testamentu*, eds. K. Bardski, W. Chrostowski, trans. Z. Kościuk, Warszawa 2000, 574.

937 J.W. Marshall, *John's Jewish (Christian?) Apocalypse*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 233.

938 Thus: A.J.Beagley, *The 'Sitz im Leben' of the Apocalypse with Particular Reference to the Role of the Church Enemies*, BZAW 50, Berlin – New York 1987; see. M. Wojciechowski, *Apokalipsa świętego Jana. Objawienie, a nie tajemnica. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, 57.

lips (or rather with the quill) of John: "I know your hardships and your poverty, and - though you are rich - the slander of the people who falsely claim to be Jews but are really members of the synagogue of Satan." (Rv 2:9) Similar is the message of the verse: "Look, I am going to make the synagogue of Satan - those who falsely claim to be Jews, but are liars, because they are no such thing - I will make them come and fall at your feet and recognize that I have loved you." (Rv 3:9)[939] The mention of blasphemy or insults does not necessarily mean an offensive statement directed against God but rather against what the Christians considered to be sacred or even against themselves.[940] At the time of the formation of the Book of Revelation, the term "synagogue" pointed to a single religious community rather than to Judaism as a whole. It seems then that the polemic is directed against a single community (or even a part of it or maybe a single figure).

An interesting fact is that opponents of Christians falsely present themselves as the Jews, which implies that Jewish identity is honourable. Therefore, among the opponents of John one cannot see Jews in general but rather those who falsely claim to be the Jews or once were the Jews but due to their behaviour they were excluded from the community of the chosen nation.[941] A fact worth emphasizing is that the book of Revelation does not contain polemic against Judaism, and terms such as "the Law," "circumcision" or "covenant" are not used. Opponents of John are members of the local Jewish community who are characterized by two attitudes: hostility against (or at least disapproval of) Christians as well as some form of unorthodoxy. This unorthodoxy may have consisted in, for example, recognising Zeus as the Greek equivalent of God Jahweh, as confirmed in the *Letter of Aristeas* as well as in the inscriptions found in Mysia and Delos.[942]

To sum up this part of our considerations, it should be stated that Johannine writings not so much affected the separation of Church from Synagogue or constituted one of the factors that contributed to the split as they were its testimony.[943]

---

939 M. Wróbel, *Motywy i formy żydowskich prześladowań pierwotnego Kościoła (I-II w. po Chr.)*, 432–433.

940 Cf. Dz 13,45; 18,6; Rz 3,8; 1Kor 10,20; 1P 4,4.

941 D. Kotecki, *Kościół w świetle Apokalipsy św. Jana*, SBP 6, Częstochowa 2008, 70; W. Popielewski, *Alleluja! Liturgia godów Baranka eschatologicznym zwycięstwem Boga (Ap 19,1-8)*, StBib 1, Kielce 2001, 105–106.

942 M. Wojciechowski notes that it may have also referred to other Christians who were closer to Judaism, or who preferred to be associated with a legal religion rather than with a religion persecuted by the authorities; *Apokalipsa świętego Jana. Objawienie, a nie tajemnica. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, 137.

943 This, however, does not in any way undermine the Jewish character of Johannine writings, especially the Revelation: "Without denying the potential value of Jewish Christianity as an analytical apparatus in general, it does much more harm than good in the case of the Apocalypse. John's deep investment in Judaism - understood narratively, ritually, socially, theologically, culturally, and historically needs to be understood through the category that makes sense of it: the book is Jewish"; J.W. Marshall, *John's Jewish (Christian?) Apocalypse*, 255.

The ways of the two religious groups in the region which was inhabited by John's community were already running almost separately although the relationship between them was still so vivid that the Christian polemic with Judaism was reflected on the pages of writings attributed to John the apostle in an extremely sharp manner.[944] The difficulty in proper assessing the relationship between Church and Synagogue in John is, among other things, due to his use of the term *Ioudaioi* in various shades of its meaning. What is more, some passages of John's writings which until now have been regarded as anti-Jewish, turn out to be remarks expressing intra-ecclesial criticism directed against the Jews who had accepted Jesus, namely the Judeo-Christians.

Apocryphal Apocalypses as Witness to the Division between Church and Synagogue

In addition to the writings which over time have shaped the canon of the New Testament, other religious writings of Christian provenance began to emerge. Contrary to a belief popular until recently, the vast majority of people in the ranks of the Church were not people from illiterate circles, often identified with the poor strata of society. The level of education did not go hand in hand with social status. The art of writing and reading was often mastered by slaves who belonged to the lowest social classes.

Udo Schnelle, professor at the University of Martin Luther in Halle, argues that the issue of illiteracy did not concern almost half of the population in the first centuries. Joining new religious communities (primarily Christian) was accomplished mainly thanks to education and dissemination of literary works. No religious figure before Christianity had so quickly acquired such a huge literary legacy as the figure of Christ. Christianity can even be called a creative literary movement. From the very beginning of the existence of the Church, the Old Testament was read in a new way and new literary genres were created (like the "gospels"). Moreover, Christians were to a large extent bilingual and were not only able to read the texts and understand them but also to pass on their content, often translating

944 In relation to the Gospel of John, Adele Reinhartz from University of Ottawa states: "On the narrative level, we can say with some certainty that the Gospel of John portrays a substantial rift between Jesus and his followers and the Jews who do not believe. Responsibility for this rift is laid at the feet of the Johannine Jews, who have agreed to expel believers from the synagogue and who persecute Jesus for claiming to be the Son of God"; A. Reinhartz, *'Common Judaism', 'The Parting of the Ways', and 'The Johannine Community'*, w: *Orthodoxy, Liberalism, and Adaptation. Essays on Ways of Worldmaking in Times of Change from Biblical, Historical and Systematic Perspectives*, ed. B. Becking, Leiden 2011, 87.

it into a different language.[945] Some of the early-Christian scriptures are now part of the apocryphal collection.

Jewish apocalypticism even before the birth of Christ created favourable conditions for the spread of the Christian message. Joachim Gnilka rightly notes that although Jesus could not be called an apocalyptic or apocalypticism could not be considered as the mother of Christian theology, it cannot be denied that thanks to its new vision of history, a paradigm appeared which made it possible to give birth to a Christian current. Thanks to that, it was possible to look at history from the point of view of its end. In its interpretation, history was heading towards the final end, to the moment when God would judge the world. In this context, a purely temporal perspective was abandoned[946] and apocalyptic writings appeared.

Out of the three apocalyptic writings dating back to the end of the first or beginning of the second century, two show great convergence in terms of their form and content[947]: the *Fourth Book of Ezra* and the *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. Some authors are even inclined to see a literary link between these writings.[948] The *Apocalypse of Abraham* was probably created independently of them.[949]

A new idea in Jewish apocalypticism appears in the *Fourth Book of Ezra*: for the first time the hope for a new eschatological era was nursed. However, this idea functions in the book simultaneously with a thought that the eschatological kingdom shall come in this world: "For my son Jesus shall be revealed with those that be with him, and they that remain shall rejoice within four hundred years." (*4 Ezr* 7:28)[950] In a sense, this idea is similar to the theology of the Revelation to John, where the coming of a new earth and new heaven will be preceded by a millennial earthly kingdom.

Although in the past exegetes were inclined to claim that some parts of apocalyptic material, in which the celestial kingdom is referred to, are later additions to the main body of the works, nevertheless, now the majority of them tend to believe that the dramatic political situation at the turn of the first and second centuries

945 Schnelle adds: "We should thus presuppose a relatively high intellectual level in the early Christian congregations, for a comparison with Greco-Roman religion, local cults, the mystery religions, and the Caesar cult indicates that early Christianity was a religion with a very high literary production that included critical reflection and refraction"; U. Schnelle, *Das frühe Christentum und die Bildung*, NTS 61 (2015) 2, 113.

946 J. Gnilka, *Pierwsi chrześcijanie. Źródła i początki Kościoła*, 426.

947 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 121.

948 M. Parchem, *Pojęcie królestwa Bozego w Księdze Daniela oraz jego percepcja w pismach qumrańskich i w apokaliptyce żydowskiej*, RSB 9, Warszawa 2002, 112.

949 C. Rowland, *The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material*, in: *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, 219–221.

950 *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 1999, 384.

triggered the emergence of the idea of a kingdom in the next world. It functioned alongside the idea of the ultimate messianic kingdom on earth. Both perspectives on the end times – one of a temporal dimension, the other of a supernatural dimension – existing simultaneously in the same work, caused the readers of *the Fourth Book of Esdras* to perceive temporal things *sub specie aeternitatis*. This, in turn, resulted in greater concern for the eternal than temporal matters. It is God himself, defined in the work as many as sixty times as the "Most High"[951], who will take care of inflicting justice on the unbelievers, both from Israel and from other nations. The essence of life on earth is observing the Law. Breaking the law must be punished:

> For there be many that perish in this life, because they despise the law of God that is set before them. For God hath given strait commandment to such as came, what they should do to live, even as they came, and what they should observe to avoid punishment. Nevertheless they were not obedient unto him; but spoke against him, and imagined vain things; And deceived themselves by their wicked deeds; and said of the most High, that he is not; and knew not his ways: But his law have they despised, and denied his covenants. (*4 Ezr* 7:20-24)

The *Syrian Apocalypse of Baruch* is also distinguished by apocalyptic character. Its original text was written in Hebrew and then translated into Greek – the Syrian version is a translation of the Greek text. The work was written in the first half of the second century AD in Palestine. It is also known as the *2 Baruch* to distinguish it from the canonical Book of Baruch. The author tells the story of the announcement of destruction of Jerusalem which prophet Baruch received from God. The destruction is supposed to be carried out by four angels, and then the whole city is to be occupied by the Chaldeans.

The reader may be surprised that the destruction of the Tabernacle takes place not only with God's consent but in a sense even on God's initiative (*ApBar* 3 and 80). Prophet Baruch should stay in the city while Jeremiah should go to Babylon – and all this at God's command. God also reveals to Baruch that pagans will be punished for their wrongdoing (*ApBar* 13 and 82) whereas after the arrival of the Messiah the Temple will be rebuilt. The authors of these two apocrypha seem to ask themselves the question of the sense of being righteous if the world is heading for disaster anyway. Their response goes in the following direction: people who obey the Law (*ApBar* 32; 44; 46; 51,7; 77,13) will be "caught" (*ApBar* 48,30; *4 Ezr* 14). Both the children of Israel and the Gentiles will be punished in the end – God himself will punish them.

---

951 L. Wianowski, *Bóg i aniołowie w wybranych pismach apokaliptyki żydowskiej*, in: *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Waldemara Chrostowskiego w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, III, ed. B. Strzałkowska, Warszawa 2011, 1509.

A work known in short as *The Apocalypse of Abraham* belongs to the genre of apocalypses as well.[952] There is no doubt that the work was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic but it has been preserved only in the Old Church Slavonic and Romanian translations. It describes the appointment of Abraham and the covenant between him and God. The Patriarch was chosen from among the polytheistic people to go and offer God a sacrifice on Mount Horeb. This part of the work is based on Gn 15:9-17. After offering his sacrifice, Abraham receives visions from God showing, among other things, the destruction of the Temple and the punishment that would affect the Gentiles.[953] It is precisely the vision of the destruction of the Temple that makes us date the creation of the work after the year 70 AD.[954] The author probably belonged to the priestly circles but it is not certain if he was an Essene. He emphasizes the motif of Israel's choice and the covenant, and highlights the final victory of the righteous ones (*ApAbr* 32).[955]

A complex process of creation characterizes the *Sibylline Oracles,* a book which in its title refers to a pagan prophetess of legendary origin. She was identified with the prophetess of Eritrea. The work consisting of fourteen books[956] started to be created probably in the first century BC while its latest part was formed at the beginning of the seventh century AD. Particular books could have been written in different environments like Asia Minor, Palestine or Egypt. The whole work, written in hexameter, gives rise to research on a new "Sibylline" literary genre. The content of individual books is quite diverse.[957]

---

952 The full title is: *The Book of the Apocalypse of Abraham, son of Terah, son of Nahor, son of Serag, son of Arphaxad, son of Shem, son of Noah, son of Lamech, son of Methuselah, son of Enoch, son of Jared.*

953 C. Rowland, *The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material*, 222.

954 "The issues which are raised are what we would have expected Jews to have struggled with after the traumatic experience of 70 CE. There would be an inevitable reappraisal of attitudes with needs for more precise definitions of what was required of the people of God and an emphasis on the centrality of the Law"; C. Rowland, *The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material*, 222.

955 R. Rubinkiewicz presented the proposal of symbolic reading of the first part of the book; *Apokalipsa Abrahama 1-6. Propozycja interpretacji symbolicznej*, RTK 29 (1982) 1, 79–94.

956 There are basically twelve books but the eighth book is divided into three parts and as a result the ninth and the tenth books were created. However, many researchers accept the dual division: books I-VIII and XI-XIV.

957 It is discussed more precisely by J.J. Collins in his article *The Sybilline Oracles* (in: *Compendium rerum iudaicarum ad NovumTestamentum*, II, *Jewish Writings of Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, Assen – Philadelphia 1984, 357–382).

The following topics can be enumerated: criticism of idolatry, the announcement of the coming of the kingdom of God, the annihilation of Belial, God's judgement, the history of the world which combines elements of Greek myths with biblical themes, the history of Israel with the stress put on Assyrian captivity and the destruction of the Temple, threats against pagan powers (Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Libya, the land of Gog and Magog, Rome, Phoenicia, Crete, Thrace, Greece), criticism of polytheism, references to historical events (Xerxes' expeditions, the Peloponnese war, Nero's escape, the eruption of Vesuvius, events since the time of Alexander the Great up to Hadrian's time). In some books there are typically Christian interjections, which indicates that the original Jewish text was reworked by followers of Christ. Intrusions of Christian nature can be seen mainly in the *First and the Second Book of Sibylline Oracles*. There is periodization of history here, with a division into ten generations, emphasising the crisis of the end times and the judgement.[958]

The picture of Jewish eschatology that emerges from the apocalypses mentioned above has different shades. The first of them could be described as "nationalistic." The fall of the uprising in the year 66 and the Temple lying in ruins called for religious interpretation; however, there were no figures comparable to those of the Old Testament prophets who would attempt to explain the situation of the nation. Jewish identity could have been disturbed by the growing sense of distance from the Creator. Human helplessness in the face of history makes us look for God's interventions in the final days or even transfer them to the "world to come." At the time of those interventions, the role of the Chosen Nation will prove to be particularly important for the fate of the whole world.[959]

The other vision of apocalyptic eschatology can be called "traumatic" – the pain and fear in the face of events that have already taken place as well as those that are to come finds its expression in literary works.[960] The change in the fate of the oppressed is connected in these apocryphal books with the establishment of social justice, observance of the Law, abandonment of godlessness and finally with the coming of the Messiah. The books also have a specific idyllic touch. It is manifested in the fact that the authors of the apocalypses, while drawing a picture of punishment and annihilation for iniquity, refer it mainly to the Gentiles. The chosen nation will be rescued, will be rewarded and will experience consolation.[961] Since

958 M. Parchem, *Wprowadzenie do apokaliptyki*, in: *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu. Pisma apokaliptyczne i testamenty*, ed. M. Parchem, Kraków 2010, 91–92.

959 M. Miduch, *Apokaliptyka żydowska – o nadziei*, HJ 7, Kraków 2012, 67.

960 S. Jędrzejewski, *Apokaliptyka jako rodzaj literacki*, RBL 51 (1998) 1, 31. It seems that from the point of view of literary studies, in this case it is better to speak of a genre, and not a literary form. In Polish biblical studies this inaccuracy (confusion of the genre with the literary kind or form) was launched by improper translation of the constitution *Dei Verbum* of the Second Vatican Council. Unfortunately, half a century after the Council the problem has not been overcome yet.

961 T.W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, Sheffield 1989, 97.

the sin on earth has intensified beyond the limits, hence the conclusion that the annihilation of the wicked ones is already near and this means the imminent salvation of Israel.[962] The traumatic events of the present time are becoming a sign of the emerging hope.[963] The hope is connected either with a dimension that goes beyond the earthly framework or with the establishment of God's reign on earth engulfed in prosperity, happiness and lack of suffering in any of its forms.[964]

What influence could the Jewish apocalyptic literature at the turn of the first and second centuries have had on Judeo-Christians who still felt ties with the Synagogue and in some cases might have considered themselves its members? Apocryphal apocalypticism reaffirms the belief of Christians that God is not powerless in the face of evil in the world, and that He restores justice in due time. We should expect God's interventions, not necessarily modelled on those that have already taken place; God can act in an absolutely new way. In order to experience this action, one needs to fight evil inside and around oneself. However, violence must be abandoned in the fight against evil, and revenge must be left to God. The vengeance awaits sinners mainly at the time of the final judgement. Apocalypticism develops images of heaven, hell and judgement. The final victory will be sealed by the resurrection of the righteous ones.

For Christians, however, the righteous ones were those who believed in Christ, not those whose main effort was concentrated on obeying the Law. In the opinion of R.H. Charles, expressed already a century ago, ethical teaching included in Jewish apocalypticism and preserved on the pages of apocryphal books provides a connecting link between the thought of biblical Judaism and the New Testament. In this way, apocryphal literature in matters concerning moral issues would constitute a kind of transition or could be seen as a bond between the two Testaments. This is because the teaching of apocrypha on moral issues is in a sense a step forward when compared to the teaching of biblical Judaism.[965]

Judaic ideas and apocryphal images were, to some extent, taken over and reworked by the first Christians. The doctrine of the victory of good over evil, of the judgement of God, of heaven, of hell, of eternal punishment, of the reward, of Parousia, and of the resurrection was developed. However, this was done primarily on the basis of the Gospel and Paul's letters as well as other books of the New Testament. Where the Jewish apocalyptic literature deviated from the lines defined by the canonical Christian scriptures, it was not accepted by the mainstream of Christ's followers and could only be reflected in the views of some gnostic sects.

Thus, although apocryphal literature of Judaism was inspiring for Christians, it could not be taken over by the Church community in its entirety, nor could it even

962 P. Sacchi, *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia*, Brescia 1990, 111.
963 A. Diez Macho, *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, Madrid 1984, 47.
964 M. Miduch, *Apokaliptyka żydowska – o nadziei*, 88.
965 R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudoepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913, XI.

become a dominant feature shaping everyday Christian customs or mentality. It could even be harmful, as the supporters of Jewish apocalypticism in its apocryphal version preferred to wait for God's intervention rather than take an effective action to meet human needs.[966] Literary convergences also exist between apocryphal literature and books of the New Testament or non-biblical Christian literature.[967] However, they do not necessarily imply direct borrowings or quotations but they may indicate common sources or a similar environment in which particular books were created.[968]

Letters to Christian Communities of St Ignatius (c. 107 AD)

The letters of the Antioch Bishop Ignatius fit into Christian-Jewish polemic at the beginning of the second century. Ignatius rarely referred in them to the Old Testament as he came from pagan Antioch.[969] He as the first one used the term "Christianity" (Gr. *christianismos*) in contrast to "Judaism" (Gr. *ioudaismos*).[970] Ignatius came into conflict with the Roman authorities about the year 115 and was sentenced *ad bestiam*. Expecting to be torn apart by wild animals, on his way to the Eternal City he decided to offer the last guidelines to the local Churches associated with him.[971] Among others, these were the communities that supported him on his way to Rome. He sent letters to the inhabitants of Rome as well as to Ephesus, Magnesia and Tralles (from Smyrna), to Philadelphia, Smyrna and to Polycarp, the

966 This opinion is shared by J.L. McKenzie; *The New Testament without Illusion*, Chicago 1980, 239.

967 However, it is difficult to assess to what extent the apocryphal teaching was representative of the whole Judaism. The same applies to the teaching of the Qumranians which is marked by the sect mentality. Hence, the Aramaic Targums seem to be the most representative of biblical Judaism.; S. Sandmel, *The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity*, New York 1969, 11–12.

968 For example, it is worth noting that Paul's phrases in Rm 3:20 and 7:14 are almost identical to those in *Ezr 4.* 9:32.36. There are also some convergences between the statements of Christ and the phrases contained in these apocrypha (*4 Ezr* 4:28 i Mt 13:39; *4 Ezr* 4:36 i Mk 13:32). Large convergences can also be seen between *4 Ezr* 9:35 and Rv 6:9-11; *4 Ezr* 4:41 and Rv 1:18; *4 Ezr* 12:42 and 2P 1:19; S. Mędala, *Wprowadzenie do literatury międzytestamentalnej*, 168.

969 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 140.

970 A.Y. Reed, L. Vuong, *Christianity in Antioch: Partings in Roman Syria*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 118.

971 Using an allegory, Ignatius concludes that already on his way to Rome he had to cope with animals: "From Syria even unto Rome I fight with beasts, both by land and sea, both by night and day, being bound to ten leopards, I mean a band of soldiers, who, even when they receive benefits, show themselves all the worse" *(The Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans 5:1). Roberts-Donaldson English Translation.*

bishop of the latter city (from Troad). In his correspondence, he clearly opposes the Judaizers.

The Judaizers wanted to reduce the distance between Christians and the Jews, which was absolutely against the will of the Bishop of Antioch. In his *Epistle to the Magnesians,* the author devotes a lot of attention (Chapters VIII-XI) to the subject of the adoption of Jewish practices by Christians.[972] He is strongly opposed to this practice in accordance with the decisions of the so-called Council of Jerusalem.[973] Ignatius does not avoid strong language, calling it "absurd" to proclam Christ in speech but in the mind to adhere to Judaism. In this epistle there are the following words: "For Christianity did not embrace Judaism but Judaism Christianity." (*Epistle to the Magnesians* 10,3) They have been preceded by the expressive statement, "It is absurd to profess Christ Jesus, and to Judaize."

As a reminder of Paul's admonitions in his First Letter to Timothy, the bishop of Antioch forbids the addressees "to give attention to myths and unending genealogies" (1Tm 1:4) because such an attitude is proper for the Jews but it is unbecoming of Christians. Living the Jewish way, especially practicing circumcision and observing the laws of purity is nothing else than rejecting the grace of Christ. Ignatius turns out to be a good expert on Jewish Sabbath Law. He condemns Christians who eat food prepared the day before, drink cold drinks on the Sabbath, walk only in an enclosed space, take care not to transgress the Sabbath Day's walk or find pleasure in dances that do not make any sense from a Christian point of view. Instead of the Sabbath, the followers of Christ should celebrate Sunday as the day of resurrection.[974]

It is interesting that Ignatius calls Sunday the "queen" *(Magn.* 9) of all the days of the week, just as the Jews speak of the Sabbath: "R. Jannai donned his robes, on Sabbath eve and exclaimed, 'Come, O bride, Come, O bride!' R. Hanina robed himself and stood at sunset of Sabbath eve [and] exclaimed, 'Come and let us go forth to welcome the queen Sabbath." (*Sab.* 119,1) The Judaizers are defined by Ignatius with the terms derived directly from Paul's correspondence with Timothy: "they will be treacherous and reckless and demented by pride, preferring their own pleasure to God." (2Tm 3:4) They trade Christ, trade His word and sell their Lord.

The *Letter to the Philadelphians* is also known in two versions; both contain a warning against Jewish practices. This time, the author refers more to John's thought rather than to Paul's correspondence with Timothy. He calls a liar everyone who proclaims God's Law and rejects Christ, pointing out at the same

---

972 There are two versions of this letter, shorter and longer; both essentially similar in terms of the content.

973 H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70-312)*, in: *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, 258–259.

974 M. Humphries, *Early Christianity*, 107.

time that the father of a such one is the devil (cf. Jn 8:44). The strong point of the bishop of Antioch are his comparisons. In his opinion, the one who receives Christ and rejects God's Law is a disciple of Simon the Sorcerer. Who accepts the Holy Trinity but is ashamed of Christ's Passion is equal to the Jews who killed Him. (*Fil.* 6).

One of the arguments included in this letter Ignatius begins with the words: "But if any one preach the Jewish law (*ioudaismos*) unto you, listen not to him. For it is better to hearken to Christian doctrine (*christianismos*) from a man who has been circumcised, than to Judaism from one uncircumcised. But if either of such persons do not speak concerning Jesus Christ, they are in my judgement but as monuments and sepulchres of the dead, upon which are written only the names of men." (*Fil.* 6,1-2)[975] Speaking of uncircumcised men who proclaim Judaism, Ignatius probably refers to pagan Christians who too firmly adhere to the Jewish Law, even though they do not practice circumcision.[976] The circumcised man who proclaims Christianity is probably a Judeo-Christian.[977] Ignatius contrasts the two groups; however, they are not Jews and Christians but followers of Christ of different currents, more or less practising the provisions of the Torah.[978] He explains: "When I heard some saying, if I do not find it in the ancient Scriptures (Gr. *archeiois*)[979], I will not believe in the Gospel. On my saying to them, it is written, they answered me, that remains to be proved. But to me Jesus Christ is in the place of all that is ancient: His cross, and death, and resurrection, and the faith which is by Him, are undefiled monuments of antiquity." (*Fil.* 8,2)

As mentioned above, Ignatius of Antioch most probably came from a pagan environment in which he was able to become very well acquainted with the thought of Greek philosophers; therefore, his perfect knowledge of Jewish beliefs and customs is all the more impressive. In his letters the criticism is directed against Judaizers and it is as a trace of internal disputes within the Church but it also sheds light on the mutual relations of Christians and the Jews. Ignatius is aware, however, that both the Jews and the Gentiles are called to salvation through Christ, and he expresses this idea in his correspondence with the inhabitants of Smyrna: "[He] was truly, under Pontius Pilate and Herod the tetrarch, nailed [to

975 A.Y. Reed, L. Vuong, *Christianity in Antioch: Partings in Roman Syria*, 118.

976 P. Foster, *The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch*, in: *The Writing of the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. P. Foster, Edinburgh 2007, 91; C.K. Barrett, *Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius*, in: *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly, R. Scroggs, Leiden 1976, 220–224; S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaism Without Circumcision and 'Judaism' Without Circumcision in Ignatius*, HTR 95 (2002) 395–415.

977 J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, 128.

978 R.M. Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers*, IV, *Ignatius of Antioch*, Camden 1966, 103.

979 The word refers to the Old Testament; J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, 128.

the cross] for us in His flesh. Of this fruit we are by His divinely-blessed passion, that He might set up a standard for all ages, through His resurrection, to all His holy and faithful [followers], whether among Jews or Gentiles, in the one body of His Church." (*Smyr.* 1,2)[980]

Around the Reference of Pliny the Younger to Christ and Christians (110 AD)

The rich Roman Senator, who during his long political career held many positions including the position of a Roman legate in Bithynia and Pontus, Pliny the Younger sent a letter to the Emperor Trajan at the beginning of the second century in which he asked how to deal with Christians, against whom numerous accusations were made at that time.[981]. According to the author of the letter, the only mistake and greatest fault of Christians was to gather before the dawn on a certain day of the week to raise hymns praising Christ "as God" (Latin *quasi deo*), and in order to oblige themselves under oath to avoid crime, adultery, theft and to keep their word.[982] Pliny's positive evaluation of Christians did not prevent the legate from condemning them to death[983] although the sentences were not devoid of certain doubts. Pliny confesses to Trajan:

> I have never participated in trials of Christians. I therefore do not know what offenses it is the practice to punish or investigate, and to what extent. And I have been not a little hesitant as to whether there should be any distinction on account of age or no difference between the very young and the more mature; whether pardon is to be

980 After: F. Drączkowski, *Patrologia*, 19.

981 At Trajan's time, Roman authorities did not identify Christians with Jews any more. Roman officials never demanded sacrifices to their gods from the Jews but they made such demands of Christians; W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, 395; J. Engberg, *Condemnation, Criticism and Consternation. Contemporary Pagan Authors' Assessment of Christians and Christianity*, in: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 203.

982 Here is an extract from the original text of the letter to Trajan, stored at Morgan Library in New York: „Sollemne est mihi, domine, omnia de quibus dubito ad te referre. Quis enim potest melius vel cunctationem meam regere vel ignorantiam instruere? Cognitionibus de Christianis interfui numquam: ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat aut quaeri. Nec mediocriter haesitavi, sitne aliquod discrimen aetatum, an quamlibet teneri nihil a robustioribus differant; detur paenitentiae venia, an ei, qui omnino Christianus fuit, desisse non prosit; nomen ipsum, si flagitiis careat, an flagitia cohaerentia nomini puniantur. Interim, [in] iis qui ad me tamquam Christiani deferebantur, hunc sum secutus modum. Interrogavi ipsos an essent Christiani" (*Ep.* 10.96).

983 E.G. Hardy, *Christianity and Roman Government*, New York 1971, 102–140; W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, 162–164.

> granted for repentance, or, if a man has once been a Christian, it does him no good to have ceased to be one; whether the name itself, even without offenses, or only the offenses associated with the name are to be punished. Meanwhile, in the case of those who were denounced to me as Christians, I have observed the following procedure: I interrogated these as to whether they were Christians; those who confessed I interrogated a second and a third time, threatening them with punishment; those who persisted I ordered executed. For I had no doubt that, whatever the nature of their creed, stubbornness and inflexible obstinacy surely deserve to be punished. There were others possessed of the same folly; but because they were Roman citizens, I signed an order for them to be transferred to Rome.[984]

In fact, it was the constant practice of Roman leaders who tried and sentenced members of groups considered criminal or illegal. In trials against Christians, Pliny turned out to be so "merciful" that he spared the lives of those who publicly denied Christ and made sacrifices to the Roman gods. Pliny himself was aware that Christ was a human but by his believers was venerated as God.[985]

The popular opinion that Christians were accustomed to meeting together on a specific day before sunrise to sing songs to Christ as God (*quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi deo dicere*) is called by the sender "a great blame or error" (*hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae vel errori*). From the point of view of Judaism, worshipping a man as God was a total blasphemy. Since the consciousness of the historicity of the figure of Jesus of Nazareth was not questioned by the Jews at the beginning of the second century, none of them would dare to worship him as God, not to be accused of blasphemy and be threatened with exclusion from the Synagogue.

---

984 Responding to the doubts of Pliny, Trajan wrote: "You observed proper procedure, my dear Pliny, in sifting the cases of those who had been denounced to you as Christians. For it is not possible to lay down any general rule to serve as a kind of fixed standard. They are not to be sought out; if they are denounced and proved guilty, they are to be punished, with this reservation, that whoever denies that he is a Christian and really proves it - that is, by worshiping our gods - even though he was under suspicion in the past, shall obtain pardon through repentance. But anonymously posted accusations ought to have no place in any prosecution. For this is both a dangerous kind of precedent and out of keeping with the spirit of our age." "Later Emperor Hadrian confirmed the main elements of Trajan's policy. As the later apologists emphasized the then official politics was curious. The very effect of being a Christian, a member of an illegal group, was a crime regardless whether or not Christians actually committed any of the acts that they were often accused of. Nevertheless, the pursuit of Christians was not part of the then imperial policy. Up to the middle of the third century, the persecutions of Christians were instigated mainly by local authorities, not by the empire's government"; H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70-312)*, 306–307.

985 M. Humphries, *Early Christianity*, 212.

Worshipping man as God directly opposes the Law of Moses and even the Decalogue itself, hence it is clear that when writing about Christians, Pliny the Younger did not mean the followers of Judaism. The two communities were then already perceived as separate groups. What is more, regarding the singing in honour of Christ as "guilt" and "a mistake" would perfectly correlate with Jewish view of Christianity. The conclusion which may be drawn from Pliny's letter is that the Jews and the followers of Christ were seen by the polytheistic society not only as two separate religious movements but also as two hostile groups.

Jewish Uprisings in the Diaspora in the Years 115–117

At the time of Trajan the persecution of Christians was still going on but Christ's followers were no longer identified with the Jews (at least in the diaspora), as evidenced by the events that took place in the years 115-117 when local Jewish uprisings against the Roman Empire broke out in Cyrene, Egypt, Cyprus and Mesopotamia. Eusebius of Caesarea mentions them in his work in the following words:

> In the eighteenth year of Trajan's reign there was another disturbance of the Jews, through which a great multitude of them perished. For in Alexandria and in the rest of Egypt, and also in Cyrene, as if incited by some terrible and factious spirit, they rushed into seditious measures against their fellow-inhabitants, the Greeks. (*Hist.* 4,2,1)[986]

Since the uprisings took place in four parts of the empire inhabited by the diaspora Jews almost at the same time, it is difficult for researchers to determine their chronological order. This is not a matter of primary importance though. It would be more important to answer the question whether all these revolts were part of a broad plan, or whether they could have broken out independently of each other. Historians are reduced to assumptions rather than the analysis of validated source information.[987] The absence of sources does not allow to clearly define the reasons for these rebellions against the authority of Rome, either. Their beginnings fade away in the darkness of conjectures. It is possible that in the diaspora messianic tendencies revived. This religious factor could be taken into account especially in Africa where many of the participants of the first Jewish uprising had fled. Among them, messianic tendencies could still be alive. The longing for Ptolemaic times was also of considerable importance.

---

986 The testimony of Eusebius, written much later than the reported events had taken place, is confirmed by a letter of the wife of the prefect of the house in Upper Egypt, a certain Apollonios as well as by notes that were probably made by the governor of Egypt, Marcus Rutilius Lupus.; J. Warzecha, *Z dziejów diaspory aleksandryjskiej*, 369–370.

987 J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, 94–95.

At that time, the life of ordinary people was much better in terms of economy and religion. In Alexandria, on the other hand, the coexistence of the Greek and Jewish inhabitants (the diaspora community was quite numerous there) proved extremely difficult. Eighty years earlier (in 38 AD) street riots took place there, and since then the tension between Greeks and Jews continued to grow. Many pagan temples were destroyed in Cyrene, including the temples of Apollo, Zeus, Demeter, Artemis and Isis. The inscriptions discovered during the excavations prove that the destruction took place during *tumultus Iudaicus*.[988] Dio Cassius in the following words (drastic and picturesque at the same time) reports those events:

> Meanwhile the Jews in the region of Cyrene had put one Andreas at their head and were destroying both the Romans and the Greeks. They would cook their flesh, make belts for themselves of their entrails, anoint themselves with their blood, and wear their skins for clothing. Many they sawed in two, from the head downwards. Others they would give to wild beasts and force still others to fight as gladiators. In all, consequently, two hundred and twenty thousand perished. In Egypt, also, they performed many similar deeds, and in Cyprus under the leadership of Artemio. There, likewise, two hundred and forty thousand perished. (*Hist. rom.* 68, 32,1-2)[989]

---

988 S. Appelbaum, *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt*, British Archeological Reports Supplement Series 7, Oxford 1976, 45; S. Appelbaum, *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene*, Leiden 1979, 269–285; J. Reynolds, R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and God-Fearers at Aphrodisias*, Cambridge Philological Society Supplement 12, Cambridge 1987, 34; G. Lüderitz, *Corpus judischer Zeugnisseaus der* Cyrenaika, Tübingen 1983, 17–25; M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, 34–35; T.D. Barnes, *Trajan and the Jews*, JJS 40 (1989) 145–162.

989 After: M. Goodman, *Rzym i Jerozolima. Zderzenie antycznych cywilicacji*, trans. O. Zienkiewicz, Warszawa 2007, 354. One hundred years after the note by Dio Cassius, Eusebius of Caesarea interpreted the Jewish uprisings from the Christian perspective: "The teaching and the Church of our Saviour flourished greatly and made progress from day to day; but the calamities of the Jews increased, and they underwent a constant succession of evils. […] The insurrection increased greatly, and in the following year, while Lupus was governor of all Egypt, it developed into a war of no mean magnitude. In the first attack it happened that they were victorious over the Greeks, who fled to Alexandria and imprisoned and slew the Jews that were in the city. But the Jews of Cyrene, although deprived of their aid, continued to plunder the land of Egypt and to devastate its districts, under the leadership of Lucuas. Against them the emperor sent Marcius Turbo with a foot and naval force and also with a force of cavalry. He carried on the war against them for a long time and fought many battles, and slew many thousands of Jews, not only of those of Cyrene, but also of those who dwelt in Egypt and had come to the assistance of their king Lucuas. But the emperor, fearing that the Jews in Mesopotamia would also make an attack upon the inhabitants of that country, commanded Lucius Quintus to clear the province of them. And he having marched against them slew a great multitude of those that dwelt there; and in consequence of his success he was made governor

Ascribing cannibalism to opponents was treated as a propaganda stunt in antiquity. [990] The number of victims is probably also exaggerated in this report. Nevertheless, the battles were bloody, which is confirmed by an anonymous author in a letter written in Greek on papyrus: "The one hope and expectation that was left was the push of the massed villagers from our district against the impious Jews; but now the opposite has happened. […] our forces fought and were beaten and many of them were killed."[991]

In the eastern parts of the Empire, in Babylonia (Mesopotamia), the inhabitants generally rebelled against the power of Rome, hence the rise of the Jews should be seen as the partaking of the followers of Judaism in this general revolt of the people subdued by the Empire. Eventually, all these uprisings were quickly suppressed[992] but it did not exacerbate in the sense of political sanctions the already difficult situation of Christians. Trajan's successor, Hadrian, left Christians relatively in peace, which cannot be said about the Jews.[993] However, He was still more gentle than Trajan, as evidenced by the *Sibylline Oracles* (5,1-50), a work created shortly after the suppression of the uprisings.

The question whether the uprisings that broke out between the years 115-117 in the diaspora had a significant impact on the mutual relations between Christians and the Jews is difficult to answer clearly today. It seems that if so, this impact was insignificant. The uprisings could have become a source of conflict between the two communities but only if several conditions had been met. Firstly, it is a matter of the interpretation of the precept of the Law: "You will not revile God, nor curse your people's leader." (Ex 22:27) In the LXX version, i.e. in the text used in the diaspora, we read about "gods," not "God." Then the command "You will not blaspheme gods" can be read in the light of Ex 22:7, where the LXX speaks of "judges" and later the Vulgate of "gods" as those who exercise power in the name of the only God. The comparison of the HB, the LXX and the Vulgate may prove helpful in the discovery of how Ex 22:7 was interpreted in the diaspora:

---

of Judea by the emperor. These events are recorded also in these very words by the Greek historians that have written accounts of those times" (*Hist.* 4:2,1-5).

990 P. Fredriksen, *What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, 56.

991 *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicorum*, II, ed. V.A. Tchernikover [et al.], Cambridge 1957, no 438, 1-9. At the end of the year 117, an Egyptian official wrote a letter to the Prefect of Egypt asking for sixty days' leave. He motivated his request as follows: "because of the attack of the impious Jews, practically everything I possess in the villages of the Hermoupolite and in the metropolis needs my attention"; ibid., no. 443, 2.

992 One of the consequences of these uprisings was the introduction of two units of Roman troops controlling Jerusalem (Legion X) and Galilee (Legio II - Traian Fortis) in the year 117; B. Isaac, I. Roll, *Judea in the Early Years of Hadrian's Reign*, w: *The Near East Under Roman Rule: selected Papers*, Leiden 1998, 182–197.

993 H.-Ch. Puech, *Storia dell'ebraismo*, trans. M.N. Pierini, Cles 1993, 178–179.

Ex 22:7 (HB)	**Ex 22:7 (LXX)**	**Ex 22:7 (V)**
"If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall come near unto God, to see whether he have not put his hand unto his neighbour's goods."	"If the thief is not found, the owner of the house must present himself to the judges to determine whether or not he has taken his neighbour's property."	"If the thief be not known, the master of the house shall be brought to the gods, and shall swear that he did not lay his hand upon his neighbour's goods." [994]

St Jerome based his Latin translation on the Hebrew text, and he chose the version of "gods" because the judges settling disputes were seen as God's representatives on earth. The Septuagint departed from the literal translation in favour of the generally accepted interpretation that the word referred to "judges." The same process could have been accomplished in the case of Ex 22:27; here both the LXX and the Vulgate speak of "gods." However, if in the diaspora Ex 22:27 had been read literally, then the command contained in this text could have been applied to pagan gods. The Jews followed this command in the diaspora by not destroying places of worship of the pagan idols. Josephus certifies this when he writes that "the legislator clearly forbade them from scoffing at and defamation of gods recognized by other nations because of the very name of God." (*Ap.* 2,237)[995]

However, this command was in force on the territories of the diaspora, while in the areas inhabited by indigenous Jewish communities worshiping alien gods was rigorously attacked by the Jews.[996] For this reason riots started in the year 40 and protests began when the statue of an eagle was hung in the Temple or the Roman flags were propped against its walls. If, for some reasons (unknown to us today), such Jewish attitudes were transferred to the diaspora and the Jews also fought there directly against the cultivation of pagan worship, then the uprisings in 115-117 could have influenced the relationship between Church and Synagogue, but one more condition had to be fulfilled: namely, that in the environments where these uprisings broke out, the Jews explicitly acknowledged that Christians were not monotheist and that they worshipped pagan gods. And such a fact is never mentioned either in Jewish sources or in the Roman-Greek or Christian ones.

It is clear that such accusations against Christians were present in Judaism but there are no sufficient sources to confirm that they were of significance in the cities where the uprisings took place. There are no references to Christians being

994 Translation from the Latin Vulgate into English made by members of the English College, Douai (The Douay–Rheims Bible).

995 cf. J. Flawiusz, *Przeciw Apionowi. Autobiografia*, Warszawa 2010.

996 "Paganism was to be attacked in the land of Israel, where it polluted the holy soil and brought Jews into dangerous temptation, but the idea that gentiles should be forbidden idolatry wherever they lived was a new notion"; M. Goodman, *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, 35.

involved in the armed conflicts in any way. In any case, the Jewish uprisings in the diaspora were basically limited to the conflict between the Jews and the Gentiles, and they did not have any effect on the mutual relationship between Jews and Christians.

It seems, however, that one more hypothesis on the influence of the uprisings in the years 115-117 on the relationships between Church and Synagogue cannot be underestimated, although it undermines to some extent the earlier assumption that Judaism and Christianity in the diaspora were clearly differentiated. At the same time, this hypothesis is an attempt to explain the silence on the presence of Christianity in Alexandria before the end of the second century.[997] Tradition that ascribes the founding of the Church in the greatest diaspora centre of his time to Mark the evangelist cannot be historically verified. It comes from the beginning of the second century and cannot be seriously examined for the lack of adequate sources.

It is hard to assume, however, that Christianity had not reached such an important centre as Alexandria until the end of the second century. Such an assumption is all the more difficult to prove that the references to the Christian community at the end of the second century suggest a well-organized, solid and stable group. On this basis, a view was developed that the Christian community in Alexandria was established around the middle of the first century but it was very much rooted in the Jewish community. Christians living at that time in the Alexandrian diaspora were simply Judeo-Christians, and the Roman authorities and the Egyptians did not distinguish between the two groups. The bond was very strong until the uprisings in the years 115-117 when the Jews (and with them Judeo-Christians) were crushed by the opponents. Christianity, which was later reborn in the area, originated from the pagan environment.[998]

In a sense, the thesis is supported by the already mentioned argument *ex silentio*: Paul had never come to Alexandria, a great centre of the diaspora in which academic life flourished but he planned a journey to Spain (Rm 15:24). In Alexandria he could easily communicate in Greek, while in Spain he would have to use Latin and there are no references confirming that Paul was fluent in the language of Cicero. The New Testament, however, mentions Apollos, a Jew from

997 Once accepted theory of Walter Bauer does not stand up to criticism. Bauer (*Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, Philadelphia 1971) claimed that Christianity reached Alexandria very early but it was gnostic in character and for this reason after the triumph of orthodoxy at the end of the second century the beginnings of the Church in the area were forgotten. The thesis was refuted by C. H. Roberts (*Manuscript, Society and relief in early Christian Egypt*, Oxford 1979) who pointed out that gnostic texts originating in Egypt and dated the II century are not more numerous than gnostic texts from other areas, so there is no reason to assume that in Alexandria gnosticism developed on a larger scale.

998 R. Kraft, A. Luijendijk, *Christianity's Rise After Judaism's Demise in Early Egypt*,179.

Alexandria converted to Christianity (Ac 18:24; 1Co 3:4-6; 16:12). If Apollos had been baptized in his homeland, it would have been the evidence of the presence of the Church in that place as early as in the middle of the first century.[999] Under this assumption, it is quite likely that the Alexandrian Judeo-Christians lost their lives or disintegrated during the uprisings in the years 115-117, and the few who survived gave rise to a new era of Alexandrian Christianity, open to the believers of the pagan faith.

Ebionites and Nazarenes – Jews or Christians?

Researchers dealing with early-Christian heresy most often place the Ebionites and Nazarenes among the followers of Christ who, being mistaken, decided to keep Jewish laws and customs. Sometimes both groups are described by the ambiguous term "Jewish Christianity."[1000] These groups are known mainly from the writings of the Fathers of the Church (Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus of Rome, Tertullian, Origen, Epiphanius, Jerome and Eusebius of Caesarea)[1001] who do not hesitate to call them heretics. Only two of them, Epiphanius and Jerome, mention the Nazarenes. They were friends and lived in Palestine, which makes their remarks concerning Jewish Christianity particularly interesting. The other Fathers of the Church also mention Ebionites but sometimes these references are so different in substance that it is hard to say with certainty that everyone speaks of the same group. It should be added that Epiphanius of Salamis assigns to the Ebionites at least some of the letters called *Pseudo-Clementines*, discussed in the third part of this book.[1002]

It is difficult to date explicitly the formation of the Ebionite group[1003] but the *Gospel of the Ebionites* appeared in the first half of the second century. It means that the sect had developed its activity earlier. Some see its beginnings in the middle

---

999 J. Mélèze-Modrzejewski, *Żydzi nad Nilem od Ramzesa II do Hadriana*, 280–281.

1000 P. Luomanen, *Ebionites and Nazarenes*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 81; M. Simon, *Réflexions sur le judéo-christianisme*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, II, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, 75–76.

1001 R. Bauckham, *The Origin of the Ebionites*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 162.

1002 More see: J. Verheyden, *Epiphanius on the Ebionites*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 182–208.

1003 M.A. Jackson-McCabe comments: "we must admit that we know next to nothing of the historical circumstances surrounding either the formation of the Ebionite group or their continued evolution and eventual disappearance"; M.A. Jackson-McCabe, *Ebionites and Nazoraeans: Christians or Jews?*, 192.

of the first century.[1004] The name of the sect means as much as "the poor" and it should be derived from Jesus' blessing of the poor in spirit included in Mt 5:3 (Lk 6:20).[1005] Eusebius mocks them calling them "poor" because they have a very poor idea of Christ (*Hist. eccl.* 3.27). Signs of the presence of the members of the sect could be observed in Palestine and Syria. At least this is what Epiphanius' writings suggest but he is dependent on the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist. eccl.* 3,5). According to Epiphanius, the sect originates from a person called Ebion, who was of Samaritan descent (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30,1). Today, however, almost all researchers agree that Ebion was a fictitious figure invented by Epiphanius.

Ebionites observed the law of Moses, trying to impose it also on other believers of Christ. Initially they remained in the Jerusalem community but then they supposedly separated from it.[1006] It is assumed that after the death of James the Younger in the year 62 they left the Church as a result of disputes over the succession of the bishop's capital in Jerusalem. They claimed that James was opposed to the sacrificial cult in the Jerusalem Temple (*Haer.* 30,16). Perhaps then they became susceptible to the influence of the Essenes who left the Qumran settlement and took refuge in Syria in the face of the Roman invasion in 66. The influence could be observed in the diet of the Ebionites: like the Qumranians they were vegetarian.

According to the writings of several early-Christian authors who mentioned the Ebionites, they were advocates of adoptionism – the view that Christ was only a human being (*Haer.* 30,2) and was adopted by the Father at the time of his baptism in the Jordan. Origen comments the view as follows:

> Those who give credence to the Gospel of the Hebrews[1007], in which the Saviour says, Just now my mother, the holy spirit, took me by one of my hairs and brought me to Tabor, the great mountain, have to face the problem of explaining how it is possible for the "mother" of Christ to be the holy spirit which came into existence through the Logos (*In Ioan.* 2,12).

1004 J. Misiurek, *Ebionici*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, IV, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1983, 636.

1005 M. Starowieyski, *Ewangelia Ebionitów*, in: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, I/I, *Ewangelie apokryficzne. Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, 114.

1006 "One need make only a quick comparison with the opening chapters of Acts to see that these basic doctrines had a place in the teaching of the earliest Jerusalem church: the resurrection of the dead (Acts 2:24, 32; 3: 15; 4:10); God is the creator of all things (4:24); and belief in one God and his child (*pais*) Jesus Christ (3:13,26; 4:27,30). To this point we do not have anything that would differentiate the Nazarene church from the primitive church"; R. Pritz, *Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century*, 44.

1007 In the writings of Origen the differentiation between the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and the *Gospel of the Ebionites* is not clear.

The Ebionites denied the pre-existence of the Son of God and some of them also denied Mary's virginity. They argued that obeying the Law also by ethno-Christians was a condition necessary for salvation. They avoided any contact with the Gentiles (*Haer.* 30,2). Irenaeus of Lyon claims that they practised circumcision and all other customs of the Law, and worshipped Jerusalem as the "house of God." *(Adv. haer* 1,26) They carried out ritual purification after sexual intercourses (*Haer.* 30,2). They used Matthew's Gospel willingly but modified it in many places *(Haer.* 30,13). For example, they removed Jesus' genealogy from it because, rejecting the idea of virgin conception, they believed that Joseph was the natural father of Jesus. Irenaeus of Lyon confirms: "They use only the Gospel according to Matthew and reject the apostle Paul, whom they call an apostate from the law." (*Adv. haer.* 1,26)[1008]

As it has already been mentioned, the Ebionites, like residents of the community in Qumran, refrained from eating meat (*Haer.* 30,13). They were supposed to find justification of this practice in the revised version of the Gospel according to Matthew in which John the Baptist ate only honey, and not locusts. A similar change concerns the words of Jesus himself, who confessed to the apostles that he did not wish to eat the Passover with them (*Haer.* 30,13). Sacred feasts (it is hard to call them the Eucharist) were celebrated using unleavened bread and water (*Haer.* 30,16). Not only Sunday was celebrated but also the Sabbath and other Jewish feast days. They rejected priesthood and Eucharistic sacrifice, which again was confirmed by Epiphanius: "But to destroy deliberately the true passage these people have altered its text - which is evident to everyone from the expressions that accompany it - and represented the disciples as saying, 'Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the Passover?' and he supposedly saying, 'Did I really desire to eat meat as this Passover with you?' " *(Hear.* 30,22) Just like the Jews, they had their own synagogues, headed by the leader (Gr. *archisynagogoi*) and the elderly *(Hear.* 30,18). In the presence of the sick or bitten by snakes, the Ebionites were supposed to utter phrases resembling spells *(Haer.* 30,17).

Paul the apostle was regarded by them as an apostate from the righteousness (*Haer.* 30,16) and they reviled ideas included in the Epistle to the Galatians. Eusebius like Irenaeus certifies: "These men, moreover, thought that it was necessary to reject all the epistles of the apostle [Paul], whom they called an apostate from the

1008 Many views convergent with the beliefs of the Ebionites were described in the *Book of Elkezaj* written at the time of Trajan; it is a Judeo-Christian treatise that has not survived in full and is only cited by Hippolytus of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea and Epiphanius of Salamis; F. Stanley Jones, *The Pseudo-Clementines*, in: *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, 297–300. See also: S.C. Mimouni, *Les elkasaïtes: états des questions et des recherches*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 209–229.

law." (*Hist.* 3,25) According to the Ebionites, Paul's opposition to circumcision and the observance of other provisions of the Law had thoroughly personal reasons. They told the story of the arrival of Saul the Gentile in Jerusalem (his parents were Greek). In Jerusalem he fell in love with the high priest's daughter, and in order to gain her favour, he became a circumcised proselyte. However, this action did not succeed because the girl did not accept his courtship. Then embittered Saul turned against the Law, thus denying the necessity of circumcision (*Haer.* 30,16).[1009] However, Ebionites themselves were also supposed to approach the Law selectively, retaining only certain provisions recorded on the pages of the Torah. Such is at least the opinion of Epiphanius (*Haer.* 30,1). However, it could have its origin in the conviction that the entire group had come from among the Samaritans, and, as we know, the Samaritan Pentateuch was a little bit different from the Jewish Torah.

According to Epiphanius, Ebionites gave rise to another religious community – the Nazarenes. The name initially referred to the first Christians because of the fact that Jesus was called the Nazarene (Mt 2:23) but with time it was reserved for the Judaizing followers of Christ who observed the obligation of circumcision and the ritual provisions of the Torah including the preservation of the Sabbath. According to Jerome, they lived in Beroea (identified with Berea where Paul preached the Good News; Ac 17:10-14) and were descendants of Jewish Christians who fled Judea before the Jewish War in the year 66. Epiphanius depicts quite intricate genesis of the sect of the Nazarenes.

He learnt from the Acts of the Apostles, Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4,8) and Eusebius (*Onom.* 138) that the name of the Nazarenes initially applied to Christians. Reading of the speech of the rhetorician Tertullos addressed to prosecutor Felix convinced him of the existence of a heretic sect of the same name. The statement concerning Paul the apostle was particularly significant: "We have found this man a perfect pest; he stirs up trouble among Jews the world over and is a ringleader of the Nazarene sect." (Ac 24,5) Epiphanius made every effort to prove that Paul was not associated with the "Nazarene sect" but it was the group to which he was wrongly linked. It seems that the association of Paul with the schismatic group was simply the result of the malice of the Jews *(Haer.* 29,6). The author of *Panarion* really invested a lot of energy and ingenuity into his work to show the difference between the orthodox Nazarenes and their schismatic namesakes.

According to some researchers, the apocryphal *Gospel of the Hebrews* was written by the Nazarenes and was used by orthodox Judeo-Christians[1010]. Sometimes it is identified with the *Gospel of the Nazarenes.* One must be aware

1009 P. Luomanen, *Ebionites and Nazarenes*, 88.

1010 W. Chrostowski, *Nazarejczycy*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, XIII, ed. E. Gigilewicz [i in.], Lublin 2009, 859–860; A.F.J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, SVC 17, Leiden – New York – København – Köln 1992, 30.

that any conclusions concerning this issue are extremely difficult to reach[1011], not only because these works have not been preserved in their entirety but only in references made by early Christian writers, but also because other scriptures of the communities which laid the foundations of the apocryphal *Gospels* have not been preserved, either. As indicated in the introduction to this work, it is not certain whether there were two *Gospels (of the Hebrews* and *the Ebionites)* or perhaps three (*of the Hebrews, the Nazarenes* and *the Ebionites).*[1012]

The *Gospel of the Hebrews* must have been written at the end of the first century because it was known to Ignatius of Antioch and Papias. It could have been created in Jerusalem or Pella. Jerome confirms that the Nazarenes accepted the Hebrew text of the Old Testament but rejected the Septuagint. Jerome speaks about the *Gospel of the Hebrews*: "I have also had the opportunity of having the volume described to me by the Nazarenes of Beroea, a city of Syria, who use it. In this it is to be noted that wherever the evangelist, whether on his own account or in the person of our Lord the Saviour quotes the testimony of the Old Testament he does not follow the authority of the translators of the Septuagint but the Hebrew." (*De vir.* 3)

What is the identity of the Ebionites and the Nazarenes then? Some scholars tend to argue that the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (and *the Nazarenes*) belonged to the orthodox Christian group who emphasized the Messianic dignity of Jesus while the *Gospel of the Ebionites* belonged to the group of the followers of Christ separated from the Church. Interestingly enough, although Epiphanius and Jerome[1013] distanced themselves from the *Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites* as they did not accept all the articles of the faith (especially the virginity of Mary), they were also totally rejected by rabbinic Judaism because of the references to Jesus. Thus the question of the religious identity of the Ebionites and the Nazarenes has remained open up to this day.

Aristides of Athens about the Jews (c. 125 AD)

Aristides of Athens was the first apologist of Christianity. According to Eusebius of Caesarea, he delivered his *Apology* to Emperor Hadrian when the latter was staying in the former capital of philosophers. Simultaneously, Quadratus did the same: "Aristides again, a loyal and devoted Christian, has like Quadratus left us a

1011 S.C. Mimouni states directly: „Peu de questions sont plus irritantes pour l'histoire de la littérature chrétienne que celles des Évangiles judéo-chrétienns"; *Le judéochristianisme ancien*, Paris 1998, 206.

1012 M. Starowieyski, *Zaginione Ewangelie*, in: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, I/I, *Ewangelie apokryficzne. Fragmenty. Narodzenie i Dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, 98; R. Bauckham, *The Origin of the Ebionites*, 163.

1013 About the Nazarenes Jerome wrote: „Nec Judaei sunt, nec Christiani"; W. Chrostowski, *Nazarejczycy*, 859.

Defence of the Faith addressed to Hadrian. This work is also preserved by a great number." (*Hist. eccl.* 4,3,3) The event allegedly took place around the year 125.[1014] However, Eusebius did not possess the full text of the *Apology*.

Three antique versions of this work have survived till our time: Greek, Syrian and Armenian. Each of them, however, raises many questions about its faithfulness to the original text and poses difficulties in terms of textual criticism.[1015] In the Syrian version of the *Apology*, Aristides begins his reasoning with arguments for the existence of God (centuries ahead of Thomas' "evidence" *ex motu*) by asserting that God Himself does not need anything but everyone needs God. Immediately after these theses, he divides humanity into four "races": barbarians, Greeks, Jews and Christians. He puts emphasis, of course, on the discussion of Christian articles of faith (not called by this name then). The Barbarians do not know God and therefore they worship the forces of nature instead of the Creator himself. They make idols and build temples for them because they do not realize that the elements of nature pass away but true God is eternal.[1016] The Greeks are a little bit wiser than the barbarians but they do not know true God either. They have introduced to their pantheon gods, many of whom are adulterers, murderers and thieves. And people do nothing but follow their own gods.

The closest to truth as far as the knowledge of God is concerned are the Jews, Aristides says. They believe that there is one God and that only He should be worshipped, and not His creation. What is more, they imitate God's love through their help to the poor and the prisoners. Unfortunately, they have also strayed from the straight and narrow path. Although they are convinced that they serve the true God, in fact they worship angels by observing the Sabbath, the New Moon and other feasts, by practising circumcision and by observance of dietary rules and other requirements of the Law. And it must be added that they do not make it perfectly, either. Only Christians stand faithfully by true God. They believe in

---

1014 Fragments of the *Apology* were found and published in 1870; it was an Armenian text along with a translation into Latin. Twenty years later the full text of the work was found in the monastery of St. Catherine at Sinai (this time in the Syriac language); L. Misiarczyk, *Pierwsi apologeci greccy. Kwadratus, Arystydes z Aten, Aryston z Pelli, Justyn Męczennik, Tacjan Syryjczyk, Micjades, Apolinary z Hierapolis, Teofil z Antiochii, Hermiasz*, BOK 24, Kraków 2004, 504. Then, J. Armitage Robinson found almost the entire text of the *Apology* included in the medieval novel *The Life of Balaam and Josaphat* in the Greek language; N. A. Pedersen, *Aristides*, in: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 36.

1015 P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, SNTS MS 10, Cambridge 1969, 207–208.

1016 Aristides refers here clearly to the beginnings of Greek philosophy, claiming that the earth is not a god, because it can be cultivated, water is not a god, because it changes its state, fire is not a god, because it can be extinguished, air is not a god, because it manifests itself as wind, sometimes it is stronger, sometimes weaker. The same applies to the moon and the stars.

the Creator who is the Giver of the commandments, and these are essentially made concrete by helping the poor, by piety, chastity and brotherly love. They also believe in Christ, the Son of God, and therefore they become "new people." What is more, the world still exists only thanks to the intercession of Christians, as others are deceivers and deserve to be annihilated.

The Greek version of the *Apology* differs slightly from the Syrian one. Instead of four, it speaks of three races: those who worship so-called gods, the Jews and Christians. The first group was divided into three sub-groups: The Chaldeans, the Greeks and the Egyptians. A positive image of the Jews included in the Syrian version also disappears. Believers of Judaism are presented as oppressors of the prophets and of the only Son of God. However, researchers come to the conclusion that original is the Syrian version, more favourable to the Jews. This view correlates with the belief that at the time of the formation of the *Apology* of Aristides in some regions Church was not yet completely separated from Synagogue and often relied on its institutional structures.[1017] The question that remains open is the doubt of whether the author of the work, coming from Athens, reflected on pages of the *Apology* the mutual relations of Christians and the Jews in his city, or whether he referred to the wider socio-religious context of his time.

Seeking an answer to this question, one must bear in mind the fact that in order to win Emperor Hadrian over to faith, Aristides had to somehow distance himself from the Jews who were strongly disapproved of by Rome at that time. Although the style and structure of Christianity's first apology were not very impressive, its author must have had a kind of political sense. On the one hand, he showed the followers of Judaism as a group which was closest (apart from Christians) to the recognition of true God; on the other hand, he tried not to offend but rather to gain the sympathy of Hadrian, hostile to the Jews. In addition, one cannot rule out the possibility that Aristides was of Jewish descent, and as a Jew living in the diaspora, he was very well aware of the religious nature of the Greeks. And one more fact, perhaps the most important, overlaps with all of these complexities: Aristides presents Christians as an entirely "new" race to the Roman Emperor for whom a true religion should be old and full of tradition, thus risking rejection *a priori* of the convictions he expressed.

1017 N. A. Pedersen, *Aristides*, 40–42.

III Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 AD)

"Jerusalem's first year of freedom" – proclaimed the inscription on a coin, which was minted in Judea in the year 132 AD.[1018] The historian Dio Cassius reports that Hadrian decided to change the name of Jerusalem to Aelia Capitolina[1019]; he also banned circumcision and erected the Temple of Jupiter on the location of the Tabernacle, in honour of Julius Capitoline.[1020] The Jews could not endure this, which very much astonished the emperor himself. He thought that by building the modern city, he would make the Jews very happy. Many thousands of people would find work during the construction, and the new metropolis would bring wealth to the whole area, raising the economic status of its inhabitants. Meanwhile, the opposite happened. Hadrian's plan filled the Jews with horror and led to a rebellion.

A native of the Hasmonean family of scholars, Simon ben Kosevah (Bar Kokhba), was announced as the messiah by Akiba, taking on the name of 'Son of the Star.'[1021] New inscriptions appeared on the coins of Jerusalem: "Prince Simon" and "Priest Eleazar." Eleazar was the uncle of Bar Kokhba. He belonged to the priestly tribe. It was with his help that Bar Kokhba eradicated the last pagan inhabitants of the capital, after which he intended to resume sacrifices on the Temple Hill. The inscriptions on the coins could express the convictions of some Jews (mostly former inhabitants of the community in Qumran) that one should expect two messiahs, one from the royal house and the other from the priestly tribe. People wondered whether or not they were Bar Kokhba and Eleazar.[1022] They were those

---

1018 Other monetary inscriptions from the time of the revolt state: "Year two of the freedom of Israel" and "For the freedom of Jerusalem"; L. Mildenberg, *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War*, Aarau - Frankfurt am Main - Salzburg 1984, 29; Y. Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins. From the Persian Period to Bar Kokhba*, Jerusalem – New York 2001, 140–157. See also: L. Kadman, *Coins of Aelia Capitolina*, Jerusalem 1956.

1019 The name "Jerusalem" disappeared from official documents already in 130 while the province was renamed Syro-Palestine, harking back to the Philistines; W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, 366.

1020 M. Sicker, *Between Rome and Jerusalem. 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, 179–186; J. Ciecieląg, *Kogo uważano za Żyda w starożytności*, 47.

1021 The Talmud (TB, *Suk.* 52a) mentions two messiahs, of the Judah and of the Ephraim tribe. The mission of the second one was doomed to fail and he himself was to be executed but his activity was supposed to prepare people for the messiah of Judah. Some see here a clear allusion to Bar Kokhba who was executed; S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 322.

1022 K. Armstrong, *Jerozolima. Miasto trzech religii*, 200.

who instigated the last struggle for national independence against the Romans in 132. Dio Cassius in the following words describes the beginning of the uprising:

> At Jerusalem [Hadrian] founded a city in place of the one which had been razed to the ground, naming it Aelia Capitolina, and on the site of the temple of the god he raised a new temple to Jupiter. This brought on a war of no slight importance nor of brief duration, for the Jews deemed it intolerable that foreign races should be settled in their city and foreign religious rites planted there. So long, indeed, as Hadrian was close by in Egypt and again in Syria, they remained quiet, save in so far as they purposely made of poor quality such weapons as they were called upon to furnish, in order that the Romans might reject them and they themselves might thus have the use of them; but when he went farther away, they openly revolted. To be sure, they did not dare try conclusions with the 449 Romans in the open field, but they occupied the advantageous positions in the country and strengthened them with mines and walls, in order that they might have places of refuge whenever they should be hard pressed, and might meet together unobserved underground; and they pierced these subterranean passages from above at intervals to let in air and light. (*Hist. rom.* 69,12-14)[1023]

As shown above, the decision to turn Jerusalem into a pagan city with temples of Roman deities should be considered as the main reason for the outbreak of the Bar Kokhba revolt.[1024] It is also important not to overlook the fact that the change of the name of the Jewish capital and the intention to build it in a Roman way were combined with the ban on access to Jerusalem which encompassed all the Jews. However, it is very likely that this ban was a consequence of the uprising and was issued after its fall. Detailed studies in this field do not give a clear answer as to whether the uprising was the result of the decision to rebuild the city or vice versa. It is not impossible that when Hadrian ordered the reconstruction of Jerusalem, even with pagan temples, the Jews still hoped to find a place for their beloved Temple and sacrificial worship. The uprising might have broken out when it was clear that the hopes had been dashed.

These conclusions can be drawn from the reading of the *Roman History* by Dio Cassius but one cannot ignore the work entitled *History of Augustus*, according to which the reason for the outbreak of the uprising was quite different: namely, the ban on circumcision or, more precisely, the ban on "genital mutilation" (Latin *Moverunt ea tempestate et Iudaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia*; *Hadrian* 4,2).[1025] It is documented that the successor of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius,

---

1023 After: J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, 215. The author's translation.

1024 M. Goodman, *Trajan and the Origins of the Bar Kokhba War*, in: *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome*, ed. P. Schäfer, Tübingen 2003, 23–29.

1025 A. Oppenheimer, *The Ban on Circumcision as a Cause of the Revolt. A Reconsideration*, in: *Between Rome and Babylon. Studies in Jewish Leadership and Society*, ed. A. Oppenheimer, Tübingen 2005, 243; A.M. Rabello, *The Ban of Circumcision as Cause*

allowed the Jews to circumcise their sons but he maintained the ban on castration. Such a decision stirred dissatisfaction among the Jews anyway because it meant that the Gentiles converted to Judaism were forbidden to be circumcised. In any case, it was still a milder prohibition than a total ban on circumcision which, as we know, was for the Jews the sign of the covenant of the nation with God, anchored in God's command addressed to Abraham (Gn 17:10-11).

The situation resembled the time of Maccabees' when the highest price, the price of life, was paid for obeying the order of circumcision (1Mch 1:60). If the Jews treated circumcision with such seriousness, the ban on practising it could turn out to be a sufficient reason for the uprising. However, also this time, a chronological problem occurs: the researchers are once again not in agreement as to whether the ban was the cause or maybe the consequence – a sanction – of the uprising. It is difficult to determine the date when the prohibition was introduced.[1026] The majority of authors though, having analysed not only the mentions in *August's History* but also the few Talmudic references, are in favour of the first opinion: the ban on circumcision was issued by Hadrian before the uprising and, just as the intention to rebuild the city, it contributed to the outbreak of the rebellion.[1027]

Allegedly Bar Kokhba's followers, who joined the uprising, used to cut off the end of their little fingers as a sign of courage and determination. They fought honourably but, as it befitted the pious Jews, they refrained from fighting on the Sabbath day. Rufus, the governor of Judea at the time when Bar Kokhba led the nation to revolt, was supposed to once ask Rabbi Akiba how the seventh day differed from the other days. Answering, Akiba asked the interlocutor what, in his opinion, was the difference between Rufus and other people. The ruler replied that his superior, the Roman Emperor, wanted this difference. "Rabbi Akiba said, so too God elevated the Sabbath above all others." *(Sanh.* 65,2) For this reason, insurgents tried

---

of Bar Kokhba's Rebellion, Israel Law Review 29 (1995) 192–193. Some researchers prefer to read the Latin phrase *mutilare genitalia* in reference to castration which was prohibited by Hadrian. However, there is no reason to equate circumcision with castration; R. Abusch, *Negotiating Difference: Genital Mutilation in Roman Slave Law and the History of the Bar Kokhba Revolt*, in: *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome*, ed. P. Schäfer, Tübingen 2003, 80.

1026 J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, 102–105. For more information on this topic see: S.J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London 1999, 25–68; P. Schäfer, *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World*, Cambridge – London 1997, 93–105; S.P. De Vries, *Obrzędy i symbole Żydów*, trans. A. Borowski, Kraków 1999, 251–274.

1027 E.M. Smallwood in 1959 in the article *The legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Cicrumcision* (Latomus 18 (1959) 334–347) was not certain if the prohibition preceded the uprising. A clear opinion was expressed, however, two years later: E.M. Smallwood, *Addendum*, Latomus 20 (1961) 93–96. cf. also: J. Geiger, *The Ban of Circumcision and the Bar-Kokhva Revolt*, Zion 41 (1976) 143–145.

not to violate the Sabbath rest. The religious motivation of the insurgents was also reinforced by Akiba's opinion that the rebellion leader was the expected messiah (JT, *Taan.* 4,68; BT, *Sanh.* 93b).

It is impossible to maintain the once commonly accepted statement that the proclamation of Bar Kokhba as the messiah stirred a spontaneous uprising, since it had been prepared for several years. This is indicated by the record of Dio Cassius who claimed that the insurgents had been preparing weapons and hiding places, and waited for the moment when Hadrian would depart far away from Palestine. Careful preparations for the rebellion reflect the realistic thinking of the leaders and make it possible to guess the real goals for which the uprising broke out. The aim was not so much casting the Roman yoke (the insurgents had to be aware that it would not succeed) but the conquest of Jerusalem and rebuilding the Temple. It seems that it was the realistic judgement of the situation and setting goals which seemed to be achievable that made Bar Kokhba so successful and popular in Jewish society. Little is known about his knowledge of the Law, everyday religiousness and wisdom which should characterize rabbis, although Bar Kokhba himself was not a rabbi. Nothing is known about his social or economic position. Hence, it is safer to assume that those were mostly his leadership skills which ensured his position among the Jews forming the insurgent units. Such an image of the leader of the rebellion emerges from his letters found by the Dead Sea.

Christians, of course, did not join the uprising, referring the Jewish Messianic expectations only to the person of Jesus of Nazareth and recognizing that they had already been accomplished. They rather presented Bar Kokhba as an anti-messiah, ridiculing his nickname[1028] and recognizing him as a despotic robber who could dominate the insurgents as slaves.[1029] The note by Eusebius of Caesarea is a confirmation that this image of Bar Kokhba became widespread:

> As the rebellion of the Jews at this time grew much more serious, Rufus, governor of Judea, after an auxiliary force had been sent him by the emperor, using their madness as a pretext, proceeded against them without mercy, and destroyed indiscriminately thousands of men and women and children, and in accordance with the laws of war reduced their country to a state of complete subjection. The leader of the Jews at this time was a man by the name of Barcocheba (which signifies a star), who possessed the character of a robber and a murderer, but nevertheless, relying upon his name, boasted to them, as if they were slaves, that he possessed wonderful powers; and he pretended that he was a star that had come down to them out of heaven to bring them light in the midst of their misfortunes.

1028 In retrospect, the Jews themselves did the same. In *Lamentationes Rabba* the author directly calls the leader "a liar" (*LamRab* 2,4 do Lm 2,2); W Horbury, *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*, Cambridge 2014, 1.

1029 J. Ciecieląg, *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132 – 135 po Chr.*, 197–198.

> The war raged most fiercely in the eighteenth year of Adrian, at the city of Bithara, which was a very secure fortress, situated not far from Jerusalem. When the siege had lasted a long time, and the rebels had been driven to the last extremity by hunger and thirst, and the instigator of the rebellion had suffered his just punishment, the whole nation was prohibited from this time on by a decree, and by the commands of Adrian, from ever going up to the country about Jerusalem. For the emperor gave orders that they should not even see from a distance the land of their fathers. Such is the account of Aristo of Pella.
>
> And thus, when the city had been emptied of the Jewish nation and had suffered the total destruction of its ancient inhabitants, it was colonized by a different race, and the Roman city which subsequently arose changed its name and was called Aelia, in honour of the emperor Aelius Adrian. And as the church there was now composed of Gentiles, the first one to assume the government of it after the bishops of the circumcision was Marcus. (*Hist. eccl.* 4,6,1-4)[1030]

The unfavourable opinion of Eusebius about the leader of the second Jewish uprising was expressed more than one and a half centuries after the end of the rebellion, and should therefore be read with a great dose of caution and scepticism. It is known that it is not only "biased" ideologically (theologically) but it also raises several historical questions. Above all, it is not known what is the historical value of the message of Ariston from Pella, one of the first Christian apologists, and to what extent this message was accurately recorded by Eusebius. Ariston lived at the time of Bar Kokhba and a few years after the end of the uprising, probably in Alexandria, he wrote the apology of Christianity in which Jason proves to a Jew named Papiscus that the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfiled in Christ and thanks to the power of these arguments leads the adversary to the acceptance of the faith. However, Ariston's work has not been preserved either in the original or in the Latin translation made in the third century. Only a few passages from the writings of Cyprian, Origen, Jerome and Maximus the Confessor are known.[1031] However, a valuable piece of information in Eusebius is that after the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem and the complete ban on their return, the Christian community was still able to develop there under the leadership of the first bishop of ethno-Christian descent.

The evaluation of the uprising of Bar Kokhba by Christians found its expression much earlier than in the remark of Eusebius quoted above. The author of the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Peter* written shortly after the fall of the uprising (in the

---

1030 After: A. Lisiecki, in: Euzebiusz z Cezarei, *Historia kościelna. O męczennikach palestyńskich*, Poznań 1924, 149–150.

1031 A.B. Hulen, *The Dialogues with the Jews as Sources of Early Jewish Argument against Christianity*, JBL 51 (1932) 58–70; E. Florkowski, *Aryston z Pelli*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, I, ed. F. Gryglewicz, R. Łukaszyk, Z. Sułowski, Lublin 1973, 962; W. Horbury, *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*, 42.

second half of the second century) [1032] refers to Jesus' parable about a fig, a parable which is a call for vigilance (Mt 24:32 and Lk 13:6-9). The *Apocalypse of Peter* is a work that reports events after Jesus' resurrection and before his ascension. Its addressees are Judeo-Christians being in very difficult situation: they still feel Jewish but they are treated as traitors by Bar Kokhba.[1033] The framework for the work is a revelation that Jesus was supposed to deliver to His successors on the Mount of Olives during Christophany. The author of the work (presumably coming from Egypt) addresses to them the message of consolation, showing Jesus who gathers his disciples on the Mount of Olives and gives them his last instructions. In one of them he unmasks Bar Kokhba as a false messiah:

> Hast thou not understood that the fig-tree is the house of Israel? Verily I say unto thee, when the twigs thereof have sprouted forth in the last days, then shall feigned Christs come and awake expectation saying: I am the Christ, that am now come into the world. And when they (Israel) shall perceive the wickedness of their deeds they shall turn away after them and deny him [whom our fathers did praise], even the first Christ whom they crucified and therein sinned a great sin. But this deceiver is not the Christ. And when they reject him he shall slay with the sword, and there shall be many martyrs. Then shall the twigs of the fig-tree, that is, the house of Israel, shoot forth: many shall become martyrs at his hand. Enoch and Elias shall be sent to teach them that this is the deceiver which must come into the world and do signs and wonders to deceive. And therefore shall they that die by his hand be martyrs, and shall be reckoned among the good and righteous martyrs who have pleased God in their life (*ApPt* 210-18).[1034]

By calling the false messiah a "liar," the author not only makes an allusion to Mk 13:22 and Mt 24:5 but also indirectly refers to the aforementioned root of Bar Kokhba's name (Kosevah): the verb based on the root k-z-b means "to lie." Since the author admits that "our fathers" have crucified Christ, many scholars believe that he must be a Judeo-Christian who admits to his Jewish roots. Hence, the martyrs who he speaks about are probably Judeo-Christians who did not join the uprising, for which they were stigmatized by Bar Kokhba.[1035]

1032 M. Starowieyski dates the work even earlier. Taking into account the fact that there is no direct mention of the fall of the uprising, he claims that it was written after its outbreak but before the year 135; *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, III, *Listy i apokalipsy chrześcijańskie*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2001, 225.

1033 A. Mrozek, *Chrześcijaństwo syryjski w starożytności w kontekście powstania Gemary babilońskiej*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 132.

1034 cf.*Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, III, 229.

1035 R. Bauckham, *Jews and Christians in the Land of Israel at the Time of Bar Kochba War with Special Reference to the Apocalypse of Peter*, in: *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. G.N. Stanton, G.G. Stroumsa, Cambridge 1998, 228–231.

The revolt apparently led to the escalation of violence of the insurgents against Christians as well as against the Romans. Throughout the fights, certain political independence of the Jews was conducive to such an attitude towards the followers of Christ. Justin emphasizes that, by the order of Bar Kokhba himself, those who did not want to publicly deny Christ were severely punished: "For in the Jewish war which lately raged, Barchochebas, the leader of the revolt of the Jews, gave orders that Christians alone should be led to cruel punishments, unless they would deny Jesus Christ and utter blasphemy." (*Apol.* 31,6)[1036] However, it is difficult to unequivocally assess this mention of Justin from a historical perspective, as the whole *Apology* is polemical by its very nature. It is known that the attitude of the Jews towards Christians was negative (and vice versa) but it is difficult to assess the extent of this disfavour.

At all events, following the bloody defeat of the uprising in Jerusalem, called since then as we know Aelia Capitolina, two statues of deities of the Greco-Roman pantheon and the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus were erected.[1037] For the Jews access to the city was forbidden.[1038] Hadrian carried out an act that today would be called "ethnic cleansing."[1039] Some Christian sources report that the Jews could appear in Jerusalem only once a year. The permission referred to the 9th day of the month *av*, the day of national fasting commemorating the destruction of the Temple by the Babylonians in the year 586 BC and by the Romans in the year 70 AD.

The followers of Judaism allegedly could appear in the Holy City on that day to mourn the destruction of the Tabernacle. This tradition has been preserved only in Christian sources, in the works of Eusebius of Caesarea (*Hist.* 4,6,2) but it is not confirmed by Jewish writings, hence it is open to question.[1040] However, some researchers allow the possibility that when Jerusalem was no longer a Jewish city, a small number of Jews were still living there.[1041] The Jews themselves understood

---

1036 M. Heemstra, *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context*, 227.

1037 E. Zawiszewski, *Historia zbawienia*, 73–75.

1038 Jewish long-lasting longing for Jerusalem and their own independent state led to the so-called "Jewish melancholy experience." It is a continuous tension between the expected peace (Hebrew *Shalom*) and a reality that contradicts it. E. Wiesel wrote about this experience in his book *Contre la mélancholie*, and also J. Heschel in the work entitled *A Passion for Truth*; S. Quinzio, *Hebrajskie korzenie nowożytności*, trans. M. Bielawski, Kraków 2005, 71–75. cf. also: R. Kalmin, *Jewish Babylonia between Persia and Roman Palestine*, Oxford 2006, 21.

1039 J. Taylor, *Parting in Palestine*, 87.

1040 J. Rendel Harris, *Hadrian's Decree of Expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem*, HTR 19 (1926) 199–206.

1041 Thus: M. Avi-Yonah, *The Jews of Palestine: A Political History from the Bar Kohba War the Arab Conquest*, Oxford 1976, 79–81; J. Schwartz, *Jewish settlement in Judea after the Bar Kochba War*, Jerusalem 1986, 183–186; see: S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do*

that the reconstruction of the Temple and the restoration of the desired independence cannot be a purely human work. From the point of view of their theology, the situation needed a supernatural intervention of God Himself.[1042]

The question of whether the Judeo-Christians living in Jerusalem and Judea had to leave it after Hadrian's order remains open. Most researchers confirm it. The reason was simple – they were circumcised, and this in the eyes of the Romans still made them Jews, regardless of religious beliefs. Eusebius states that after the year 135, only Christians of pagan descent were bishops in Jerusalem (*Hist.* 4,5). It is to be assumed that ethno-Christians who, unlike Jews and Judeo-Christians, were accepted by the Roman administration, arrived in the capital of Judea. This does not mean that ethno-Christianity was favoured by the Romans in comparison to the treatment of the Jews but at least they had the right to live in Jerusalem and in its vicinity. Thus, the political and administrative factors contributed to the acceleration of the process of the separation of Christianity and Judaism.[1043]

After the end of the uprising, places relating to the new Judeo-Christian tradition were also destroyed.[1044] Hadrian, although born to a Spanish family who had made money on growing olives, was not devoid of architectural talent.[1045] On the site of Christ's grave, which was already a place of great importance for Christianity, he ordered to erect the temple of Venus. Thanks to that he indirectly helped the future archaeologists.[1046] The emperor's ban on circumcision made it

---

czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220), in: *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny*, ed. H. Shanks, Polish ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2013, 318.

1042 S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 321–322.

1043 J. Taylor, *Parting in Palestine*, 98.

1044 H. Daniel-Rops, *Kościół pierwszych wieków*, trans. K. Ostrowska, Warszawa 2013, 42–43.

1045 S.S. Montefiore described works carried out in Jerusalem by Hadrian, pointing out that in Jerusalem, on the ruins of a Jewish town, he planned a classical Roman city built around the cults of Roman, Greek and Egyptian gods. The magnificent triple entrance, the Neapolitan Gate (now the Damascus Gate), built of Herodian stones, opened up to a circular space, decorated with columns, from where two main streets, Cardos – axes, led to two forums, one near the fortress of Antonia, and the other one south of today's Holy Sepulchre Church; S.S. Montefiore, *Jerozolima. Biografia*, trans. M. Antosiewicz, W. Jeżewski, Warszawa 2011, 145.

1046 Venus was worshipped in the Middle East as Ashtarte, who every year went down to the underworlds in search of Adonis, god of fertility, and the one resurrected every year, restoring the cycle of vegetation. This irony concerning Christ's grave, who as the Christians believed was resurrected, later allowed the empress Helena to locate in a relatively easy way the burial chamber in which the body of crucified Jesus had been laid. Constantine ordered to carry out excavations in 326. Eusebius describes them as follows: "The emperor, […] directed that the ground itself should be dug up to a considerable depth, and the soil which had been polluted by the foul impurities of demon worship transported to a far distant place. […] as soon as the original surface of the ground, beneath the covering of earth, appeared,

necessary for the followers of Judaism to practise it secretly. Christians, on the other hand, did not have to worry about this order at all because it did not concern them.[1047] Ethno-Christians not only did not have to worry about circumcision but they could also live in the Jewish Holy City. So Hadrian desecrated the place that God had chosen to dwell in (Zion) but on the other hand he placed Christ in the Roman pantheon. This decision against both religions, due to the different treatment of their followers, deepened the hostility between the two communities.

immediately and contrary to all expectation, the venerable and hallowed monument of our Saviour's resurrection was discovered"; A. Millard, *Skarby czasów Biblii. Odkrycia archeologiczne rzucają nowe światło na Biblię*, 288–289.

1047 W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, 465.

Part III On Separate Ways (136–313 AD)

And now, O Lord, why hast Thou [...] dishonoured the one root beyond the others and scattered thine only one among the many?
And those who opposed thy promises have trodden down those who believed thy covenants.
If Thou dost really hate thy people, they should be punished at thy own hands.

Fourth Book of Ezra 5:28-30

They are assailed by the Jews as foreigners, and are persecuted by the Greeks; yet those who hate them are unable to assign any reason for their hatred.

The Epistle to Diognetus

I Until the First Amoraim (136–220 AD)

According to Eusebius of Caesarea, until the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian, all the bishops of Jerusalem were "Hebrews by birth, had sincerely embraced the faith of Christ. […] and as all other bishop they were in communion with those of Jerusalem." (*Hist.* 4,5,2) According to the historian who came from the port built by Herod the Great, the successive bishops in the Holy City were: James ("the Lord's brother"), Simeon, Justus, Zacchaeus, Tobias, Benjamin, John, Matthew, Philip, Senecas, Levi, Ephres and Joseph as well as Judas murdered at the time of Hadrian. Although the bishops of Jerusalem were Judeo-Christians, practically the paths of the Church and the Synagogue ran separately almost everywhere.

It seems that particular local communities had to define themselves clearly. Their members were either Christians or followers of Judaism. Judeo-Christians were "absorbed" by ethno-Christian groups while the communities consisting mostly of Judeo-Christians (if they existed, it was mainly on the territory of Palestine and east of it) "separated" themselves from official Judaism. Such polarization of positions resulted on the one hand in the disappearance of the conflicts between ethno-Christians and Judeo-Christians, frequent in the first decades of Christianity, and on the other hand, in the escalation of mutual accusations of both religious groups (Christianity and Judaism), accusations which were petrified both in Christian and in Jewish literature.

Among the Jews a new generation of the Tannaim emerged, who were active between 135 and 170. Their leader was Simon ben Gamaliel (Gamaliel II). As the result of repressions imposed by the Romans, Galilee rabbinic schools had been closed down. Seven disciples of rabbi Akiba, risking their lives, managed to get across to Babylonia, where they joined the circle of eminent teachers of the Law. The persecutions of the Jews were slightly less severe after the year 138, when Antoninus Pius succeeded Hadrian to the throne (138-161). The Tannaim revived then their activities in Galilee, and even some of the refugees returned from Babylonia to Palestine. The rabbis focused on developing and clarifying the already existing principles of the interpretation of the Torah.[1048]

The Christian-Jewish polemic present in the writings of the church writers and works of rabbis fits perfectly well into the standards of antique literature in which

---

1048 K. Pilarczyk notices however that the Tannaim were forced to suspend their work since the Romans resumed persecutions when the Jews lent support to the Parthians with whom Rome was at war; K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 195. Cf. S.S. Miller, *The Rabbis and the No Existent Monolithic Synagogue*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 50–61.

an invective played an important part. Therefore, the first part of this chapter is devoted to discussing the issue of an antique invective in general (excursus) to reach then for literary works which to a greater or lesser extent make use of this weapon. Among Christian writings we can enumerate *The Epistle of Barnabas*, *The Dialogue with Trypho* by Justin Martyr, some apocrypha of the New Testament, the description of the martyrdom of Polycarp of Smyrna, works of Meliton of Sardis and the oldest Latin homily directed against the Jews.[1049] On the part of the rabbis, the indictments and invectives addressed against Christ and His followers settled on the pages of the Mishnah which laid the foundations for the Talmud.

Paradoxically, Christians and Jews shared the same fate in political terms. Both were harassed by the Roman authorities. The Jews suffered a terrible defeat in the Bar Kokhba uprising and could not expect Rome's favour. Christians were in a similar situation, albeit for very different reasons. The persecutions that they suffered led to a new model of holiness in the Church. It was martyrdom for Christ. However, in order to avoid one-sided assessments, it is necessary to emphasize the existence of testimonies (speeches, letters, comments on biblical books and synodal documents) which also show Christian-Jewish relations in a positive light in the second and third centuries. There were Christians who continued to attend synagogues on the Sabbath day, celebrated Jewish ceremonies with their Jewish friends, accepted the Aaron blessing, left their children with the Jews to be taken care of, and even married the Jews.[1050] There is no doubt, however, that after the uprising of Bar Kokhba in Palestine (apart from the very exceptional cases mentioned below) one can no longer talk about the common way of Christians and the Jews. Despite mutual contacts between the members of both religious communities, their separation generally became a fact.[1051]

1049 However, it should be added that the polemic with Jews was not at all one of the most important topics in early Christian writings: "The writings of the Fathers of the Church were not all *Adversus Judaeos* texts, in fact most of them were not. To what extent some of these polemical and non-polemical writings of the Fathers were no more than apologies of Christianity and not attacks on Judaism is debatable, particularly after the fourth century. Furthermore, the majority of these texts were not the Christian side's response to Jewish arguments, but were part and parcel of a wider Christian literary effort. Some of the most virulent Christian attacks on Jews and Judaism were not part at all of the *Adversus Judaeos* literature"; S. Simonsohn, *The Jews of Italy. Antiquity*, 271.

1050 P. Fredriksen, *What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, 60.

1051 "All indications are that as from the Bar Kokhba war, there was a steep development towards a general separation of Judaism and Christianity"; P.J. Tomson, *The Wars against Rome, the Rise of Rabbinic Judaism and of Apostolic Gentile Christianity, and the Judaeo-Christians: Elements for a Synthesis*, 22.

The Epistle of Barnabas (c. 138 AD)

The apocryphal *Epistle of Barnabas* was considered by early Christians to be an inspired letter which should be included in the canon of the New Testament.[1052] Both Clement of Alexandria and Origen, who also hailed from the Egyptian capital of science, attributed the letter to Barnabas himself. Nevertheless, the collaborator of the apostle of the nations could not have been its author, and the reason is not only the date of its creation (the missionary would have had to be well over a hundred years old when he wrote it) but also the views expressed in it.[1053] A native of Cyprus belonging to the tribe of Levi (Acts 4:26), Barnabas quickly became one of the leaders of the Church. According to tradition (it is not known how much of it is only a legend) his teacher was Gamaliel, the mentor of Paul the apostle.

Barnaba was allegedly converted after the healing of the paralytic at the Pool of Bethesda (Jn 5:2-15) and then he brought to Jesus his aunt, the mother of Mark the evangelist. He supposedly belonged to the group of seventy-two disciples of Jesus.[1054] It was him who introduced Paul to the apostles in Jerusalem. When the persecution of the Hellenists, or Judeo-Christians speaking Greek, broke out, Barnabas moved to Antioch on the Orontes, where he conducted missionary work among the pagans. He collaborated with Paul for a long time. He accompanied him on the trip to his native Cyprus, as well as to the meeting of the apostles in Jerusalem, which would decide the fate of Christians of pagan descent. Their paths diverged after the dispute concerning the person of John Mark, *nota bene*, the cousin of Barnabas. The missionaries disagreed as to whether he should accompany them on another trip, since he had withdrawn from the previous one.

For some time, Barnabas and Paul formed one missionary group and shared the same views on the institution of Judaism. However, the author of the letter claims that circumcision is the result of delusion by an evil spirit, and the Old Testament requirements to offer sacrifices and to practise fasting should have never been read literally. The tradition showing Barnabas as a strong opponent of Judaism is very early, since it goes back to *The Letter of Barnabas* and was passed over through the

---

1052 The writing was included in the Codex Sinaiticus.

1053 The approximate date of the creation of the letter can be determined on the basis of several clues of internal criticism. Since the author speaks about the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem, it is clear that the writing was created after the year 70. The letter was known to Clement of Alexandria, so it must have been written before the end of the second century. Its large part concerns the construction of the Temple. The author concludes that the reconstruction took place at his time. If it does not refer to the spiritual Temple but to the real place in Jerusalem, it should be assumed that the text was written shortly after the year 130, when, in the place of the Jewish sanctuary, Hadrian erected a sacred building in honour of Jupiter; W. Horbury, *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*, 298–300.

1054 M. Starowieyski, *Św. Barnaba*, in: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, II/2, *Apostołowie*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2007, 1121.

following centuries, as evidenced by the apocrypha entitled *The Acts of Barnabas* whose oldest copies date back to the sixth century. It describes missionary journeys of the main character. In his apostolic mission, he was disturbed by a Jewish magician named Bar Jesus who eventually led to the death of the missionary:

> And Barjesus, having arrived after two days, after not a few Jews had been instructed, was enraged, and brought together all the multitude of the Jews; and they having laid hold of Barnabas, wished to hand him over to Hypatius, the governor of Salamis. And having bound him to take him away to the governor, and a pious Jebusite, a kinsman of Nero, having come to Cyprus, the Jews, learning this, took Barnabas by night, and bound him with a rope by the neck; and having dragged him to the hippodrome from the synagogue and having gone out of the city, standing around him, they burned him with fire, so that even his bones became dust. And straightway that night, having taken his dust, they cast it into a cloth; and having secured it with lead, they intended to throw it into the sea. (*Ac.Bar.* 23)[1055]

Who was then the author of *The Epistle of Barnabas*? The opinions of scholars are divided in that respect. Some insist that he was a diaspora Jew, others that he was a teacher of pagan descent but very well informed about the Old Testament and the Jewish customs. It is possible that his name was indeed Barnabas, and that in the course of history he was identified with the character of The Acts of the Apostles. However, it is more likely that this name was applied to him by the readers of the work due to the fact that the Letter to the Hebrews, also attributed to Barnabas, is in many places convergent with *The Epistle of Barnabas*. However, it seems that the original addressees of the letter were Judeo-Christians, then Christians and finally the followers of Judaism who rejected Christ.[1056] From the genological point of view, however, *The Epistle of Barnabas* is not a letter (there are no typical features of antique epistolography) but rather a religious instruction addressed to people well known to the author.[1057]

According to Marek Starowieyski, the reason for writing *The Epistle of Barnabas* was the danger threatening the community to which the author was very deeply attached. This danger was represented by Judaism which still had enormous power of attraction and many unstable Christians searched in it for norms governing their lives. Small and quite often weak Christian communities were threatened either by absorption into the Jewish mass or by Judaic syncreticism.[1058] As far as

---

1055 cf.M. Starowieyski, in: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, II/2, *Apostołowie*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2007, 1137.

1056 S. Stabryła, *Historia literatury starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu. Zarys*, Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków 2002, 22.

1057 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 146; M. Starowieyski, *Św. Barnaba w historii i legendzie*, AnCrac 23 (1981) 391–413.

1058 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 147.

the relationship between Judaism and Christianity is concerned, the writer stresses the fact that the institutions of the Old Testament and the rituals of Judaism like circumcision, sacrifices and celebration of the Sabbath had spiritual purposes. God did not want the circumcision performed on the body but the circumcision of hearts and ears. Such a conclusion is drawn by the author of *The Epistle of Barnabas* from a specific exegesis of the passage referring to the circumcision of Abraham's family members: "Then Abraham took his son Ishmael, all the slaves born in his household or whom he had bought, in short all the males among the people of Abraham's household, and circumcised their foreskins that same day, as God had said to him." (Gn 17:23) The author of the letter uses a paraphrase of the text:

> For he says, Abraham circumcised out of his household eighteen and three hundred. What, then, was the knowledge that was given by this? Learn that he mentions the eighteen first, and then, having made an interval, he mentions the three hundred. In the eighteen, I and H, you have Jesus; and because the cross in the letter T was about to convey the grace of redemption, he mentions also the three hundred. Therefore, he shows Jesus in the two letters, IH, and the cross in the one. (*Ac.Bar.* 9,8)[1059]

Barnabas first refers to the name of Jesus that begins in Greek with the letters IH. The letter "I" in Hebrew gematria refers to the number ten while the letter "H" corresponds to the number eight, hence the eighteen indicates Jesus. He then refers to the number three hundred which in Greek gematria corresponds to the letter "T" which is similar in shape to the cross. And therefore we may draw the simple conclusion that when talking about circumcision, God meant circumcision of the heart which by faith accepts the grace obtained on the cross by Jesus. This quite risky exegesis is repeated a number of times on the pages of the comparatively short letter.

The author puts rhetorical questions into the mouth of God: "Again, he saith unto them, Did I command your fathers, when ye came out of the land of Egypt, offer unto me whole burnt offerings and sacrifices? – did I not rather command them this? – Let each of you bear no malice against his neighbour in his heart, and love not a false oath (*Bar.* 2,7-8). God did not demand sacrifices in the Temple of Jerusalem but a contrite heart (*Bar.* 16,1-10). God did not want them to literally obey the dietary law and the law of Sabbatical rest but to elevate the Law to the level of the spirit. The Jews, however, were deceived by the evil spirit and distorted the sense of the Law, and therefore "after such great signs and wonders were wrought in Israel they were even then finally abandoned [by God]." (*Bar.* 4,14)[1060]

The author of the letter warns Christians not to be deceived. One must not hearken to Christians of Jewish descent who urge other followers of Christ to observe the Law. There are only two ways in life, and those who allied with the Jews walk the way of darkness: "There are two ways of doctrine and authority,

1059 The author's translation.

1060 S. Lowy, *The Confutation of Judaism in the Epistle of Barnabas*, JJS 11 (1960) 32–33.

the one of light, and the other of darkness. But there is a great difference between these two ways. For over one are stationed the light-bringing angels of God, but over the other the angels of Satan. And He indeed (i.e., God) is Lord for ever and ever, but he (i.e., Satan) is prince of the time of iniquity." (*Bar.* 19,1) It is true that Christians are not obliged to abide by the Jewish Law but the premises Barnabas (or rather Pseudo-Barnabas) starts with are fundamentally false. It is not true that the institutions of the Old Covenant had only spiritual meaning and should not have been literally put into practice.[1061]

The Epistle of Barnabas is therefore a letter which clearly proves that the separation of Christianity from Judaism in Palestine is already a fact, and then that a new dividing line is drawn: Christians (ethno- and Judeo-Christians who have given up observance of the Law) and Judeo-Christians observing the Law.

Excursus: On Ancient Invective

When the ways of Church and Synagogue separated for good, Christians and the Jews throughout the empire wrote about each other. They wrote unfavourably, even in a very hostile manner but in step with the literary convention of their time. In the works of both, one cannot fail to come across invectives – sometimes simple and sometimes quite sophisticated ones. The contemporary reader may be shocked by some of the epithets or comparisons but the shock might be toned down if we look at the role of an invective in the antiquity in general. Ancient writers – Greek, Roman, Christian or Jewish – advocating their views, used not only intellectual arguments. Logical reasoning was only part of the argumentation. The other part, not less significant, were arguments *ad hominem*. Among them, invectives were not something to be avoided. A verbal insult was an integral part of the argument and its lack could have underestimated the value of the argumentation.

Let us start with an example. A son of a certain Athenian landowner, born in Salamis around 480 BC, is the author of about ninety works. Only eighteen have been preserved to this day. In a drama entitled *Hippolytos*, Euripides presents the contemporary view of the role of a woman in a society: "Great Zeus! Why did you create this shining trap, this evil form called woman to glint forever in front of man? If you wished for the human race to grow, then could not little souls simply be bought at a temple for a true prayer and a fee of gold? But now plague is in our homes, smilingly scattering our fortunes to the ground. How clear it is that women are a curse."[1062] It seems that the author of *The Bacchae* was more appreciated after

1061 Perhaps those premises, inconsistent with the official teaching of the Church, were the reason why the scripture was not finally included into the canon of the New Testament.

1062 P. Jurzyk, *Wybrane elementy napastliwej polemiki antyariańskiej w* Orationes contra Arianos *św. Atanazego Wielkiego na tle literackiej tradycji inwektywy*, WPT 14 (2006) 2, 181–182.

his death than in his lifetime. This is not only because his introduction of the innovative technique of *deus ex machina* to theatrical plays was quite controversial but also because of the sophisticated invectives – like the one quoted above – which he used in his plays.

The term "invective" is derived from the Latin verb *inveho* meaning "to bring in" or "to enter," and in a passive form, it takes on a meaning indicating an intrusion.[1063] Etymologically, therefore, an invective is a verbal assault or an insult. It may concern a person, a group of people or an institution. In rhetorical terms invectives were applied on a large scale: from everyday vulgar words most frequently used by the lowest social groups (but certainly not only) to literary works characterized by excellent compliance with the principles of classical rhetoric. The invective (*invectiva oratio*) is slightly different from the "abusive speech" (*vituperatio*); the latter mocks a vile descent or upbringing of the opponent while the former – his wrong convictions or utterances. The development of the invective in Greece dates back to the time of Euripides, while in Rome it developed at the end of the Republic and at the time of the empire. It was used by the greatest rhetoricians: Archilochus, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Bion of Borysthenes and Sotades of Maroneia, Gaius Lucilius, Cicero, Novius, Sallust, Catullus, Varro Atacinus, Seneca or Juvenal.[1064] The last one in the following words mocked the Jews:

> Some who have had a father who reveres the Sabbath, worship nothing but the clouds, and the divinity of the heavens, and see no difference between eating swine's flesh, from which their father abstained, and that of man; and in time they take to circumcision. Having been wont to flout the laws of Rome, they learn and practice and revere the Jewish law, and all that Moses committed to his secret tome, forbidding to point out the way to any not worshipping the same rites, and conducting none but the circumcised to the desired fountain. For all which the father was to blame, who gave up every seventh day to idleness, keeping it apart from all the concerns of life.[1065]

With the passing of time, an invective became a form of art. It was discussed and taught in rhetoric textbooks. One of the most popular ones entitled *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, written by an unknown author and dedicated to somebody named Gaius Herennius, devoted a lot of space to descriptive speech.[1066] This can be of two types: laudatory or virulent. An abusive speech, consisting of a classic triad (an

1063 *Słownik łacińsko-polski. Według słownika Hermana Mengego i Henryka Kopii*, ed. K. Kumaniecki, Warszawa 1986, 277.

1064 S. Longosz, *Zarys historii inwektywy wczesnochrześcijańskiej*, RT 3 (1996) 2, 363–365.

1065 E. Zolli, *Historia antysemityzmu*, 86. Similar are Haman's words addressed to King Ahasuerus; "There is a certain unassimilated nation scattered among the other nations throughout the provinces of your realm; their laws are different from those of all the other nations, and the royal laws they ignore; hence it is not in the king's interests to tolerate them" (Est 3:8).

1066 K. Kumaniecki, *Literatura rzymska. Okres cyceroński*, Warszawa 1977, 543.

introduction, the main body and the conclusion), should contain in the introduction the justification of one's own performance, and in the conclusion the words whose aim was to provoke the listeners; the central part was focused on stigmatizing the opponent. In the introduction, the orator showed the noble motives which induced him to take a stand on a controversial issue, he depicted the immensity of evil committed by the opponent or appealed to the noble feelings his listeners. The main part of the oration consisted in insults and invectives against the opponent.

The accusation of the opponent was supposed to be carried out in chronological order, starting from the period prior to his birth and then describing his life and post-mortem fate. It could be done in two ways, depending on the conditions. It was necessary to stigmatize and show in unfavourable light his homeland, environment, family house, ancestors and parents indicating their baseness, low background, morally dubious occupations, and refer to all possible bad signs which had foretold the birth of such a vile person. The other way suggested doing just the opposite: to show the greatness of the person's characteristics and to point out how dishonourably the opponent used and wasted them.

Then it was recommended to discuss the persons vices and virtues, dividing them into corporal, spiritual and external ones and then criticising them one by one. Almost every characteristic could be mocked: the name, the ugliness of the body or its beauty used by the person for evil purposes, the wildness of character, the evil upbringing, the unwillingness to learn, bodily passions, the length of the wasted life and, if the person had already died, the disgraceful death as well as posthumous punishments that the person undoubtedly endured.

Spiritual qualities had to be discussed in the order of four virtues: prudence, justice, moderation and fortitude. And thus lack of wisdom and prudence, stupidity, inactivity, insidiousness, cunning nature, duplicity and hypocrisy, intemperance, impatience, explosiveness, pride, cruelty, forgeries and drunkenness, godlessness, disrespect towards parents, perjury, theft, robberies, unfair decisions and regulations, and finally cowardice and a lack of willingness to face difficulties in defending the homeland were heavily criticized. In a word, all faults and vices could be attributed to the opponent.

Among the external matters topics to be discussed were evil company, disgraceful conduct, the authority which the person abused, squandered wealth, outstanding debts, the way in which the person approached honours, influences, power, held offices, and how insensitive the person was to the admonitions of others. If the opponent did not live any more, it was necessary to present in dark colours his posthumous fate and harmful consequences of his mundane activities. It was desirable to show how he dishonoured his homeland and family, what wretched offspring he left behind, how unjust were the laws and regulations he had issued, what criminal institutions and unfaithful cities he had founded.[1067]

1067 P. Jurzyk, *Wybrane elementy napastliwej polemiki antyariańskiej w* Orationes contra Arianos *św. Atanazego Wielkiego na tle literackiej tradycji inwektywy*, 181–182.

At the end of a speech, it was necessary to arouse the excitement of the listeners. This was usually done by giving specific examples of the aforementioned disadvantages, bad and immoral behaviour and swindle of the opponent. Exaggerating the negatives was most desirable.

At the moment of its greatest popularity, the Roman invective took various forms. The most primitive and often obviously vulgar was an invective in the form of a booklet containing sharp harassing speeches and lampoons. It was of the most personal nature. There was also a more sophisticated form imitating various literary genres such as historical works or philosophical biographies, dialogues or poems. Most freedom was given to authors in such forms as a letter, an edict or a memorial.[1068] Some insults and epithets were so vulgar that they could by no means be accepted by the sensibilities of our time. However, they did not have the effect that we could expect today. Valerius Catullus excelled in vulgarisms and obscenities, using them to ridicule even Julius Caesar and his favourite soldier Mamurra. This one, though offended at first, made little of the characteristics attributed to him as soon as their author begged for forgiveness. The evidence of such an approach is a remark made by Suetonius:

> Valerius Catullus, as Caesar himself did not hesitate to say, inflicted a lasting stain on his name by the verses about Mamurra; yet when he apologised, Caesar invited the poet to dinner that very same day, and continued his usual friendly relations with Catullus's father (*Caes.* 73).

Jewish works are not better in this respect, especially the works produced by rabbis who, in a sense, continued here the biblical tradition.[1069] According to the

---

1068 S. Longosz, *Zarys historii inwektywy wczesnochrześcijańskiej*, 366.

1069 The invective was known to the authors of the inspired books of the Scripture. Among zoological motifs, the most popular one was the dog which served the writers of the Hebrew Bible as a highly offensive and depreciating comparison. Goliath the Philistine, with a catapult in his hand, addresses David sneeringly: "Am I a dog for you to come after me with sticks?" (1S 17:43). The same David would address Saul shortly after: "On whose trail is the king of Israel campaigning? Whom are you pursuing? On the trail of a dead dog, of a flea!" (1S 24:15). Certain Abishai, hearing the words of Shimei cursing David asks the king rhetorically: "Why should this dead dog curse my lord the king?" (2S 16:9). The psalmist weaves this epithet in the prayer that a few centuries later would be read as messianic lamentation: "A pack of dogs surrounds me, a gang of villains closing in on me" (Ps 22:16). Inconsolable Isaiah complains about the leaders of his people: "Its watchmen are all blind, they know nothing. Dumb watchdogs all, unable to bark, they dream, lie down, and love to sleep" (Is 56:10). The readers of the Proverbs may be left with quite negative aesthetic impressions after reading the line: "As a dog returns to its vomit, so a fool reverts to his folly" (Pr 26:11). Similar are the words of the first pope: "The dog goes back to its vomit and: As soon as the sow has been washed, it wallows in the mud" (2P 2:22).

Talmud, for example, the teachings of the Torah are destined for the Israelites, not for dogs, that is for the Gentiles. The midrash *Tillin* states directly that the nations of the world are similar to dogs. Jesus' statements also fit into the biblical invective (*Tillin* 6,3).[1070] When a Syrophoenician woman, whose daughter is tormented by an evil spirit, asks him to intervene, the Master from Nazareth behaves like a typical Jew of that time; He says: "The children should be fed first, because it is not fair to take the children's food and throw it to little dogs." (Mk 7:27) Some exegetes made an attempt to defend Jesus, explaining that the woman wanted to deceive Him, and therefore she called Him a son of David, simulating her affiliation with the chosen nation. Jesus, after revealing the dishonesty, first remains silent (Mt 15:23) and then refers to the stereotypical description of the pagans as dogs.

The Teacher of Nazareth sometimes uses very sophisticated invectives, fully understood only in its historical and religious context. He spoke to the Pharisees, i.e. the ones "separated" from the rest of the Jewish society because of their emphasis on the observance of the Law of Moses: "Alas for you, scribes and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs that look handsome on the outside, but inside are full of the bones of the dead and every kind of corruption. In just the same way, from the outside you look upright, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness." (Mt 23:27-28)[1071] The comparison of Pharisees to the bones of the dead bodies was insulting to them also because of the event that Jesus' listeners surely remembered. In about the year 6 AD a few Samaritans, fierce enemies of the Israelites, got into the inner courtyard of the Temple to throw around bones of a dead person previously stolen from the nearby necropolis. The Temple was desecrated and hostility between the two nations increased.

1070 However, one Rabbi Simon, reversing the existing perspective, compares not the heathen nations (Hebrew *am-haarez*) but the Israel itself to a dog. This analogy is used to emphasise the loyalty of that animal and it says "that Israel is over all nations, like a dog over all animals"; H.L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, I, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, München 1924, 723–724.

1071 The custom of painting graves white developed in ancient Israel because of the fact that the Law forbade those heading for the Temple in Jerusalem to give their offerings there any contact with the dead. Such a person became ritually unclean and as a result excluded from the worship for a certain time. The dead obviously had to be buried; however, those directly involved in the burial could not attend any liturgical gatherings in the national sanctuary for a certain period of time. The situation became particularly troublesome when it concerned the so-called pilgrimage festivals, i.e. the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles and the Feast of Weeks. The Rabbis, interpreting the Law, even claimed that when the shadow of the deceased carried in the funeral procession fell on someone of the burial participants, it brought about ritual impurity. Not to mention the situation when someone accidentally stepped on a grave dug up in the ground! For this reason graves were painted white - to be visible in the sun from afar.

In the 60s of the first century, a relative of Christ and the brother of James the Younger, while rebuking Christians in Judeo-Christian communities, resorts to quite a sublime invective: "They are a dangerous hazard at your community meals, coming for the food and quite shamelessly only looking after themselves. They are like the clouds blown about by the winds and bringing no rain, or like autumn trees, barren and uprooted and so twice dead; like wild sea waves with their own shame for foam; or like wandering stars for whom the gloom of darkness is stored up for ever…" (Jud 12-13) The metaphors applied here: meteorological, botanical, astrological and hydrological could evoke a positive image; however, in the context of the reprimand, it becomes a gentle form of an invective. Thus, spiteful remarks present on the pages of the Bible not only justified but even encouraged the early Christians to use invectives in polemics with their opponents.[1072]

The early Christian invective is characterized by quadruple opposition; it is anti-pagan, anti-heretical, anti-governmental and anti-Jewish. Christianity can also boast of classics as far as an invective is concerned: Tertullian, Lucifer of Cagliari, St Jerome of Stridon, Hermias and St Gregory of Nazianzus. Adversaries were accused of stupidity, ignorance and unfaithfulness. Already in the second century Tatian the Syrian in his *Address to the Greeks* by means of irony and sarcasm derided mythology, poetry, rhetoric, philosophy and the visual arts. He argued that the Greeks were degenerated, immoral and licentious. He showed cruelty of the gladiator fights. Hermias became the author of an excellent work entitled *Derision of gentile philosophers.* Tertullian in the *Apologetics* used explicit terms to describe the Gentiles: foolish, unwise, forgers, godless, impudent, blind, shameless. In anti-heretic polemics only in Tertullian's works (*Prescription against heretics* from c. the year 200, *Against Hermogenes* from c. the year 200; *Adversus Marcionem* / *Against Marcion* from c. 207-212; *Against the Valentinians* from about 210; *Medication against Scorpion* and *Adversus Praxeam* from about 213 AD), the researchers counted two hundred and twenty five insults and nicknames.[1073] As an example of the invective used by Tertullian in the polemics with heretics, let us use a fragment of the work *Against Marcion* in which the author describes the homeland of a heresiarch:

> Strange tribes inhabit it - if indeed living in a wagon can be called inhabiting. These have no certain dwelling-place (…) They carve up their fathers' corpses along with mutton, to gulp down at banquets (…). [In Pontus] there is sternness also in the climate - never broad daylight, the sun always niggardly, the only air they have is fog, the whole year is winter. (*Adv. Marc.* 1,1)[1074]

1072 S. Longosz, *Zarys historii inwektywy wczesnochrześcijańskiej*, 375.

1073 J. Jurzyk, *Wybrane elementy napastliwej polemiki antyariańskiej w* Orationes contra Arianos *św. Atanazego Wielkiego na tle literackiej tradycji inwektywy*, 192.

1074 Anti-heretical invectives appeared in the circles of people who regarded themselves as Christians. Both sides of the polemic were proud to be followers of Christ. As an example, the polemic between Athanasius the Great and the Arians can be used. Athanasius took part in the Council of Nice in 325, whereupon he

Tertullian did not fail to draw an image of Marcion himself: "(…) fouler than any Scythian, more roving than the waggon-life of the Sarmatian, (…), darker than the cloud, (of Pontus) colder than its winter, more brittle than its ice, more deceitful than the Ister, (…) Pontic mouse ever had such gnawing powers as he who has gnawed the Gospels to pieces." (*Adv. Marc.* 1,1) Interestingly, even the Popes were regaled with invectives. And thus, Hippolytus of Rome in the work *The Refutation of all Heresies* called Callixtus I "a clever deceiver, a sophisticated cheater, a lousy liar who knows how to beguile others, a man with a heart full of venom and false views, a cheater, profligate and a wicked man" (*Philosophumena* 9,11-12). The invective against rulers was supposedly as severe as that against heretics. Interestingly, the least severe insults were directed against the Jews, probably because Judaism and Christianity stem from common roots.

An invective, an insult, an offence, humiliating epithets and demeaning words belonged to the arsenal of stylistic means of ancient oratory polemics. Their lack in any polemical work would diminish its value. This was true not only in case of the polemics between pagans but also in the controversies between Christians and heretics, Jews or the authorities of the empire. This comment is extremely important in describing the mutual references of Christians and followers of Judaism in the second and third centuries. It clearly indicates that today's view of offensive speech cannot be transferred to a time when, in a polemic, it was a norm or even a necessity.

The Chosen Nation in the Works of Justin Martyr (c. 140 AD)

Not all Palestinians supported the project which was from the start doomed to failure, namely the Bar Kokhba revolt, and certainly it was not a dream of the Gentiles living in Samaria. Justin, later called the Martyr, was born around the year 100 in Flavia Neapolis, a town formerly known as Sichem, in Samaria. Soon

---

became the bishop of Alexandria. In Alexandria four years earlier, Arius, who had been denying the divine nature of Christ, was excommunicated. Athanasius was then the secretary of the bishop of Alexandria. He had many problems with Arius not only because of a dogmatic dispute. Since Arius was supported by bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, Athanasius experienced an exile several times. The dogmatic problems were then accompanied by personal experience. As orthodoxy was seriously threatened, Athanasius decided to save it in a literary way: he wrote *Orations against the Arians* in the years 356–358 AD. They are an excellent example of the Christian anti-heretic invective. The author claims that Arius imitates effeminate customs (1,1) and that "but, for all his many writings to and fro, like the serpent, he did but fall into the error of the Pharisees" (1,4). Athanasius assigns to Arius the term "imitator of the devil's recklessness" (1,8); J. Jurzyk, *Wybrane elementy napastliwej polemiki antyariańskiej w* Orationes contra Arianos *św. Atanazego Wielkiego na tle literackiej tradycji inwektywy*, 194–195.

after that a temple commemorating Zeus and an amphitheatre were built there, the figure of which appears on a mosaic map in Madaba. Justin, a typical representative of the wealthy bourgeoisie of Greek descent, decided to avoid the consequences of the military turmoil and went to Asia Minor. His destination was Ephesus. Financially independent, he did not have to worry about livelihood. He preferred to focus in philosophy.

At first he joined the stoics but, disappointed by the ideas of the supporters of the school in Stoa Poikile, he joined the peripatetics. But it also turned out that he did not go too far with the propagators of scholarly walks. He was impressed by the philosophy of Pythagoras who, *nota bene*, had formulated his mathematical divagations several centuries earlier in Tyre, located not far from Justin's hometown. Eventually, neither the secrets of Heraclites' ideas nor the Pythagorean theses satisfied the hunger for knowledge of the young "friend of wisdom."[1075] It was only done by an old man, probably encountered in the vicinity of Ephesus. He proved that philosophical efforts to justify the immortality of the soul can at most fail in comparison with Christian prayer which opens up to God and leads to Christ.[1076] Since then, faith became for Justin "the only certain and useful philosophy." (*Dial,* 8)[1077] But he looked at the only right philosophy through Plato's eyes, whom he treated as an ally. Both the Truth discovered in Christ and Plato with his way of deduction became faithful friends of the first apologist.

When Justin arrived in Ephesus, the public cult of Artemis as the mother goddess had been cultivated there for seven centuries. In the sixth century BC Croesus ordered to build there a temple in honour of Artemis. A few decades before Justine appeared in Ephesus, Paul the apostle had been almost lynched by enraged followers of mother goddess. Ephesus was also famous for the cult of Cybele who was identical with the Greek "Mother of the Gods" and for the worship of the Queen of Heavens.[1078] It was impossible for Justin, while staying in Asia Minor, not

---

1075 J. Ulrich, *Justin Martyr*, w: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 51–53.

1076 B. Altaner, A. Stuiber, *Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła*, trans. P. Pachciarek, Warszawa 1990, 128.

1077 Quotations derived from the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Henceforth, quotes shall be followed only by numerical reference without repeating the title.

1078 God himself had once openly opposed the cult, complaining to Jeremiah: "You, for your part, must not intercede for this people, nor raise either plea or prayer on their behalf; do not plead with me, for I will not listen to you. Can you not see what they are doing in the towns of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children collect the wood, the fathers light the fire, the women knead the dough, to make cakes for the Queen of Heaven; and, to spite me, they pour libations to alien gods. Is it really me they spite, Yahweh demands, is it not in fact themselves, to their own confusion? So, Lord Yahweh says this, my anger, my wrath will be poured down on this place, on man and beast, on the trees of the countryside and the fruits of the soil; it will burn, and not be quenched" (Jr 7:16–20).

to come into contact with the followers of the Ephesian cults. However, he may have participated actively in the life of the Christian community founded there by the apostle of nations who had lived in Ephesus three times. Paul's longest stay in the city at the mouth of the Cayster River took place in the years 55-58. During the stay in Ephesus, Justin was following not only Paul's tracks, since the tradition connected with John the apostle was very lively there, too. About thirty years earlier, he had formed a community of followers of Christ in the city, leading it as the bishop. John came here allegedly with the Mother of Christ and lived on the hill of Coressus in a house on the foundations of which a small church stands today.

The entire vibrant past of the city, in which pagan paths crossed and were entangled with the Christian routes, could not be unknown to Justin, delighted with the teachings of the followers of Christ. In Samaria, he probably came to know at least cursorily the Hebrew Bible. In Asia Minor he plunged in philosophy. In the end, however, he gave his heart to Christianity. And it was then that his road crossed with the path of a Jew named Trypho. There is no reason to doubt that the source of the *Dialogue with Trypho* were disputes with an authentic figure of the follower of Judaism. There are authors maintaining without any convincing evidence that Trypho was only a fictional character.[1079] Certainly, the disputes could have been extended and completed in the writing process although Justin's style and literary craftsmanship are not of the top level.[1080]

Researchers of ancient Christian scriptures usually distinguish in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, apart from the introduction in which the author describes his spiritual development (2-8), three parts. The first one (9-47) concerns the Judaic ritual laws and their transitional character, the second one (48-108) is supposed to prove that worship given to Christ is not a denial of monotheism, while the third one (109-142) argues that also the Gentiles may belong to the Church.[1081] The whole dialogue between a Christian and a Jew maintains the tone of a factual, scientific

1079 Thus, D. Boyarin, according to whom Justin's work presents the dialogue between the emerging ethno-Christianity and rabbinic Judaism: "This literary dialogue between Justin Martyr and a fictional, non-rabbinic Jew, Trypho, is arguably part of a broad dialogue between nascent Gentile Christianity as a social formation and nascent rabbinic Judaism as a social formation"; D. Boyarin, Justin Martyr Invents Judaism, 457.

1080 D. Boyarin, Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity, 38.

1081 The so-called theology of substitution originates to a large extent from the third part of the *Dialogue* in which Justin argues that Christians are "true" and "spiritual" Israel (*Dial.* 125). P. Richardson interprets this part of Justin's argument in such a way that his conclusion is unequivocal: in order to become a Christian, one should renounce Judaism ("[…] to accept Christianity means the abandonment of one's Jewishness"); *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 10. Cf. E. Osborn, *Przeciwgnostycka teologia Ireneusza i Hipolita*, in: *Historia teologii*, I, *Epoka patrystyczna*, ed. A. di Bernardino, B. Studer, trans. M. Gołębiowski, J. Łukaszewska, J. Ryndak, P. Zarębski, Kraków 2003, 169–171.

debate. Both of them treat the interlocutor seriously and do not ignore him but try to use logical arguments to justify their arguments. What is interesting, Justin himself claims that thanks to this conversation, he became more committed to Christ: "When he had spoken these and many other things, which there is no time for mentioning at present, he went away, bidding me attend to them; and I have not seen him since. But straightway a flame was kindled in my soul; and a love of the prophets, and of those men who are friends of Christ, possessed me; and whilst revolving his words in my mind, I found this philosophy alone to be safe and profitable. Thus, and for this reason, I am a philosopher." (*Dial.* 8) And thus, it was the Jew who contributed to Justin's deeper love of Christ. Trypho accused Christians – albeit in a tactful manner – of not observing the Law of the Old Covenant:

> This is what we are amazed at, "said Trypho," but those things about which the multitude speak are not worthy of belief; for they are most repugnant to human nature. Moreover, I am aware that your precepts in the so-called Gospel are so wonderful and so great, that I suspect no one can keep them; for I have carefully read them. But this is what we are most at a loss about: that you, professing to be pious, and supposing yourselves better than others, are not in any particular separated from them, and do not alter your mode of living from the nations, in that you observe no festivals or sabbaths, and do not have the rite of circumcision; and further, resting your hopes on a man that was crucified, you yet expect to obtain some good thing from God, while you do not obey His commandments. Have you not read, that soul shall be cut off from his people who shall not have been circumcised on the eighth day? And this has been ordained for strangers and for slaves equally. But you, despising this covenant rashly, reject the consequent duties, and attempt to persuade yourselves that you know God, when, however, you perform none of those things which they do who fear God. If, therefore, you can defend yourself on these points, and make it manifest in what way you hope for anything whatsoever, even though you do not observe the law, this we would very gladly hear from you, and we shall make other similar investigations. (*Dial.* 10)

The *Dialogue* became *de facto* the first compendium of Old Testament quotations supporting the faith in Christ. What is more, being an inheritor of the Alexandrian school, Justin made extensive use of allegory in the interpretation of those quotations. It is enough to point out the symbolism of the cross, whose types – according to Typho's adversary – are innumerable in the Old Testament. The raised hands of Moses during the war with the Amalekites represent the cross of Christ: "Moses himself prayed to God, stretching out both hands, and Hur with Aaron supported them during the whole day, so that they might not hang down when he got wearied. For if he gave up any part of this sign, which was an imitation of the cross, the people were beaten, as is recorded in the writings of Moses; but if he remained in this form, Amalek was proportionally defeated, and he who prevailed by the cross." *(Dial.* 90)

A symbol of the cross is also the serpent exalted in the desert by Moses, in accordance with the words of Jesus Himself (Jn 3,14-15). Everyone bitten by the

serpent should die but he survived because Christ, exalted on the cross, took upon himself this death (*Dial.* 91). The entire Psalm 22 announces the event of the cross (*Dial.* 98-105). The type of Christ crucified is Noah who had revived mankind through faith, water and tree, which means through the cross: "For Christ, being the first-born of every creature, became again the chief of another race regenerated by Himself through water, and faith, and wood, containing the mystery of the cross; even as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters with his household." (*Dial.* 138) For Justin, the cross was also announced through the paradise tree of life and through the stone columns in Betel, through Aaron's wand and Moses' cane, through a tree planted by flowing water and through a shepherd's stick from Psalm 23.[1082]

The assumptions that the adversary of Justin could have been Tarfon, a rabbi belonging to the third generation of Tannaim, are not entirely unfounded. He is known to have been active in Jabneh and Lydia.[1083] He descended of a priestly family and as a rabbi he basically followed the line of teaching set by Shamai although he did not always agree with the views of the school. He was so honest that he refunded his father the money the latter had spent on his redemption as the first-born son.[1084] He showed similar honesty in reference to the principles of Judaism. He was allegedly so angry with the Jews who accepted Christianity that he promised to burn their every book, even if the name of God was mentioned there.[1085] It is not clear whether the book he meant could have been the Septuagint.

It is known, however, that Justin devoted a lot of space in the *Dialogue* to proving that the already discussed prophecy of Is 7:14 concerned the Virgin Mary, and that the Jews in opposing Christians had departed from their own tradition. Justin considered as unreliable the rabbis who had replaced the term "virgin" with the term "young woman" in the Isaiah prophecy:

> But I am far from putting reliance in your teachers, who refuse to admit that the interpretation made by the seventy elders who were with Ptolemy[king] of the Egyptians is a correct one; and they attempt to frame another. And I wish you to observe, that they have altogether taken away many Scriptures from the translations effected by those seventy elders who were with Ptolemy, and by which this very man who was crucified is proved to have been set forth expressly as God, and man, and as being crucified, and as dying; but since I am aware that this is denied by all of your nation, I do not address myself to these points, but I proceed to carry on my discussions by means of those passages which are still admitted by you. For you assent to those which I have brought before your attention, except that you contradict the statement,' Behold, the

1082 H. von Campenhausen, *Ojcowie Kościoła*, trans. K. Wierszyłowski, Warszawa 1998, 18.

1083 Z. Borzymińska, „Tarfon", in: *Polski słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, II, ed. Z. Borzymińska, R. Żebrowski, Warszawa 2003, 696.

1084 *The Tosefta, Ber.* 6,16.

1085 The treatise *Sab.* 116:1.

> virgin shall conceive,' and say it ought to be read, 'Behold, the young woman shall conceive.' (*Dial.* 71)

Justin is able to conduct long (sometimes even too long) arguments based on Old Testament quotations that he skilfully combines with his historical knowledge.[1086] However, his arguments are not necessarily limited to intellectual ones. In step with the ancient practice, the author eagerly uses arguments *ad hominem* which in fact resemble the use of a *baculum*. It couldn't be otherwise, since the Jews had not only crucified Christ, the only Righteous One, but also spread disgraceful news of Christians as heretics:

> For other nations have not inflicted on us and on Christ this wrong to such an extent as you have, who in very deed are the authors of the wicked prejudice against the Just One, and us who hold by Him. For after that you had crucified Him, the only blameless and righteous Man, - through whose swipes those who approach the Father by Him are healed, - when you knew that He had risen from the dead and ascended to heaven, as the prophets foretold He would, you not only did not repent of the wickedness which you had committed, but at that time you selected and sent out from Jerusalem chosen men through all the land to tell that the godless heresy of the Christians had sprung up, and to publish those things which all they who knew us not speak against us. So that you are the cause not only of your own unrighteousness, but in fact of that of all other men. (*Dial.* 17)

Justin accuses the Jews of hatred towards Christians and thus justifies the fact that the latter accuse Jews of hardness of the heart. He even claims that the Jews may be rejecting Christ because they are afraid of the persecutions to which Christians are subjected (*Dial.* 39). He accuses them of bad will because they reject his argumentation based on sacred writings of the chosen nation, and not on Greek philosophy (*Dial.* 68).[1087] The course of history shows that Jews are wrong, remaining obstinate about the rejection of the gospel. They did not take off their blinders even after the destruction of Jerusalem and the devastation of the Palestinian land, which was an obvious punishment of God (*Dial.* 108). In the discussions, the Jews simply pick at words instead of trying to grasp the fundamental thought of the adversary.

In retaliation they can expect that during the final judgement, God will treat them in the same way – He will pick at every word: "For though one should speak ten thousand words well, if there happen 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 setting it up as

---

1086 Thus, he proved that the Old Testament was now the Bible of Christians although it had once been the Bible of the Jews; however, by not having believed in it the Messianic prophecies, they had rejected it; S.J.D. Cohen, *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, 213.

1087 However, Justin did not reject Greek philosophy; M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 18.

something impious and guilty; in order that, when you are judged with the very same judgement by God, you may have a much heavier account to render for your great audacities, whether evil actions, or bad interpretations which you obtain by falsifying the truth." *(Dial.* 115)

In such a situation, the prophetic gifts that once manifested themselves in the chosen nation could not continue to be present there but were offered to Christians (*Dial.* 82). Despite the fact that the hand of the Jews is still erected against Christians who are murdered and hated, the believers in Christ respond to them with a generous prayer for the conversion of adversaries, according to the Lord's encouragement (*Dial.* 133). Such an attitude is awe-inspiring. And for this reason Trypho and Justin part as friends. None of them has convinced the other but the conversation itself has been a great pleasure to them (*Dial.* 142). Both of them would be glad to continue if it were not for the fact that the ship by which Justin is supposed to travel has already set the sails.

Justin Martyr also argues that initially spiritual gifts were given to the followers of Judaism (that is, the prophecy of Is 11:1-2 was fulfiled) but now God is handing them over to the believers in Christ. He gives examples of the work of the Holy Spirit in Christian communities known to him: "It was requisite that such gifts should cease from you [Jews]; and having received their rest in Him [in Christ], should again, as had been predicted, become gifts which, from the grace of His Spirit's power, He imparts to those who believe in Him, according as He deems each man worthy thereof […]. According to that, it was said: 'He went up to the heights, took captives, he gave gifts to humanity.' (Ep 4:8) And again, in another prophecy it is said: 'And it shall come to pass after this, I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh, and on My servants, and on My handmaids, and they shall prophesy (cf. Ac 2:17-18; Jl 3:1-2) […]. Now, it is possible to see among us women and men who possess gifts of the Spirit of God; so that it was prophesied that the powers enumerated by Isaiah would come upon Him, not because He needed power, but because these would not continue after Him." (*Dial.* 87-88)

The presence of charismatic gifts in the Church Justin regarded as an important argument for the authenticity of Christianity:

> "Daily some [of you] are becoming disciples in the name of Christ, and quitting the path of error; who are also receiving gifts, each as he is worthy, illumined through the name of this Christ. For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God […]. It was prophesied that, after the ascent of Christ to heaven, He would deliver us from error and give us gifts. The words are these: 'He ascended up on high; He led captivity captive; He gave gifts to men' (Ep 4:8) […]. We […] have received gifts from Christ, who has ascended up on high." (*Dial. 39*)

The analysis of the *Dialogue* allows us to make an assumption that at the time of Justin some Judeo-Christians still attended synagogues on the Sabbath day. The possibility is suggested, for example, by the mentions of verbal insults that the Jews were supposed to hurl at the followers of Christ in synagogues:

> [...] you have slain the Just One, and His prophets before Him; and now you reject those who hope in Him, and in Him who sent Him - God the Almighty and Maker of all things - cursing in your synagogues those that believe on Christ. [...] and now you reject those who hope in Him, and in Him who sent Him - God the Almighty and Maker of all things - cursing in your synagogues those that believe in Christ. (*Dial.* 16,96)[1088]

It is possible that these insults point to the eighteen blessings that the Jews already uttered in the form of a prayer at that time.[1089] Interestingly, unlike other early Christian writers, Justin believes that Judeo-Christians who attend synagogues and preserve Jewish law will be saved but only if they do not demand that ethno-Christians preserve Jewish customs, too (*Dial.* 47). Generally speaking, Justin's reference to the Jewish gatherings is negative although one cannot speak of total opposition between Church and Synagogue yet, since, as it has already been mentioned, it is most likely that Judeo-Christians still participated in the gatherings. In general, however, the Martyr does not hesitate to call them "perverse gatherings." (Ps 21:17)[1090] Justin was probably the first to use the term "Synagogue" as the synonym of Judaism but the polarization between the Church and the Synagogue was not complete at that time. According to him, Christ married both Leah and Racheal, the Synagogue and the Church. (*Dial.* 134)[1091]

1088 Justyn Męczennik, *1 i 2 Apologia. Dialog z Żydem Tryfonem*, trans. L. Misiarczyk, Warszawa 2012, 178.296. In the same work by Justin one can also find other references to cursing Christians in synagogues: "I hold that those of the seed of Abraham who live according to the law, and do not believe in this Christ before death, shall likewise not be saved, and especially those who have anathematized and do anathematize this very Christ in the synagogues, [...]. Agree with us, therefore, and do not insult the Son of God; ignoring your Pharisaic teachers, do not scorn the King of Israel as the chiefs of your synagogues" (*Dial.* 47:13). Judith Lieu warns, however, that the Church fathers' statements on synagogue congregations should be viewed with a certain mental restriction although she does not completely deny their historical character; J. Lieu, *The Synagogue and the Separation of the Christians*, in: *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, 204.

1089 The authors of the book on early synagogues confirm this hypothesis, adding: "but it is by no means necessarily the case that ritualized abuse is intended (such as became commonly characterized in later Christian polemic): it may just as well refer to sporadic denunciation of belief in Jesus as the messiah in sermons"; A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, 267.

1090 cf. the term "synagogue of Satan" in Ap 2:8-11 and 3:7-13; A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue fron its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, 269–271.

1091 "This is a far cry from later medieval representations of "synagogue" and "church," where the former is depicted as either defeated or even executed by the hands

Another important work by Justin, which concerns the relationships between Christianity and Judaism, is the *Apology*. Justin addressed it "To the Emperor Titus Aelius Adrian Antoninus Pius Caesar Augustus, and to Verissimus his son, the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher, own son of Caesar and adopted son of Pius, a lover of learning, and to the sacred Senate, with the whole People of the Romans." The work created in Rome was one of many addressed to the authorities in defence of Christianity. It is doubtful whether the emperors ever read these works but they certainly raised the spirit of the Christians themselves who firmly took the Roman side in the Roman-Jewish conflict. Such radical distancing from the Jews did not prevent the followers of Christ from referring to themselves as "Israel."[1092]

Both in the *Dialogue with Trypho* and in *Apology*, there is another important factor which contributed significantly to the separation of Church and Synagogue: exegetic analysis of theophany. This refers to the following fragments: Gn 18; Gn 28; Gn 32; Ex 3; Ex 19; Ex 24; Is 6; Ezk 1; Dn 7 and Hab 3 (LXX). All these texts – according to the Martyr of Neapolis – must be read from the Christological perspective. It is not God the Father but the Son of God who reveals himself to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Isaiah and other prophets (*Apol.* 63.17).

It seems extremely interesting to view in this perspective the dispute between Justin and Trypho concerning the appearance to Abraham of three mysterious characters: "Yahweh appeared to him at the Oak of Mamre while he was sitting by the entrance of the tent during the hottest part of the day. He looked up, and there he saw three men standing near him." (Gn 18:1-2a) The exegetic difficulty is caused by the singular of the term "Lord," and then the mention of three characters. Justin runs the conversation with Typho in such a way that the latter initially admits that the passage refers to three angels (*Dial.* 56,5); then he changes his mind and is convinced that God revealed himself to Abraham in the company of two angels (*Dial.* 57,1)[1093]; at the end he comes to the conclusion that the figure whom he recognized as God cannot be identical to the God Creator (*Dial.* 60,3). For Justin the argument is sufficient to consider this figure to be Christ.

A similar deduction can be made in relation to other theophanies included in the Old Testament. The reaction of Trypho to such exegesis may be only one: "For you utter many blasphemies, in that you seek to persuade us that this crucified man was with Moses and Aaron, and spoke to them in the pillar of the cloud; then that he became man, was crucified, and ascended up to heaven, and comes again to earth, and ought to be worshipped." *(Dial.* 38,1) In the debate on Christ's identity, apart from the arguments "from the prophets," used since the beginning of the existence of Church community (the Old Testament prophecies have been fulfiled

---

of the so-called living crosses"; A. Runesson, D.D. Binder, B. Olsson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, 272.

1092 W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, 390.

1093 Signs of such a tradition can be found in Philo of Alexandria (*De Abrahamo* 24.121).

in Christ), in Justin's writings there are also arguments "from theophanies." Their Christological interpretation (connected with the liturgical worship of Christ as God)[1094] proposed by Justin turned out to be unacceptable for the Jews and as a result it became another step separating Christian and Jewish communities.

After the dispute with Justin, as an itinerant teacher, Justin finally arrived in Rome where he founded a school. There, in the vicinity of the Bath of Timothy whose location is unknown today, he used to gather his disciples. All this was happening at the time of Mark Aurelius, a stoic philosopher on the throne who, *nota bene*, died in 180 in Vindobona on the Danube River (today's Vienna). During the two decades of his rule there were still wars going on (mainly with Germans), the Tiber flooded the streets and squares of Rome, there were hunger and street riots in the city, accompanied by fires, the plague of Black Death and the plague of locusts. However, the emperor tried to approach these events in accordance with his own maxim: "When you arise in the morning, think what a privilege it is to be alive, to think, to enjoy, to love…"

One of Justin's disciples who arrived in Rome was Tatian the Syrian.[1095] After the death of his teacher, he left the Eternal City where he accepted Christianity and returned to Syria. There he renounced marital life, meat and wine.[1096] In one of his propagandistic works, probably not without the influence of his teacher's views, he appreciated the Old Testament:

> Moses was older then the ancient heroes, wars and demons. And we ought rather to believe him, who stands before them in point of age, than the Greeks, who, without being aware of it, drew his doctrines [as] from a fountain. For many of the sophists among them, stimulated by curiosity, endeavoured to adulterate whatever they learned from Moses, and from those who have philosophized like him, first that they

1094 "The exegetical and theological parting of the ways on the issue of biblical theophanies was bound to have a real and lasting social impact. For both sides of the debate, Scripture reading was not so much an individual as a communitarian enterprise and part of a complex network holding together sacred text, doctrinal speculation, and liturgical and ascetical practices, with each element unfolding its meaning in reference to the others. Evidently, the identification of Jesus as subject of the OT theophanies had practical consequences for the communal worship of the God of Israel and thus for the worshipping community's religious experience. This experience set in motion a process of reshaping the self, which in turn led inevitably to a gradual social distinction between the two worshiping communities and the individuals within them"; B.G. Bucur, *Justin Martyr's Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies and the Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism*, TS 75 (2014) 1, 50.

1095 L. Misiarczyk, *Pierwsi apologeci greccy. Kwadratus, Arystydes z Aten, Aryston z Pelli, Justyn Męczennik, Tacjan Syryjczyk, Micjades, Apolinary z Hierapolis, Teofil z Antiochii, Hermiasz*, 501; R. Falkenberg, *Tatian*, J. Ulrich, *Justin Martyr*, in: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 67.

1096 B. Altaner, A. Stuiber, *Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła*, 134.

> might be considered as having something of their own, and secondly, that covering up by a certain rhetorical artifice whatever things they did not understand, they might misrepresent the truth as if it were a fable. (*Tatian's Address to the Greeks* 40)

Among the followers of Christ who were persecuted at the time of Aurelius, there were the Montanists. The prefect of the city, Rusticus, served as the arm of Roman justice. The persecuted Justin was forced to conduct with him a dialogue which was very different from the conversation ha had with the Jew Trypho. The fruit of this dialogue was not a written work but a nickname that adhered to the Samaritan Christian: Martyr. That is how the biographer relates the last moments of the life of Justin:

> The saints were seized and brought before the prefect of Rome, whose name was Rusticus […] Rusticus said: "Now let us come to the point at issue, which is necessary and urgent. Gather round then and with one accord offer sacrifice to the gods" Justin said: "No one who is right thinking stoops from true worship to false worship". Rusticus said: "If you do not do as you are commanded you will be tortured without mercy". Justin said: We hope to suffer torment for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so be saved. For this will bring us salvation and confidence as we stand before the more terrible and universal judgement-seat of our Lord and Savior". In the same way the other martyrs also said: "Do what you will We are Christians; we do not offer sacrifice to idols". The prefect Rusticus pronounced sentence, saying: "Let those who have refused to sacrifice to the gods and to obey the command of the emperor be scourged and led away to suffer capital punishment according to the ruling of the laws". Glorifying God, the holy martyrs went out to the accustomed place. They were beheaded, and so fulfilled their witness of martyrdom in confessing their faith in their Saviour. (*Martyrium s. Justini et sociorum*)[1097]

Justin Martyr's writings, filled with references against Jews, reflect their author's way of thinking about Judaism. However, researchers are still confronted with the question to what extent these texts are actually directed against the Jews, and to what extent they reflect the state of the intra-church polemics with the so-called "Judaizers."[1098]

1097 Św.Justyn, *Apologia, Dialog z Żydem Tryfonem*, *Pisma Ojców Kościoła* 4, Poznań 1926, XXIII-XXV.

1098 S.J.D. Cohen concludes his arguments on this subject: "Scholars have long debated whether the anti-Judaism of these texts is the result of social competition between Jews and Christians, each side eagerly trying to win over converts, or whether it is a function of internal Christian self-definition, as the Christians of the second century C.E. tried to sort out exactly what Christianity was and what Christianity was not"; *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, 214.

Martyrdom for the Faith in the Second Century: Jewish and Christian View

Justine Martyr's attitude towards martyrdom was not isolated among Christians. Jesus announced persecutions for the faith (cf. Missionary Speech in Mt 10) and these announcements quickly began to come to fruition. The Acts of the Apostles describe in detail Stephan's martyrdom, Josephus mentions the death of James the Righteous, and they are accompanied by a whole list of followers of Christ who did not hesitate to give their lives in defence of their convictions. This situation led already in the second century to the creation in Christianity of an ideal worth imitating – the ideal of martyrdom for the faith.

The beginnings of the formation of this ideal can be seen on the pages of the Acts of the Apostles where we learn that the disciples were "glad to have had the honour of suffering humiliation for the sake of the name [of Jesus]." (Ac 5:41) The stories of the first martyrs, initially passed on verbally, were later published in the form of literary works. Some of the apocryphal works had been used by Christians as a pattern for their own works concerning the model of martyrdom for the faith. Such books include, among others, the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* which seems to have been a structural model for the *Martyrdom of Polycarp.*[1099] The same applies to the apocrypha entitled *Vitae Prophetarum.*[1100] In fact, some of the apocryphal works of the Hebrew Bible were, in some way, taken over and supplemented with Christian additions by the followers of Christ.

Literature about the martyrs of the first centuries is enormous but the value of individual pieces is uneven. The most concise files of the martyrs are the court transcripts of their interrogations. They were taken down in shorthand by the secretaries and then rewritten by Christians. Shortly afterwards, literary descriptions (now called *passiones*) were written by eyewitnesses.[1101] The cult of the martyrs was expressed, among other things, by the fact of gathering for the celebration of the Eucharist and organizing love-feasts at their graves. Such practices are confirmed in the second century. At times, the faithful collected the ashes of the martyrs to worship them but in a different way than they worshipped God, which was testified by the author of the *Martyrdom of Saint Polycarp*: "For Him indeed, as being the Son of God, we adore; but the martyrs, as disciples and followers of the Lord, we worthily love on account of their extraordinary affection towards." (17,3)

The Christian martyrs, therefore, started to be worshipped but not all among the persecuted were brave enough to suffer a death for Christ. Apostates appeared

---

1099 G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Stories of Biblical and Early Postbiblical Times*, 56.

1100 D. Sartan, *The Lives of the Prophets*, in: *Jewish Writings of Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT 2/II, Assen 1984, 56–57.

1101 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 143–144.

in the Church, too. "Is there a chance for them to be saved?" people asked. This dilemma grew stronger during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161). It was him who led to the deification of Hadrian, whence he earned the nickname of Pius ("pious"). In the years 140-155, the Church was led by a pope who bore an identical name. Pope Pius had a brother, a certain Hermas. Unfortunately, the children of Hermas denied their faith in the face of persecution. Hermas himself was born a slave and sold as a slave to a Roman matron named Rhode. She was a Christian and procured the liberation of Hermas, thereby instilling in his heart the love for Christ; a love so great that the freed man not only suffered persecution in His name but was also greatly anguished by the conduct of his children.[1102] He tried to solve his dilemmas in the work entitled *The Shepherd*, written in Rome, albeit in Greek.[1103] During his prayer, Hermas heard the words of Christ:

> But now the mercy of the Lord has taken pity on you and your house, and will strengthen you, and establish you in his glory. Only be not easy-minded, but be of good courage and comfort your house. For as a smith hammers out his work, and accomplishes whatever he wishes, so shall righteous daily speech overcome all iniquity. Cease not therefore to admonish your sons; for I know that, if they will repent with all their heart, they will be enrolled in the Books of Life with the saints. (*The Shepherd* 3,2)[1104]

1102 In many ecclesiastical circles the view then prevailed that those who committed sins after their baptism could have them all forgiven at once if they only repented. The view constituted a reaction to the popular the then moral rigorism, according to which after the baptism it was not possible to have sins forgiven. Some limited the list of unforgivable sins to only one: apostasy from the faith. This was the case of Hermas' children. Rigorists based their opinions on the Epistle to the Hebrews: "As for those people who were once brought into the light, and tasted the gift from heaven, and received a share of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the goodness of God's message and the powers of the world to come and yet in spite of this have fallen away - it is impossible for them to be brought to the freshness of repentance a second time, since they are crucifying the Son of God again for themselves, and making a public exhibition of him" (Heb 6:4-6).

1103 The authorship is attributed to Hermas on the basis of the mention in the *Muratorian Canon*: "But Hermas wrote The Shepherd "most recently in our time", in the city of Rome, while bishop Pius, his brother, was occupying the chair of the church of the city of Rome. And therefore, it ought indeed to be read; but it cannot be read publicly to the people in church"; M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 149. The structure of this book is traditional in terms of the standard of the time: five visions (*visiones*), twelve commandments (*mandata*) and ten similarities (*similitudines*).

1104 F. Szulc is the author of a book titled, *Syn Boży w „Pasterzu" Hermasa*." *Świadectwo chrystologii judeo-chrześcijańskiej* (SAC 2, Katowice 2006). Strange is the fact that in the entire work of Hermas, the words "Jewish" or "Judaism" do not appear. *Roberts-Donaldson English Translation*

Thus, while in the second century in Christianity there appeared the view that those who had denied their faith may repent, and at the same time the cult of martyrs begans to grow stronger, things looked entirely different in Judaism.[1105] Yes, the Jews glorified their heroes of faith, as evidenced by the story of the seven martyr brothers and their mother from the time of the Maccabees (2 Mch 7:1-42). In Judaism, however, there was no cult similar to the Christian worship of those who shed blood for faith.

At that time, the Jews were not urged – like the followers of Christ – to renounce their religion or offer sacrifices to pagan gods. Still, there were those who made concessions and committed acts which in the eyes of some rabbis were regarded as deviations from the fathers' faith. For example, a Jew named Eleazar, the son of Jason, held a prominent position in the city administration and his name could be found next to those of Apollo priests in an inscription dedicated to the worship of the pagan god. Eleazar most likely did not renounce Judaism, as evidenced by his Jewish name, since it was customary among the Jews who abandoned the religion of their fathers to accept Greek names. However, preserving the name did not change much in the eyes of many rabbis. The mere fact of the appearance of Eleazar's name in the inscription worshipping Apollo was reason enough to condemn him. Another inscription, coming from Asia Minor and dating back to the mid second century, mentions a Nicetas from Jerusalem who donated one hundred drachmas to the festival in honour of Dionysus. Such behaviour also exposed the person to accusations of idolatry.[1106]

Many Jews fighting in defence of their faith lost their lives in the uprisings against Rome both during the first and the second Jewish war. Yes, their sacrifice was remembered but they were not worshipped in the Christian way. Examples of Jewish martyrs of the time shortly after the revolt of Bar Kokhba are Pappus and Lulianus who were presumably brothers. They came from Alexandria but moved to Palestine. For unknown reasons, they were imprisoned in Laodice and were soon released as the judge suddenly died. Even before Bar Kokhba revolt, when the Jews had expected to rebuild the Temple, Pappus and Lulianus set up tables loaded with silver, gold and valuables along the way from Akko to Antioch to provide with them every follower of Judaism who decided to come back to their homeland. Every pair of hands was of great help in the reconstruction. This was considered by the Roman authorities to be part of the preparation for a rebellion (probably the rebellion of Bar Kokhba which was soon to break out). According to one midrash, those were the Samaritans, jealous about the possibility of rebuilding the Temple, who informed Rome about the activities of Pappus and Lulianus. When

1105 J.-P. Valognes, *Vie et mort des chrétiens d'Orient. Des origines à nos jours*, Paris 1994, 22.

1106 P. Borgen, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, 21.

they were captured after the uprising, they were executed in Lydda, hence they are now known as the "martyrs of Lydda."[1107]

In the second and third centuries, the Romans viewed the religions of Christians and of the Jews differently. From their perspective, a "good religion" could take pride in its many traditions, it was old and respectable. Moreover, religious practices should have been performed *rite*, or, in other words, according to a constant ritual and in accordance with centuries-old cultic rules.[1108] In this respect, Christianity differed significantly from Judaism although both religions shared the Old Testament roots. In the eyes of the Romans, Christianity was a new religion (or more precisely a "new superstition"), in contrast to the ancient religion of the Jews. Customs and cultic practices were only at the stage of formation in the Church, while the Synagogue cult had already been centuries old. The reasons for the aversion (and the subsequent persecution) towards Christians and the Jews on the part of the Romans were therefore different. The former suffered for religious reasons while the latter mainly for political reasons,especially after the Bar Kokhba revolt.[1109]

The Case of Marcion (c. 144 AD) and the *Gospel of Judas*

Marcion was born the son of a bishop of Sinope (although the celibacy of the bishops was recommended, it was not obligatory for many centuries). He was born in Sinope in Pontus, on the shores of the Black Sea, but moved to Rome, where – unable to explain the alleged differences between the Old and the New Testament, he rejected the former entirely, founded a school and became one of the first prominent heresiarchs.[1110] Undoubtedly, he significantly influenced the shape of Christianity in the second century, if only by the fact that the theses he proclaimed aroused strong opposition.

Marcion is the author of only one work preserved to our times, entitled *Antitheses*, in which he meticulously explains the views whose advocating cast him out of the community of the Church. His own father was the first to excommunicate him, and the family drama and the split-up was later confirmed by the

---

1107 R. Gottheil, S. Kraus, *Pappus*, in: *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, IX, ed. I.K. Funk, A.W. Wagnalls, New York 1906, 512.

1108 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijaństwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 196.

1109 For more information about the idea of martyrdom in Judaism and Christianity in the first centuries see: D. Boyarin, *Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*, JECS 6 (1998) 577–627; D. Boyarin, *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*, Stanford 1999.

1110 Through his work as a ship-owner, he quickly came into a large fortune. When he arrived in Rome, he began to gain followers. He handed over all his property to the Church authorities but it was returned to him in its entirety when it turned out that Marcion was a heresiarch.

Church in Rome. Marcion's work has not survived to our times but its content can be successfully recreated thanks to the quotations which have been preserved in the writings challenging the views of the creator of the heresy. Most of the quotations have been preserved in Tertullian who devoted a lot of energy to fighting Marcionism and wrote a five-volume work entitled *Adversus Marcionem*.

Marcion did not acknowledge the allegorical interpretation of the Bible, so widely popularized in the Church of the second century by the Alexandrian school. Reading the text of the Old Testament almost exclusively literally, he did not accept the anthropomorphisms used by inspired writers to represent the image of God. He seemed to be a merciless judge who at most was able to coin the principle of "an eye for an eye" (Ex 21, 23, Lv 24:19-20, Dt 19:21), which was not used in practice even by God Himself, for He sought retribution and punishment for the transgressions of fathers with their descendants even down to the fourth generation (Ex 20:5-6, 34:6-7, Nb 14:18, Dt. 5:9-10).[1111]

Such deliberations lead the heresiarch to conclude that God the Creator of whom the Old Testament speaks has nothing to do with the God of Jesus Christ.[1112] This does not mean, however, that Marcion accepted all New Testament writings; on the contrary. He recognized the Gospel of Luke as authoritative and binding as well as some of Paul's letters (excluding 1Tm, 2Tm and Tt) which he further elaborated on leaving some content out of them.[1113] The Old Testament we need only to be able to recognize which demiurge should be rejected.[1114] And if we reject the Law of the Old Testament (as Christians do), how can we accept the God who bestowed this Law? Marcion asked.

Rejecting the Hebrew Bible, Marcion rejected thereby the whole Judaism. His indirect merit nevertheless is that he contributed to the selection of the

---

1111 Marcion did not realize that in the ancient Middle East (especially during the Paleolithic Period) legal co-responsibility was very widespread and included not only family of the guilty one but also his town and, in the case of a king, the whole country; G. Furlani, *La civiltà babilonese e assira*, Roma 1929, 491. Marcion seems not to notice generational responsibility Ezk 18:1-4.

1112 It is possible that Marcion shaped his beliefs under the influence of Persian dualism and other vivacious gnostic doctrines; E. Zolli, *Historia antysemityzmu*, ed. A. Latorre, trans. B. Bochenek, Kraków 2010, 68.

1113 R.M. Leszczyński, *Marcjonici*, in: *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, XI, ed. S. Wilk, E. Ziemann, R. Sawa, K. Góźdź, J. Herbut, S. Olczak, R. Popowski, Lublin 2006, 1254–1255. See also: R.S. Wilson, *Marcion*, New York 1980; H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Begginings of Christianity*, London 1992; J. Regul, *Die antimarcinitischen Evangelienprologe*, Frankfurt 1969; R.J. Hoffmann, *Marcion, on the Restitution of Christianity*, Chico 1984; H. Jonas, *Ewangelia Markiona*, Gnosis 3 (1992) 18–22; B. Aland, *Marcion*, ZTK 70 (1973) 420–447.

1114 J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, 162. According to the author, Marcion was the one to whom we owe the division into the Old and the New Testament; ibid., 161.

New Testament canon. The radical reduction of the number of inspired books by Marcion in a sense forced the Christian community to determine the canon, which happened soon afterwards, namely around the year 185 when the so-called Muratorian Canon appeared.[1115] Christians of pagan descent massively rejected the Old Testament thus following Marcion's example. On the same basis, the Gospel of Judas, discovered lately, was created.[1116] It was written by a gnostic group called the Cainites.

The Cainites expressed very peculiar views: they radically opposed the God of the Old Testament to the God proclaimed by Jesus. As a consequence, they put on the pedestal those who opposed God of the Old Covenant, especially Cain, Esau and Corah. Cain killed his brother Abel whose sacrifice God accepted; since the sacrifice of Cain was rejected; it became a sufficient motive for the murder. Esau in exchange for food gave Jacob his privilege of primogeniture. When Jacob was deceitfully blessed by his father, he was very angry. Corah was a Levite who organized the rebellion against Moses and Aaron. He did not understand why they were leaders, and he was angry because the people did not get to Canaan quickly enough. Corah and others died since they rejected the leader chosen by God and rebelled against him. These negative heroes of the Old Covenant became figures admired by the Cainites who wrote the *Gospel of Judas.*[1117]

1115 H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70-312)*, 284–285.

1116 The apocryphal writing was publicized by the Swiss researcher Frieda Nussberger-Tchacos in 2006. Three years before the announcement of the finding and the the publication of its content, M. Starowieyski had rightly quoted the data that we had had about the *Gospel of Judas* and which after the comprehensive study of the content of the apocrypha remain valid. Starowieyski assumed that The Gospel had been used by a group of agnostics called the Cainites and probably contained a description of the Lord's passion to show how the secret of betrayal was fulfiled, that is how Judas had contributed to the redemption of the world; *Ewangelie apokryficzne*, I, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, 124.

1117 *The Gospel of Judas* was known in the antiquity of Christianity. Irenaeus spoke unfavourably about it: "[…] Judas the traitor was thoroughly acquainted with these things, and that he alone, knowing the truth as no others did, accomplished the mystery of the betrayal; by him all things, both earthly and heavenly, were thus thrown into confusion. They produce a fictitious history of this kind, which they style the Gospel of Judas" (Adv. *Hear.* 1,31). Of similar opinion on the Doctrines of the Cainites and the *Gospel of Judas* was Epiphanius bishop of Salamis on Cyprus, living in the fourth century. In his work *Panarion,* he described in detail the heresies known to him. Against the Cainites he wrote: "And they say that because of this Judas had found out all about them. For they claim him too as kin and regard him as possessed of superior knowledge, so that they even cite a short work in his name which they call a *Gospel of Judas*" (*Hear.* 38,1.5). Theodoret of Cyrus provided similar information about the Cainites who composed the *Gospel of Judas*

The case of Marcion's followers and the Cainites is so interesting because both groups rejected Judaism in the same way as the true followers of Christ did but it was for totally different reasons. While the Church could not imagine Christianity without the Old Testament seen as the preparation for the coming of Christ, Marcionism and the Cainites rejected it as a canonical book of faith. This attitude significantly complicated the relations between Christians and the Jews. In the eyes of rabbis, both Marcion and the followers of the heresy of the Cainites were the followers of Christ, and therefore were the same as Christians. The Church, however, had to expel from its ranks the followers of erroneous teaching, which paradoxically created a situation in which the legitimate followers of Christ were often closer to Judaism than to the Gnostic sects formed on the basis of Christianity.

Jewish Involvement in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp of Smyrna* (c. 156 AD)

Today's Izmir is surrounded by mountains from the east and the south. The city, located in one of the bays of the Aegean Sea, was once known as Smyrna. It was destroyed in the year 178 when a massive earthquake reduced the agora, built by Alexander the Great, to a heap of rubble. Mark Aurelius ordered its reconstruction and only after three years since the tragedy, life came back to the city. It was believed that the prosperity of the city and its inhabitants depended on Poseidon, the god of the seas, and Demeter, the goddess of fertility.

Twenty-five years earlier the bishop of Smyrna, Polycarp, had been executed on the city stadium. He was a disciple of John the apostle but did not descend from a Jewish family.[1118] At the time of Domitian, John was exiled to the island of Patmos where political prisoners were kept but at the end of his life he allegedly returned to Ephesus. Where he met Polycarp, it is not clear. It is known though that it was him who appointed Polycarp as bishop of Smyrna. Irenaeus of Lyon, the disciple of Polycarp brought up in Smyrna, recalls:

> I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat as he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and the manner of his life, and his physical appearance, and his discourses to the people, and the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and with the others who had seen the Lord. And as he remembered their words, and what he heard from them concerning the Lord, and concerning his miracles and his teaching, having received them from eyewitnesses of the 'Word of life.' (*Hist.* V,20,5-8)

---

and added that Judas had immediately received an award for the treason – he had been hanged (*Haeret.* 1,15).

1118 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 141.

It is known that around the year 155 Polycarp stayed in Rome where he discussed the celebration of Easter with Pope Anicetus. They failed to reach a common position on the dates of the major Christian festival; the Pope, however, found in Polycarp a zealous defender of the faith against heretics. Allegedly, when Marcion, exiled by his bishop, appeared in front of Polycarp asking whether he recognized him, the Bishop of Smyrna answered without hesitation: "Yes, I know you very well, you, firstborn son of the devil." Perhaps such an inflexible attitude was the fruit of Ignatius' admonitions – in a letter to Polycarp he encouraged him to continue in true faith as an anvil being hit by a hammer.

A certain Marcion, different from the heresiarch, is the author of a letter which contains a trustworthy record of Polycarp's death. This letter was written shortly after the martyrdom of the bishop and sent to the church in Philomelion in Phrygia. The bishop had been betrayed by one of his servants. Polycarp was hiding on a farm in the vicinity of the city and was caught there. He was taken to the stadium, where the crowd gathered to watch the games. According to the author of the letter, when proconsul Quadratus ordered Polycarp to curse the name of Christ, he said firmly: "For eighty and six years have I been his servant, and he has done me no wrong, and how can I blaspheme my King who saved me?" No requests could persuade Polycarp to betray the Saviour. The crowd, however, loudly demanded blood. The description of Polycarp's martyrdom depicts in a very vivid way what happened at the Smyrna stadium:

> And when the funeral pile was ready, Polycarp, laying aside all his garments, and losing his girdle, sought also to take off his sandals, - a thing he was not accustomed to do, inasmuch as every one of the faithful was always eager who should first touch his skin. For, on account of his holy life, he was, even before his martyrdom, adorned with every kind of good.
>
> Immediately then they surrounded him with those substances which had been prepared for the funeral pile. But when they were about also to fix him with nails, he said, "Leave me as I am; for he that giveth me strength to endure the fire, will also enable me, without your securing me by nails, to remain without moving in the pile." They did not nail him then, but simply bound him. And he, placing his hands behind him, and being bound like a distinguished ram [taken] out of a great flock for sacrifice, and prepared to be an acceptable burnt-offering unto God, looked up to heaven, and said, "O Lord God Almighty, the Father of Thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the knowledge of Thee, the God of angels and powers, and of every creature, and of the whole race of the righteous who live before thee, I give Thee thanks that Thou hast counted me worthy of this day and this hour, that I should have a part in the number of Thy martyrs, in the cup of thy Christ, to the resurrection of eternal life, both of soul and body, through the incorruption [imparted] by the Holy Ghost. Among whom may I be accepted this day before Thee as a fat and acceptable sacrifice, according as Thou, the ever-truthful God, hast fore-ordained, hast revealed beforehand to me, and now hast fulfilled. Wherefore also I praise Thee for all things, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, along with the everlasting and heavenly Jesus Christ, Thy

> beloved Son, with whom, to Thee, and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and to all coming ages. Amen."
> When he had pronounced this amen, and so finished his prayer, those who were appointed for the purpose kindled the fire. And as the flame blazed forth in great fury, we, to whom it was given to witness it, beheld a great miracle, and have been preserved that we might report to others what then took place. For the fire, shaping itself into the form of an arch, like the sail of a ship when filled with the wind, encompassed as by a circle the body of the martyr. And he appeared within not like flesh which is burnt, but as bread that is baked, or as gold and silver glowing in a furnace. Moreover, we perceived such a sweet odour [coming from the pile], as if frankincense or some such precious spices had been smoking there. (*The letter of the Smyrnaeans Recounting the Martyrdom of Polycarp* 13,2 – 15,3)

The saint's biographers claim that those were the active members of the Synagogue in Smyrna who eagerly participated in bringing about Polycarp's death. There are two mentions of the Jews who were first supposed to enthusiastically provide the wood for the stake and then demanded that the corpse of the martyr be burned, contrary to the will of the Christians who wanted to bury it with dignity.[1119] There is also a parallel description of the event depicted above, according to which when the executioners wanted to nail him to a post, the saint assured them that no restraint was necessary, that Jesus would empower him to bear the flames. When the stake was set on fire, the flames avoided Polycarp's body. Having seen that the guards realized that Polycarp could not be burned so "they stabbed him with a spear" and the blood that ran down extinguished the flames. This happened on February 23, 166. After Polycarp's death, the Christians of Smyrna collected his bones and located them in the church of Smyrna.[1120]

While reading this account, one should remember that early Christian descriptions of martyrdom constituted a specific literary genre in which the historical layer was often interpreted theologically, or in step with the spirit of popular religiosity. It is a thoroughly Christian genre, anchored in the evangelical accounts of the Passion of the Lord on the one hand, and in ancient biographies on the other hand. An ancient Greek novel depicting the achievements of famous personalities often contained biographies remodelled, refined, and sometimes even altered by the authors. The reason for the use of particular rhetorical figures such as a hyperbole, exaggeration or idealization was of course the purpose of the work. The fictitious elements introduced into such works could not cross certain boundaries, namely, they had to fit within the spectrum of other probable events in the

1119 P. Fredriksen, *What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, 58.

1120 After: *Żywoty Świętych Pańskich na wszystkie dni roku*, Katowice – Mikołów 1937 [there are no page numbers].

character's life.[1121] So even if the description of the martyrdom of the bishop of Smyrna does not fully reflect the historical truth, for sure it reflects the atmosphere of those times.[1122] And it was an atmosphere of open reluctance between Christians and the Jews. At least such a picture is drawn in the traditional interpretation of *Martyrdom*, followed for centuries.[1123] This situation has slightly changed in recent decades.

The opinions of several researchers suggest that when Jews are mentioned in *The Martyrdom of Polycarp of Smyrna*, the references do not *de facto* concern the followers of Judaism but Christians of Jewish or even of pagan descent who are inclined to preserve the Law of Moses. This opinion appeared because such an image of the local church in Smyrna emerges from the analysis of two other works, namely the Apocalypse of St. John and the writing entitled the *Martyrdom of Pionius*. In the Apocalypse information about the "Synagogue of Satan" appears twice (Ap 2:9; 3:9); the researchers prove that this is a reference to Judaizing Christians.[1124] The same applies to the *Martyrdom of Pionius*; the Jews in this work are Christians leaning towards the Jewish way of life.[1125] Researchers suggest adopting a similar approach in the case of *Polycarp's Martyrdom*. However, it seems improbable (even taking into account the specificity of the literary genre, in which the description of the martyrdom was described) to accept the thesis that those were Christians who helped the oppressors to kill Polycarp.

The problem of the identity of the Jews in the description of Polycarp's death is ultimately not resolved. The first mention of the Jews includes their words regarding the martyr: "This is the teacher of Asia, the father of Christians, the destroyer of our gods, the one who teaches many that one should not sacrifice." (12,12) It seems problematic that a phrase such as "our gods" came from the mouth of the followers of Judaism. It can indeed lead to the assumption that it is about Christians coming from paganism who are now inclined to preserve Jewish practices and customs. There are references in ancient Christian literature where the Gentiles are consciously called the Jews. Is it really the case here?[1126]

1121 A perfect example of such an ancient biography is a work by Xenophon dedicated to the Persian King Cyrus, entitled *Kyrou paideia*. The author equips the main character with many noble features.

1122 W.H. Carroll, *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, I, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, 388.

1123 P. Richardson concludes his arguments on this subject with a clear statement: "*The Martyrdom of Polycarp*, by associating Jews and Gentiles so closely together, seems to make Jews and Christians totally separate"; *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, 18–19.

1124 D. Frankfurter, *Jews or Not? Reconstructing the 'Other' in Rev 2:9 and 3:9*, HTR 94 (2001) 414–416.

1125 E.L. Gibson, *Jewish Antagonism or Christian Polemic: The Case of the* Martyrdom of Pionius, JECS 9 (2001) 357–358.

1126 A. Cameron, *Jews and Heretics – A Category Error?*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 345.

The second doubt concerns the collection of wood and ignition of the fire by the Jews on the day of the "Great Sabbath." Although it is difficult to say what kind of celebration the author had in mind when speaking about the "Great Sabbath," it is certain that on the Sabbath day such activities were prohibited by the Law (Ex 35:3; Nb 15:32-36). According to the opinion of some authors, the remark once again refers to Judeo-Christians celebrating Holy Saturday before Easter Sunday. The third problematic issue concerns the mention according to which the Jews intended to collect bones of the burned remains of the martyr (*Martyrdom of Polycarp* 18). It would obviously be illogical to maintain that the Jews wanted to show respect to a Christian believer who had died for his faith. However, archaeologists have proven that there were cases of synagogues being built on the burial places of eminent figures of Judaism, especially on the graves of famous teachers of the Law. If Judeo-Christians took the custom over, it might have been important to them to pay respect to the mortal remains of Polycarp by creating a place of worship on the site of his burial.[1127]

Melito of Sardis' Accusations Against the Jews?

Gold used to be a source of wealth of the inhabitants of some parts of today's Aegean Turkey,[1128] where the kingdom of ancient Lydia was situated. One of the greatest attractions of today's Sart, once known as Sardis, are the ruins of a synagogue just 90 kilometres east of Izmir.[1129] The building, of considerable size, was erected here in the middle of the second century AD, at the time when Melito was the leader of Christian community in the town. The house of Jewish congregation is impressive because of its size and magnificent ornaments. Earlier, before the chants of a *hazzan* resounded here, the building had been home to spacious baths and a gymnasium. The flooring was covered with mosaics and the walls were

1127 E.L. Gibson, *The Jews and Christians in the* Martyrdom of Polycarp. *Entangled or Parted Ways?*, 155–158.

1128 Croesus, the king of ancient Lydia living in the sixth century BC, came from here and was for the Greeks the epitome of wealth. He gathered his wealth in gold. However, the richness did not protect Coresus from Cyrus the Great, the King of Persia, who turned out to be gracious for the Jews oppressed in Babylonia by the successors of Nebuchadnezzar. The legend noted by Herodotus says that Croesus was supposed to inquire the oracle of Delphi about the fate of the expedition against the Persians. The answer was enigmatic: Croesus would destroy a great empire. Convinced that it meant the empire of Cyrus, without hesitation he launched his campaign against the Persians. Shortly afterwards, the imprisoned king of Lydia threw himself on the burning pyre.

1129 S. Fine, *The Complexities of Rejection and Attraction, Herein of Love and Hate*, 239–240. For more information see: A.T. Kraabel, *Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context*, in: *Studies Presented to George M.A. Hanfmann*, ed. D.G. Mitten [i in.], Mainz 1971, 77–85.

tiled with colourful stone. It was a changing room of the bathhouse that was later rebuilt into a synagogue.

Melito of Sardis is included among apologists.[1130] This disciple of St John was recognized by Polycrates as one of the great stars of Asia who "lived in the Holy Spirit" (Eusebius, *Hist.* 5,24,5). Polycrates also revealed Melito's personal secret; by calling him "a eunuch," he stated that he lived in celibacy. Not much is really known about the famous bishop of Sardis. He went on a trip to Palestine where he got acqainted with the canon of the Old Testament. He was the supporter of Easter celebration on the 14th day of the Jewish month of nisan, regardless of the day of the week. Consequently, he defended the Quartodecimanists. He was a millenarist and strongly opposed Marcionism and the Gnostics.

Melito was the author of over a dozen writings from among which only the *Peri Pascha* (*On the Pascha*) homily and fragments of the *Apology* addressed to Mark Aurelius have survived. In the *Apology* he convinces his readers that peaceful relations between the state and the Church are beneficial for both sides. He defended his views concerning the date of the paschal festivals in two volumes of the work *On the Passover.*[1131] In the work *On Christian Life and the Prophets* he apparently combated the views of the Montanists. The fruit of his Palestinian voyages were six volumes of *Extracts from the Law and the Prophets* which contained the list of the canonical books of the Old Testament. He expressed his criticism of the theses of Marcion in three volumes of *On the Incarnation of Christ.*[1132] For obvious reasons, however, we are particularly interested in the first work mentioned above, where some statements directed against the Jews appear.

The complete reconstruction of the *Peri Pascha* was possible only in the last century.[1133] It was made on the basis of various fragments, preserved not only in the Greek language. Its author proved to be in favour of applying the principles of Greek rhetoric to preach Christ's message. He put all his effort into turning his paschal message into an extraordinary literary masterpiece which served as a means to communicate theological ideas. They are the key to the correct understanding of the content of the homily. "Melito knows what the announcement is, what the

---

1130 E. Kessler, *An Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations*, 54.

1131 S.E. Johnson, *Asia Minor and Early Christianity*, in: *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, II, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, 155–158.

1132 B. Altaner, A. Stuiber, *Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła*, trans. P. Pachciarek, Warszawa 1990, 126.

1133 In 1940, B. Campbell Bonner published *Peri Pascha* recreated on the basis of extensive papyrus fragments from the Chester Beatty and the University of Michigan collections. Twenty years later, M. Testuz published an even more reliable text of the homily; he published a papyrus dating back to the fourth century and found in the Bodmer Library in Geneva. Several fragments in Greek were also found among the papyruses from Oxyrhynchos; M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 153.

implementation is and what is the fulfilment. The Old Testament announces, the Gospel realizes, the eschatology fulfils."[1134]

The theological assumption of the poetically expressed view of Melito is as follows: the history of the chosen nation described in the Old Testament is a model of the history of the Church. The history of the people of the New Covenant follows, step by step, the individual stages outlined by the history of Israel. Knowing the history of the Jews is necessary to understand the history of the Church. Unfortunately, according to Melito, the study of the history of the Jews must lead to their rejection. This is the impression one may get when skimming some fragments of the homily, for example the excerpt referring to Christ's death:

> This one was murdered. And where was he murdered? In the very center of Jerusalem! Why?
> Why?
> Because he had healed their lame,
> and had cleansed their lepers,
> and had guided their blind with light,
> and had raised up their dead.
> For this reason he suffered.
> Somewhere it has been written in the law and prophets,
> They paid me back evil for good, and my soul with barrenness
> plotting evil against me saying,
> Let us bind this just man because he is troublesome to us.
> Why, O Israel did you do this strange injustice?
> You dishonoured the one who had honoured you.
> You held in contempt the one who held you in esteem.
> You denied the one who publicly acknowledged you.
> You renounced the one who proclaimed you his own.
> You killed the one who made you to live.
> Why did you do this, O Israel? (*Peri Pascha* 72-73)[1135]

Today such cumbersome questions could easily be considered anti-Semitic. Would the bishop of Sardis, however, have accepted such a label? Certainly not. His understanding of the Jewish identity was much closer to the one presented in John's Gospel than to ethnic connotations. Contrary to Geza Vermes' views, according to which the Gospel of John is full of hatred against the Jews[1136], in his comprehensive study entitled *Anti-Judaism and the Gospel*

1134 E. Staniek, *Wielcy mówcy Kościoła starożytnego. Antologia*, Kraków 2007, 52.

1135 "Melito is notorious for his charge of deicide – killing God – which became a recurring theme in the history of Christian anti-Judaism. He argued that not only had Jews rejected Christ, they killed him"; E. Kessler, *An Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations*, 54.

1136 G. Vermes, *Twarze Jezusa*, trans. J. Kołak, Kraków 2008, 31.

according to Saint John Mirosław Wróbel showed that the term "Jews" takes on different meanings in the writings of the beloved disciple of Jesus.[1137] None of the evangelists calls for love as often as John does. *Ioudaioi* must also be embraced with love.

Wróbel shows that the semantic field of the term *Ioudaioi* which appears seventy-two times on the pages of the fourth Gospel is very wide. Essentially, it does not refer to a nation but to those who are opposed to the teaching of Jesus. The "Jews" of the fourth evangelist may indicate all those who betray Christ, even Christians who have rejected the faith. The use of this term by Melito of Sardis is quite similar. In other words, the accusations in his homily against the Jews should be read in their historical context and referred to the Marcionists and the Montanists whose teachings Melito was trying to eradicate rather than to the members of the chosen people. The words of his message sound very different when "Israel" is undersood as heretics who have departed from proper learning:

> But you, O Israel [...] nor did you absolve yourself of guilt before the Lord,
> nor were you persuaded by his works.
> The withered hand which was restored whole to its body did not persuade you;
> nor did the eyes of the blind which were opened by his hand; nor did the paralyzed bodies
> restored to health again through his voice;
> nor did that most extraordinary miracle persuade you, namely,
> the dead man raised to life from the tomb
> where already he had been lying for four days.
> Indeed, dismissing these things, you, to your detriment,
> prepared the following for the sacrifice of the Lord at eventide:
> sharp nails, and false witnesses, and fetters, and scourges,
> and vinegar, and gall, and a sword, and affliction,
> and all as though it were for a blood-stained robber.
> For you brought to him scourges for his body, and the thorns for his head.
> And you bound those beautiful hands of his, which had formed you from the earth.
> And that beautiful mouth of his, which had nourished you with life, you filled with gall.
> And you killed your Lord at the time of the great feast.
> Surely you were filled with gaiety, but he was filled with hunger;
> you drank wine and ate bread, but he vinegar and gall;
> you wore a happy smile, but he had a sad countenance;
> you were full of joy, but he was full of trouble;

1137 M. Wróbel, *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*, Lublin 2005, 251–253.

you sang songs, but he was judged;
you issued the command, he was crucified;
you danced, he was buried;
you lay down on a soft bed, but he in a tomb and coffin. (*Peri Pascha* 77-80)

Every sinner can recognize himself in these images. The bishop of Sardis speaks about the history of the Church and the history of individual believers, filling with content the "outline" created by the history of the chosen nation. Therefore, it is necessary to talk about the Jews.[1138] The fact that the accusations contained in Melito's homily can be attributed to all sinners is confirmed by the following statement: "Therefore all men on the earth became either murderers, or parricides, or killers of their children. And yet a thing still more dreadful and extraordinary was to be found: A mother attacked the flesh which she gave birth to, a mother attacked those whom her breasts had nourished; and she buried in her belly the fruit of her belly. Indeed, the ill-starred mother became a dreadful tomb, when she devoured the child which she bore in her womb." *(Peri Pascha* 52)

The period when Melito was writing his work was for the Church a time when more and more often questions concerning conversion and sin in the ecclesial community were asked. Advocates of radical solutions believed that public sinners should be excluded from the community immediately; those who presented a milder attitude wished to offer to the sinners a chance to return. The first option was applied without hesitation in relation to the heresiarchs; if the exhortations on the part of church authorities were not obeyed, excommunication was imposed on the creator of the erroneous teaching and his followers. A sin against the Church was identified with a sin against Christ Himself, according to His own words: "in so far as you did this to one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did it to me." (Mt 25:40)

This is how another excerpt from Melito's *Peri Pascha* should be approached. Since it was uttered at the liturgical assembly on the occasion of Easter and those were Christians, and not Jews, who participated in it, "Israel" should certainly be understood as the Church to which the term "new Israel" was later frequently applied[1139]:

1138 On exactly the same principle, many Church Fathers and later Christian writers up to the present day have used the topos of Egypt. It was the pharaoh and the Egyptians who opposed the exodus of the Israelites from captivity. And it was the pharaoh and the Egyptians who became the personification of evil and forces hostile to God. The pharaoh is compared to Satan, and his army - to demons. In this allegory it is the Jews who turn out to be faithful to God and are praised for the consistent implementation of His will. And one can hardly find any polemic directed against the Christians on the part of the Egyptians whose national pride and feelings would have been offended due to such critical descriptions.

1139 The same direction is followed by Clement of Alexandria when he interprets Jacobs' struggle against the angel (Gn 32:25-33). In the form of an angel, he sees Christ himself (Logos), and consequently, the change of Jacobs' name to Israel he refers to

> O lawless Israel, why did you commit this extraordinary crime
> of casting your Lord into new sufferings–your master,
> the one who formed you,
> the one who made you,
> the one who honoured you,
> the one who called you Israel?
> But you were found not really to be Israel,
> for you did not see God, you did not recognize the Lord, you did not know,
> O Israel,
> that this one was the firstborn of God,
> the one who was begotten before the morning star. (*Peri Pascha* 81-82)

Participation in the Easter liturgy was supposed to encourage the faithful to examine the conscience. It is well known that the custom of single repentance became widespread in the third century. People waited to confess their sins until the end of their lives. The custom had not been known to Melito yet but the emphasis in teaching was put on the fact that after being baptised, when all sins were forgiven, Christians should at all cost avoid mortal sins, i.e. sins which, according to John the apostle, brought death: "If anyone sees his brother commit a sin that is not a deadly sin, he has only to pray, and God will give life to this brother - provided that it is not a deadly sin. There is sin that leads to death and I am not saying you must pray about that." (1Jn 5:16) The examination of conscience became the duty of every believer. Also of those who listened to Melito's message:

> O ungrateful Israel, come here and be judged before me for your ingratitude.
> How high a price did you place on being created by him?
> How high a price did you place on the discovery of your fathers?
> How high a price did you place on the descent into Egypt,
> and the provision made for you there through the noble Joseph?
> How high a price did you place on the ten plagues?
> How high a price did you place on the nightly column of fire,
> and the daily cloud, and the crossing of the Red Sea?
> How high a price did you place on the gift of manna from heaven,
> and the gift of water from the rock, and the gift of law in Horeb,
> and the land as an inheritance, and the benefits accorded you there? (*Peri Pascha* 87–88)

Christians who become the new Israel: "What Jacob perceived, said Clement, was indeed God in his yet-unnamed Logos by whom He is manifested to human beings; but his Christian readers would understand that the 'new name' Israel was kept back for a 'new people', and was properly applicable to Jesus, the Logos incarnate as the instructor and tutor to lead the world to God"; C.T.R. Hayward, *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings. From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion*, Oxford 2005, 344.

This specific examination of conscience reflects the repetition of the journey of Israel across the desert in the life of the believers in Christ. Every Christian travels from death to life in the same way as once the chosen nation travelled from the Egyptian captivity to the Promised Land. God performs greater miracles in the life of believers than in the history of Israel. The journey of Israelites to the Promised Land becomes the paradigm of personal journey of faith of every Christian. The unfaithfulness of Christians causes the death of Christ. Because after all He was pierced for our sins:

> O frightful murder! O unheard of injustice!
> The Lord is disfigured and he is not deemed worthy of a cloak for his naked body,
> so that he might not be seen exposed.
> For this reason the stars turned and fled, and the day grew quite dark,
> in order to hide the naked person hanging on the tree,
> darkening not the body of the Lord, but the eyes of men.
> Yes, even though the people did not tremble, the earth trembled instead;
> although the people were not afraid, the heavens grew frightened;
> although the people did not tear their garments, the angels tore theirs;
> although the people did not lament, the Lord thundered from heaven,
> and the Most High uttered his voice. (*Peri Pascha* 97-98)

The bishop of Sardis, endeavouring, like the whole Church of the second half of the second century, to work out a better definition of conversion and repentance and struggling with the problem of deviation from faith and the desire of sinners to return to full communion with the ecclesial community, is indeed breathing fire at unfaithful Christians who depart from Christ in the same way as the Israelites once abandoned God. Pointing at the cross and the grave of the Saviour, the bishop of Sardis hails Christians: "he was crucified; you danced!" *(Hom. pas.* 80) One of Melito's best-known works is, therefore, not part of the polemic of the Church with the Synagogue but it is a sign of intra-church criticism for purely parenetic purposes.

The Epistle to Diognetus (c. 180 AD) about the Jews

The *Epistle to Diognetus* is a short apology of Christianity[1140] which survived among Justin's writings. It was probably written in an Alexandrian environment. All we know about its addressee is that he was a Gentile. The apology, discovered by

1140 According to some researchers, the *Letter to Diogenes* is an example of "protreptic" literature rather than an apology; D.M. Swancutt, *Paraenesis in Light of Protrepsis. Troubling the Typical Dichotomy*, in: *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, ed. J. Starr, T. Engberg-Pedersen, Berlin 2004, 113–121.

chance at a fish market in 1436, is often referred to as the "pearl of early Christian literature."[1141] Its author is unknown but for centuries the work was wrongly attributed to St Justin.[1142] The content of the script shows that the author, as a Christian of pagan descent, was not very well acquainted with the beliefs of Judaism. He used, however, very sophisticated style of writing displaying perfect knowledge of Greek rhetoric. His aim was to persuade the addressee (who may be a fictitious figure) to accept the faith in Christ. The approximate dating of the letter's creation (c.180 or even later) is possible thanks to certain socio-cultural elements contained in it as well as to its similarity to the apology of Aristides, the *Protreptikos* by Clement of Alexandria and several other apologetic works dating back to the second century.[1143]

Two chapters of the *Epistle to Diognetus* express criticism of Judaism. Interestingly, at the beginning, the author speaks favourably about the Jews because they worship one God. The praise of monotheism, however, immediately entails criticism of worshipping practices among the followers of Judaism which the apologist sees as not differing in any way from pagan cult.[1144] Probably on the basis of 1Co 1:20-25, the author divides humanity into the Gentiles, the Jews and Christians. By making offerings to God, the Jews act "pious but foolishly." (*Diog*. 3,3) It is interesting to note that while criticizing Jewish attitude towards sacrificial offerings, the author never quotes the Old Testament. In general, references to the Old Testament can only be found in chapters 11 and 12 (the picture of Paradise), and they probably do not belong to the original corpus of the letter but were added by one of the copyists.[1145]

The opinions suggesting that the work was created among Marcionists should be rejected because it lacks the polemical elements typical of the followers of the heresiarch and moreover the author often refers to the idea of creation, while for Marcion the Creator was a demiurge.[1146] The author of the *Epistle to Diognetus* does not avoid rhetorical questions referring to Jewish practices:

1141 A. Klostergaard Petersen, *Heaven-borne in the World: A Study of the* Letter to Diogenetus, in: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 125.

1142 M. Starowieyski, *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijanstwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, 155–156; H.G. Meecham, *The Epistle to Diogenetus. The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes*, Manchester 1949, 61; E. Molland, *Die litteratur- und dogmengeschichtliche Stellung des Diogenetbriefes*, ZNW 33 (1934) 292.

1143 Numerous allusions to the persecution of Christians suggest the end of the second century (*Diog*. 5,11; 6,5; 6,9; 7,7-9; 10,7).

1144 Cf. Dt 4:28; Ps 115:4-7; Is 44:9-20; Wis 13:10-16; 15:4-17.

1145 Thus: K. Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diogenet*, Darmstadt 1984, 287–290.

1146 J. Lieu comments: "The *ad Diogenetum* is unusual in the second century in not finding any such [Old Testament] history; consistent this may be, yet ultimately it was to prove unsatisfactory, and the denial of history, as implied by Marcion's

> […] how can this be lawful? And to speak falsely of God, as if He forbade us to do what is good on the Sabbath-days—how is not this impious? And to glory in the circumcision of the flesh as a proof of election, and as if, on account of it, they were specially beloved by God—how is it not a subject of ridicule? And as to their observing months and days, as if waiting upon the stars and the moon, and their distributing, according to their own tendencies, the appointments of God, and the vicissitudes of the seasons, some for festivities, and others for mourning—who would deem this a part of divine worship, and not much rather a manifestation of folly. (*Diog.* 4,3-5)[1147]

The writer seems to see in Christians a type of "new people" – new not only in the sense of being different from pagan nations but also from Israel. Although the members of the Church live as all others, yet they are different from them. They do not differ too much from their surroundings, and yet they are "souls for the world." (*Diog.* 6,1) "So great is the office for which God hath appointed them, and which it is not lawful for them to decline." (*Diog.* 6,10)

In the eyes of the author of the letter, "things are quite funny" *(Diog.* 4,1) and he means here scruples about nutritional regulations, exaggeration in observing the Sabbath, circumcision which is no more but self-inflicted injury, hypocritical fasting or celebration of the new moon. Speaking of the sacrifices offered in the Jerusalem Temple (burnt offerings, incense, blood, fat), he claims that God is the Creator of all these things and everything is anyway His property. It is possible that, among the Jews, the hope of rebuilding the Temple was still alive, and the author of the letter himself expected that soon they would resume sacrificial worship. It is after all difficult to believe that sixty years after the destruction of the Temple by Titus, news about the event did not reach the sender of the letter.

The other possibility to explain the remark about the sacrifices offered by the Jews is the assumption that the author of the letter obtained information about the cult only from the Old Testament, and he was not interested in the issue of the Temple lying in ruins. The third attempt to justify the presence of these references is a presumption that the writer wanted to keep pace with the rabbis who, though deprived of their place of worship, continued to discuss how to exercise it, which is exemplified by the content of the Mishnah. Regardless of whether any of these hypotheses are true or not, the fact that at the time of the composition of the *Letter to Diognetus* Christians had definitely cut themselves off from the religious community of Judaism without losing the awareness of the common roots of both religions should be taken for granted.[1148]

---

rejection of the Creator God of the Jews, was excluded as heretical"; J. Lieu, *Neither Jew nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity*, London 2002, 189.

1147 A. Świderkówna, in: *Pierwsi świadkowie. Wybór najstarszych pism chrześcijańskich*, Ojcowie żywi VIII, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 1998, 363.

1148 In a different manner J. Taylor: „Between 70 and 135 C.E., as Jews continued to live in Judea within a system of Jewish law, so did the group(s) we refer to as Jewish-Christians. There is no reason to think that they were considered separate from

The author of the letter explains to Diognetus that Christians do not fast in the same way as the Jews do (*Diog*. 4,1). This is a clear reference to the Day of Reconciliation, the greatest Jewish festival. Hence, the conclusion may be drawn that even the Judaeo-Christians did not celebrate Yom Kippur at the time when the letter was written. In the meantime, however, Origen certifies something else and in relation to Christians of pagan descent. In the *Homilies on Jeremiah*, he reprimands a Christian woman that she still participates in the Jewish celebration of the Day of Reconciliation as if she had never heard of the reconciliation made by Christ. God should be asked to forgive sins in the secret of one's heart, Origen argues, not in public, as the Jews do (*Hom ad Jer.* 13)[1149].

The comparative study of these two references (from the *Letter to Diognetus* and the *Homilies on Jeremiah* by Origen), combined with the analysis of Paul's letters (especially Rm 14) and the Letter to the Hebrews, allowed the researchers to draw a chronological model showing the relation of Christians to the celebration of the Day of Reconciliation. Immediately after the resurrection of Christ and until the end of the first century in Judeo-Christian communities this practice was accepted although it did not involve making sacrificial offerings in the Temple of Jerusalem. In the first half of the second century, the celebration of Yom Kippur by Judeo-Christians was only tolerated, and since the middle of the second century, it was regarded as totally anti-Christian.[1150]

Activity of Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi

The great-grandfather of Rabbi Judah (also: Yehudah) ha-Nasi, commonly known as the Prince, was Gamaliel, the patriarch living in the Jabneh period. Ha-Nasi's activity falls on the second half of the second century and the first couple of years of the third century. This activity did not involve the polemics with Christians but it cannot be denied that Judah ha-Nasi contributed a lot to the development of the rabbinate. Juda (Yehuda) ha-Nasi, also known as Rabbenu ha-Kadosh (Our Saint Rabbi) or simply Rabbi, was allegedly a friend of Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus. Ha-Nasi radically changed the image of rabbinism.[1151] It was a period

---

Judaism, even if other Jews thought they erred in their belief in Jesus as Messiah"; J. Taylor, *Parting in Palestine*, 94. cf. also: J. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins*, Oxford 1993, 19–20; J.C. Paget, *Jews, Christians and Jewish-Christians in Antiquity*, WUNT 251, Tübingen 2010, 289–324.

1149 N.R.M. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews. Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third Century Palestine*, Cambridge 1976, 35–36.

1150 D. Stökl ben Ezra, *'Christains' Observing 'Jewish' Festivals of Autumn*, 72–73.

1151 Some authors argue that this change was so far-reaching that the "rabbinic sect" became the religion of "all the Jews; K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 59.

when the rabbis were no longer only religious teachers but also leaders of whole communities who conducted at the same time synagogue services.

Judah ha-Nasi, first of all, strengthened the position of rabbis in Jewish society in the Palestinian territories, including those Jews who at first did not identify themselves with rabbinic Judaism. Secondly, the scope of jurisdiction of rabbis has widened considerably at his time; advice was sought not only on topics such as ritual purity or marital rights but also the laws regarding kosherness, the Sabbath and synagogue practice. The influence of rabbis on social life was becoming stronger and stronger. Thirdly, until the time of ha-Nasi, rabbis usually belonged to the affluent social groups while, during his rule, this situation began to change to such an extent that there were traces of tensions between the rabbis and the rich followers of Judaism. Fourthly, the rabbinate owes to ha-Nasi a peculiar form of urbanization. Before his rule, rabbis were usually influential only in villages and small towns; once the leadership was taken over by ha-Nasi, the increasing influence of the rabbis became visible in urban areas. Fifthly, and finally, the greatest merits of ha-Nasi are visible in the editing of the Mishnah.[1152]

Before the year 70 AD, we can speak of the so-called "first Mishnah," in which oral traditions dating back to the time of Moses (according to the beliefs of the rabbis) were collected[1153]; this collection constitutes the foundation of the Mishnah of Rabbi Akiba who in turn laid the foundation for the Mishnah of his disciple, Rabbi Meir. The edition of the final version was made by Judah ha-Nasi. The body of the Mishnah text was divided into six orders (*sedarim*) which in turn were divided into tractates (*mesachtot*) consisting of chapters (*parakim*).[1154]

The first order, called *Zeraim* (seeds, plants), comprises eleven tractates. It contains rules on soil cultivation, care for crops and food, and it also mentions the rights of poor people, priests and Levites concerning the crops. The second order, entitled *Moed* (festival), consists of twelve tractates and, as the name suggests, describes holiday rituals. The third order, *Nashim* (women), consists of seven tractates discussing marriage and divorce. The fourth order, entitled *Nezikin* (damages), comprises ten tractates which *de facto* constitute a code of civil and criminal law. The fifth order, *Kodashim* (sanctities), consists of eleven tractates concerning sacrifices, temple worship and the duties of the priests. The last order,

1152 S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 346–349.

1153 Some scientists do not hesitate to talk about the beginnings of the Mishnah at the time around 70 AD. It is true that some texts of the Mishnah refer to the existence and functioning of the Temple and royal institutions but it is not known if their origins really date back to those times or if it is just an attempt to anchor rabbinic views in the period when the Tabernacle still existed.

1154 J.J. Schoeps, *Miszna*, in: *Nowy leksykon judaistyczny*, ed. J.H. Schoeps, trans. S. Lisiecka, Warszawa 2007, 556–558.

Tohorot (pure things), consists of twelve chapters which discuss the issues of purity and ritual uncleanliness.[1155]

The Mishnah is a book of rules, however, it is not a book of the law. It cites various, often different, interpretations of legal regulations, without clearly indicating which the right one is. In addition, it extensively discusses institutions and rituals that no longer existed in the period of its formation (e.g. sacrificial rituals or authority of the high priest), omitting altogether those that functioned at that time (the synagogue, Roman authorities, city councils, etc.). The greatness and the importance of the Mishnah for almost all subsequent religious literature of Judaism is that it is a biblical and extra-biblical work, written in Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic, and created both in Palestine and in the diaspora. Thus, it combines an unusual wealth of opinions and trends.[1156]

The creation of the Mishnah did not mean, however, the end of the formation of the rabbinic tradition. It was just contrariwise: the Mishnah gave an impulse to comment on it. These commentaries are known as the Gemara ("an ending," "an addendum"). They were created in Palestinian and Babylonian circles, giving rise to two versions of the Talmud. At the same time as the Gemara, a parallel work called the Tosefta was created, a work of a halakhic character which consists almost entirely of the same orders as the Mishnah and almost the same tractates (except for *Abot, Tamid, Middot* and *Qinnin*). According to some researchers, the creation of the Tosefta should be dated soon after the Mishnah, perhaps about the year 300.[1157]

Such a dynamic development of the written rabbinic tradition which, from the oral tradition of commentaries on the Torah, went through subsequent stages of shaping (by writing down the Mishnah, the Tosefta and the Gemara) testifies to the totally different development of the paths of Christianity and rabbinic Judaism at the end of the second century. While the rabbis focused on commenting on the Law, the Christian tendency initiated by Peter in the house of Cornelius and by Paul, proclaiming that salvation did not come from the deeds of the Law, grew stronger. In general, Christians rejected the cultic rules described in the Old Testament,

---

1155 The content of various treaties of the Mishnah are discussed in detail by T. Jelonek, *Schemat Miszny*, Kraków 2001, 7–72. The Mishnah is a very extensive work. For example, the Mishna's contemporary German translation consists of more than a thousand pages; *Die Mischna ins deutsche Übertragen, mit einer Einleitung und Anmerkungen von Dietrich Correns. Das grundlegende enzyklopädische Regelwerk rabbinischer Tradition*, trans. D. Correns, Wiessbaden 2005.

1156 S.J.D. Cohen, *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135-220)*, 352. See also: K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 191–226.

1157 The Talmud ascribes the Tosefta to Rabbi Nehemiah who lived at the same time as Rabbi Meir. But it is not certain whether the remark concerns the Tosefta. Rabbi Saadia Gaon ascribes the Tosefta to rabbi Hiyya bar Abba; J. Neusner, *The Emergence of Judai*, London 2004, 163.

keeping only the moral law, filled with Jesus' call for holiness and subjected to spiritualization and interiorization. Rabbis, on the other hand, in addition to the moral rules, preserved and even tightened the requirements regarding the laws of cleanliness, building "a fence around the Torah." Because of the approach to the Law of Moses, Church and Synagogue became almost completely alien to each other at the turn of the second and third centuries.

The Oldest Latin Homily *Against the Jews* (c. 190 AD)

Humbert of Romans, the Master General of the Dominican order living in the thirteenth century, published a treatise concerning the education of preachers. The treatise was entitled *De eruditione praedicatorum.* The author presented there a thesis that the word of a preacher had such a power that it was able to raise the dead. This idea was also supposed to refer to the earliest surviving Latin homily entitled *Against the Jews.* Most likely, it came into existence at the end of the second century in Italy, possibly even in Rome itself, but it has been preserved to our times in the writings of Cyprian of Carthage.

From time immemorial Sunday liturgy began with the reading of the Scriptures. It was confirmed by St Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I, 67). The pattern of Christian liturgy was based, according to Justin, on the model of the synagogue service. This means that an integral element of Sunday Christian gatherings – as in the case of Jewish assemblies – was a homily, delivered after the reading of the Holy Scriptures. If it is true that Rome was the place where the Anti-Jews homily was first delivered, it must have got a lot of publicity there.

The Jewish community in Rome was large again. More than a hundred years had already passed since the infamous decree of Claudius, expelling the followers of Judaism (including Judeo-Christians) from the town on the Tiber River. Successive waves of Jews emigrated to Rome after the Jewish uprising in 66-72, after the year 90 when the academy of Jabneh was founded and after the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135 AD). Some Jews settled on the Tiber not of their own free will but were brought there as slaves after the fall of the uprisings. In any event, the Roman diaspora was quite prosperous at the end of the second century. The atmosphere of the time is reflected in the fact that shortly after the year 212, Caracalla granted to the Jews (though not only to them) the privilege of Roman citizenship.

The author of the homily *Against the Jews* remains unknown but with his speech he engages in a polemic with the Judaizers who were quite influential in the Roman Christian community. The conflict, which was already visible at the so-called Jerusalem Council in the middle of the first century and which also stirred the atmosphere of disagreement between Paul and Peter, continued. In the same way as once the apostle of nations opposed Cephas because "he was manifestly in the wrong" (Ga 2:11) now the Christians coming from among the Gentiles disapproved of the followers of Christ rooted in Judaism. Judaizers still intended to include in the practice of the community some Judaic elements. The preacher is openly opposed to such intentions and he places Judaizers beside those

who rejected Christ at the time of the First Covenant. This is how the author sees characters opposed to the will of God. In an extremely dynamic way he compiles pairs of biblical characters. Some remained faithful to God while others contested Him, thereby turning their hearts away from Christ who was to come to earth:

> ["The prophets who were sent to them and who were proclaimed Christ were put to death]. [...] Moses they cursed because he proclaimed Christ, Dathan they loved because he did not proclaim Him; Aaron they rejected because he offered the image of Christ, Abiron they set up because he opposed Him; David they hated, because he sang of Christ, Saul they magnified, because he did not speak of Him; Samuel they cast out because he spoke of Christ, Cham they served, because he said nothing of Christ; Jeremiah they stoned while he was hymning Christ, Ananias they loved while he was opposing Him; Isaiah they sawed asunder shouting His glories, Manasseh they glorified persecuting Him; John they slew revealing Christ, Zechariah they slaughtered loving Christ, Judas they loved betraying Him." (*Against the Jews* 21-26)[1158]

The Latin homily, therefore, is characterised by a specific double meaning: on the surface, it is the story of the Jews who had contributed to the death of Christ but its more fundamental purpose is the admonishion of Judaizers whose actions were destroying the unity of the Body of Christ. The juxtaposed pairs of figures create a strong contrast. Moses was contrasted to Dathan; according to the author of the homily the first one, remaining faithful to God's commands predicted Christ, whereas the second one as the leader of the conspiracy against Moses did not predict Christ and was punished for his disobedience (cf. Nb 15:32-33). Aaron was contrasted with Abiron; the first one through his priesthood showed similarity to Christ; the second one, who was the leader of the revolt against Aaron, spoke against Christ. David was juxtaposed with Saul: the first extolled Christ whereas the other one – persecuting David – persecuted the Saviour himself (cf. 1K 19:14). Elijah was juxtaposed with Ahab: the former preached Christ when he rejected false prophets; the latter said nothing about Christ but persecuted the prophet. Jeremiah was juxtaposed with Hananiah: the former preached Christ, prophesying the Babylonian captivity; the latter turned out to be an opponent of Christ because he prophesied falsely (Jr 28:1-17). Isaiah was juxtaposed to Manasseh: the first one preached about Christ, suffering the death of a martyr; the latter persecuted Christ by doing what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord (2K 21:2). John the Baptist and Zechariah were opposed to Judas: the first one introduced Christ (Mk 6:27); the second one loved Christ (Mt 23:35); the last one, however, turned out to be a traitor (Mt 26:14-16).

The author of the homily shows incredible knowledge of the history of the chosen people. He often refers in his argumentation to the events in the history of Israel, finding there figures whom he considers to be types of Christ. The method of typology clearly fits into patristic exegesis combined with the Alexandrian

1158 After: E. Staniek, *Wielcy mówcy Kościoła starożytnego. Antologia*, 88.

allegorical approach. The typology becomes an exegetical key to the reading of the Old Testament. Therefore, the type of Christ is represented by such figures as Moses, Aaron, David, Elias, Jeremiah, Isaiah, John the Baptist or Zechariah; the adversaries of Christ are represented by Dathan and Abiron, Saul, Ahab, Hananiah, Manasseh and Judas. Judaizers, trying to impose their will on the Christian community, assume the attitude of the latter. They are the ones who, like fun-loving and playful wedding guests, are responsible in the eyes of the author of the homily for the tragic death of Christ:

> The Lord was judged, while Israel enjoyed itself, Christ suffered, while the godless shouted, He was crucified, while the mob rejoiced, and the Lord was buried, while the commoners feasted. They sealed their cruelty and crime through their ignominious ceremony. Tell me and speak, ungodly Israel. Is this the sacrifice you offer to the Father who sacrificed his Son? Are these the blood sacrifices you have poured as a blood covenant to the best God? Jerusalem, you danced while Christ was killed, you sang in a blissful voice while you said: nail him, hang him! It's because of this defamation and disease of the people of Israel that the Lord complained to you, saying: "I hate the new moon, the Sabbath, the feast days." "My soul abhors solemnities and fasting." Not without reason did the innocent Lord hate your ceremonies, during which you expelled His one and only first-born Son. Oh hard day, oh insane hour, oh mourning festival, wretched land, defiled city and its people, bloodied by the crime committed against the Lord, they murdered the Lord and they released the traitor! (*Against the Jews* 39-42)

For such shameful behaviour the playful Jews got their just deserts in the end. What was the penalty? First of all, depriving them of their own homeland, the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple, the defeat of national liberation uprisings organized against the Romans and the diaspora. Unfaithful and deaf to God's admonitions, the Jews demanded with their conduct the coming of the tyrant, through whom the Almighty administered his punishing justice. The tyrant was personified by Titus who changed Jerusalem into new Sodom:

> Rejected by the people Christ sent the tyrant, who they desired. The one who destroyed their cities, and gave them up into captivity, he who took the spoils, and changed their homeland into a wilderness like Sodom. With deep reluctance The Lord took away from Jerusalem the strength of bread and water, the power of a militant man, a judge, a prophet, a sage, a praiseworthy adviser and an experienced architect and a wise helper. He transferred all these aids, safeguards and means of defence to the pagans, along with all his control, having seized his banner among them, broke down the camp and created military power there where He began to reign. No longer a kingdom in Jerusalem, it is in us: here is the camp, here is the army, here is the commander, here is the strength, here is the Bridegroom, here is the wedding, here is the King, here is Christ, and here is the resurrection and eternity. […] This is why you have become an outcast in your homeland, wandering over rivers of pagans and begging with a pleading voice and a bitter complaint, saying: Since help and protection

> you have killed, the lightness you have persecuted, defender you have rejected, the Bridegroom you have nailed, the King you have hanged. I have been cast out like a wretch from my possessions, I have become a stranger and have arrived in the estates of others. Forgive, o Lord God, those rejected, have mercy on abandoned, unfortunate and terribly defeated ones. And there is the punishment, Israel! There the state is in Jerusalem! (*Against the Jews* 56-59.65-67)

The Jews themselves looked for the cause of the fall of the Temple elsewhere. A Talmudic tractate *Sanhedrin* explains: "Said Rabbi Ishmael, the very night that Solomon completed the construction of the temple in Jerusalem, he married Pharaoh's daughter, and the people of Jerusalem attended both celebrations, going from one to the other. The rejoicing at the wedding ball was greater than the rejoicing in celebration of the completion of the Temple. At that time a thought came before the Almighty to destroy the Temple. [As it is written,] 'Yes, from the day when this city was built until today, it has been such cause of anger and wrath to me that I mean to remove it from my sight.' " (Jr 32:31)"[1159]

Another tractate, *Yoma*, points to specific sins and human attitudes which aroused the wrath of God and led to the destruction of the Tabernacle. The author asks the question why the first Temple was destroyed. The reasons were three, he says: idolatry, abandoning the customs and the murder. And the Second Temple, when the Israelites were engaged in the study of the Torah, the commandments, and good deeds, why was it destroyed? – asks the author of the tractate. Because there was disagreement at that time. Thereof a conclusion can be drawn that quarrel is of the same importance as the three sins mentioned above: idolatry, abandoning the customs and murder.

The tractate *Berakhot* then, depicting the effects of the destruction of the Temple, encourages the readers to totally rely on heavenly Father: "Since the day that the Temple was destroyed, the Sages began to be like Bible-teachers, and the Bible-teachers like sextants, and the sextants like helpers, the helpers have become sparse and there are none that seek. On whom is it for us to rely? - on our Father in Heaven."[1160]

Christians, however, could only look with indulgent compassion at such attempts to seek comfort and to regret the miserable fall of the magnificent Temple. They knew that the Temple had already fulfiled its role. From the moment of Christ's death on the cross, every believer in Him could worship God in spirit and truth, the author of the homily maintains. One does not have to wander in arduous pilgrimages to a city in which the slaughter of lambs, goats and oxen takes place. It is enough to believe in the redeeming power of the death of the paschal

---

1159 R. Pacifici, *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, Milano 1997, 140.

1160 R. Pacifici, *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, 191.

Lamb who bowed his head on the altar of the cross, becoming at the same time the priest and the sacrificial offering. In the end, it was His Body that turned out to be the Temple which he rebuilt only three days after its destruction. The veil of the Tabernacle, split in two like a curtain in a drama, opened the heavens to all believers. The deliberations lead to a simple conclusion that we do not have to be concerned about rebuilding the stone temple but about clinging to Him whose blood frees us from all sins.

The homily fits into the polemic concerning the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. The author draws a picture of a boy who instructs an elderly man. It seems that the image represents the ancient beliefs of the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob on the one hand, and the young, less than two hundred years old Church on the other hand. The boy teaches the old man, the student instructs the teacher. It is as if God said to Israel: "Here I give you my disciple to explain to you the Law which was established at Horeb to decide on matters relating to the Zion and the Law. He is not educated and explains the writings; a boy teaches an old man. […] Now, those who have once studied, learn, those who once commanded, now receive the orders, those who baptised are now being immersed and those who once performed circumcisions, are now being circumcised." (*Against the Jews* 77-81) The last phrase obviously refers to the circumcision of the spirit, not the body; otherwise the polemic with the Judaists would be incomprehensible.

In his final reflections, the author of the homily changes the tone of his speech, up to this moment quite harsh towards the Jews and the Judaizers. At the same time, this change makes the title of the homily pointless; it should not be called *Against the Jews* if so much room is devoted by the anonymous preacher to the encouragement of the Jews to conversion. The homily is not directed against the Jews but to the Jews – to encourage them, to change their way of thinking, and to convert them. Although Israel sinned, it is not devoid of chance. It still has the time to change its ways: "The one who you killed now lives, unholy Israel. And yet He did not completely deprive you of hope. For he did give the grace of penance, if you do manage to find some way to repent. Who is so dear, who is so paternal, so merciful? Take - say - salvation, though you have killed me; be an heir with the virgin, though you did not deserve it. If you repent, I will forget." (*Against the Jews* 68-69)

Calendar of the Jews and Christian Dispute over the Date of the Celebration of Easter

According to the Talmud (JT, *Sanh.* 19a; BT, *Ber.* 63a-b), shortly after the fall of the Bar Kokhba uprising (135 AD), rabbi Chanina took refuge in Babylonia where he worked on the development of the Jewish calendar. It is true that the Temple had been in ruins for almost seventy years and no ritual was celebrated there, the custom of sacrifice ceased and it was impossible to make pilgrimages to the Holy City on the occasion of *regalim* (pilgrimage festivals); still, the calendar was the

basis for religious life and non-religious Jewish rituals.[1161] At the time of the Second Temple, the high priest supervised the calendar; after its fall, the rabbis in Palestine took care of it.

Chanina attempted to take the initiative, trying to transfer the responsibility for the shape of the calendar to the Babylonian diaspora but his attempts failed. The rabbis in the land of Israel still had a decisive influence on Jewish religiosity although they moved from Judea to Galilee. It was only after centuries that the Babylonian diaspora took over the dominant role.[1162] The rabbis who lived in Galilee created a tradition according to which living outside of *Eretz Israel* in times of peace was synonymous with idolatry: "It's taught that living in Israel is equal to all the *mitzvot* of the Torah.[…] It's better for a person to live in Israel in a city inhabited mostly by idol worshippers, rather than outside the Land in a city that is completely Jewish." (Tosefta, *Av. zar.* 4,3-6) Evidently, the residents of the Babylonian diaspora did not share this view.

While rabbis were busy working on their calendar, Christians were debating about their own festivals. At the end of the second century the date of the celebration of Easter was not the same for the entire Church. Among Christians there were those who still referred to Jewish tradition and wanted to commemorate the resurrection of Christ at exactly the time of the Jewish Passover, i.e. on the 14th day of the nisan month. Those followers of Christ lived mainly in Asia, and were called Quartodecimans from Latin *quartus decimus* ("14th"). They had strong arguments: on the 14 nisan Jesus and the apostles celebrated the Passover. With this assumption, Easter could be held on any day of the week. A different opinion was expressed by the Christians of Rome, where the commemoration of Christ's resurrection was celebrated on the first Sunday after the Passover because Christ resurrected on Sunday.[1163] In Rome, the custom of celebrating Easter on Sunday was already established at the time of Pope Sixtus (c. 116-126).[1164] Almost until the end of the second century, Asian churches celebrated Easter according to their calendar, and churches related to Rome according to their practices. The former were therefore more strongly influenced by the Jewish tradition.

The situation was to change under Pope Victor (189-198) who decided to unify Easter celebrations for the whole Church. To this end, he excommunicated all those who followed the Quartodecimans. His project was not successful since many bishops rebelled against him. One of Victor's most intense opponents was

---

1161 On the key role of the calendar for religious life of the Jews devoid of the Temple see: S. Stern, *Calendar and Community: A History of Jewish Calendar*, Oxford 2001.

1162 The issue of the influence of rabbinic centres in Palestine (especially in Galilee) and in Babylon on the religious life of the Jews in the first centuries after the fall of the Temple was discussed by I.M. Gafni; *Land Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*, Sheffield 1997.

1163 L.T. Geraty, *From Sabbath to Sunday: Why, How and When"*, 259–260.

1164 F.F. Bruce, *The Spreading Flame*, 260.

Polycrates, the bishop of Ephesus (*Hist eccl.* 5,23-24). The dispute grew stronger. The bishop of Lyon, Irenaeus, made an attempt to encourage the Pope to preserve unity with the Christian communities in Asia (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5,24.10-18). The matter continued to be discussed for over a century as it was not until the Nice Council in 325 when the final decision was made to celebrate Easter on the first Sunday after the full moon of spring.[1165] The emperor Constantine, to whom Eusebius of Caesarea attributed the following words, was to support this opinion: "And first of all, it appeared an unworthy thing that in the celebration of this most holy feast we should follow the practice of the Jews, who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin, and are, therefore, deservedly afflicted with blindness of soul […] Let us then have nothing in common with the detestable Jewish crowd; for we have received from our Saviour a different way." (*Hist. eccl.* 1,9)[1166]

Septimius Severus Against the Jews and Christians (AD 202). Tertullian

In view of the great development of the Church, which seemed to be a threat to the worship of many gods of the Roman Empire, Septimius Severus, in order to secure internal stability, made a decision that proved to be a repression both against the Jews and against the followers of Christ. In a decree dated 202 (or 203), he forbade any proselytizing, Jewish as well as Christian. This decree struck primarily at the Church. The emperor's biographer noted that Severus "gave the citizens of Palestine numerous rights. Under the threat of severe punishment, he forbade conversion to Judaism; he ordered the same for Christians."[1167]

As mentioned several times, after the fall of the Temple in the year 70, and especially after the rebellion of Bar Kokhba in 135, Judaism lost its missionary vigour to a significant degree and actually ceased to be a missionary religion. Meanwhile, Christianity was a very attractive cult for many citizens (and slaves) in the Empire; hence the decree of Septimius Severus struck directly at the evangelizing work of the Church which was spreading and held its door wide open to the pagans. One did not have to wait long for the effect of the emperor's move. The first of these effects was the disorganization of one of the largest intellectual centres of Christianity, namely the Alexandrian school led by Clement (of Alexandria), followed by the outbreak of another wave of persecution directed at the followers of Christ in Egypt, North Africa and Gaul.[1168]

1165 H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70-312)*, 261.

1166 After: L.T. Geraty, *From Sabbath to Sunday: Why, How and When"*, 260–261.

1167 After: M. Wysocki, *Eschatologia okresu prześladowań na podstawie pism Tertuliana i Cypriana*, Lublin 2010, 73.

1168 S. Benoît, *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, 98.

Paradoxically, and even ironically, the decree of Septimius Severus made the two hostile religious communities suffer the same consequences. At that time the Church was separated from the Synagogue throughout almost the whole Empire, and mutual reluctance often appeared wherever there were any contacts between the Jews and Christians. Meanwhile, the emperor's decree turned out to be equally sinister for both religious communities. The equal treatment of the Jews and Christians by the emperor did not bring the two religions closer to each other and subsequently caused an even greater split and mutual reproach.

There is a supposition that although, generally speaking, both communities were perceived by society and also by local authorities as separate, there were at least some environments in which Christians were still confused with the Jews. This is evidenced by the confusion of Jews and Christians in the years 218–222, at the time of Elagabalus who intended to place the cults of the Jews, the Samaritans and Christians in the same temple.[1169]

This was the time when the works of the apologetist Tertullian were created.[1170] Although the subject of Judaism was not of primary interest for the Carthage author of *Apologeticus*, he sometimes made references to the Jews in his writings. Tertullian calls synagogues the "fountains of persecution" (*fontes persecutorum*; *Scorpiace* 10,10).[1171] The Romans were supposed to persecute Christians, among other reasons, because of bad opinions about them spread by the Jews. Tertullian cites the sentences of some Romans: "It is just in the same way that you are in the habit of saying of us: 'Lucius Titus is a good man, only he is a Christian'" while another says, "I wonder that so worthy man as Caius Seius has become a Christian." (*Apol.* 3,1) These statements were allegedly uttered because of the bad opinion expressed about the Christians by the Jews.[1172]

In another work the writer of Carthage speaks about a certain follower of Judaism who spread untrue information about Christians and walked the streets holding a donkey's head with a caption *Deus christianorum onocoetes* ("the donkey God of Christians"). "As a result the whole city is talking about the Donkey Priest." (*Ad nat.* I, 14.2) Tertullian also mentions a day-long debate of a certain Christian with a Jewish proselyte, a debate that did not bring any results (*Adv. Iud.* 1,1).[1173] It is interesting to note that the accusation that Christians cultivated the

1169 J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, , 93; M. Wysocki, *Eschatologia okresu prześladowań na podstawie pism Tertuliana i Cypriana*, 74–75.

1170 S. Adamiak, *Żydzi w rzymskiej Afryce Północnej*, BPT 7 (2014) 1, 100–101.

1171 P. Fredriksen, *What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, 58.

1172 W.H.C. Frend, *Tertuliano e gli Ebrei*, RSLR 4 (1968) 3–10; W.H.C. Frend, *A Note on Tertulian and the Jews*, StPatr 10 (1970) 291–296; D.M. Scholer, *Tertulian on Jewish Persecution of Christians*, StPatr 17 (1982) 821–828.

1173 Tertullian also gives us information about the language of African Jews. According to him, they meet every Saturday to read the Bible in their own language – which

cult of a donkey was initially addressed against the Jews. This clearly shows that Christianity was seen as a religion associated with Judaism at Tertullian's time. The Jews were accused of the alleged cult of the donkey as early as around 200 BC, which, according to Josephus, was confirmed by Mnaseas from Patara:

> According to that testimony, during the long war against the Idumaeans, the Jews were approached by a certain Zabidus, a worshipper of the god Apollo in the Idumaean city of Adora. Zabidus promised to deliver the Idumaean god into the hands of the Jews if they would let into their temple alone (and watch him from a distance). After having gained the Jew's trust Zabidus built a wooden structure with three rows of lamps, bound it to his body, and by walking back and forth, gave those watching from a distance the impression that the stars were walking on the ground. Shocked at the illusion, the cheated Jews stood far away, while Zabidus maintaining silence. Zabidus with all peace went into the tabernacle and tore the golden head of ass - as they jokingly wrote - and expeditiously returned to Adora. (*Ap.* 2,112-114)[1174]

Josephus confirms this information in another place, accusing Apion that he had the nerve to claim that the Jews placed the head of a donkey in the sanctuary and worshipped it as worthy of the greatest respect (*Ap.* 2,80). There are similar remarks in Plutarch (*Quest. conv.* 4,5) or Tacitus (*Hist.* 5,4).[1175]

Let us, however, return to Tertullian. The fact that at his time the Jewish community in Carthage was in really good shape is evidenced by the tombstones of Gamart, a town on the Mediterranean coast, not far from Carthage. The opinion of researchers about the inscriptions on tombstones discovered in the 1880s was not unequivocal. According to some, they prove that the entire cemetery belonged to the Jewish community, while according to others, Christians could also be buried

---

probably means Hebrew, and not Aramaic. He also mentions that Carthage Jews referred to Christians as Nazarenes; S. Adamiak, *Żydzi w rzymskiej Afryce Północnej*, 101.

1174 The town of Dora is probably Idumaen Adora; A. Kasher. *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities during the Second Temple Period (332 BCE – 70 CE)*, Tübingen 1990, 51–52.

1175 The history of the tradition concerning the cult of a donkey was drew up by B. Bar-Kochva (*An Ass in Jerusalem Temple – the Origins and Developement of the Slander*, in: *Josephus' Contra Apionem. Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*, ed. L.H. Feldman, J.R. Levison, Leiden – New York – Köln 1996, 310–326). He shows pre-Greek genesis of the tradition of Moses mounting an ass. It was created in Egypt at the time of Persian domination. Its genesis is linked to the identification by the Egyptians of newcomers from the east, usually hostile nomads, with god Typhon who was presented in the form of an ass or covered with donkey skin; P. Piwowarczyk, *Negatywny obraz Żydów w starożytności klasycznej i jego uwarunkowania*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 160.

in this necropolis. The latter opinion is based on non-Jewish decorative elements on tombstones and lamps found inside the graves. What is more, the vast majority of the inscriptions were engraved in Latin. In any case, there is no doubt that the Jews and Christians lived side by side in Carthage, which naturally had to result in mutual contacts.[1176] Their echoes can be found in the work *Adversus Iudaeos* by Tertullian.

The echoes of the Jewish way of looking at Jesus, Tertullian included in yet another of his works, entitled *De spectaculis*. The work was written at the turn of the second century. In a few phrases the author contained a lot of allegations of the Jews against Jesus:

> This is that carpenter's or hireling's son, that Sabbath-breaker, that Samaritan and devil-possessed! This is He whom you purchased from Judas! This is He whom you struck with reed and fist, whom you contemptuously spat upon, to whom you gave gall and vinegar to drink! This is He whom His disciples secretly stole away, that it might be said He had risen again, or the gardener abstracted, that his lettuces might come to no harm from the crowds of visitants! (*De spect.* 30,6)[1177]

The North African theologian draws the allegations that he puts into the mouths of the Jews straight from the evangelical tradition. This is where Jesus is called the son of a carpenter (Mt 13:55; Mk 6:3) hanging about with harlots (Lk 7:36-50; Jn 8:1-11). The Jews in the Gospels accuse Jesus of breaking the Sabbath law (Mt 12:1-14; Mk 2:23 – 3:6; Lk 6:1-11) and say that He is possessed by the evil spirit (Mt 9:34; 10:25; Mk 15:19; Jn 19:3). The Gospels confirm that Samaritan descent is ascribed to Jesus (Jn 8:48; 10:20). The evangelists tell the story of the betrayal of Jesus by Judas for money (Mt 27:30; Mk 19; Jn 19:3). The thought of alleged stealing of the body of Jesus from the tomb also appears in the Gospel (Mt 27:64; 28:12-15).[1178] It goes without saying that Tertullian derived these accusations from personal polemics with the Jews but it is also almost certain that he used the evangelical material.

Tertullian does not reject the Old Testament scriptural tradition of Israel but calls it the treasure (Latin *thesaurus*) of the entire Jewish religion and in consequence also of Christianity. He knows that for the Romans, Judaism is a respectful religion with a long tradition. For this reason, he proves that Moses had been earlier than Homer, and the prophets had been acting in Israel even before the Greek philosophers appeared (*Apol.* 19,2).[1179] On the other hand, although he is Marcion's theological opponent (as evidenced by the letter *Against Marcion*), he

---

1176 G.D. Dunn, *Tertullian*, The Early Church Fathers, London – New York 2004, 32–33.

1177 Tertulian, *O widowiskach (De spectaculis)*, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1970, 113.

1178 M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, 101.

1179 N. Willert, *Tertulian*, in: *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, 179.

agrees with him on one thing: in the Old Testament, God acted more severely and more dangerously than at the time of the New Covenant. This is happening for one reason: God of the Old Testament had to deal with a nation much more stubborn than the Gentiles to whom the Good News was preached.[1180]

The Beginnings of Talmudic Tradition about Jesus and Christians

As it has been mentioned in the chaper presenting sources, the Talmud is a relatively late work, since its editing dates back to the sixth or seventh century, or even later years.[1181] Nevertheless, the Mishnah, which is part of the Talmud, was probably edited at the end of the second century. Such dating allows us to assume that the Talmudic traditions about Jesus and Christians were already – at least in part – shaped at the time of the final edition of the Mishnah. As Mirosław Wróbel rightly notes, Talmudic texts about Jesus and His followers are not a continuous block but are scattered in various tractates. A proper evaluation of sources should take into account the historical context of their origin (the Palestinian context and the Babylonian context) which largely shaped the nature and intensity of the polemics between Judaism and Christianity. While evaluating the sources one should take into account the fact that Jewish communities in Palestine and in Babylonia lived in different political and social circumstances.[1182]

Passages concerning Jesus and Christians in the Talmud reflect the attitude of original Judaism towards Christianity and can go back as far as the first century.[1183] There is still a debate among the researchers about which passages actually originally spoke of Jesus and which ones over time began to be interpreted as references to Jesus or Christians (although they did not initially refer to them). The references to this discussion made below do not lose sight of the fact that both groups of texts are of little historical value.[1184] On the one hand, this is due to the fact that for the Jews, Jesus was not an extremely important figure (Judaism of the

1180 G.D. Dunn, *Tertullian*, 33–34.

1181 Because of the position of the Talmud in Israel's religious tradition, some call the people of God's choice not the "people of the book", but the "people of two books" (the Bible and the Talmud); H. Freedman, *Talmud. Biografia*, 11.

1182 M. Wróbel, *Antyewangelia w źródłach rabinicznych*, VC 2 (2014) 220; M. Wróbel, *Terminologia pism rabinicznych w odniesieniu do Jezusa i Jego wyznawców*, RH 62 (2014) 8, 79–80.

1183 These texts reflect the polemic between rabbinic Judaism and Christianity whose beginnings go back to the first century; M. Wróbel, *Krytyka tekstologiczna i historyczna passusów Talmudu o Jezusie i chrześcijaństwie*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 47.

1184 M. Wróbel, *Antyewangelia w źródłach rabinicznych*, 222.

first century knows at least a few cases of people claiming to be the Messiah); on the other hand, it is the result of conscious, as it seems, silence about Jesus and Christianity in rabbinic sources. The environment in which the two versions of the Talmud came into existence should be taken into account.

The Jewish community in Palestine lived in different conditions than the Jews in the Babylonian diaspora. The former was shaped under the Roman rule at the time when Christianity was growing in strength; the Babylonian community developed mainly during the reign of the Sasanian Empire, when Christians were persecuted by Persian rulers. At the time of the edition of the Jerusalem Talmud (from the 3rd to the 5th cent.), Christianity dominated in Palestine; hence its editors could consciously ignore the references to Jesus and Christians not to unnecessarily expose themselves to conflict and criticism.

In the Babylonian Talmud, however, there are many more references, as the rabbis there belonged to a larger religious community than the Christians and could express their hostile attitude towards Jesus and His disciples more freely.[1185] The presence of Christians in Mesopotamia is evidenced by the fact that many of Christ's followers were deported from Antioch to Persia during the early Sasanian rule. This means not only mutual contacts between Christians and the Jews but also, as confirmed by passages included in the Talmud, that conversions to Christianity occurred among the followers of Judaism.[1186]

Already in the first decades of the existence of the Church, the belief in the birth of Jesus from the Holy Spirit spread among Christians. The truth about the virgin birth strengthened with the passing of time which is evidenced by the Infancy Gospels (Mt 1-2; Lk 1-2). In response to such beliefs of the followers of Christ, in rabbinic Judaism there appeared a charge of bastardry against the founder of Christianity. What is more, the truth about Christ's virgin birth went hand in hand with the strengthening of the conviction of his divine filiation, that is to say of his deity, which, in the opinion of the Jews, overtly opposed the idea of monotheism and had to encounter a fierce reaction. According to the tractate *Sanhedrin,* Jesus was not only born out of wedlock, but was known as the proponent of heresy:

> For it has been taught: And for all others for whom the Torah decrees death, witnesses are not hidden, excepting for this one. How is it done? - A light is lit in an inner chamber, the witnesses are hidden in an outer one [which is in darkness], so that they can see and hear him, but he cannot see them. Then the person he wished to seduce says to him, "Tell me privately what thou hast proposed to me'; and he does so. Then he remonstrates; 'But how shall we forsake our God in Heaven, and serve idols'? If he

1185 M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*,189–190.

1186 J. Ciecieląg, *Żydzi pod rządami Sasanidów*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 168.

> retracts, it is well. But if he answers: 'It is our duty and seemly for us', the witnesses who were listening outside bring him to the Beth din, and have him stoned. 'And this they did to Ben Stada in Lydda [Jesus], and they hung him on the eve of Passover. Ben Stada was Ben Padira. R. Hisda said: 'The husband was Stada - the paremour Pandira. But was nor the husband Pappos b. Judah? His mother's name was Stada. But his mother was Miriam, a dresser of woman's hair? - As they say in Pumbaditha. This woman has turned away from her husband. (BT, *Sanh.* 67,1)[1187]

The last sentence of the quoted passage raises a certain linguistic doubt: perhaps the Hebrew term *megaddela*, meaning a woman who does hair, is a deformation of Mary Magdalene's name… Then we would have the overlapping of two traditions here: one relating to Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and the other one to the figure of Mary from Magdala.[1188]

The name of Jesus' father is also uncertain. Let us first devote some attention to the name of Pantera. In the same way he is called in the tractate *Hullin (*2,22-23). In other manuscripts, the following options can be found: Pantira, Pandera, Panteri. Researchers in different ways explain the origin of the name and its variants. In general, one of the three proposed explanations are accepted. Some claim that it is a distortion of the Greek *parthenos*; this would be a reference to the belief of Christians that Mary was a virgin.[1189] Others believe, following Origen who put such a conviction in Celsus' mouth, that, in the opinion of the Jews, the father of Jesus was a Roman soldier named Pantera: "[…] speaking of the mother of Jesus, and saying that when she was pregnant she was turned out of doors by the carpenter to whom she had been betrothed, as having been guilty of adultery, and that she bore a child to a certain soldier named Pantera." (*Cel.* 1,32). Still others see

---

1187 cf. K. Bardski; *Teksty z tradycji hebrajskich dotyczących Jezusa*, 163–169. There is a parallel text in the Jerusalem Talmud describing the stoning of Jesus in Lydda (Lod). It is known that there was an important Christian community there: "In the case of any one who is liable to death penalties enjoined in the Torah, it is not proper to lie in wait for him except he be a beguiler. How do they lie in wait? Two scholars are stationed in an inner room, while the culprit is in an outer room. A candle is lit and so placed that they can see him as well as hear his voice And so they did to Ben Stada in Lod. They concealed two scholars [from the school of Torah], and stoned him" (*Sanh.* 7,16).

1188 Tertulian knows the charge of bastardy against Jesus (*De spectaculis* 30,6). The apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus* (2,3-6) depicts the Jewish elders accusing Jesus of his bastardy ("He was born from adultery") in the presence of Pilate, Annas and Caiaphas. If indeed Jesus had been a child of adultery, He could not have been tried by the Sanhedrin, because the Law forbids it: "No half-breed may be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh." (Dt 23:3).

1189 J. Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth*, Berlin 1934², 32; D. Rokeah, *Ben Stara Is Ben Pantera – Towards the Clarification of a Philological-Historical Problem*, Tarbiz 39 (1969–1970) 14; M. Hengel, *Die vier Evangelien und das eine Evangelium von Jesus Christus*, Tübingen 2008, 342; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, Princeton 2007, 16–21.

in the name an alternated form of the Aramaic adjective *pattira* – "sent away."[1190] It would mean that Jesus was the son of a woman who had been sent away and thus divorced.

In the text from 634 AD, entitled the *Didascalies of Jacob*, a scholar from Tiberias depicts the family tree of Jesus: Jesus' mother was the daughter of Joachim, the son of Pantera, brother of Melchi, from the family of Nathan, the son of David.[1191] Saint John of Damascus thinks that it was Mary's grandfather whose name was Pantera (*De fid. orth.* 4,14). In any case, the Talmudic mentions which deny Jesus the virgin conception are not only a rejection of this one truth but also undermine the whole Christianity, since they call into question the descent of Jesus from the family of David and thus query his messianic mission.[1192]

There are other attempts to explain the name of Pantera in reference to the father of Jesus. Some researchers associate this name with an animal known for the fact that it can reproduce with other types of wild cats. Thus the offspring of a panther and a lion is the leopard. It would therefore be an allusion to Mary's unlawful relationship with someone who could be compared to a panther.[1193] Others, following Epiphanius (*Haer.* 3,78,7) and John Damascene, conclude that Pantera was the name of Jesus' grandfather, the father of Joseph.[1194]

Another name under which Jesus was supposed to be known is Ben Stada (in other versions: Ben Stara; BT, *Sab.* 104,2). To date, there is no consensus between the authors on how to interpret them. According to some, it refers to Mary, and the term Stada (or: Stara) should be translated as "unfaithful." Others think that Ben Stada is the nickname of Jesus.[1195] Still others object to such identification.[1196]

1190 E. Lipiński, *Pandera & Stada and Jehoshua bar Perachya*, in: *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 66.

1191 F. Manns, *Leggere la Mišnah*, 70.

1192 P. Schäfer in the following words summarizes Talmudic narratives about the descent of Jesus: "This powerful counternarrative shakes the foundations of the Christian message. It is not just a malicious distortion of the birth story (any such moralizing categories are completely out of place here); rather, it posits that the whole idea of Jesus' David's descent, his claim to be the Messiah, and ultimately his claim to be the son of God, are based on fraud"; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 22.

1193 H. Laible, *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar and Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Cambridge 1893, 23–25.

1194 J.Z. Lauterbach, *Rabbinical Essays*, Cincinnati 1951, 473–487.

1195 Thus: B. Pick, *Jesus in the Talmud. His Personality, His disciples and his sayings*, Chicago 1913, 13–28; W. Ziffer, *Two epithets for Jesus of Nazareth in the Talmud and Midrash*, JBL 85 (1966) 356–357; the latter proposes to change in Hebrew the word *dalet* into *nun*, to obtain 'ben Satana'.

1196 F.F. Bruce, *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, London 1974, 54–65; J. Schwarz, *Ben Stada and Peter in Lydda*, JSJ 21 (1990) 1–18; E. Lipiński, *Pandera & Stada and Jehoshua bar Perachya*, 51–66. Others propose the term "Stada" derived from Greek *stauros* – "cross." For the Jews the cross was a symbol

A detailed study of both names has been carried out recently by Edward Lipiński who has reached the following conclusions: the names Pandera and Stada, ascribed to Jesus' father in the later Talmudic tradition, are incorrectly passed on in certain manuscripts and in printed texts based on them. These phrases originally sounded like *pantira*, the by-form of the Aramaic female adjective of *pattira*, "sent away," and *sotera*, which is an Aramaic version of the originally Greek word "Saviour." The term *ben-pantira,* therefore, suggested that Jesus was the son of a woman sent away by her husband. This opinion was already rejected by the Gospel according to Matthew 1:20, at the end of the first century AD. The term *ben-sotera*, "son / disciple of the Saviour" had to refer to an unknown Judeo-Christian, tortured to death in Lydda, probably at the beginning of the second century AD. The spelling and the meaning of both terms were distorted over the years, especially in the Babylonian Talmud.[1197]

There are authors who see Jesus in the Talmudic mentions of Balaam (JT, *Ber.* 3,3; BT, *Sanh.* 106:1-2; *Bawa barta* 14,2).[1198] According to Nb 22:5 – 24:25, Balaam was a Gentile who was supposed to utter curses over Israel but thanks to God's intervention he blessed the people. Apparently, he also induced Israelites to an illegal idolatrous worship (Nb 25). However, there are not enough arguments to prove the identification of Jesus of Nazareth with the Talmudic Balaam.

As far as the content of the quoted passage is concerned, there are significant discrepancies here when compared to the evangelists' accounts of the death of Jesus (Mt 26-27; Mk 15; Lk 22-23; Jn 18-20). According to the Jewish Law, the deceiver of the people should be killed by stoning (Dt 13,7-12), and this is probably why the punishment is mentioned in reference to Jesus. The Talmud emphasizes that the hanging of Jesus took place on the Eve of the Passover, and the manuscript from Florence adds that it was the day before the Sabbath. The author of the passage mentions the words of Rabbi ben Chasda, an Amorite living at the turn of the third and fourth centuries. According to him, Jesus was known under two names because one was used by Mary's husband and the other by her lover (cf. BT, *Sab.* 104,2).[1199]

In the Talmud, Jesus is also accused of practising magic: "R. Eliezer said to the Sages: Isn't it true that Ben Stara brought witchcraft out of Egypt by marking on his flesh? They said to him: He was an idiot, and one does not bring proofs from idiots. Wasn't he rather the son of Pandira!" *(Sab.* 104,2; the *Bab.)* The cuts on the skin indicate tattoos. Indeed, in another place in the Talmud, the figure of Ben Stada returns in the context of making tattoos: "He who upon the Sabbath cuts letters upon his body is, according to the view of R. Eliezer guilty, according to the view

of a curse; thus: D. Rokeah, *Ben Stara Is Ben Pantera – Towards the Clarification of a Philological-Historical Problem*, 17.

1197 E. Lipiński, *Pandera and Stada*, SJ 11 (2008) 2, 205.

1198 R.T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 73–74.

1199 P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 28–30.

of the wise not guilty. R. Eliezer said to the wise: Ben Stada surely learned sorcery by such writing. They replied to him: Should we in any wise on account of a fool destroy all reasonable men?" (*Sab.* 11,15) As follows from the above, Ben Stada's opinion should not be taken into account when discussing whether one is allowed to make a tattoo on the Sabbath day as he is considered to be foolish.

Researchers do not speak with one voice about the identity of the "son of Stada." Perhaps this name refers to the prophet who came from Egypt and who allegedly predicted the fall of Jerusalem. The Acts of the Apostles say: "Some time ago there arose Theudas. He claimed to be someone important, and collected about four hundred followers; but when he was killed, all his followers scattered and that was the end of them." (Ac 5:36) It is also possible that it might be a figure with whom the tribune identified Paul when he asked him: "Aren't you the Egyptian who started the recent revolt and led those four thousand cut-throats out into the desert?" (Ac 21:38)

The event is described by Josephus: "Moreover, there came out of Egypt about this time to Jerusalem one that said he was a prophet, and advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives, as it was called, which lay over against the city, and at the distance of five furlongs. He said further, that he would show them from hence how, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem would fall down; and he promised them that he would procure them an entrance into the city through those walls, when they were fallen down. Now when Felix was informed of these things, he ordered his soldiers to take their weapons, and came against them with a great number of horsemen and footmen from Jerusalem, and attacked the Egyptian and the people that were with him. He also slew four hundred of them, and took two hundred alive. But the Egyptian himself escaped out of the fight, but did not appear any more." *(Ant.* 20,8,6; cf. *Bell.* 2,13,5)

In any event, the above mentioned allegation of practising magic returns in the tractate *Sanhedrin*: "It was taught: On the eve of the Passover Yeshu was hanged. For forty days before the execution took place, a herald went forth and cried, 'He is going forth to be stoned because he has practised sorcery and enticed Israel to apostasy. Anyone who can say anything in his favour, let him come forward and plead on his behalf.' But since nothing was brought forward in his favour he was hanged on the eve of the Passover!" (*Sanh.* 43,1)[1200] According to the Jewish custom, the herald had to announce for forty days the judgment concerning Jesus but, because of the lack of voices defending him, Jesus was to be first stoned and then hanged. Stoning was the punishment imposed by the Jewish Law, while crucifixion was the punishment envisaged by the Roman Law.[1201]

1200 The whole passage was removed from the Vilnius edition of the Talmud whereas in manuscript from Florence (II. 1.8–9) the name of Jesus Nazarene was removed.

1201 More about the punishment by crucifixion in the Roman Law see: M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, Philadelphia 1977; G.S. Sloyan, *Crucifixion of Jesus: History, Myth, Faith*, Minneapolis 1995; F.T. Zugibe, *The Crucifixion of Jesus: A Forensic Inquiry*, New York 2005.

According to the tractate *Sabbath* (14,4) in the Jerusalem Talmud also the disciples of Jesus practised healing. One of them was, for example, Jacob of Kephar Sama (or Jacob of Kefar Sekanya mentioned in the Midrash *Qoheleth Rabbah* to Koh 1,4 cited below):

> There was a case in which a snake bit Eleazar ben Dama. Jacob of Kephar Sama arrived to heal him in the name of Jesus [Yeshua]son of Pantira. But Rabbi Ishmael did not permit it. [Jacob] said: "I will bring you proof (from the scriptures) that [Jesus] may heal me!" But he died before he was able to produce the proof. Rabbi Ishmael said to him: Happy are you, O Ben Dama, for you left this world in peace and did not break through the fence of sages, and so in dying you have carried out that which has been said: "A serpent will bite him who breaks through a wall" And did not a snake already bite him? But a snake will not bite him in the age to come.[1202]

The same story is told in the tractate *Hullin* (2,22-23) where it is inscribed in the context of the reflection on dealing with heretics (*minim*): books of heretics should be considered as magic, no commercial transactions with heretics should be conducted, their children must not be taught any craft and it is even forbidden to seek their treatment (*Hullin* 2,20-21). Rabbis Ben Dama and Ishmael presented here belonged to the second generation of Tannaim and therefore they were active at the turn of the first century. Ben Dama was the nephew of rabbi Ishmael, known for his uncompromising attitude towards heretics.[1203] As it can be seen in the quoted passage, the prohibition to seek medical help from heretics was advanced to such an extent that it was better to die than to be healed by a dissenter in the name of Jesus. The authors here cite Qoheleth as a reference: "he who undermines a wall gets bitten by a snake." (Qo 10,8) The "wall" is of course the "wall around the Law," put by Pharisees and rabbis.

Jacob, mentioned in the passage of the *Sabbath* (14,4), was allegedly the cause of profound unhappiness suffered by Eleazar ben Hyrcanus. Eleazar's disciples suggested that the reason for this sadness might be the fact that he believed in

---

1202 It is impossible not to notice the irony which this passage contains: "Eleazar b. Dama keeps company with a heretic and wants to be healed by him and his potent charm, but his merciless uncle prefers the beloved nephew to die rather than to be healed by a heretic. The bitter irony of Ishmael's behaviour can hardly be missed. Instead of justifying his refusal to accept the heretic's healing power with an appropriate verse from the Bible, Ishmael resorts to the authority of the rabbis: what a happy death did you die, Ben Dama – not because you did not transgress the commandments of the Torah, no, because you did not transgress the commandments of us, your fellow rabbis. For transgressing the hedge or fence that we erected around the Torah inevitably results in death. We, the rabbis, are much more powerful than any of these heretics because it is we who ultimately decide about life and death"; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 55.

1203 The event in question is dated before the Bar Kochba revolt; M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, 87.

some teaching preached by Christians. The rabbi reacted in the following way to the suggestion of his disciples: "Once I was walking in the main street of Sepphoris, and met Jacob of Kefar Sekanya, who repeated to me a heretical saying in the name of [Jesus ben Pantera] which pleased me well" This conversation concerned the imperative Dt 23:19: "You must not bring the wages of a prostitute […] to the house of Yahweh your God." Jacob suggested that the money earned this way should be spent on building bathhouses and toilets. Eleazar confirmed the rightness of such a decision, thus confirming the words of the apostate and attracting disease upon himself (*KohRab* to 1,24).[1204]

In the quoted midrash, Jesus is described as "someone" (Hebrew *peloni*)[1205] because some texts do not mention His name following the tradition in which the name *Yeshu* constitutes an abbreviation of the first letters (acrostic) of words in the sentence: "May his name and memory be obliterate." The Talmud in the tractate *Avodah Zara* speaks about the same thing in a slightly different manner:

> When he [rabbi Eleazar] came home, his disciples called on him to console him, but he would accept no consolation. Said R. Akiba to him, 'Master, wilt thou permit me to say one thing of what thou hast taught me?' He replied, 'Say it.' 'Master,' said he, 'perhaps some of the teaching of the Minim had been transmitted to thee and thou didst approve of it and because of that thou wast arrested?' He exclaimed: 'Akiba thou hast reminded me.' I was once walking in the upper-market of Sepphoris when I came across one [of the disciples of Jesus the Nazarene] Jacob of Kefar-Sekaniah by name, who said to me: It is written in your Torah, Thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot . . . into the house of the Lord thy God. May such money be applied to the erection of a retiring place for the High Priest? To which I made no reply. Said he to me: Thus was I taught [by Jesus the Nazarene], For of the hire of a harlot hath she gathered the and unto the hire of a harlot shall they return. Those words pleased me very much, and that is why I was arrested for apostasy; for thereby I transgressed the scriptural

1204 A similar record is contained in the treatise *Avoda Zara* (16:2; bab.).

1205 Jesus is thus called in the treatise *Chagiga* 4,2 (bab.) but the remark is of little historical value and is a vague reference to *Sab.* 104,2 (Bab.). In the treatise *Yoma* 66,2 (TB), the name Peloni is associated with "the world to come", which could indicate the eschatological ideas proclaimed by Jesus but there are not enough arguments to support this thesis. If the passage of the Mishnaic treatise *Jevamot* speaks of Jesus, or at least was related to the figure of Jesus over the centuries of interpretation (although at first it could refer to someone else), the conclusion which can be drawn is that the *peloni*, Jesus, was a bastard: "Who is a bastard?… R. Shimon ben Azzai said: I found a book of genealogies in Jerusalem and in it is written: 'The man Plony is a bastard' "; M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, 82.

> words, Remove thy way far from her - which refers to minut - and come not nigh to the door of her house - which refer to the ruling power.' (*Av. zar.* 16, 2-17.1)[1206]

In this passage Jesus was called a Nazarene as in Mt 2:23. Christians were called Nazarenes in Ac 24:5, and the name appears in one of the versions of the twelfth blessing of the prayer discussed earlier: *Shemone Esre*.[1207] Eleazar ben Hyrcanus, who is described in this passage taken from the Talmud, was excluded from the Jewish community for his relationship with Judeo-Christians. The punishment was put on him by Gamaliel II.[1208] The fact that this passage refers to Christians is evidenced by a few facts: heretics are called *minim*, and this term in rabbinic texts often referred to Christians; heresy is defined by the term *minut* derived from the same root as *minim*; finally, there appears here a figure of Jacob of Kefar Sekanya who in many rabbinic writings is recognized as a Christian. Some researchers even suggest that Eleazar ben Hyrcanus could have participated in Christian love-feasts which, according to rabbis, were of orgiastic nature.[1209] Such an interpretation can be confirmed by the reference to Pr 5:8 where heresy in the interpretation of rabbis should be linked to prostitution.[1210]

Some researchers claim that Jesus appears in the Talmud also under the name of Balaam. If so, it is Jesus to whom we should refer the fragment in which Rabbi Hanina's interlocutor states: "Balaam, the lame, was thirty-three years old when the robber Pinchas killed him." (BT, *Sanh.* 106,2) *The Stories of Balaam* are probably the Gospels, and the allusion to the priest Hele (Pinches; 1Sm 2:12) should be related to Pontius Pilate. Hanina's interlocutor was supposed to be "a certain apostate," i.e. probably a Christian. It is questionable, however, if this passage really

---

1206 The name Yeshu the Nazarene appears in the manuscripts of Munich (95), New York (15) and Paris (1337); M. Wróbel, *Krytyka tekstologiczna i historyczna passusów Talmudu o Jezusie i chrześcijaństwie*, 18–19.

1207 The name "Nazarenes" is discussed in the work by S.C. Mimouni (*Les Nazoréens. Recherche étymologique et historique*, RB 105 (1998) 208–262).

1208 G. Alon, *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.)*, I, Jerusalem 1980, 292.

1209 "R. Eliezer becomes the rabbinic doppelgänger of Jesus. He combines in his person and life two major strands of the rabbinic perception of Jesus and his followers: sexual excesses and magical power. Hence, it is not just the painful process of the breaking-off of 'Christianity' from 'Judaism', which becomes apparent here; rather, we get a glimpse at the weapons that the rabbinic Jews used in order not only to demarcate themselves from Christian Jews but to fight against them with all the means at their disposal. And a fight to the death it was, because even the Roman governor acquitted R. Eliezer of the charge of sexual orgies and even heaven approved of his use of magic against rabbinic reasoning, of anarchic and destructive power against sober interpretation of the Torah, of 'Christianity' against the rabbinic version of 'Judaism' "; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 51.

1210 Thus: J. Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*, Darmstadt 1978, 152–154.

speaks of Jesus, for three reasons: it is doubtful that Christians should ask a Jew about the age of Jesus; it is not clear why Pilate should be seen in Pinchas; it is unlikely that the Gospels would be called the *Stories of Balaam.*

Some also refer to Jesus a fragment of the Babylonian Talmud from the *Sanhedrin* tractate where Balaam is mentioned: "Balaam also the son of Beor. A soothsayer? A soothsayer? But he was a prophet! R. Johanan said: At first he was a prophet, but subsequently a soothsayer. R. Papa observed: This is what men say, 'She who was the descendant of princes and governors, played the harlot with carpenters.' " (*Sanh.* 106,1)[1211] It is much more probable that the following passage speaks of Jesus: "If a man says to thee 'I am God', he lies; If he says, 'I am the Son of Man', he shall rue it. If he says 'I ascend to haeven', he has said it, and will not affect it." (JT, *Taan.* 9,2)[1212] Allusions to the teaching of Jesus and to the events described in the Gospels may be clearly seen here.

The next mention related to Jesus contains the idiom "to burn food." This phrase means the same as betraying the orthodox teaching. The Talmudic commentary to Ps 91,10 confirms it: "There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plaque come nigh thy dwelling [means] that thou mayst not have a son or a disciple who burns his food in public like Jeshu the Nazarene." *(Sanh.* 103,1)[1213] According to other researchers the phrase "to burn food" (similar to "to spoil food") indicates sexual abuse. The tractate *Berakhot* (17,2) states: "you will not have a son or a disciple who publicly spoils his food like Jesus the Nazarene (Yeshu ha-Notzri)."[1214] Jesus was juxtaposed in this tractate with Ahitophel who betrayed the king (2Sm 16:20-23), Doeg who used to kill the priests (1Sm 22,18-19), and Gehazi the servant of Elisha whom he robbed (2K 5:20-27).[1215] In the Mishnah (*Sanh.* 10,2) these three characters

1211 The Vatican Manuscript marked with number 108 clearly states that the text refers to Jesus; M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, 86.

1212 S.T. Lachs, *R. Abbahu and the Minnim*, JQR 60 (1970) 197–198.

1213 Some editions omit the words "Jesus Nazarene." The name of Jesus Nazarene can also be found in the following text: "Our Rabbis taught: Let the left hand repulse but the right hand always invite back: not as Elisha, who thrust Gehazi away with both hands, and not like R. Joshua b. Perahjah, who repulsed Jesus" (*Sanhedrin* 107,2). The censored editions of the Talmud do not contain the phrase "and not like R. Joshua b. Perahjah, who repulsed Jesus (the Nazarene) with both hands."

1214 This lesson is included in the Munich (95) and Florence (II.1.8-9) manuscripts.

1215 The anonymous author of this passage of the Mishnah does not justify the comparison of Jesus with these characters: "From this Mishna it becomes clear that Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi (and in addition Balaam) are listed together because they are the only four private individuals (in contrast to three kings) who are excluded from what is actually, as the Mishna maintains, reserved for all of Israel. The anonymous author of the Mishna does not give any justification for his harsh verdict"; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 32.

appear next to Balaam and it is claimed that they will not have the participation in the life to come.

There is one more reference which is sometimes read by researchers as an allusion to Jesus. It is included in the tractate *Sabbath* (116,1-2). A woman came to Rabbi Gamaliel, the teacher of St Paul and in a sense the defender of Christians. She demanded an inheritance from her father. According to her acquittance, described as "a philosopher," she was entitled to it. The acquaintance presumably cited the teaching of Jesus claiming that both the son and the daughter are entitled to the inheritance. Gamaliel, recalling the words of Jesus "I have not come to endure the Law or the Prophets" (Mt 5:17), argued that Moses' rules were still valid, and according to them the daughter had the right to inherit only after the death of the son: "If a man dies without sons, his heritage will pass to his daughter" (Nb 27:8b). The anecdote ends with the words: "She said to him. Let your light shine as a lamp! R. Gamaliel said: The ass has come and has crushed the lamp." The last sentence allegedly contains an allusion to Jesus. This interpretation is confirmed by the Oxford Codex where the already mentioned acquaintance of the interlocutor of Gamaliel directly refers to the Gospel. Other commentators, instead of "the Gospel" here, use an insulting phrase *Avon Gilion* ("sinful margin"). The philosopher's claim would also prove the messianic status of Jesus because, as Christians believe, he was born of the Virgin and was a descendant of David, and therefore could inherit the promises given to David through his mother.

It is worth having a closer look at the term *gilion* which in the plural (*gilionim*) was most probably referred to the Gospels.[1216] Since it refers to an empty margin of manuscripts, it is therefore possible to use it in an ironic sense: by phonetic similarity in the writings of the rabbis it may signify the emptiness of the Gospel's content.[1217] What is more, in these texts the term *gilionim* often appears next to the term *sifre minim* meaning "the books of heretics," including Christian books.[1218] So it could indicate the New Testament writings, Early Christian extra-biblical writings, as well as the books of the Hebrew Bible that were copied by Christians. In the latter case, not the very content of the books but the fact that Christians

1216 Not all scientists agree with this statement. According to R.T. Herford, this term indicates unwritten parts of a manuscript (margins) on which different glosses, annotations, biblical quotes were added; R.T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, 155; G. Alon, *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.)*, 276–277. Others relate the term to the Apocalypse of St John which in Syriac was called *Gilion*; H.P. Chajes, *La lingua ebraica nel cristianesimo primitivo*, Florence 1905, 9.

1217 G.F. Moore, *The Definition of the Jewish Canon and the Repudiation of Christian Scriptures*, in: *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader*, ed. S. Leiman, New York 1974, 115–117.

1218 There are researchers who see in the *sifre minim* the original redaction of the Gospel according to Matthew and Mark; C.C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, New York 1941, 111.

used them made them "unclean." In the first two cases the content itself was not acceptable to the Jews. Therefore in the Tosefta there is the following passage which tells the story of the dispute among the rabbis about whether the books of *minim* should be burnt:

> The *gilionim* and books of *minim* are not to be saved from a fire, but burned in their place together with their names of [God]. Rabbi Yose ha-Gelili says: "On a weekday you cut out the names and put them in genizah, and burn the rest." Rabbi Tarfon says: "Let mi lose my sons if they were to come into my possession and I did not burn them and the names in them." Even if a pursuer was pursuing me, I would enter a pagan temple but I would not enter their building. For pagans do not know [God] and deny Him, but these now Him and deny Him, and of them it is written. Rabbi Ishmael said: If to make peace between man and wife, God said a book written in holiness should be wiped out with water, how much more so should the books of *minim*, which make trouble between Israel and their Father in Heaven, be wiped out, both them and their names![…]. Just as we do not save them from a fire, so we do not save them from a landslide, nor from water nor from anything that destroys them. (Tosefta, *Sab.* 13,5; BT, *Sab.* 116,1)[1219]

As it follows from the above, the dilemma of some Jews was the question whether the writings of Christian provenance should be saved from the fire since they contained the tetragrammaton. The answer is obvious: these are not holy books, so they must be burnt, and the name of God should be removed beforehand. According to the Tosefta *Yadayim* (2,13), the Christian scriptures "do not defile the hands" which means that they are not considered sacred by the rabbis.

Rabbis knew the Christian conviction that Jesus had to seek refuge in Egypt but they did not know that it was Jesus in his infant years, and they placed the stay in the land of the pharaohs in an anachronistic context, setting it up at the time of Alexander Jannaeus (104-78 BC). Rabbi Joshua, son of Perahjah, also mentioned in the passage, developed his teaching activity at the time of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BC).[1220] Allegedly, Jesus had to flee the slaughter of rabbis ordered by the king. When he returned to his homeland, he apparently kept looking for women for unambiguous purposes. In the description of his return, the term *aksania* plays an important role. It means both an inn and a woman running it: "When King Jannai slew our Rabbis, R. Joshua b. Perahjah (and Jesus) fled to Alexandria of Egypt. […] He arose, went, and found himself in a certain inn, He said: 'How beautiful is this Acsania!" Thereupon (Jesus) observed, 'Rabbi, her eyes are narrow. Said to him: 'Wretch,' he rebuked him dost thou thus engage thyself. 'He sounded four

1219 cf.M. Wróbel, *Terminologia pism rabinicznych w odniesieniu do Jezusa i Jego wyznawców*, 82.

1220 S. Gero, *The Stern Master and His Wayward Disciple: A 'Jesus' Story in the Talmud and in Christian Hagiography*, JSJ 25 (1994) 287–311.

hundred trumpets and excommunicated [Jesus]. […] And a Master has said, 'Jesus the Nazarene practised magic and led Israel astray.' " (*San.* 107,2; Bab.)

Joshua ben Perahjah took the position of the leader of Sanhedrin at the end of the second century BC and was active at the time of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BC). This fact is an obvious proof that he had never met Jesus.[1221] In any case, there are many anachronisms of this type in rabbinic tradition. The reason is undoubtedly the similarity of names: Jeshua, the disciple of ben Perahjah, should not be confused with Jesus of Nazareth. Anyway, this brief reference draws the image of Jesus who looks at women hungrily, and what is more, he ascribes such thinking to his teacher. The cursing of Jesus as the punishment for this misdeed means His exclusion from the community of Judaism *(cherem).* Jesus, excluded from the Synagogue, was supposed to devote himself to practising magic and delusion of people.[1222]

Another slightly convoluted fragment of the Talmud describes Jesus as "a sinner." Rabbis treat Him equally with other dissenters from morality; namely, they show Jesus in the company of Titus, the Roman emperor who, before taking the throne, as the leader of the army destroyed the Temple of Jerusalem; then Jesus is shown in the company of Balaam, the prophet of nations hostile to Israel, the Ammonites and the Moabites. The main character in the passage is Onkelos, the son of emperor Titus' sister, known from a targum. It is him who calls out three characters from beyond the grave:

> Onkelos son of Kolonikos was the son of Titus's sister. He had a mind to convert himself to Judaism. He went and raised Titus from the dead by magical arts, and asked him: 'Who is most in repute in the [other] world? He replied: Israel. What then, he said, about joining them? He said: Their observances are burdensome and you will not be able to carry them out. Go and attack them in that world and you will be at the top as it is written. Her adversaries are become the head etc.; whoever harasses Israel becomes head. He asked him: What is your punishment [in the other world]? He [Titus] replied: What I decreed for myself. Every day my ashes are collected and sentence is passed on me and I am burnt and my ashes are scattered over the seven seas. He then went and raised Balaam by incantations. He asked him: Who is in repute in the other world? He replied: Israel. What then, he said, about joining them? He [Balaam] replied: Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever. He then asked: What is your punishment? He replied: With boiling hot semen. He then went and raised by incantations [Jeshu Nazarene and asked him]. He asked him: Who is in repute in the other world? He replied: Israel. What then, he said: What about joining them? He replied: Seek their welfare, seek not their harm. Whoever touches them touches the apple of his eye. He said: What is your punishment? He

1221 P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 39.

1222 M. Wróbel, *Krytyka tekstologiczna i historyczna passusów Talmudu o Jezusie i chrześcijaństwie*, 24–25.

> [Jeshu] replied: With boiling hot excrement, since a Master has said: Whoever mocks at the war of the Sages is punished with boiling hot excrement. Observe the difference between the sinners of Israel and the prophets of the other nations who worship idols. (*Git.* 56,2-57.1)

It should be noted that not all manuscripts of the tractate *Gittin* mention "Jeshu the Nazarene." The Vatican (140) and the Munich (95) manuscripts mention only "Jeshu" and in other versions the phrase "sinners of Israel" appears. Onkelos was going to convert to Judaism and decided to pose two questions to the dead called out from the other world: who is the most respected figure in the world of the dead and if he should join this figure. It turns out that all the interlocutors give the same answer to his first question: it is Israel. In response to the second question only Jesus gives an answer devoid of any hostility towards Israel. Jesus advises Onkelos to look for good and prosperity. This answer clearly alludes to Zc 2:12: "For Yahweh Sabaoth says this, since the Glory commissioned me, about the nations who plundered you, 'Whoever touches you touches the apple of my eye.' " However, the punishment that all three interlocutors of Onkelos suffer is horrible and abominable: Titus was burnt and his ashes were spread over seas, Balaam was cooked in his own semen, and Jesus in his own excrement. It is possible that the overtone of the whole fragment is intended to question the Christian faith in resurrection.[1223]

One more fragment of the Talmud is worth quoting; it does not refer directly to Jesus but to his disciples who are called by their names. The only possible identification is that the name Mathai may relate to Matthew the evangelist or the apostle Matthias and Todah may indicate Judas Thaddaeus. It turns out that the names are not accidental:

> Jeschu had five disciples - Mathai, Nakkai, Netzer, Bunni, Todah. Mathai was brought before the judgment seat. He said to the judges: 'Is Mathai to be put to death? Yet it is written: Mathai (when) shall I come and appear before God?' They answered him: Nay, but Mathai is to be executed; for it is said: Mathai (when) shall (he) die and his name perish? (cf. Ps 41:6) 'Nakkai was brought. He said to them: 'Is Nakkai to be put to death? Yet it is written: Naki (the innocent) and righteous slay thou not' (cf. Ex 23:7). They replied to him: 'Nay, but Nakki is to be put to death; for it is written: In covert places doth he put to death the Naki' (cf. Ps 10:8). Netzer was brought. He said to them: Is Netzer to be put to death? Yet it is written: A Netzer (branch) shall spring up out of his roots' (cf. Is 11:1). They replied to him: 'Netzer is to be put to death; for it is said: Thou art east forth from thy sepulchre, like an abominable Netzer Is 14:19). Bunni was brought. He said: Is Bunni to be put to death? Yet it is written: Israel is Beni (my son), my first born' (cf. Ex 4:22). They replied to him: Nay, but Bunni is to be put to death; for it is written: Behold, I will slay Binkha (thy son), thy first born' (cf. Ex 4:23). Todah was brought. He said to them: 'Is Todah to be put to death? Yet it is written: A

1223 M. Wróbel, *Krytyka tekstologiczna i historyczna passusów Talmudu o Jezusie i chrześcijaństwie*, 26.

> psalm for Todah (thanksgiving)' (cf. Ps 100:1). They replied to him: 'Nay, but Todah is to be put to death; for it is written: Whoso offereth Todah honoureth me.' (cf. Ps 50:23)

It should be noted that the etymology of the names of Jesus' disciples clearly refers to the scriptural arguments quoted here. And so, Mathai's name in Hebrew means "when," Nakkai's name comes from *naqi* ("innocent"), Netzer's name means "a shoot" or "a carcass," Bunni's name indicates *beni* ("my son"), while Todah means "thanksgiving."[1224] The purpose of the whole description is to warn pious Jews, followers of rabbinic Judaism, against any contact with the Jewish followers of Christ.[1225]

The disciples of Jesus were to heal in His name but the healed, who saved his mortal life, lost eternity. Such a situation allegedly happened to the grandson of Rabbi Joshua ben Levi who lived in the first half of the third century. An unknown Christian was supposed to return physical health to him at the same time exposing him to the loss of eternal life: "Joshua b. Levi had a grandson, who swallowed something dangerous. Someone came along and whispered over him in the name of Jesus Panteri"[1226]and he recovered. 'When he (the magician) went out, [Joshua] said to him, 'What did you say over him?' He said to him such and such a word. Rabbi Jehoshua answered: 'It would have been better for him if he had died and thus [had not been done for him].' 'It was as an error that went out from before the ruler.' " (JT, *Av. Zar.* 40.4; cf. *Sab.* 14,4)

The comparison of the recovery in the name of Jesus with an error made by the ruler is based on the fragment of the Book of Qoheleth: "There is an evil that I saw under the sun, like an error that goes forth from before the ruler. Folly was set at great heights." (Qo 10:5-6a) Healing in the name of Jesus is therefore – according to the editors of the tractate – a stupidity. Rabbi Joshua said to the healer that it would have been better for the boy to die than to hear the prayer in the name of Jesus. Rabbi's reasoning is logical: what benefit is there in regaining physical health if one loses his share of eternal life?

Not only should one refuse to take advantage of the healing done by Jesus' disciples but it is also forbidden to celebrate Sunday because Christians recognize it as the day of Christ's resurrection. Many researchers thus understand the fragment of the Babylonian version of the tractate *Avodah zara*: "Rav Tahlifa bar Abdimi said

---

1224 "Except for Mattai, whose name may or may not allude to the apostle Matthew (the alleged author of the Gospel bearing his name), the names of the remaining four disciples are not reminiscent of any of the twelve apostles. But this again should not be taken as historical information because it becomes immediately clear that all five names (including Mattai) are designed according to the Bible verses used for the disciples' defence and sentencing"; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 77.

1225 S.J.D. Cohen explains: "Pious rabbinic Jews are to stay away from Jewish-Christian *minim*, the disciples of Yeshu ben Pantira"; *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, 226

1226 In the treatise *Sabbath* (JT) there appears Yeshu Pandera and not Yeshu ben Pandera.

that Shmuel said: The day of the Nazarene should be forbidden forever according to Rabbi Ishmael." (6,1) It is possible that Samuel, mentioned in the text, is Shmuel ha-Katan, to whom the edition of the twelfth blessing of the *Eighteen Benedictions*, called the "Blessing of the heretics," is attributed.

The following fragment of the Babylonian version of the tractate *Ta'anit* also refers to the Nazarenes, i.e. the followers of Jesus of Nazareth: "on the eve of the Sabbath they did not fast out of respect to the Sabbath, still less did they do so on the Sabbath itself. Why did they not fast on the day after the Sabbath? Rabbi Johanan says: 'Because (out of respect) of the Nazarenes.' " (27,2) Researchers argue that the text may refer to the abolishing of fasting on some days in the Judeo-Christian community which celebrates both the Sabbath and Sunday.[1227]

Another passage where most probably Christians are mentioned are the instructions given to the Jews in the Tosefta tractate *Hullin:*

> If meat is found in the hand of a non-Jew, it is permitted to derive benefit from it. [If it is found] in the hand of a *min*, it is forbidden to derive benefit from it. That which comes forth from the house of a *min*, indeed it is the meat of sacrifices to the dead (idolatrous worship), for they said: The slaughtering of a *min* is idolatry; their bread is the bread of a Samaritan; their wine is the wine of [idolatrous] libation; their fruits are untithed; their books are the books of diviners, and their children are *mamzerim*. We do not take from them, not do we give to them, and we do not teach their sons a craft. We are not healed by them, neither healing of property nor healing of life." (*Hul.* 2,20-21)[1228]

According to the ritual law, meat from slaughter made not by a Jew cannot be eaten by a Jew but it can be sold by him. However, if the slaughter is performed by a *min* (most probably a Christian) then the meat cannot be sold or consumed. Moreover, any business contacts with *minim* should be avoided. Using the same term in reference to Christians, the Babylonian version of the Talmud accentuates a prohibition in the passage which has already been cited above: "A person may not engage in dealings with heretics, and one may not be treated by them even in a case where it is clear that without medical attention one will experience only temporal life." (*Av. zar.* 27,2)

It is worth noting here that there are passages in the Talmud that do not refer directly to Jesus or Christians but they show common sources of evangelical and Talmudic traditions, or perhaps even a certain literary dependence. Let us provide some examples. Jesus formulated His version of the "golden rule" known in ancient literature (the name itself comes from the seventeenth century). It was recorded by Matthew (7:12) and Luke (6:31). The Talmud ascribes the "golden rule" to Hillel. According to the tractate *Sabbath* there was a gentile who once came before

1227 S.C. Mimouni, *Les Nazoréens. Recherche étymologique et historique*, 242.

1228 cf.M.Wróbel, *Krytyka tekstologiczna i historyczna passusów Talmudu o Jezusie i chrześcijaństwie*, 43–44.

Shammai, well-known for his rigorism, and asked him to teach him the whole Torah in such a short time in which a man can stand on one foot. The rabbi used a ruler to get rid of the intruder. "The same fellow came before Hillel, and Hillel converted him, saying: That which is despicable to you, do not do to your fellow, this is the whole Torah, and the rest is commentary, go and learn it." (*Sab.*31,1)

The case is similar with Jesus' logion about a camel passing through a needle's eye (Mt 19:24) though in the Talmudic tradition the camel was replaced by an elephant. The tractate *Berakhot* includes such a recording: "dreams only contain images that enter a person's mind. […] Said Raba: Know that this is the case, for one is neither shown a golden palm tree nor an elephant going through the eye of a needle in a dream." *(Ber.* 55,2) Similar is an excerpt from another tractate: "Are you from Pumbedita that you push an elephant through the eye of a needle?" *(Baw. Mec.* 38,2)[1229]

The rabbinic tradition also coined a logion similar to Jesus' statement of two or three gathering together in His name (Mt 18:20). According to wise men, studying the Torah can help a man attain the awareness of such Presence of God (*Shekinah*) which was once experienced in the Temple: "when two sit together and words of Torah pass between them, the Divine Presence rests between them." *(Pir. Ab.* 3,3)[1230]

To conclude this part of our discussion, it must be stated that among the above-mentioned excerpts only a few passages from the Talmud can be undoubtedly regarded as references to Jesus of Nazareth or to Christians. Other passages are uncertain, and still others – although the researchers are trying to find the figure of Jesus or his disciples in them – almost certainly do not refer to them. Some passages mention Jesus only incidentally.[1231] What is more, changes made in various written

---

1229 H. Freedman, *Talmud. Biografia*, 47. One of the haggadahs concerning the exodus of Israelites from Egypt sounds surprisingly familiar to a Christian ear. According to it, when Moses and Aaron visited the pharaoh to ask him to allow the children of Israel to go out to the desert in order to honour their God, the pharaoh was supposed to answer that he did not know the God of Israel. Then he went into his library to learn something about Him. He found a lot on the deities of Maobab, Ammonites or Sidon but nothing about the God of Israel. When he mentioned it to Moses, the latter answered: "Is it the way of the dead to be sought after among the living, or the living among the dead?" (*ExRab* 5,14); M. Remaud, *Vangelo e tradizione rabbinica*, trans. R. Fabbri, Bologna 2005, 7.

1230 K. Armstrong, *Biblia. Biografia*, trans. A. Dzierzgowska, Warszawa 2009, 70. The term *Shekinah* comes from the Hebrew verb meaning 'dwelling' and in the rabbinic writing it is the most commonly used term indicating the presence of God in the Temple. It may also indicate the presence of God among the people; M.E. Lodahl, *Shekhinah Spirit. Divine Presence in Jewish and Christian Religion*, 51–52.

1231 "The Jesus passages in the rabbinic literature, most prominently in the Babylonian Talmud, reveal a colourful kaleidoscope of many fragments – often dismissed as figments – of Jesus' life, teachings, and not least his death. They are not told as an independent and coherent narrative but are scattered all over the large corpus of literature left to us by the rabbis. Even worse, only very rarely do they address

or printed editions of the Talmud allow us to assume that the editors of the text, in some way, imposed the way of understanding of these passages on the readers. Some editors suggested that they referred to Jesus and Christians while others omitted or removed such suggestions completely. The changes in the editions of the Talmudic texts were made centuries later than the period of our interest (30-313 AD); hence they constitute a later testimony of the perception of Christianity by rabbinic Judaism. The most reliable passages are those in which the changes were not made and in which we almost certainly recognize the original intention of the authors to refer them to Jesus and his disciples.

Although only a few fragments can be included in this group, the image of Christianity and its Founder, which emerges from them, is totally negative. "In the early days, the rabbis were warned against the magical power and appeal of the doctrine proclaimed by heretics. Later rabbis showed weakness and foolishness of heretical teachings whose contradictions and lack of logic were easy to refute using appropriate argumentation. Jewish sages sought to demonstrate the superiority of rabbinic doctrine and presented their interpretation of the biblical Christian faith."[1232] The fact – let us reiterate this remark – that there are very few texts about Jesus and Christianity in the Jerusalem Talmud is the result of the very strong position of Christianity on the territories of ancient Palestine at the time of the edition of this version of the Talmud and rabbis consciously avoided situations provoking conflict. There are definitely more such references made in the Babylonian Talmud. Although these records in both versions of the Talmud do not have greater historical value and are full of inaccuracies and errors, they nevertheless testify to the hostile attitude of the rabbis towards the Christian community.

Jesus, the object of our inquiry, directly; in many cases the immediate subject of the rabbinic discourse has nothing to do with Jesus and his life: he is mentioned just in passing, as a (minor) detail of an otherwise different and more important subject, or else he and his sect are carefully disguised behind some codes that need to be deciphered"; P. Schäfer, *Jesus in Talmud*, 95.

1232 M. Wróbel, *Antyewangelia w źródłach rabinicznych*, 221.

II Until the Milanese Rescript (221–313 AD)

The last century of the period within the scope of our interest (221-313 AD) is the time during which the Church and the Synagogue in most regions of the ancient world functioned almost entirely separately. Both communities practiced their religious customs and maintained their own beliefs, living next to each other and hardly entering any bilateral relations. Both Christians and the Jews focused more on strengthening their own identity. In this respect, the Church in a sense gained the timing advantage because its history was several decades longer than that of rabbinic Judaism. In Palestine (especially in Judea), the population of its residents was almost entirely replaced. The areas were now dotted with Christian communities while the Jews were building their synagogues in the diaspora.

An example of a specific lack of interest of both religious communities in mutual relations are archaeological discoveries in a small town of Dura-Europos on the Euphrates river. In the third century, the Jews turned one of the housing complexes there into a synagogue. Christians did the same, transforming one of the houses into an assembly hall. One cannot – as some researchers would like to do – distinguish in Dura-Europos separate Christian and Jewish districts. The population of the town mingled and daily life went on harmoniously. The walls of the synagogue were covered with beautiful frescoes of which many, or, precisely speaking, more than sixty percent, have survived. Among the decorative elements, one can find the Ark of the Covenant destroying the temple of the Philistine god Dagon (cf. 1Sm 5-6). The temple of Dagon was indeed located not far from the synagogue. In another fresco Elijah was presented defeating the prophets of foreign deities on Mount Carmel (cf. 1K 18). This is a clear allusion to the deities of the Roman Empire.[1233] However, among the synagogue frescos one cannot find a single reference to Christianity.[1234]

1233 R.M. Jensen comments: "The discovery of the synagogue and its extensive fresco paintings of biblical stories confirmed the existence of Jewish representational art from this early date, and offered a whole new perspective on narrative iconography in that tradition. Such a find startled those who had assumed that Jews were consistently and universally aniconic, observing the second commandment which seemingly prohibited the creation of figurative images"; R.M. Jensen, *The Dura Europos Synagogue, Early-Christian Art., and Religious Life in Dura Europos*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 154.

1234 S. Fine, *Jewish Identity at the Limus: The Jews of Dura Europos Between Rome and Persia*, in: *Cultural Identity and the Peoples of the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. E.S. Gruen, Los Angeles 2011, 303–304; the frescoes are described in detail by S. Fine in his article: *The Complexities of Rejection and Attraction, Herein of Love and Hate*,

It is different in the case of the above mentioned Christian assembly hall. The house was built around the year 230. A decade later it was converted into an assembly hall (or a church) which had a capacity of approximately eighty persons. In the frescoes placed there (in the baptistery) there are elements associated with the Old Testament and the New Testament. It means that the elements of Jewish tradition had its place in Christian art and the followers of Christ already recognized them as their own religious legacy.[1235]

Almost until the middle of the second century, Christianity did not represent a unified image but was characterized by many different forms and local tendencies as far as the practising of faith was concerned. At the end of the second century, however, there was a clear effort to combine those local tendencies into mainstream currents. Thus, apart from Greek and Latin Christianity, typically Syrian – and therefore Semitic – Christianity emerged, which means that it contained and developed Judeo-Christian traditions. However, it was not a homogeneous trend but varied in many aspects, mainly in geographical, historical and linguistic terms. Even political boundaries proved to be of significance. Christianity within the Roman empire was in a sense separated from the Christianity of the Parthian Empire.

Nevertheless, contacts between Christian and Jewish communities were particularly important and until the third century Semitic Christianity was characterised by an extremely strong link with Judaism.[1236] What is more, there were departures of the Jews from the religion of their fathers in favour of Christianity. Research shows that one of the reasons for abandoning Judaism was the excessive expansion of the principles, rules and daily ritual cleanliness regulations introduced by Babylonian rabbis. In this perspective Christianity seemed to be a more attractive religion.[1237] The complexity of the relations not only between Christians and the Jews but also relations among different religions in general was evidenced by the inscription which was created on the initiative of one of the greatest Persian sorcerers named Kartir, active during the reign of Sasanian ruler Bahram II (276-293).[1238] The inscription confirms the distinction between Roman Christianity (*christianoi*) and Semitic Christianity (*notzri*):

---

in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 240–241.

1235 E.M. Meyers, *The Torah Shrine in the Ancient Synagogue. Another Look at the Evidence*, in: *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London – New York 2005, 179–180.

1236 A. Mrozek, *Chrześcijaństwo syryjskie w starożytności w kontekście powstania Gemary babilońskiej*, 127.

1237 J. Ciecieląg, *Żydzi pod rządami Sasanidów*, 170.

1238 The priest Kartir initiated a plan of elimination of ethnic and religious minorities; J. Ciecieląg, *Żydzi pod rządami Sasanidów*, 169.

> And in all the provinces, in every part of the empire, the acts of worshipping Ohrmazd and the gods were enhanced. And the Zoroastrian religion and the Magi were greatly honoured in the empire. And the gods, 'water', 'fire' and 'domestic animals' attained great satisfaction in the empire, but Ahriman and the idols suffered great blows and great damages. And the doctrines of Ahriman and of the idols disappeared from the empire and lost credibility. And the Jews, Buddhists, Hindus, Nazarenes, Christians, Baptists and Manichaeans were smashed in the empire, their idols destroyed, and the habitations of the idols annihilated and turned into abodes and seats of the gods.[1239]

Occasionally, bilateral meetings of the followers of Christ with the Jews at official level were organized. Christians expressed their attitude towards the Jews (negative by nature) in letters intended for members of their own religious communities. It looked the same on the other side, as the fragments of the emerging Talmud presented in the previous chapter illustrate. This situation lasted invariably until the Milanese rescript which brought the wave of freedom for the believers of Christ.

New Demography of Palestine in the Third Century

Although Hadrian, after the Bar Kokhba uprising which ended in the year 135 AD, expelled Jews from Jerusalem (as it has already been mentioned), their presence outside the capital city was still vivid. At the beginning of the third century, the Jews dominated in *Eretz Israel*. Obviously, any estimates in this respect may be only approximate. According to research, in the third century the land of Israel may have been inhabited by up to one and a half million inhabitants, and the Jews constituted one third of them.[1240] The number of synagogues (up to one hundred and twenty) in eastern Galilee testifies to the significant activity of the followers of Judaism at the end of the Roman period and at the beginning of the Byzantine period.[1241] Even if during the two uprisings (or wars) many synagogues were destroyed, it seems that they were rebuilt, some of them even between the years 70 and 132.[1242] At a time when the Temple ceased to exist, it was natural

---

1239 After: J. Wiesehöfer, *Ancient Persia: From 550 BC to 650 AD*, trans. A. Azodi, London – New York 1998, 199.

1240 M.D. Herr, *The History of Eretz Israel. The Roman Byzantine Period*, Jerusalem 1985, 109; I.M. Gafni, *Świat Talmudu. Od Miszny do podboju arabskiego*, in: *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2013, 357.

1241 E.M. Meyers, *The Problem of Scarcity of Synagogues from 70 to ca. 250 C.E.: The Case of Synagogue I at Nabratein (2nd-3rd Century C.E.)*, in: *'Follow the Wise': Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honour of Lee I. Levine*, ed. Z. Weiss, O. Irshai, J. Magness, S. Schwartz, Winona Lake 2010, 435–448; E.M. Meyers, C.L. Meyers, *Response to Jodi Magness's Review of the Final Publication on Nabratein*, BASOR 359 (2010) 67–76.

1242 E.M. Meyers, M.A. Chancey, *Alexander to Constantine: Archeology of the Land of the Bible*, New Haven 2012, 208–224.

for the followers of Judaism to pay more attention to the synagogue liturgy, not only by taking care of its exterior design but also a sufficient number of houses of prayer.[1243]

Quite large was also the community of the Samaritans who pointed out at their Jewish roots.[1244] The Jews were reinforcing their influence in the diaspora, primarily in Babylonia.[1245] In the middle of the third century, rabbis even tried to create their own Sanhedrin in Nahar-Pakod (not far from Sura) in Babylonia but their plans failed. As a consequence, Jewish scholars from those areas were still subordinate to the religious authorities in Galilee (especially in the Tiberian centre, famous thanks to Judah ha-Nasi).

Christians living in the homeland of Jesus primarily occupied Greek cities, mainly on the coast. The fact can be confirmed by the list of bishops who took part in the Council of Nicaea. Every now and then there appear names of Greek *poleis* there. Furthermore, the growth of the Christian population living in Palestine becomes apparent when the original (Greek) text of the *Onomasticon* by Eusebius of Caesarea is compared to the Latin translation made by Jerome. In the translation made by the patron of exegetes, the number of towns increases significantly when compared to the original text by the historian from Caesarea.[1246] Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that the data derived from literary sources such as the writings of Eusebius and Jerome do not find enough confirmation in the results of the analyses of data coming from archaeological excavations. It seems that the size of the population was much smaller than many researchers have assumed.

There are only few unquestionable artefacts or archaeological sites that testify to the presence of the followers of Christ in Galilee in the third century. They are linked to Capernaum, Nazareth and Megiddo, or more specifically Kefar Othnay, located in the immediate vicinity of Megiddo.[1247] What is more, some scholars also

---

1243 This process expanded even after the Milanese rescript. Under Constantine's rule, the Syro-Palestine was called "the Holy Land," and magnificent churches commemorating the most important events in the life of Jesus began to be built after the visit of St Helen, the mother of the emperor, to these territories. In the seventh century there were over three hundred of them. And - paradoxically - this does not mean decreasing of the liveliness of the Jewish Community: "One might suppose that a byproduct of this would be the diminuition of the Jewish community. But that was not the case. Despite a decline in new Jewish settlement in the fourth century, the significant remains of ancient synagogues in Galilee, the Golan, and the many Jewish towns and villages suggest a strong Jewish community that thrived throughout the Byzantine period"; E.M. Meyers, *Living Side by Side in Galilee*, 142.

1244 M. Avi-Yonah, *The Jews under Romans and Byzantine Rule*, Jerusalem 1984, 75–76.

1245 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 60.

1246 I.M. Gafni, *Świat Talmudu. Od Miszny do podboju arabskiego,* in: *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny*, 358.

1247 E.M. Meyers, *Living Side by Side in Galilee*, in: *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, 134. Christian place of

question the hypothesis proposed by Franciscan archaeologists Stanislao Loffreda and Virgilio Cirbo according to which Christians escaping from Jerusalem as a result of the Jewish-Roman war in 66 settled at Capernaum rather than at Pella.[1248] It is certain, however, that almost two hundred years later Christians organized a kind of study centre at Caesarea Maritima in which, as it has already been mentioned, Origen arrived in 232, and in which a century later Eusebius settled at the episcopal cathedral.

Returning to Kefar Othnay, it must be emphasized that the discoveries made there in 2005 and in the following years provided a lot of data about the presence of Christians in this part of Galilee in the third century. Great interest was aroused by the uncovering of a Christian mosaic dated to the third century as well as the discovery of a room identified as a house of prayer of the followers of Christ. In this house Eucharist was probably also celebrated. The floor mosaic contains several interesting inscriptions. One of them reads: "Akeptous, the God-loving, offered this table for the God Jesus Christ as a remembrance." Another panel of the mosaic contains two images of fish also linked by archaeologists to Christianity.

This new demographic configuration influenced the relations between Church and Synagogue in such a way that rabbis finally ceased to treat the followers of Christ as heretics and saw in them representatives of another and, let us add, competitive religion. However, the competitiveness does not mean that rabbis paid much attention to Christianity. The centre of religious leadership of Judaism was shifted at that time to the east, to Babylonia. Jews living by the Euphrates river were growing in strength not only in terms of their number but also in terms of the development of the writing tradition of Judaism. The growth overlapped with the reign of the new Sasanian dynasty (c. 224 AD) and with the intensification of the cult of Zoroaster. The Jews living in the Babylonian diaspora thus had to face a new political and religious situation, which somehow distracted them from the conflict with Christians.

---

prayers uncovered in Kfar Othnay was devoted work by: Y. Tepper, L. Di Segni, *A Christian Prayer Hall of the Third Century CE at Kefar ,Othnay (Legio): Excavations at the Megiddo Prison 2005*, Jerusalem 2006.

1248 The Gospels often mention Jesus' stay in Capernaum, and some of the references speak even of His home in this town (Mk 2:1; Mt 4:13; 9:1). There is no doubt that in the fifth century there was a church there, built on the site of the former *domus ecclesiae,* but the existence of Christian cult in this place as early as at the end of the first century, as some archaeologists assume, is questioned. The issue is discussed in detail in the monograph by Ignazio Mancini (*Archeological Discoveries Relative to the Judaeo-Christians: Historical Survey*, Jerusalem 1970).

Sages of Israel in Confrontation with Christians

Researchers of Christian-Jewish relations as well as scholars engaged in the study of Judaism formulated a thesis according to which the time after the final edition of the Mishnah, and thus more or less the beginning of the third century, can be regarded as the beginning of the "Talmudic era."[1249] Rabbi Johanan Bar Nappaha who died in 279 is regarded as one of the greatest sages of the Talmudic era.[1250] The Talmud is full of bar Nappaha's opinions on almost every topic. He was one of the scholars who were defined as the "sages of Israel." In addition to giving advice, providing further interpretation of the biblical passages and explaining the individual commandments of the Torah, sages also discussed Christian ideas. It seems that the debate was usually held with an imaginary adversary. The only listeners of such debates in synagogues were the Jews.

Sometimes real confrontations took place. These were held mainly in large geopolitical centres such as, for example, Caesarea Maritima.[1251] The fact that debates were sometimes conducted between Christians and the followers of Judaism at the end of the third century is evidenced by the writings of both Christian and Jewish provenance.[1252] It is not known, however, whether they were mostly held face to face or rather involved a confrontation of views in writing.[1253] J.G. Gager quotes several accounts of public disputes between Christians and rabbis: Tertullian was a witness to such debates in North Africa; the confrontation between Justin and Trypho supposedly occurred in a public place; there were also many witnesses to a discussion between a certain Timotheus (a Christian) and Aquila (a Jew); and

1249 J. Neusner, *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism*, Missoula 1979, 6.

1250 R. Kimelman dealt with reconstruction of his biography and thoughts in his doctoral dissertation entitled *R. Yohanan of Tiberias of the Social and Religious History of Third Century Palestine* (Ann Arbor 1980). cf. also: R. Kimelman, *Rabbi Yohanan and the Professionalization of the Rabinate*, Annual of the Institute for Research in Jewish Law 9–10 (1982–83) 329–358.

1251 M.B. Herr, *The Historical Significance of the Dialogues between Jewish Sages and Roman Dignitaries*, SH 22 (1971) 121–122,

1252 What is more, they also took place in the following centuries and therefore D. Stökl ben Ezra says: "I will argue that direct contact between Jews and Christians left its traces […] after the fourth century. This direct contact encompasses polemic as well as non-polemic influence ('adoption') and therefore does not conform to the common conception of an early and absolute 'Parting of the Ways' "; D. Stökl ben Ezra, *Whose Fast Is It? The Ember Day of September and Yom Kippur*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 262.

1253 E.E. Urbach, *The Repentance of the People of Niniveh and the Discussion Between Jews and Christians*, Tarbiz 20 (1950–51) 118–122.

finally Origen, on several occasions, mentions disputes during which the audience played the role of a jury, advocating one or the other of the disputants.[1254]

The debates were motivated by several objectives. Firstly, both Christians and the Jews were afraid of the exodus of the faithful from their communities in the event of suffering a defeat in such a dispute. Secondly, a further goal was to convince the pagan observers to convert to Judaism or to Christianity. Thirdly, the witnesses to the dispute might have been the Judaizers who had not decided yet about their affiliation with the Church or with the Synagogue. For them, the disputes could have been one of the main factors influencing the decision. An interesting fact is that the participants of the debates did not expect to convince the disputant in the sense that he would then convert to the religion of his adversary.

It happened quite often, however, that "the debates" were only imaginary. Numerous Christian writers confronted in their works fictitous Jewish opponents, ascribing to them stereotypical views which those never preached. In this way, the image of a Jewish adversary was shaped – an image no Jew ever identified himself with. The Christians themselves, however, appeared in these mental debates as towering over the Jews with intelligence, thus becoming an object of admiration of the pagan readers.[1255] Let us use the figure of Origen as an example here: in his writings, he often uses statements such as "Jews claim" or "a certain Jew told me."

Sextus Julius Africanus was once present during the debate of Origen with some "ignoramus" – as he called them – meaning some uneducated (in his opinion) people. In his condemnation of the followers of Judaism, Origen referred very critically to the Jewish interpretation of the history of the virtuous Susanna from the Book of Daniel (Dn 13:1-64). Africanus noticed that the Hebrew version of the Book of Daniel did not contain this episode, and that it was only included in the Greek version used by Christians. He decided to write a letter to Origen who knew the Hebrew language and had personal contacts with many Jews asking why he had referred to this event at all (*Epistula ad Originem*, 2,5,7). In response, Origen explained that he learned the story from certain "learned Jews," and besides he had lived for a long time among the followers of Judaism so he was familiar with their views (*Epistula ad Africanum* 11-12).[1256]

1254 J.G. Gager continues: "[…] we can conclude, that public debates between Christians and Jews were familiar feature of the Greco-Roman landscape for at least the first three hundred years of Christianity's existence"; *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, Ney York – Oxford 1985, 154.

1255 A.S. Jacobs, *The Lion and the Lamb. Reconsidering Jewish-Christian Relations in Antiquity*, 99–100.

1256 It cannot be assumed that Origen consciously proclaimed untruth or maliciously assigned to Jews views that they did not profess. It should rather be treated as a rhetorical device; A.S. Jacobs, *The Lion and the Lamb. Reconsidering Jewish-Christian Relations in Antiquity*, 109–110.

Essentially, the content of the debates (both real and imaginary ones) concerned almost exclusively the interpretation of the excerpts of the Old Testament (the Hebrew Bible). It is almost certain that in Christian environments there appeared lists of biblical texts which were supposed to be the key arguments for advocating one's views when dealing with particular topics. These quotations were called *testimonia*. The regularity with which the same biblical passages appear in the Christian writings on particular topics shows that the *testimonia* were passed from one community to another and were very popular. One such collection of quotations was cited by Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage, around the year 250. It comprised twenty-four topics to which the most important passages of the Old Testament were matched:

(1) the Jews have fallen under the heavy wrath of God, because they have departed from the Lord, and have followed idols;
(2) they did not believe the prophets, and put them to death;
(3) it was previously foretold that they would neither know the Lord, nor understand nor receive Him;
(4) he Jews do not understand the Holy Scriptures;
(5) to understand the Scriptures, the Jews should first believe in Christ;
(6) they will lose Jerusalem, and leave the land which they had received;
(7) they will also lose the Light of the Lord;
(8) the first circumcision, of the flesh, was made void, and the second circumcision of the spirit was promised instead;
(9) the former law, which was given by Moses, was about to cease;
(10) the new law was given by Jesus;
(11) another dispensation and a new covenant was offered by God;
(12) the old ritual purification ceased to exist and has been replaced by baptism;
(13) the old yoke was removed, and a new yoke has been given;
(14) the old leaders have been replaced by the new ones;
(15) the old temple passed away and the new Temple is Christ Himself;
(16) the old sacrifices lost their significance and have been replaced by the new sacrifice;
(17) the old priesthood ceased and has been replaced by the new Priest whose authority will last forever;
(18) another prophet after Moses was promised, Christ, who has brought the new covenant;
(19) two peoples were foretold by the prophets; that is, the ancient people of the Jews, and the new people of Christianity;
(20) the Church will have more sons from among the Gentiles than the synagogue had had before;
(21) the Gentiles rather than the Jews will believe in Christ;
(22) the Jews will lose the bread and the cup of Christ, and all His grace; these will be received by Christians whose name will be blessed on earth;
(23) rather the Gentiles than the Jews will attain the kingdom of heaven;

(24) the Jews can obtain the pardon of their sins only if they admit to the killing of Christ, accept His baptism, and, joining the Church, they shall obey His precepts.[1257]

Jews, who naturally knew the Hebrew Bible better than Christians, could find many arguments refuting the theses of Christ's followers but they still had to face an undeniable fact pointed out by many as the sign of God's rejection of Israel: the Jerusalem Temple was in ruins and the nation was deprived of its homeland. Although Judaism in its rabbinic form was still developing, the old questions still remained unanswered. Attempts to answer them sometimes emerged from the pages of the developing literature created by the rabbis. But gradually Jesus and his followers almost disappeared from its pages. According to Jan Iluk, until the fourth century, representatives of the Jewish *politeia* could, to a certain extent, disregard the testimony of the development of the Christian *politeia*. Opinions of rabbis from the Tannaim and Amorite schools left no doubts as to which side they regarded as right. A Judeo-Christian or a Christian descended from the Hellenes, Romans or heathens was a heretic (*minim*) who did not deserve to be regarded as a partner in a religious dispute. The Talmud scenes never present a Jew and a Christian as two religious adversaries appearing next to each other. This could happen in the treatises by Justin or by Origen or in the homilies by the Church Fathers in the series *Adversus Judaeos*. A Talmud rabbi resolved the matter with a short, often blunt statement: having considered Yeshu to be a godless and impure member of the Jewish politeia, someone violating the Law of Israel, he sentenced him to oblivion; the figure was overshadowed by silence.[1258]

The Development of Rabbinic Literature

The Jewish sages, in disputes with Christians – whether fictitious or real – relied on biblical texts and, whenever possible, referred to biblical characters, episodes and interpretations. In their exegesis, they used not only the seven rules of Hillel and the rules developed later by his successors but turned out to be the creators of a new literary genre which took the name of the haggadic midrash. It originated in the Palestinian environment but seemed to be totally unknown in the Babylonian diaspora of the third century.[1259]

1257 The list quoted after: A.L. Williams, *Adversus Judaeos. A Bird's-Eye View of Christian* Apologiae *Until the Renaissance*, Cambridge 1935, 56–64.

1258 J. Iluk, *Żydowska politeja i Kościół w Imperium Rzymskim u schyłku antyku*, II, *Żydowska antyewangelia. Antyczna tradycja i nowożytne trwanie*, Gdańsk 2000, 33–34.

1259 One of the attempts to explain this state of affairs is the recourse to the statement of rabbi Abbahu recorded in the Talmud. Asked why he so often referred to the Bible while rabbi Safra who lived in Babylonia did not, he offered this answer to his (probably) Christian interlocutors: 'We live among you and that is why we have to learn' (*Av. zar.* 4,1).

The environment in which midrashim were created was twofold: the school (*bet midrash*) and the synagogue (*bet kneset*). In schools, an exegetical midrash called *parshani* was usually practised in which the biblical text was commented line by line. The synagogue became the place where the homiletic midrash called *darshani* developed which used tales, stories, and parables. In rabbinic literature, two types of material can be distinguished: moral and legal guidelines, and stories. The first one creates the so-called *halakha* which means "the way" or "walking" and which includes material covering the entire area of the Jewish Law and its application. *Haggadah,* on the other hand, consists in the interpretation of the narrative material of the Hebrew Bible and it is not deprived of stories contemporary to the rabbis or of folklore themes. Haggadic exegesis is more free; on the one hand, it is inseparably connected with tradition; on the other hand, it is open to current problems or issues vital in a particular community.[1260]

After the emergence of the Mishnah, the development of rabbinic literature became even more dynamic. First, attention must be paid to the set of additions to the Mishnah created by the rabbis commenting on this book. Those commentaries were called in Aramaic *baraita*, as they remained outside the Mishnah (in Aramaic *baraitot* means "outside"). *Baraita* was an important argument in rabbinic disputes; references were made to opinions of authorities important in the interpretation of the Torah. It is not known, however, why the comments were not written in the Mishnah itself. Another material added to the Mishnah was the Tosefta (in Aramaic "an addition") which was also divided into six parts. This work was completed about the year 230.

A very extensive commentary on the Mishnah was the Gemara, which was created independently in two centres, in Palestine and in Babylonia. The Palestinian Gemara, containing haggadic commentaries to thirty-nine (out of the sixty-three) tractates of the Mishnah, forms along with the Mishnah the Palestinian Talmud, written in the Galilean dialect of the Aramaic language. The Babylonian Talmud comprises commentaries to thirty-seven tractates. It was written in the eastern variety of the Aramaic language. The Palestinian Gemara was completed in the fourth century whereas the Babylonian one – a century later. In Palestine five generations of Amorites worked on it, and in Babylonia – eight generations.

The period within the scope of our interest covers three generations of Amorites (up to c. 320 AD). Apparently, some of them knew the entire Mishnah by heart. They basically focused on harmonising rules, which at first reading might have seemed to be inconsistent. Where necessary, they referred to the already mentioned *baraita*. The first generation of Palestinian Amoraim was associated with Tiberias. Their activity falls on the years 220-250, and the main representatives include Chanina bar Chama (the most talented student of ha-Nasi), Yannai and

1260 G. Stemberger, *Il Midrash. Uso rabbinico della Bibbia. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, Bologna 1992, 29.

Joshua ben Levi. Rabbinic academies also developed in Lydda, Sepphoris, Caesarea and Akbara in Upper Galilee.

The most prominent representative of the second generation of Palestinian Amoraim (the years 250-290) was Johanan bar Nappaha. Towards the end of their activity, many rabbinic academies in Galilee fell into decline, because Jewish teachers left Palestine, emigrating to Babylonia, Syria or Cappadocia. It was the result of the difficult political and economic situation of the Galilean Jews. At the time of the third generation of Amoraim (the years 290-320) the circumstances were the same. What is more, after the Milanese rescript, many followers of Christ settled in Palestine, what led to further social degradation of the Jews.

The first generation of Babylonian Amoraim (the years 220-250) came from Palestine. Mar Ukva, Rav and Mar Shmuel arrived in Babylon to found academies there. The position of the Egyptian diaspora of Alexandria was weakening at that time while Babylonian rabbis had to face the above mentioned and still growing cult of Zoroaster. During the second generation of Amorim (in the years250-290) the Enharden academy (previously run by Mar Shmuel) was closed because the city was destroyed by Odenatus, the prince of Palmyra. A major rabbinic study centre was established in Pumbedita – it was led by Judah bar Ezekiel. [1261] It competed with a school in Sura, which at that time was run by a certain Huna. Judah bar Ezekiel introduced a method of dialectic discussion which replaced the previous acquisition of the content by memorizing.[1262] About the third generation of Babylonian Amoraim we know so much that they gathered twice a year and after the debates, comments were written down *ad hoc* and with time they were included in the Talmud.

A retrospective look at the evolution of Christian and Jewish literature in the second and third centuries allows to reconstruct the process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue in this aspect. Firstly, in both religious communities the process of canonization of the sacred books took place.[1263] For the Jews, this process started in the environment of Jabneh at the end of the first century and probably lasted for several decades. Christians already had their books of the New Testament, created in the first century (possibly some at the beginning of the second century). The process of their canonisation occurred more or less half

1261 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 200–204.

1262 Due to new methods introduced by Judah bar Ezekiel, his name was included in the list of so-called five great rabbis who had marked the essential stages of the development of rabbinic Judaism. Alongside with Judah, rabbis Akiba, Yehuda ha-Our, Rav and Ashi have also been included in the group; K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 204.

1263 A. Salvesen, *A Convergence of the Ways. The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 234–235.

a century later than in the Jewish environment. The oldest and obviously unofficial list of inspired books is the so-called Muratorian Canon, formed in Rome and dating back to approximately the year 180. It lacks Heb, Jm, 1-2P and 3Jn. However, from the same environment comes the testimony of Clement of Rome who knew and referred to these letters (except for 3Jn). It can be assumed that in the second century the Church knew the entire later canon of the books of the New Testament.

The methods of commenting on the scriptures were different in Judaism and in Christianity (we omit here the issue of the Hebrew and New Testament apocrypha discussed above). The Jews built commentaries based on their own exegetic methods. This is how the Mishnah, *baraita*, the Gemara, the Tosefta (and ultimately the Talmud) came into being, as well as the haggadic and halakhic midrashim and targumim. Almost all these writings have the character of "collective works"; they were created as a result of long rabbinic disputes and contain the views of many teachers, each of whom gained authority to a greater or lesser degree.

Literature of this type is alien to the Christian thought. The oldest non-biblical Christian writings are essentially works created by individual authors. The Fathers of the Church commented on the Bible, wrote letters to Christian communities, and presented writings that were a systematic interpretation of the teaching of the faith. Thus two distinct types of religious literature were formed in rabbinic Judaism and in early Christianity.

Didascalia Apostolorum and *Pseudo-Clementines* on Obeying the Jewish Law

The full title of the work written in Greek in the first half of the third century and quickly translated into Syriac[1264] is: *Didascalia, that is, the teaching of the twelve Apostles and the holy disciples of our Lord.* Epiphanius calls them *Apostolic Constitutions.*[1265] The work was created in northern Syria and was written by an anonymous bishop who was also probably a medical doctor. It is addressed to a Christian community of pagan descent which also included Judeo-Christians.[1266] One of the most important subjects of great interest to the author of the book is the question of the possibility of accepting the apostates within the Church. According to the writer, in the same way as adultery, apostasy is a sin which – contrary to a sin against the Holy Spirit – can be forgiven but requires a longer period of

1264 J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, 125.

1265 B. Altaner, A. Stuiber, *Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła*, 148.

1266 The author uses not only biblical quotes but also fragments of *Didache*, *the Gospel of Peter*, *Acts of Paul, The Shepherd* by Hermas as well as writings of Ignatius and Irenaeus; P.F. Bradshaw, *The Search of the Origins of Christian Worship*, Oxford 2002, 78–80.

repentance after excommunication. The bishop may order a fast lasting from two to seven weeks.

What is more important, however, from the point of view of Christian-Jewish relations, the author of *Didascalia* treats with great austerity those followers of Christ who consider the ritual laws of Moses as still being in force.[1267] He claims that he is quoting the entire text of the apostolic letter sent to Antioch after the Jerusalem Council (Ac 15; *Did. ap.* 1,24) which was the result of the so-called "Antioch incident" (Ac15:23).[1268] However, if Acts 15 deals essentially with circumcision and the law of *kashrut*, the author of *Didascalia* focuses on practices of ritual purification of impurity caused by monthly bleeding, on vegetarianism and on ascetic practices (*Did. ap.* 23-24).

Another difference between the decisions of the Jerusalem Council and the content of the work is that the decisions of the apostolic congregation concerned the Christians of pagan descent while the directives of *Didascalia* are addressed to Judeo-Christians. Meanwhile, according to the Syrian bishop, God left the Synagogue and has come to the Church of the Gentiles. Similarly, Satan ceased to tempt the Jews and his hatred is directed towards Christians creating divisions within the Church. Just as he once deceived false prophets and Simon the Sorcerer, he now deceives the followers of Christ, ordering them to observe Jewish customs (*Did. ap.* 24).

After all – claims the author – it would be sufficient to circumcize one's heart, and not the body, in accordance with Jeremiah's incentive. And just one baptism is enough instead of many ablutions because Isaiah does not say: "wash yourselves" but "wash and make yourselves clean." (Is 1:16) There is no need to avoid pork because Peter was given a vision in which he was ordered to kill and eat animals considered unclean by the Jews. We must not take upon ourselves the yoke of Jewish rules but the yoke of Christ himself who is calm and humble in heart; only then can we find the comfort of the soul *(Did. ap.* 25).

The author makes an interesting distinction as far as the validity of the Law is concerned; according to him, the Decalogue is binding for all people while the detailed ritual regulations were given only to Israel as a punishment for the idolatrous cult of the golden calf in the desert during the journey to the Promised Land (*Did. ap.* 26). The author defines the Decalogue with the term *nomos* while the ritual rules he defines as *deuterosis*. *Deterosis* does not appear in Greek to define detailed rules but is a language calque taken from the Mishnah.[1269] Since Christians

---

1267 C. Fonrobert, *The* Didascalia Apostolorum: *A Mishnah for the Disciples of Jesus*, JECS 9 (2001) 483–509.

1268 Let us remember that it refers to the activities of Judeo-Christians who, without the permission of the ecclesiastical authorities, left Judea and in Antioch and other Syrian cities proclaimed among Christians the necessity of observing the whole Jewish law, including circumcision and ritual norms.

1269 H.I. Newman, *The Negativity of Rabbinic Judaism: Obstacles on Path to the New Consensus*, in: *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*,

derived their terminology from rabbinic writings, it may mean that the interaction between the followers of Christ and the Jews may have been still alive in some circles.[1270] Charlotte Fonrobert even goes so far as to put forward the thesis that *Didascalia* constitute a kind of counterbalance to the Mishna and the Tosefta; she justifies the thesis with a juxtaposition of parallel regulations in *Didascalia* and in rabbinic sources.[1271] In any case, the Syrian bishop's letter proves that in the first half of the third century there were still some Christians living in the area north of Palestine who tried to observe the Jewish regulations and that the author himself was in contact with rabbis.

The preservation of the Jewish Law by Judeo-Christians is described quite differently in the *Pseudo-Clementines*, i.e. works attributed to the Roman Clement, which include *Homilies* and *Recognitions*.[1272] *Homilies*, which consist of twenty books, were preceded by the *Letter of Peter to James*, James's reply and the *Letter of Clement to James*. The work *Recognitions* was written in ten volumes.[1273] *Homilies* were created before the year 325 because they were quoted by Eusebius while *Recognitions* are a little later.[1274] Both works seem to be a reflection of the complicated relations between Syrian Christianity and Judaism.[1275] The ties between the two religious communities must have been strong because the author of the texts has an excellent knowledge of Judaism which could only be acquired by its follower or an intellectual staying in close relations with Jewish scholars.[1276]

In contrast to *Didascalia*, the author of *Pseudo-Clementines* orders Christians to observe the Jewish ritual law. *The letter of Peter to James* contains complaints of the

---

ed. L.I. Levine, D.R. Schwartz, Tübingen 2009, 169; W. Horbury, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Study – An Historical Sketch*, in: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston – Leiden 2010, 6.

1270 W. Horbury, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Study: An Historical Sketch*, 3–4.

1271 C. Fonrobert, *The* Didascalia Apostolorum: *A Mishnah for the Disciples of Jesus*, 501–508.

1272 F. Stanley Jones, *The Pseudo-Clementines*, 292.

1273 M. Starowieyski, *Pseudoklementyny*, in: *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu, II/I, Apostołowie. Andrzej, Jan, Paweł, Piotr, Tomasz*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2007, 526.

1274 F.S. Jones, *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*, OLA 203, Leuven 2012, 205.

1275 A.Y. Reed, L. Vuong, *Christianity in Antioch: Partings in Roman Syria*, 125.

1276 A. Baumgarten comments: "The Pseudo-Clementine texts exhibit detailed and specific knowledge of rabbinic Judaism. Their awareness is not of commonplaces or of vague generalities which might be based on a shared biblical heritage, but of information uniquely characteristic of the rabbinic world. There can be no doubt that we are dealing with two groups in close proximity that maintained intellectual contact with each other. The authors of the Pseudo-Clementines quite obviously admired rabbinic Jews and their leaders"; *Literary Evidence for Jewish Christianity in the Galilee*, 46–47.

first Pope that the followers of Christ of pagan descent rejected his call to observe ritual laws and chose the "lawlessness" (*anomos*) proclaimed by Paul (2,3-4). An even more distinctive approach is attributed to Peter in one of the homilies:

> And this is the service He has appointed: To worship Him only, and trust only in the Prophet of truth, and to be baptised for the remission of sins, and thus by this pure baptism to be born again unto God by saving water; to abstain from the table of devils, that is, from food offered to idols, from dead carcases, from animals which have been suffocated or caught by wild beasts, and from blood; not to live any longer impurely; to wash after intercourse; that the women on their part should keep the law of purification; that all should be sober-minded, given to good works, refraining from wrongdoing, looking for eternal life from the all-powerful God (*Hom.* 7,8).[1277]

Contrary to the author of *Didascalia*, Pseudo-Clement maintains that anyone who professes the faith in God of Israel (and thus all Christians) should obey the commandments written in the Torah.[1278] Baptism is considered as the first step of purification. It purifies the Gentiles accepting the faith in Christ and entering the Church from the impurity resulting from the sin of idolatry, the sacrifice of animals offered to idols and menstrual impurity. Furthermore, Christians should also avoid eating meat from animals that have not been killed in a manner prescribed by the Law (*Hom.* 7,4.8; 11,28-30; 13,4; 9,19).

It is very difficult to give a single opinion on the mutual relations between Judaism and Christianity which the author of the *Homilies* presents to the readers, and the reason is that the text consists of many "layers" created at different times and reflecting different stages of the development of these relations. It seems, however, that the original text stresses complementarity of both religions: the Jews can be saved by the observance of the Law and Christ's coming into the world was necessary in order to open the way to salvation for the Gentiles.

It is surprising that the words "Christian" and "Christianity" do not appear in the *Homilies* even once. The author speaks of the Jews, mainly about Pharisees, as the heirs of Moses. Paul and Barnabas identify themselves with the sons of Israel (*Hom.* 1,13; 3,4; 9,20). Even when the author speaks of Clement and other followers of Christ, he does not call them Christians but uses the term "God-fearing" (*theosebeis*). Jesus is seen as the "true prophet" who had previously revealed himself in Adam and in Moses. His teaching is identified with the Mosaic commandments. What is more, one of the homilies contains a specific redefinition of people who should be regarded as the Jews: "If anyone acts impiously, he is not pious; in the same manner, if he who is of another tribe keeps the law, he is a Jew (*Ioudaioi*); but he who does not keep it is a Greek." (*Hom.* 11,16) Pseudo-Clement

---

1277 After: A.Y. Reed, L. Vuong, *Christianity in Antioch: Partings in Roman Syria*, 126.

1278 It concerns not only moral commandments but also those related to ritual purity; J. Klawans, *purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*, Oxford 2006, 53.

argues that there are two ways of salvation which ultimately constitute the same way; the wisest is the one who follows both of them (*Hom.* 8,7).[1279]

In *Recognitions* there appears a statement which is interpreted by many authors as recognition of two possible ways leading to salvation: "It is therefore the particular gift bestowed by God upon the Hebrews that they believe Moses; and the particular gift bestowed upon the Gentiles is that they love Jesus." (*Recognitions* 4,5)[1280] The author shares the opinion of Pharisees concerning the transmission of the Law to Moses and in consequence to the elders of the people of Israel: "The Law of God was given by Moses without writing, to seventy wise men to be handed down." (*Hom.* 3,47) Exactly the same statements could be heard at that time from Palestinian rabbis. The rabbis referred to Moses himself, seeing in themselves the followers of his tradition (*Pir. ab.* 1-5).[1281] What is more, some researchers have reached the conclusion that Pseudo-Clementine literature allows to formulate the thesis that its author (or authors) recognised the authority of the rabbis.[1282] In addition, his (or their) understanding of apostolic succession was shaped precisely on the basis of the idea of oral transmission in the rabbinic tradition.[1283]

It must therefore be acknowledged that Pseudo-Clementine literature definitely differs from other Christian writings in which one can see the reflection of mutual

---

1279 In the opinion of Karin Hedner Zetterholm of Lund University, the environment in which the *Pseudo-Clementines* were created had a significant impact on the self-identification of the emerging rabbinic Judaism which defined its identity by separating itself from the views proclaimed by Pseudo-Clement: "the inner-Jewish struggle over the correct interpretation of Judaism and what it meant to be God's special people between rabbis and Jesus-oriented Jews contributed to the shaping of a rabbinic Jewish identity to a much larger extent than has hitherto been recognized"; K. Hedner Zetterholm, *Alternate Visions of Judaism and Their Impact on the Formation of Rabbinic Judaism*, 152.

1280 J.G. Gager, *Did Jewish Christians See the Rise of Islam?*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 367.

1281 A. Tropper, *Tractate* Avot *and Early Christian Succession Lists*, in: *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 159–188.

1282 Thus: A. Baumgarten, *Literary Evidence for Jewish Christianity in the Galilee*, in: *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. L.I. Levine, New York 1992, 43.

1283 A.Y. Reed, *'Jewish Christianity' as Counter-History? The Apostolic Past in Eusebius' 'Ecclesiastical History' and the Pseudo-Clementine 'Homilies'*, in: *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Past in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. G. Gardner, K. Osterloh, Tübingen 2008, 88. Some researchers are inclined to accept that the original text of the *Homilies* was written by a folloer of Judaism and then was rewritten by Judeo-Christians. Such a possibility is indicated by the analysis of those parts of the *Homilies* which do not have a parallel in *Recognitiones*; J.C. Paget, *Jews, Christians and Jewish-Christians in Antiquity*, 427–492.

relations between Christians and the Jews in the third century. Pseudo-Clement shows harmonious relations of the members of Church and Synagogue, seeing God's activity in both communities.[1284] This also leads to a surprising conclusion that it is difficult to talk about the parting between Church and Synagogue in some of the Syrian communities in the first half of the third century. What is more, researchers have asked themselves in recent years whether Pseudo-Clementine literature is in fact Christian, or actually Jewish.

In the search for an answer to this question, they conclude that the need to categorise such writings into one or the other of the two groups is more an effort of contemporary minds who seek to assign them to a specific religious trend rather than an attempt to uncover the historical reality of the time when these writings were created. The "Christian" and "Jewish" categories did not necessarily have to be separate in those days, as it is almost always assumed today.[1285] In other words, contemporary assumptions about religious identity can sometimes overly affect the categorization of ancient religious communities. The attempts to unequivocally interperet in religious terms the environment in which *Pseudo- Clementines* were created is a perfect illustration of the case.

Jewish Exegetical Methods in Origen

Origen is believed to be the first Christian writer who came from a Christian family. His father, Leonidas, provided him with an education not only in mathematics, grammar and rhetoric but also in theological thinking and the principles of Christian faith. The latter were rooted so deeply in the heart of the young believer that he repeatedly demonstrated quite radical behaviour in his conduct. When Leonidas fell victim to persecution in 202, his son intended to share his father's fate. His life was spared only because his mother, frightened by her son's ardour, hid his clothes. Without clothes, he could not leave the house.[1286]

> For, at first, entreating him, she begged him to have compassion on her motherly feelings toward him; but finding, that when he had learned that his father had been seized and imprisoned, he was set the more resolutely, and completely carried away with his zeal for martyrdom, she hid all his clothing, and thus compelled him to

1284 "The attitude toward Judaism reflected in these materials is of a different kind from that found elsewhere in early Christian literature. Not only is there no trace of anti-Jewish polemic, but the validity of Jewish tradition is extended down to the author's own time"; J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, 124.

1285 A.Y. Reed, *"Jewish Christianity" after the "Parting of the Ways". Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines*, in: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 189.

1286 F. Drączkowski, *Patrologia*, Pelplin – Lublin 1999, 53.

> remain at home. But, as there was nothing else that he could do, and his zeal beyond his age would not suffer him to be quiet, he sent to his father an encouraging letter on martyrdom, in which he exhorted him, saying, "Take heed not to change your mind on our account." (Eusebius, *Hist.* 6.2)

Origen's comprehensive education was completed by Clement of Alexandria who acquainted him with the writings of Philo and also with the Jewish religion.[1287] The creator of *Hexapla* probably never learnt Hebrew but in his monumental work he included the text of the Hebrew Bible to facilitate, as he claimed, discussions with the Jews. After the death of his father, Origen sold his library, consisting of works of pagan authors, thanks to which he could lead a humble life devoted to science, prayer and writing. Since by nature and conviction he remained an ascetic, the money he earned was enough to survive, away from luxuries and unnecessary pleasures.[1288] In spite of this attitude, his life was filled with long journeys during which he delivered theological lectures. His main occupation, however, remained writing.

In Alexandria Origen was in contact with the very active community of the diaspora. Jewish migrants, as we know, arrived there long before Alexander of Macedon.[1289] The largest wave of them arrived in Alexandria in Persian times. According to Philo, they "inhabited Alexandria and the rest of the country from the Catabathmos on the side of Libya to the boundaries of Ethiopia." (*Flac.* 43) We can find similar observations in Josephus (*Ant.* 19,278-285; *Bell.* 2.488).[1290] The followers of Jahweh settled in the north-eastern part of the city, near the royal palace, on the very sea shore *(Bell.* 2,488) although synagogues were situated also in other parts of the city (*Legat.* 20).[1291]

Coming back to the figure of Origen, today some researchers question the rumour suggesting that the Alexandrian scholar deprived himself of his masculinity because it was only Eusebius who mentioned that fact. Nevertheless, it

---

1287 "Clement and Origen's shared concerns include a defence of the ecclesiastical tradition against the Gnostics on the basis of allegorical interpretation of the Bible and an eschatology in which God's punishments are purificatory rather than retributive. Both authors also distinguish between simple Christians motivated by fear and more advanced, spiritual Christians motivated no longer by fear but by love"; J.W. Trigg, *Origen*, The Early Church Fathers, London – New York 1998, 9.

1288 H. von Campenhausen, *Ojcowie Kościoła*, trans. K. Wierszyłowski, Warszawa 1998, 39.

1289 M. Stern, *The Jewish Diaspora*, in: *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, I, ed. S. Safrai, M, Stern, Amsterdam 1976, 122.

1290 V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, Philadelphia 1966, 197–209; H. Conzelmann, *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in Greco-Roman Era*, Minnepolis 1992, 11.

1291 P. Borgen, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, 95.

is quite possible that Origen spoke of himself when he commented on Christ's words: "There are eunuchs born so from their mother's womb, there are eunuchs made so by human agency and there are eunuchs who have made themselves so for the sake of the kingdom of Heaven. Let anyone accept this who can." (Mt 19:12) About his experience he wrote:

> [Such is man] that instead of rising with the spirit of the words he reads, he remains with the letter. Indeed, some of my predecessors did not hesitate in their writings to provide reasons for certain people, for the kingdom of heaven, to dare to experience the third, as similar to the first two, by their inability to marry. We who once understood Christ and the Word of God, according to the body and the letter, and who now do not understand Him in this way (cf. 2Co 5,16) do not accept the interpretation of those who, for the Kingdom of Heaven, supposedly dealt with the third and their inability of marriage. I would not waste my time confuting the view of those who and the third inability in the likeness of the first two want to comprehend bodily, if I did not see people who dared and did not meet those who can make such a hot-hearted believer, but are not willing to listen to reason.[1292]

Origen was undoubtedly one of the most creative writers of antiquity who outclassed all Church Fathers with his literary output. Beside Plotinus, a pagan, he was considered as the most versatile and inquisitive mind of his age. Jerome claimed that over two thousand works can be attributed to him (*Apology* 2,22). The entire intellectual legacy of Christian writers until his time had been just a prelude to Origen's work. Eusebius adds that the pupil of Origen, Ambrose, covered for Origen the cost of a few stenographers, seven people transcribing whole texts and several calligraphers. The author of the *History of the Church* in exactly such words depicts the whirl of work around the writer: "For he dictated to more than seven amanuenses, who relieved each other at appointed times. And he employed no fewer copyists, besides girls who were skilled in elegant writing." (*Hist.* 6,23) The description shows that the genius from Alexandria created a scriptorium.

The task of the scribes was not easy. They not only had to read the transcripts correctly but also to develop their content. This fact alone proves that the copyists working for Origen were educated people. Antiquity knows a large group of scribes who were trying to rewrite scrolls or books, completely misunderstanding their content because they simply could not read. They rewrote the individual characters (or rather redrew them) without knowing their meaning. Similar examples can also be found among their Jewish predecessors. After all, the Jews needed targumim to understand the holy text.

1292 cf. Orygenes, *Komentarz do Ewangelii według św. Mateusza*, trans. K. Augustyniak, Źródła Myśli Teologicznej 10, Kraków 1998, 232–233.

Origen, who did not keep away from the rabbinic sources of knowledge, often used targumim.[1293] There is an episode connected with one of them which very well reflects the relation between Judaism and Christianity in the third century. A beautiful summary of the history of the chosen nation, compiled in the form of a list of ten songs praising God, was written by the rabbis in the *Targum to the Song of Songs*:

> Song and praises which Salomon, the prophet, king of Israel, spoke by the spirit of Prophecy before of the Lord of all world. Ten songs were uttered in this world. This song was the best of all of them. The first Song Adam uttered at the time his guild was forgiven and the Sabbat day came and protected him. Adam opened his mouth and said: 'Psalm, A song for the Sabbat day.' (Ps 92). The second song Moses uttered with the Israelites at the time the Lord of the world divided for them The Reed Sea. They all began and spoke together, as it is written: 'Then sung Moses and the Israelites.' (Ex 15,1). The third song the Israelites uttered at the time the well of water was given to them, as it is written: 'Then sang Israel.' (Nb 21,17). The fourth song Moses the prophet uttered when his time has come to depart from this world. Then he reproved the people thereby as it is written: 'Give ear, or heavens and I will speak.' (Dt 32)
>
> The Fifth song Joshua son of Nun uttered, when he waged war on Gibeon and the sun and the moon stood for him thirty-six hours and they ceased to utter the song. He opened his mouth and sang the song as it is written: 'Thus sang Joshua before Yhwh.' (Josh 10,12) The sixth song Barak and Deborah uttered on the day of Yhwh delivered Sisera into the hands of the Israelites, as it is written: 'Then sang Deborah and Barak son of Abinoam' (Jud 5,1)
>
> The seventh song Hannah uttered when she was granted a son from Yhwh, as it is written: 'And Hannah prayed and said.' (1Sam 2,1) The eight song David, the king of Israel, uttered for all the miracles Yhwh did for him. He opened his mouth and uttered the song, as it is written: 'David sang in prophecy before the Yhwh.' (2Sam 22,1) The ninth song Solomon king of Israel, uttered by the holy Spirit before the Lord of all world. And the tenth the exiles will utter it at the time they come forth from exile, as clearly written by prophet Isaiah 20,29: 'This song you shall have for joy on the of the festival of Passover is hallowed and gladness of heart, as the people to go to appear before Yhwh three times a year, with varieties of songs and the sound of music to enter the mountain of Yhwh and to worship before Yhwh, the Strong One of Israel.'[1294]

Although the ten songs were written in the *Targum to the Song of Songs*, whose final edition was made in the seventh century, they had been known to rabbis much earlier. More than once they were referred to in midrashim. Origen also knew them, presumably in an abridged version. He was delighted with the rabbinic

1293 Although in Origen's time the presence of the Jews in Alexandria was not as significant as a century earlier, it was there that he got to know a certain Jew who introduced him to the secrets of Judaic exegesis and who taught him Hebrew; J.W. Trigg, *Origen*, 11.

1294 After: F. Manns, *Jewish Interpretations of the Song of Songs*, LA 68 (2008) 285–286.

idea and, inspired by it, decided to create a similar list of songs which would reflect the stages of Christian education.

And so, Christian life begins with baptism which was announced in the Old Testament by the crossing of the Israelites through the separated waters of the Red Sea: "The waters were divided and the Israelites went on dry ground right through the sea, with walls of water to right and left of them." (Ex 14:21b-22) The first song of the baptised person is for Origen the song of Moses and Miriam: "Yah is my strength and my song, to him I owe my deliverance. He is my God and I shall praise him, my father's God and I shall extol him." (Ex 15:2) The christening is the beginning of a way which is a journey across the desert full of wild animals and multiple dangers. The follower of Christ wanders across it until he finds a source of living water that refreshes and gives strength. This source is the Bible given by God to His people.

As soon as the believer discovers the immeasurable richness of God's word written on the pages of the Sacred Scriptures, he can sing the hymn of the Israelites who found a well in the desert. Delighted by the Bible they call: "Spring up, well!" (Nb 21:17) Enriched by the Holy Book in his hand, the Christian comes back to the desert and accompanies Moses to the top of Mount Nebo. From afar, he sees the beauty of the Promised Land. This time his song takes heaven and earth as witnesses: "Listen, heavens, while I speak; hear, earth, the words that I shall say! May my teaching fall like the rain, may my word drop down like the dew, like showers on the grass, like light rain on the turf! For I shall proclaim the name of Yahweh. Oh, tell the greatness of our God! He is the Rock, his work is perfect, for all his ways are equitable. A trustworthy God who does no wrong, he is the Honest, the Upright One!" (Dt 32:1-4)

After entering the land of Canaan, a Christian has to start a battle with its residents. God will provide him with victory and then a new *Song of Deborah* will sound: "So perish all your enemies, Yahweh! And let those who love you be like the sun when he emerges in all his strength." (Jg 5:31) Christian life, however, always remains a struggle. The follower of Christ is like king David who, having conquered his enemies, sings a song of praise to God: "Yahweh is my rock and my fortress, my deliverer is my God. I take refuge in him, my rock, my shield, my saving strength, my stronghold, my place of refuge. My Saviour, you have saved me from violence." (2S 22:2) And it is only at the end of his life that he will sing the sweet song of love, Salomon's Song of Songs.

For Origen, who composed the seven songs, Christian life seems to be a constant alternation of struggle, victory and singing. God offers victory. The war is the war of the Lord, and the song belongs to His followers.

Origen also knew the allegorical interpretation of The Song of Songs presented by Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai. Yohanan in the figure of the bridegroom from the Song of Songs saw God and in the image of the bride he saw the features of the chosen nation. The Hebrew term "bridegroom" written without vowels looks the same as the name of David, and this one was sent by God.[1295] The figure of the

1295 A. Salvesen, *A Convergence of the Ways. The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome*, 248.

bridegroom refers the reader to the Most High. As the key phrase of the book, rabbis recognized the simple expression of powerful feelings uttered by the enamoured Shulamite: "My love is mine and I am his." (Dt 2:16) This confession brings to mind the formula of the covenant between God and Israel: "[…] that he will be your God, that you will be his own people." (Dt 26:17-18)[1296]

The allegory becomes clear: the poem describes God's love for the chosen people. Such a view had been prepared by the prophets who would often refer to the allegory of marriage in demonstrating mutual relations between God and Israel (e.g. Hos 1-2). Besides, in the Song of Songs the bridegroom is the king and the shepherd (Dt 1:4.7; 2:16) and in prophets such images indicate God (Is 40:11 41:21; 43:15; 44:6; 49:9-10; Ezk 37:24; 34:23). The bride is compared to a vineyard and a garden (Dt 1:6; 4:12), i.e. to the classical symbols of Israel (Is 5:7; 51:3; Ezk 36:35). Allegorical understanding of the book is therefore fully justified in biblical terms.[1297]

Origen was familiar with the rabbinic interpretation of the love poem. What is more, he used the allegory but applied it to Christ and the Church. Justification could be found in the New Testament and the transposition of the allegory to Christian ground was not difficult. After all in the Gospels Christ is called the King (Jn 18:37) and the shepherd (Jn 10:11). He is also the bridegroom (Mt 25:1-13). And is the Church not compared to the vineyard (Jn 15:1-11; Mt 20:1; 21:33-46)? For the Alexandrian exegete, there was no doubt that the Song of songs speaks of Christ and the Church.

Origen starts his polemic with the editors of the targum already in the commentary to the second verse of Solomon's work: "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth, for your love-making is sweeter than wine." (Sg 1:2) The matter was simple for the author of *Hexapla*: the kisses of the bridegroom can be identified with the Eucharist that the believers receive into their mouths. The targum offers a different interpretation of the symbol: the kisses indicate the oral Torah transmitted at Mount Sinai: "Solomon the prophet said, 'Blessed be the name of the Lord' who hath given us the law, by the hand of Moses, the great scribe, written upon two tables of stone; and the six parts of the Mishna and the Talmud to study in; and He was speaking to us face to face, as a man

1296 See: J. Słomka, *Starotestamentalne przymierza w interpretacji Orygenesa*, VV 4 (2003) 213–226.

1297 The author of the love song, identified with Solomon, describes the bridegroom using metaphors anchored in the design of the Temple of Jerusalem. His hair is like palm springs, his cheeks like herbs used as ornaments on the temple walls. And the temple is the place which God himself had chosen as his dwelling. At the same time, the beauty of the bride brings to mind the landscapes of former Israel: Jerusalem, Tirzah, Heshbon or Carmel. For this reason her figure may become an allegory of the whole nation.

who kisses his fellow, for the exceeding greatness of the love with which he loved us more than seventy nations."[1298]

To understand the last phrase mentioning the fact that God loves Israel more than seventy nations, the numerical interpretation of the Bible called gematria must be referred to. Numerical value was assigned to every letter of the Hebrew alphabet and on this basis interpretations were made. In what way was gematria used to explain the declaration: "your love-making is sweeter than wine?" The Hebrew noun "wine" corresponds in gematria to number seventy and, according to Genesis, there are seventy nations in the world. From this starting point it is not far to the conclusion that wine in the Song of Songs means all the nations on earth and that God has loved Israel above them all.

Origen, faithful to the rules of allegorical interpretation, rejected it in the rabbinic form. He did not refrain, however, from imitating the methods of rabbinic exegesis. The same *Targum to the Song of Songs* inspired him with at least two ideas: he showed Christian life in the form of seven biblical songs, using the pattern of the ten songs in which rabbis presented the history of Israel; he also adopted the allegorical interpretation of the biblical love poem. Origen's allegory does not speak of God and Israel but of Christ and the Church. In this way, thanks to Origen's skilfulness, Jewish ideas concerning the interpretation of the Song of Songs became part of Christian legacy.

Origen, however, is associated with the polemic between Christians and the Jews not so much due to the application of the rabbinic allegorical method but rather because of the power of arguments with which he refutes the accusations of the pagan philosopher Celsus. In *Contra Celsum*, an extensive fragment of the work written by this philosopher entitled *The True Word* has survived:

> This Jewish made an allegations against Jesus and above all that Jesus 'invented his birth from a virgin' while in reality he was 'born in a certain Jewish village, of a poor woman of the country' and who was turned out of doors by her husband, a carpenter by trade, because she was convicted of adultery; that after being driven away by her husband, and wandering about for a time, she disgracefully gave birth to Jesus, an illegitimate child, who having hired himself out as a servant in Egypt on account of his poverty, and having there acquired some miraculous powers, on which the Egyptians greatly pride themselves, returned to his own country, highly elated on account of them, and by means of these proclaimed himself a God. But let us now return to where the Jew is introduced, speaking of the mother of Jesus, and saying that 'when she was pregnant she was turned out of doors by the carpenter to whom she had been betrothed, as having been guilty of adultery, and that she bore a child to a certain soldier named Pantera (*Against Celsus* 1,28.32).[1299]

1298 F. Manns, *Jewish Interpretations of the Song of Songs*, 285–286.

1299 cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum*, Warszawa 1997, 79–80.83; J. Iluk, *Żydowska politeja i Kościół w Imperium Rzymskim u schyłku antyku*, II, 18; idem, *„Toledot Jeszu" – przekaz talmudyczny o Jezusie i chrześcijanach w żydowskiej recepcji*, in: *Jezus i*

The True Word was probably written in the middle of the second century in Alexandria. As it can be seen, the allegations against Jesus and his mother return here. Later they were repeated in the Talmud.[1300] After Jan Iluk, professor at the University of Gdansk, one can create the following list:

1. [Jesus] invented his birth from a virgin (I,28)
2. [Miriam] was turned out of the door by her husband, a carpenter by trade, because she was convicted of adultery (I,28)
3. the mother of Jesus, when she was pregnant, was sent away by the carpenter to whom she had been betrothed, as having been guilty of adultery with a certain soldier named Pantera (I,32)
4. she disgracefully gave birth to Jesus, an illegitimate child (I,28)
5. who having hired himself out as a servant in Egypt on account of his poverty (I,28)
6. and having there acquired some miraculous powers, returned from thence to his own country, highly elated on account of them (I, 28 and 38)
7. with his tricks of magic and not with the power of God, Jesus persuaded people to follow him as the Messiah, (I,28)
8. by means of magic tricks he proclaimed himself a God (I,28)
9. prophecies of the Old Testament did not refer to Jesus who was a madman and a fool claiming that he had come from heaven (I,50-51)
10. Jesus' deeds prove that he was not the 'son of God' but a wicked man under the influence of an evil spirit (I, 68)
11. according to Celsus: [Jesus] was punished by the Jews for his crimes (II,5)
12. The Jew continues his discourse thus: "How should we deem him to be a God, who not only in other respects, as was currently reported, performed none of his promises, but who also, after we had convicted him, and condemned him as deserving of punishment, was found attempting to conceal himself, and endeavouring to escape in a most disgraceful manner, and who was betrayed by those whom he called disciples? (II, 9)
13. Origen: Then Celsus says: […] He was begotten by one Pantera, who corrupted the Virgin, 'because a god's body would not have been so generated as you were.' (I,69) (I, 69)[1301]

Origen provides more anti-Christian arguments of Jewish provenance. The body of God could not be conceived in an unrighteous way so Jesus could not have been the Son of God (*Cels.* 1,68). Prophecies of the Old Testament did not relate to Jesus

---

chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, 184.

1300 The accusation of the bastardy Jesus is also confirmed in the apocryphal *Gospel of Nicodemus*; *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, I/II, *Ewangelie apokryficzne*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, 639–640.

1301 J. Iluk, *Żydowska politeja i Kościół w Imperium Rzymskim u schyłku antyku*, II, 18–19.

because He was simply a fool who argued that he came from heaven (*Cels.* 1,50-51). Miracles worked by Him did not come from God but were performed by an evil spirit (*Cels.* 1,68). Therefore, it is no wonder that He was punished in the end (*Cels.* 2,5). Although he gave many promises, none of them was fulfilled and, after having been unmasked, he fled and was finally delivered by his disciples (*Cels.* 2,9).[1302] Although the Alexandrian scholar draws the allegations of the believers of Judaism against Jesus from the Gospels, accusing the Jews of the cursing of Jesus, he refers to his present time.[1303] In the *Homily on Jeremiah*, he encourages to enter the synagogue of the Jews and see Jesus scourged by them with language of blasphemies (19,12); and in the *Homily to Psalm 37* he states directly that Jews have been cursing Jesus up to this day.[1304]

Origen tried to provide explanation why the story of Suzanne included in the addition to the Book of Daniel did not enter the Jewish Palestinian canon. According to him, the reason was not only that it had been originally written in Greek but also because it was recognized as inspired by the Church. He argued that Jews knowingly and intentionally removed from the Bible some passages that contained descriptions of scandals concerning old men, rulers or judges. The author of these reflections even states that probably there was a Jewish story about cutting Isaiah with a saw but it has been removed. Such statements by Origen may be surprising because there are hardly any arguments to support them, and, after all, he had Jewish teachers from whom he could draw the information. Therefore, he may have known that the Jews did not hide scandals associated with well-known figures but openly criticized their deeds.[1305]

As follows from the above, Origen willingly applied the same methods of interpretation of the Bible as were known and used by the worshippers of the Judaism but his attitude towards the Jews was characterised by open reluctance. The author of *Contra Celsum* expressed it not so much in personal meetings but rather in his works. And since he wrote quite a number of them, consequently one can come across numerous unflattering remarks about the Jews.

1302 M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, 99–100.

1303 E. Osborn, *Wejście w świat grecko-rzymski*, in: *Historia teologii, I, Epoka patrystyczna*, ed. A. di Bernardino, B. Studer, trans. M. Gołębiowski, J. Łukaszewska, J. Ryndak, P. Zarębski, Kraków 2003, 136.

1304 Quoted after: M. Wróbel, *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, 160.

1305 K. Pilarczyk, *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, 135.

Christian and Jewish Catacombs in Rome in the Second Half of the Third Century

On the basis of the analysis of archaeological data provided by researchers working at the sites set up at catacombs, we may be tempted to try and reconstruct the picture of life and mutual relations of the communities of Christians and Jews living in the capital of the Empire in the last decades of the third century. At first glance, it might seem that both the followers of Judaism and Christians buried their dead in almost the same fashion (whereby Jewish catacombs were created first) but the analysis of the inscriptions of the tombs and the iconography of the catacombs indicates two different ways of thinking and experiencing religiosity. The fundamental concern of the Jews was their way of living and practising their faith in this world while Christians looked for salvation in the future world and directed their hearts and longings towards it.[1306]

About six hundred epitaphs have survived on Jewish graves in the catacombs until today.[1307] It is surprising that such a great number of words included in them is related to the Law. The most frequently appearing word is the Greek adjective *hosios* ("saint") which is a translation of the Hebrew term *hesed*, used to describe people particularly and strictly observing the provisions of the Law.[1308] Roman followers of Judaism were also proficient in word-formation; those who obeyed the Law were referred to in epitaphs as *philonomos* ("the lovers of the Law") and *philentolos* ("the lover of the commandments"). People distinguished by their knowledge of the Law are called *nomomathēs* whereas teachers of the Law are known as *nomodidaskalos*.

Those who presided over the synagogues (*archisynagogos*) as well as their founders were also highly respected. Many men, and even women, were remembered mainly for their financial support of the Jewish communities.[1309] Such is the case of the rich proselyte Veturia Paulla who at the age of 70 joined the followers of Judaism and until the end of her life financially supported the synagogue she attended. After her death, she was called the "mother" of the synagogue. The evidence demonstrating how much the Jews respected such persons is the word appearing on epitaphs: *filosynagogos* ("a friend of synagogue").[1310]

Almost all Jewish sepulchral inscriptions alluded to the earthly life of the dead. They were ended with the phrase "rest in peace" but its intention was to express

1306 M.H. Williams, *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*, 173.
1307 A. Konikoff undertook cataloguing of them (*Sarcophagi from the Jewish Catacombs of Ancient Rome: A Catalogue Raisonée*, Stuttgart 1990).
1308 L.V. Rutgers, *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*, Leiden 1995, 192–193.
1309 M.H. Williams, *The Structure of Roman Jewry Re-Considered – Were the Synagogues of Rome Entirely Homogeneous?*, ZPE 104 (1994) 129–141.
1310 M.H. Williams, *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*,173–174.

hope that the body of the dead would not be disturbed by any thieves, earthquakes or other unfortunate events.[1311] Even the phrase "eternal house" on the Jewish epitaphs in an overwhelming majority refers to the grave. It is not an expression of faith in eternal life after death. It is possible that the Roman Jews believed in physical resurrection but the only sign of such a belief is the name Anastasios given to some, but not very numerous, children.

The meaning of iconography on the Jewish graves in catacombs is very similar to the content of inscriptions.[1312] Menorahs are the most frequent motif on the sarcophagi. They were situated in the places where the Romans used to place portraits of the dead. On the sarcophagi of the leaders of synagogues or people who contributed to their support, *aron kodesh* (a piece of furniture in which a Torah scroll was kept), shofars or floral bouquets (*lulaw* or *etrog*) were engraved.[1313]

The tombs of Christians who also buried their dead in catacombs looked quite different. Their inscriptions and images engraved on epitaphs usually related to the world to come. At once, two issues can be noticed: high frequency of the occurrence of the names Anastasios and Anastasia and the practice of noting down the accurate date of death (Roman Jews did not do that). For Christians the day of their death was at the same time the day of their birth to a new life. In iconography there often appear figures of Jonah and Lazarus seen as the symbol and the announcement of resurrection.[1314] At the same time, the mosaic scenes referring to the figure of Daniel in the den of lions or three young men rescued from the fiery furnace were supposed to indicate that death was the ultimate liberation from the world in which Christians were still exposed to persecution.

1311 J.S. Park, *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions: With Special Reference to Pauline Literature*, Tübingen 2000, 98–112. A dream, both in the Old and in the New Testament, may constitute a euphemism meaning death (Dn 12,7, LXX; Ps 87,6, the LXX; 1Th 5,10). The presence of this concept is also observed in the environment of Judaism. A rabbinic saying coming from approximately 250 AD goes: „You will sleep, but you'll not die"; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, London – New York 1966^2, 295. On the understanding death as sleep on the Jewish epitaphs, see: P. van der Horst, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*, Kampen 1991, 115–117.

1312 M.H. Williams, *Image and Text in the Jewish Epitaphs of Late Ancient Rome*, JSJ 42 (2011) 3, 328–350.

1313 S. Fine, *Art. and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archeology*, ed. S. Fine, Cambridge 2010, 155; M.H. Williams, *The Shaping of the Identity of the Jewish Community in Rome in Antiquity*, in: *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Models of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome*, ed. J. Zangenberg, M. Labahn, London 2004, 33–46.

1314 The conviction of Jonah as the symbol of resurrection is based on Mt 12:39–40; in the case of Lazarus, it is obviously the episode of raising him from the dead by Jesus (Jn 11); R.M. Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, London 2000, 172–174.

Jewish Question at the Synod of Elvira (c. 303)

Elvira, now non-existent, was a town in Spain in the vicinity of present Granada. The synod which was held there in approximately the year 303[1315] (although the synod document is dated 15 May 306) and in which nineteen bishops and twenty-six presbyters participated, was one of the most important gatherings of this type in ancient Christianity.[1316] The only person we know by the name is the president of the synod, bishop Hosius of Cordoba, who was vehemently opposed to Arians. The Church, whose members still constituted a minority in the societies of the empire and which faced persecution, presented its position mainly in reference to the issue of relations of Christians to pagan religions. The baptised were forbidden to visit pagan temples and to make offerings. Anyone who went to such a temple for the purpose of offering sacrifice (*ad templum idoli idolaturus acceserit*) would have been considered as an apostate from the faith. Even greater penalties were provided for the heathen priests who had accepted Christianity and then returned to former beliefs. All forms of idolatry met with decided opposition and these included, for instance, organizing fights of gladiators, bringing about someone's death by uttering spells or marriage of a Christian virgin to a pagan.[1317]

There is a debate among researchers if all the canons assigned to the fathers of the Synod of Elvira, constituting the final resolutions of the meeting, were actually written by them.[1318] In any event, such doubts do not refer to canon 16 of the synodal document, which puts the Gentiles and Jews in one line. It concerns mixed marriages: "Heretics, if they are unwilling to enter the Catholic Church, are not to have Catholic girls given to them in marriage, neither to Jews nor to heretics, since there can be no community for the faithful with the unfaithful. If parents act against this prohibition, they shall be excommunicated for five years."[1319]

One of the canons seems to be a reflection of the practice of cooperation between Christians and Jews; cooperation, which was getting out of control of the ecclesial authorities and then was prohibited. This refers to the issue of blessing the crops of the land: "Landlords are not to allow Jews to bless the crops they have received from God and for which they have offered thanks. Such an action would make our blessing invalid and meaningless. Anyone who continues this practice is to be expelled completely from the church (*si quis post interdictum facere usurpaverit, petinus ab ecclesia abiciatur*)." (49)

1315 P. Fredriksen, *What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, 60.

1316 M. Meigne, *Concile ou collection d'Elvire*, RHE 70 (1975) 361.

1317 M. Kieling, *Kościół wobec idolatrii na podstawie dokumentów synodów w latach 50-381*, VP 30 (2010) 55, 283.

1318 H. Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, Oxford 2002, 40–42.

1319 M. Kieling, *Kościół wobec idolatrii na podstawie dokumentów synodów w latach 50-381*, 284.

Christians were also not allowed to stay as guests in Jewish houses: "If any of the clergy or the faithful eats with Jews, he shall be kept from communion in order that he be corrected as he should (*placuit eum a communione abstineri ut debeat emendari*)." (50) Finally, one of the detailed provisions concerns the sin of adultery committed by a Christian with a Jewess: "If a Christian confesses adultery with a Jewish or pagan woman, he is denied communion for some time. If his sin is exposed by someone else, he must complete five years' penance before receiving the Sunday communion (*post quinquennium acta legitima poenitentia poterit dominicae sociari communioni*)." (78)

Although it is known relatively little about the Church in Spain before the time of Constantine, the conclusion which can be drawn on the basis of the cited decisions of the Synod of Elvira (the first one which demanded celibacy from clergy at the local level)[1320] is that the image of the relations between Christians and the Jews was not uniform. It is clear that before the synod in everyday life there were numerous private contacts between the representatives of both religions, the blessing of the produce of the land or even mixed marriages took place. Motivated by theological and historical reasons, the ecclesial authorities tried to reduce mutual contacts but it is difficult today to estimate what effect these attempts had.[1321]

The Epilogue: Towards the Milanese Rescript (313 AD)

The last years before Constantine's coming to power were marked by particularly violent persecution of Christians. They were crushed bloodily above all in the East in the years 303–311. In the West the followers of Christ were treated a bit more gently. Maxentius, who took over the reign in Italy and North Africa, definitively ended the persecution of the Church in his realm.[1322] But before that, the bloodiest butcheries of Christians in antiquity took place, generated by Diocletian in the years 303–305. The situation improved a little after his abdication in the year 305. In the West the persecutions of Christians ceased almost completely while in the East the process was gradual.

1320 It is true that celibacy is assessed differently by the Jews than by Christians, among whom monasticism was becoming more and more common, but the opinion expressed by M. Foucault and L.D. Kritzman seems to be too radical: "Christianity's parent religion, Judaism, is actively hostile to celibacy, one of monasticism's chief institutions"; M. Foucault, L.D. Kritzman, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, trans. L.D. Kritzman, London 1998, 265.

1321 C.T.R. Hayward from Durham University has confirmed this state of affairs: "[…] it is known that in the period before the first Council of Nicea (325 CE) relations between Christians and Jews in some places were cordial, even friendly"; Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and some Early Christian Writings. From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion, 357.

1322 H.W. Attridge, *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70-312)*, 314–315.

In October 312 the army of Constantine stood opposite a twice bigger army of Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge. The future emperor ascribed his victory to the God of the Christians and after his coming to power, he began to abolish all regulations hostile to the followers of the monotheistic religion. As the ruler of the western empire, Constantine invited to Milan Licinius, the governor of the eastern part of the empire. The meeting took place in February 313 and its fruit was the Milanese rescript which inter alia announced: "When you see that this has been granted to [Christians] by us, your Worship will know that we have also conceded to other religions the right of open and free observance of their worship for the sake of the peace of our times."[1323]

The rescript substantially influenced not so much the mutual relations between Christians and the Jews but rather the way in which they were displayed.[1324] When Christianity was persecuted, Jewish believers could, without serious consequences from the authorities, show their reluctance towards the followers of Christ. After the year 313, the Jews were almost totally silent on the matter of the Church.[1325] That is entirely understandable because combating a *religio licita*, they would have exposed themselves to restrictions on the part of the authorities of the Roman Empire.

After the rescript of Constantine, Christians could leave the catacombs. They inhaled the new freedom and the controversy with Judaism lost its significance. A new period of civilizational development started for the Roman world.

1323 C. Piétri, *Konstantin und die Christianisirung des Reiches*, in: *Die Geschichte des Christentums*, II, *Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (250-430)*, ed. C. i L. Piétri, Freiburg im Breisgau 2005, 207–208.

1324 A.H.Becker points out: "[…] scholars have agreed that the conversion of Constantine and the Christianization of the Roman Empire caused the communal boundaries between Jews and Christians to harden, eventually leading to their divergence into completely separate religious Communities"; A.H.Becker, *Beyond the Spatial and Temporal Limes. Questioning the "Parting of the Ways" Outside the Roman Empire*, [in:] *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed.A.H.Becker, A.Y.Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, 374.

1325 W. Chrostowski, *Żydzi i religia żydowska a Maryja Matka Jezusa*, 220.

Conclusion

> The practice of a dialogue between Christians and Jews should lead to adoption of permanent attitude, consisting in the constant openness to the presence and the needs of others. Universal virtue of a dialogue is beneficial for transformations all around the world. Common spiritual heritage of Christians and the Jews
>
> *- the Pastoral Letter of the Polish Episcopate on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the declaration Nostra aetate*

The retired professor of Princeton University, J.G. Gager, is an author of a well-known and controversial thesis that the study of the relations between the Jews and the Gentiles (within the Greco-Roman communities) is equivalent to studying the history of anti-Semitism.[1326] Leaving aside the assessment of the relevance of this expression, one can ask whether the same can be said about the research concerning relations between Christians and the Jews in the first three centuries of the existence of the Church.

For several decades of the previous century, researchers reflecting on Judaism and Christianity in the first centuries, focused on the process of the parting of the ways between both religions. This approach suggested that from one religious community described as biblical Judaism two religions finally emerged: Christianity and rabbinic Judaism; religions which not only created totally separate structures but actually displayed open hostility towards each other. In recent years, however, the direction of research has changed to such an extent that some authors are inclined to believe that the ways of Church and Synagogue have never parted. Such an approach seems to be suggested by the title of one of the most important publications in this field: *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003).

This approach emphasizes mutual ties between both religions. Paradoxically, the boundaries between them divide them and connect at the same time. *Parting of the ways* is only a mental model, claim the supporters of the new current, a model that not so much describes history but rather constitutes an intellectual construct facilitating the understanding of it. As every metaphor, this model is useful insofar as it simplifies the interpretation of biblical data, data coming from

---

1326 "The study of relations between Jews and Gentiles in antiquity is synonymous with the study of ancient anti-Semitism"; J.G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, 6.

non-biblical literature (Jewish, Christian, Roman, Greek) and the results of archaeological studies. Therefore, it cannot be treated as an axiom but as a research tool.

Both views on the issue of the Christian-Jewish relations in the early centuries after Christ, depicted above, are valuable since they make the reader aware of how complex the process was. It is obvious that the simple *parting* model, according to which at a certain point in history Judaism and Christianity became two separate religions and their mutual interactions, if any, were marked with antipathy and even hostility, is no longer sufficient. The analysis of literary data (as mentioned above: biblical and extra-biblical souces coming from both religious circles as well as Greek and Roman literature) and the outcomes of archaeological studies combined with the growing awareness of social, political, agricultural, economic and cultural situation in the early centuries after Christ prompts us to venture a thesis that, over centuries, the two religions influenced each other, shaping the convictions and even religious beliefs of their followers.

In contemporary research on the issue of Christian-Jewish relations in the first centuries, the emphasis is shifted from the model accepted for many years and still dominating (and very inspiring), a model which shows both religions as stemming from the same root, to the metaphor of a "two-lane road" (these lanes obviously stand for Judaism and Christianity, both religions in their polymorphous forms) where each of the lanes gets narrower or wider at the cost of the other. Some researchers seem to propose another image: of two ways running almost side by side, "almost" meaning that now and then they touch each other and or even cross each other. It should be immediately added, however, that although this model is becoming more and more popular, like any other mental model, it is imperfect and one must not go too far in the implications arising from it.

The aim of this study is the presentation of the dynamism of Christian-Jewish relations in the first three centuries of the existence of the Church taking into account mainly historical and theological (but not only) factors which influenced these relations and finally led to the creation of two separate religions; it must be added: religions existing side by side, in many aspects connected with each other mostly because both originate from biblical Judaism. General conclusions which can be drawn on the basis of the conducted analyses can be summarised in the following way:

(1) The terms "Judaism" and "Christianity" as well as "Church" and "Synagogue," commonly used in literature, especially in historiographic and theological works, need to be more precisely defined. These terms are usually used to indicate the contrast and even opposition between both religious communities whereas in fact, till the end of the first century, Judeo-Christian members of the Church still belonged to the Synagogue (some of them even in the fourth century participated in synagogue services) and in many regions Christianity was considered to be one of the currents of Judaism. Until the outbreak of the first Jewish war in the year 66, Christians (who *nota bene* did not refer in this way to themselves in the context of the relations with Judaism but only, and not very often, to show their

adherence to Christ in pagan environment, for example in Antioch) existed next to the Pharisees, the Essenes or the Sadducees.

In principle, two currents of Judaism survived the fall of the Temple: the Pharisees and the Jewish believers in Christ. This was when the process of distancing of these currents from each other became more dynamic, until the separation of both religious communities took place and two different religions, rabbinic Judaism and Christianity, developed. It happened in Palestine at the beginning of the second century and only since that time it is justified to speak of Church and Synagogue or Christianity and Judaism as of opposed albeit not disjunctive terms. The parting occurred earlier in Rome and in the western provinces of the Roman Empire, and later in Syria and in the regions located to the east of the homeland of Jesus.

(2) There in a need to define more precisely the technical term *parting of the ways*, which is differently translated into Polish ("parting of the ways," "the departure" of Church from Synagogue or "the departure" of Synagogue from Church understood as the continuation of biblical Judaism, "a split" between Judaism and Christianity, "a separation" etc.). This term refers us back to the model of description of the process according to which two religions emerged from biblical Judaism: Christianity and rabbinic Judaism (in this chronological order). In other words, from one "way" two different "ways" emerged.

Although the validity of the above view cannot be denied, one should be aware of the fact that Judaism of the first century did not represent one way. Apart from groups traditionally enumerated in handbooks (pharisaism, sadduceism, essenism, zealotry with its radical wing of sicarians, Herodians, scribes, supporters of John the Baptist sometimes described as the Baptists, the Egyptian Therapeutae, and possibly also the Samaritans as the heirs to the Mosaic religion), in Judaism there was also a current associated with apocalyptic literature, then the mystical trend as well as ordinary *am-haaretz*, that is shepherds not knowing the Law and the poorest people of Palestine.[1327] Different faces of Judaism in the diaspora should also be added to the list (for example, the Egyptian Therapeutae).

Therefore, many authors prefer to speak about "Judaisms" in the first century.[1328] The ways of practising Judaism were very different and sometimes distant from each other. And from them two separate religions, Christianity and rabbinic Judaism, emerged. What is more, both emphasized the "way," which means the

1327 A. Mrozek, *Chrześcijaństwo jako herezja judaizmu*, 10. The author uses the term "heresy" in the same sense in which it was used in the writings of Jewish historians of the first century and in the New Testament: Josephus and Philo used the term *hairesis* "to determine not only philosophical schools but also religious groups within Judaism such as the Essenes, the Sadducees and the Pharisees. The Meaning of the term *hairesis* in the New Testament is close to that which we find in Hellenistic texts and in Judaism"; ibid., 12.

1328 B. Chilton, J. Neusner, *Judaism in the New Testament. Practices and Beliefs*, XVIII.

manner of cultivating the bond with God, and both saw themselves as the "way." Rabbis developed *halakha*, in other words, "the way" of the interpretation and application of the Law in everyday life.[1329] Similarly, Christianity was seen as "a way" (9,2) and Christ himself declared that He was "the Way" leading towards God (Jn 14:6). What is more, because the process of disunion between the two religious communities took place in different places and at different times, and was motivated by various factors, therefore many authors prefer to speak of *partings* (plural) of Judaism and Christianity.

The issue that still calls for in-depth consideration is the complexity of the image of Christianity which was not homogeneous throughout the Roman Empire in the three first centuries. Apart from Judeo-Christians and ethno-Christians, there appeared communities like the Ebionites, the Elcesaites or the Nazarenes. Also the adherers of Marcion or of Montanus aspired to the name of Christians; they were excluded from the Church community but it does not mean that the Jews did not to see Christians in them. Hence, among the opinions about the different faces of the Church in the first centuries, one can come across the view represented for example by R. Kraft who prefers to speak of "Christianities" rather than the Christianity of that time. In any case, it is clear that the simple image of the tearing of one canvas of Judaism into two parts (like the tearing of the Temple's curtain at the moment of Jesus' death) is not adequate to express the very complex process of the emergence of the two religions.

Generally speaking, the process of creation of rabbinic Judaism and Christianity as separate religions concerns only Judeo-Christians. It is hard to speak about the "parting of the ways" of ethno-Christians and the Jews who were not Christian since their ways were never common. Even the most Hellenised Jews in the diaspora (such as Philo of Alexandria) belonged to Jewish communities which gathered on the Sabbath in synagogues and carefully protected their identity as those who were different from "the Greeks." Pagans known as "God-fearers" could not fully participate in the life of Jewish communities unless they became proselytes. On the other hand, there is no evidence of any Jewish community not believing in Christ that would welcome ethno-Christians with open arms, especially if the latter refused to circumcize. Hence, there was no need for "the parting of ways" of Christians descending from pagan religions and the Jews not recognizing Christ.

The question of internal tensions in the religious community affected most powerfully the Jewish followers of Christ. They had to decide if they should join the communities in which an increasingly large group consisted of ethno-Christians or try to stay within the Jewish communities which did not accept Christ or maybe to make an effort to develop their own religious structures comprising only Judeo-Christians. The first possibility, most often confirmed by the New Testament writings, resulted with time in the loss by the Jews believing in Christ of their

1329 In a similar way, the residents of Qumran saw their community as "the way" (1QS 4,22; 8,10.18,21; 9,5).

Jewish identity. The second possibility did not stand the test of time: the Jews believing in Christ were recognized as apostates and excluded from Synagogue by official (rabbinic) Judaism. The supporters of the third possibility, forming communities of Judeo-Christians (related to the Ebionites, the Nazarenes and the Elcesaites) had to find an intermediate status between Christians of pagan descent and Jews rejecting the faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Communities of that type, even if they managed to form coherent religious structures, did not survive long.

(3) The process of parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue followed a model illustrated by sociologists of religion, namely the process of transforming a reform movement into a wide religious trend and then into a new religion. New religious movements do not emerge from nowhere but are created in the specific environment of a particular religion. The movements draw extensively on the tradition, habits and beliefs of this religion but at the same time oppose to some of its elements. The intention of the leaders of religious renewal movements is not to create a new religion but rather to reform the existing one. Their aim usually is the rejection of certain beliefs, practices or religious rituals, which have been developing and shaping for ages, and the return to the inital purity. Thus reform movements emerge for the purpose of transforming the existing religion and do not identify themselves with the new religion.

A new religious current is called by sociologists a religious fraction which over time becomes a sect to finally create a new religion. In order for a religious fraction to be transformed into a sect, certain conditions should be fulfiled. In the case of emerging Christianity they were: (a) the increase of social and ideological (theological) tensions between the fraction of Jesus and the rest of the believing Jews; these tensions essentially concerned the recognition of the messianic mission of Jesus and His deity, observing the Law, Temple worship and the commandments relating to ritual purity; (b) the influx of classes or social groups excluded by official Judaism (like the Samaritans or the Gentiles) to the new fraction; (c) autodeclaration of the members of the new religious fraction that it identifies itself with God's Israel and that Old Testament promises of God regarding His people refer to it; (d) the replacement of important religious institutions – in this case the Temple worship – with Jesus Christ's sacrifice manifested in the Eucharist; (e) the growing awareness among the members of the new religious fraction of its own distinctness from "the master religion" expressing itself in the division into "we" and "them," "the Jews" and "their (synagogues)"; (f) a declaration on the part of the representatives of "the master religion" that the new religious fraction is not representative for the whole religion (e.g. *birkat ha-minim*). Increasing of these factors inside the sect, along with its numerical growth, leads to the establishment of a new religion.[1330]

1330 J.H. Elliott, *Phases in the Social Formation of Early Christianity: From Faction to Sect – A Social Scientific Perspective*, in: *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in*

The objective of the religious movement started by Jesus was to prepare the worshippers of Judaism for the imminent coming of the kingdom of God. Neither at the time of Jesus nor in the first generation of Christians did it have the time to transform into a sect. It was still a religious movement within Judaism. After the death of Christ, His disciples continued the mission of their Master, hoping to reach the Jews with the message of the Good News.[1331] St. Paul triggered a split between the Jews living in the diaspora and those who lived in Palestine. For all believers in Christ, he waived the requirement of circumcision, the kosher food laws and some other prerequisites of Jewish life which were incomprehensible to etno-Christians. However, he did not replace the Sabbath with Sunday and he himself attended the synagogue. To the very end, he considered himself to be a faithful Jew reformulating the definition of Abraham's descendants as those who remained faithful to the covenant. Judeo-Christians proclaiming the gospel in Judea and Galilee intended to make their co-believers aware that redemption had already become a reality. They still wanted to be a religious movement. Nevertheless, what started as a religious movement in Judaism over time became a wide religious mainstream because of the opposition within the Judaism itself (including also Judeo-Christianity), and consequently became a separate religion.

A religious movement already at its early stage meets opponents, especially among more traditional and orthodox leaders of the former religion. So it was in the case of the emerging Christianity. In the beginning this conflict allows the supporters of the reformation movement to realize with greater precision their own goals. Nevertheless, in most cases, religious authorities support the followers of traditional religion forms, and with time the members of the movement are pushed outside the religious mainstream and finally a new group emerges outside the initial community, which results in a new religion. The polarization of the objectives of both groups significantly accelerates the process which is concluded with the creation of a new religious community.

It seems that this model was applied in the case of Judeo-Christians, at least those surrounding Paul. When the proclamation of the Good News by the apostle of the nations was rejected by the Jews, Paul acknowledged that God had hardened their hearts and he went on to teach pagans. Some Judeo-Christians who accepted Paul's preaching became his opponents, others created communities with ethno-Christians who did not abide by the Jewish Law. The apostle of the nations had to convince the inhabitants of Rome and Galatia to what was apparently already known in Antioch (Ga 2:4-5), namely that Christians of pagan descent did not have to obey the Law. The whole process, enhanced by the exclusion of the followers of Christ from Synagogue after year 90, resulted in the advent of Christianity as a separate religion.

Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, 288–289.

1331 F. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*, 47–48.

From the point of view of sociology of religion, the moment in which a religious current becomes a new religion precedes the rational justification of this process. In other words, in the case of Christianity, believers in Christ actually established a new religion and only later did they develop a rational justification for the facts; justification based of course on premises which were the bone of contention with the followers of Judaism rejecting Christ at a time when Christianity was only a reformist movement within Judaism. The rationalization was primarily demanded by communities composed of ethno-Christians, where there was a need to justify why their members did not comply fully with the Jewish Law. According to the findings of sociologists of religion, each of the groups separating themselves from the religious mainstream should justify their behaviour, and the justification takes a threefold form: *denuntiatio – antithesis – re-interpretatio*. All three elements of the process of justification of the separation of two religious communities can be traced in the case of the Church and the Synagogue, which is evident in Paul's correspondence with the Romans and the Galatians.

(4) The books of the New Testament, which are an integral part of the Christian Bible, also constitute a collection of Jewish scriptures. This is because, first of all, they were created when the paths of the Church and the Synagogue were not separated yet, and secondly because their authors were the Jews who believed in Jesus as the Messiah. The exception is Luke the evangelist; however, after the acceptance of Christianity, he also became the follower of this current of Judaism which supported Jesus. Christianity became a separate religion after the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles saw the light of day. The New Testament is therefore part of Jewish literature, which was finally more clearly noticed by the Jews themselves only in the last century. It can only be understood through the prism of Jewish tradition and the religiosity of Judaism. What is more, Judaism itself in the first centuries can be understood better in the light of the letters of the New Testament.

In the emerging Church, the Hebrew Bible was read differently than it was done by other followers of Judaism. The text was reinterpreted and it needs to be added that the reinterpretation was thoroughly Christological. This was also one of the factors which finally led to the creation of two religions. Christians took over from the Jews the interpretation of many fragments of the Hebrew Bible which were perceived by Judaism as Messianic but also added other fragments to the list, in which the Jews did not see the prophecies concerning the coming of the Messiah. In both communities new methods of the interpretation of the Bible developed. Many of them were shared by both communities, others were totally different.

While the Jews followed the path governed by the seven rules of Hillel, reviewed and completed by his descendants, the Church employed the allegorical interpretation originating from Alexandria along with the "literal" approach of the Antioch school. From the renewed reading of the Bible, theology arose in the Church, then liturgy developed and moral principles were introduced. What was sought was the standardization of the articles of faith as well as moral principles and liturgy norms derived from them. Judaism was quite different in this respect. The authority of

sages and teachers was obviously acknowledged but it was possible to accept different and often divergent opinions on the same issue.

As far as non-biblical Christian and Jewish literature is concerned, it should be pointed out that since the beginning of the second century an entirely different way of translating religious beliefs into the written language in both communities began to shape. Rabbinic Judaism created its own writings which can be listed in almost chronological order as the Mishnah, the Gemara, the Tosefta and the Talmud in both versions, and also midrashim and targumim created simultaneously. Christianity gave rise to ascetic, polemical and apologetic works. A common characteristic of both literatures are apocryphal apocalypses.

At the end of the second century, not only the content of religious books was different (besides, other works did not appear at this time in Judaism or in Christianity) but also their form. Jewish believers adhered to traditional scrolls (and so it has continued up to this day – in synagogues one can read the Hebrew Bible only from scrolls); Christians, however, used more convenient codes in which they applied abbreviations of the names of saints (*nomina sacra*). This habit was totally alien to Jewish writers.

(5) There is no doubt that rabbinic Judaism and Christianity started to exist as separate religions in different places and at different times. It seems that at the earliest, the division became reality in Rome when Nero accused the followers of Christ of starting the fire in the year 64, not identifying them with the Jews any more. The Roman authorities distinguished the two religious groups already at the beginning of the second century. This is evidenced by the issue of *Fiscus Iudaicus* which, at that time, was not imposed on Christians, and also the issue of persecution. The tax imposed on the Jews by Vespasian after the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem was maintained by his son Domitian (81-96) and it encompassed those who "lived the Jewish way" and those who had rejected their Jewish roots. Not only the followers of Christ descended from Judaism (even though they were considered as those who had actually rejected their Jewish identity) but also probably Christians of pagan descent were included in the first group.

Since the time of the successor of Domitian, Nerva (96), Christians were exempt from the payment of the *Fiscus Iudaicus*. The persecution against Christians did not encompass the Jews and vice versa. After the Bar Kokhba revolt (132-135) the edge of policy of the empire was directed against the Jews (Rabbi Akiba became a famous Jewish martyr) and this time the followers of Christ were not bothered. On the other hand, Bar Kokhba himself persecuted Judeo-Christians for the reason that they recognised the Messiah in Jesus, and not in him. In Palestine, Jews and Christians saw each other as two completely separate religious communities after the creation of the Academy in Jabneh around the year 90. Both the Jerusalem Talmud and the Babylonian Talmud confirm that the blessing of *minim* from the "Eighteen Blessings" prayer was created at that time.

There are no sources coming from this period in Palestine which would confirm the presence of Christians in typically (ethnically) Jewish communities of Judaism. There are also no sources (in Palestine) confirming the presence of

Judeo-Christians in communities of Christians descending from paganism (unless the former abandoned Judaism altogether). Outside Palestine, in the second and third centuries, there were more and more critical voices in the Church concerning those Christians who seemed too "Jewish" in their convictions and practices (they attended synagogues on the Sabbath day, they followed Jewish purification rules and especially customs regarding the consumption of kosher meals).

(6) Anyone who would assume that the split between Judaism and Christianity suddenly accelerated when the news about Christ crossed the boundaries of Palestine and the mission of the Church started to develop dynamically among pagans would be wrong. The first Christian communities originating from pagan religions date back to the time of diaspora synagogues, and the most obvious illustration of this fact is the teaching of Paul; he almost always started proclaiming the Good News during synagogue gatherings. But even in the places which were reached by Christianity without contact with the local synagogues, it brought along its Judaic roots. The Gentiles accepting Christ had to come across Judaism within which the Church was emerging.

The attitude of the members of emerging Christian communities towards Judaism was mostly shaped by their founders. There were communes where the Jewish origin of the Church religiosity was emphasised stronger than in others. Indeed, the Church quite quickly dealt with the problem of those Judeo-Christians who tried to impose on the followers of Christ the obligation to circumcize, to celebrate the Sabbath and to obey dietary rules but it did not want and it could not distance itself from the story of salvation. The figures of Abraham, Moses or Isaiah were as important to Christians and they were to the Jews, though for different reasons. Thus both in Palestine and outside ot it, Judaism remained an important factor of Christian identity. The members of the Church, proclaiming the faith in Christ among pagan society, referred to Judaism. On the one hand, they showed the "truth" of the biblical religion of Israel; on the other hand, they made the listeners of the Good News aware of the fact that many Jews rejected Christ.

(7) Two preliminary assumptions, referred to in the introduction to this book, were made at the beginning of the research; namely that the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue was not a single act but a very long and complex process and that a significant part in this process was played by Judeo-Christians. The conducted analyses lead us to the conclusion that the second assumption – although it is undeniably true and should be maintained – requires more precise specification. In principle, in literature "Judeo-Christians" are those followers of Christ who descended from Judaism and as the Jews accepted the words of the Good News and baptism, thereby entering the ranks of the Church (though sometimes this term takes on different shades of meaning; see point (12)).

The theological and historical analyses have brought to light many nuances linked to this issue. It turns out that there were Judeo-Christians who had departed from practising the Law of Moses (like circumcision, celebration of the Sabbath, observance of religious dietary rules of Kashrut) almost completely, and those who, believing in Christ, still observed the Jewish customs. In this perspective, the

Judaizers coming from heathenism also played a major role. Although they entered the Christian community from a pagan community, along with the discovery the new faith they discovered Judaism and leaned towards it, sometimes even more than Judeo-Christians. In addition, various communities whose members were Judeo-Christians or/and Judaizers were characterized by stronger or less strong attachment to the Jewish tradition, customs and rules.

Thus, justified seems to be the intuition of Annette Yoshiko Reed, according to whom, in many cases, instead of speaking of one "Judeo-Christianity," we should rather speak of Christians attached to a greater or lesser extent to the Jewish way of practising the faith. It means that the believers in Jesus, attached to rules of the Mosaic Law, preserved them to a greater or lesser degree. What is more, they did not disappear from the religious scene of the ancient world as quickly as it has been widely assumed in the studies until recently. Researchers dealing with the issue of *the parting of the ways* essentially concentrated on relations between Christian and Jewish communities in the Mediterranean Sea and thus on the territories where Greco-Hellenistic and Roman cultures dominated. However, the development of Christianity was directed not only to the west of Palestine. The followers of Christ equally quickly brought the Good News to the East, to regions where Semitic mentality dominated. There, especially in Syria, Judeo-Christian communities were developing their activities over a much longer period of time than in Europe; some of them survived even till the beginnings of the fourth century.

(8) The thesis that the communities of Church and Synagogue remained unfriendly to each other since the very beginning of the proclamation of the Good News cannot be supported. Indeed, the tensions between them could be noticed almost immediately after the death and the resurrection of Christ and are in a sense a continuation of the attitude that official Judaism in Palestine adopted to Jesus himself. Since Jesus was rejected by many Jews, no wonder that a similar rejection awaited His disciples who were creating the nascent community of the Church. However, the Gospel was preached first among the Jews in synagogues which in the first century were basically led by those who descended from the tribe of Levi. Also the Christian mission among the Gentiles often started in the environment of a synagogue attended not only by Jews but also by proselytes and God-fearers.

The spark ignited at the diaspora synagogues spread the faith in Christ among believers of the Greek religion. The situation changed at the end of the first century, after the creation of Jabneh academy and spreading of the *birkat ha-minim*. Rabbis mainly descending from Pharisaic environments became leaders of synagogues while, at the same time, after the destruction of the Temple, priesthood lost its previous significance. The polarization of mutual references of Church and Synagogue as the environments adopting a negative attitude to each other grew much stronger at the beginning of the second century and, therefore, it is an anachronism to show mutual hostility of both religious communities already in the first century.

(9) When the division between Judaism and Christianity became a fact, it did not entail the discontinuity of mutual contacts between the representatives

of Judaism and Christianity, the end of debates or lack of reciprocal influence of written works created within both communities. Christian literature, after the separation of the two religions, is saturated with references to Jewish beliefs. It is worth noticing that these references often constitute a response to the writings or views proclaimed by the Jews. The same applies to rabbinic literature; we find in it – though very few – references to the views of Christians, and these references seem to be a reaction to the beliefs proclaimed by the followers of Christ.

The references in the works of both Christian and Judaic provenance neither prove the process of moving apart of the paths of Church and Synagogue nor deny it. They simply testify to the fact that Christians and Jews did not stop talking to each other or debating even when their religious paths were already separate. A perfect example of a polemical writing coming from the time when its author did not view the paths of Church and Synagogue as common is the *Dialogue with Trypho* by Justin Martyr. The work created just before the middle of the second century gives evidence (as the title itself points out) of the existence of a dialogue between the followers of Christianity and of Judaism and, at the same time, the reader has an irresistible impression that those were already two separate religions.

(10) One of the most striking features of rabbinic literature in the second and third centuries is nearly utter absence of references to Jesus and Christianity, as mentioned before. These dozen or so references, discussed in this presentation, create a thoroughly negative picture of who Jesus was and who His followers were. However, anybody assuming that Christianity was a topic of interest for the rabbis would be mistaken. Some believe that in Judaism of the second and third centuries there existed a "conspiracy of silence" about Christianity. The argument *ex silentio* may be weighty if we take into consideration the extraordinary value of oral tradition, cultivated by rabbinic Judaism. The silence about Christianity and its Founder, about the dynamically developing Church is even more surprising if we consider that there are many fragments of rabbinic literature referring to the relations with the Roman authorities, to idolatry, and even to the way in which sacrifices should be offered in the Jerusalem Temple which had ceased to exist decades before.

From the pages of Jewish literature one may get the impression that rabbis were not in any way interested in the widespread news about Jesus in whom many saw the Messiah.[1332] On the other hand, it is known that disputes between Jewish sages and Christian theologians were not a rarity at all. Interestingly, the adversaries of the rabbis were almost always Judeo-Christians because Christians coming from pagan religions were considered by the Jews to be polytheists, and therefore people one can not find common ground with. Besides, many midrashim, although they do not mention Christians, seem to give the Jewish answer to the Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible.

1332 S.J.D. Cohen, *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, 234–235.

(11) In order to describe the parting of the ways of Christianity and Judaism until they were established as two separate religions, it seems useful to apply the model according to which a vivid exchange of ideas and views, sometimes combined with sharp confrontation, takes place at the initial stage of the occurrence of different interpretations of the previously common religious heritage. When the communities solidified and clearly defined their identity, there came a time of acute polemics which was not – as until recently many researchers believed – an interreligious but intrareligious, and often also intraethnic, polemic. Criticism was aimed mainly at its own followers. Only when this polemic did not bring the expected results and both communities entrenched themselves even more in their identities, there came a weakening, and sometimes the termination of mutual debates.

The emergence of two separate religious communities from biblical Judaism is not based solely on theological factors. Neither the manner of understanding of the role of individual commandments of the Law, nor the appearance of people of pagan origin in synagogues, nor even the question of the messianic dignity of Jesus was a sufficient ground for a complete break between Christianity and Judaism. Yes, theological differences of this type stirred up tension but there had always been conflicts within the same religion. Similar phenomena existed before the year 70 within Judaism and did not result in the creation of a new religious community. It was just the accumulation of theological factors and the socio-political situation that created the *millieu* for the emergence of two religions from a single stem. A significant part among socio-political factors was played by both Jewish wars. During the first one, what for Christians had been clear immediately after the resurrection of Christ became widely known; namely the fact that His followers completely rejected the role of the worship in the Temple of Jerusalem. During the second war (the Bar Kokhba revolt), by the proclamation of the leader of the uprising as the messiah, the Jews voiced their conviction that they did not recognize him in Jesus of Nazareth.

(12) From the methodological point of view, the latest research studies on the emergence of two separate religions from biblical Judaism encounter some terminological difficulties. Researchers in both academic and popular works use in an ambiguous way the terms "Judeo-Christianity," "Judeo-Christian," "Judaizers," "Jewish Christianity" or "Christian Judaism." The meaning of these terms used by individual authors differs significantly. In some works the term "Judeo-Christian" is used to refer to the baptised Jews who joined the Church, others use it to describe Christians descending from pagan religions (ethno-Christians) who tended to observe Jewish practices. In the latter case, there is no clear border between "Judeo-Christians" and "Judaizers."

Understanding of the identity of "Judaizers" is not uniform, either. Some authors use the term to describe only those Christians who came from Judaism and agreed to adhere to Jewish traditions; there are also those who without hesitation extend the group to the followers of Christ originating from pagan religions. A reader struggles with the same issue when he or she notices how differently the terms "Jewish Christianity" and "Christian Judaism" (these mostly appear in English

literature) are used by researchers. Does the former mean Christian communities created among the Jews or maybe Jewish origins of Christianity? Is "Christian Judaism" a religion followed by the so-called Messianic Jews (referred to below)? Further research on the issue of parting of ways should sort out the terminological issue in order to systematize the methodology of the topic.

*

A fresh topic in the field of *the parting(s) of the ways* remains the issue which goes beyond the designated chronological scope of this work; namely the question of the identity of the so-called messianic Jews.[1333] Are they Jews or Christians? Or do they belong to both communities? And perhaps the question of their exclusive affiliation with one or the other of those religions is incorrectly raised? When Edith Stein, the Carmelite and today's holy patroness of Europe, was transported by rail to the Auschwitz concentration camp, she was aware that her sacrifice resulted from the affiliation with "her nation." In what way could Israel Zolli, the chief rabbi of Rome who experienced a vision of Jesus in 1944 (his wife had a similar vision at the same time) and who directly after it accepted baptism, describe his identity? When Rabbi Jacob Rabinowitz in 1969 in Pasadena believed in Jesus as the Messiah, he still identified himself as "a Jew," adding, however, that as the result of the event he became "a full Jew." Was one of the greatest mentors of Judaism of our time, a mystic and a visionary, Yitzhak Kaduri, a Christian? At the end of his life (he died at the age of 106 in 2006) he claimed that in his supernatural visions the Messiah named Jesus revealed Himself to him? Are contemporary Jews chanting on every Sabbath day songs of adoration to honour Jesus in an evangelical church at the Jaffa Gate in the heart of Jerusalem Jews or rather Christians? Possibly – as Daniel Boyarin wants it – the categories "Christianity" and "Judaism" are analogous to the categories "red" and "tall," which means that they do not exclude each other?[1334] When we look at contemporary Jews who have believed in Jesus, the Son of God and the Messiah, can we talk of any parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue at all? Or shall we – without further enquiries – accept Paul's opinion that in Christ "there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither slave nor freeman, there can be neither male nor female - for you are all one in Christ Jesus." (Ga 3:28)

*

The question of the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue requires further detailed study. It should be conducted from both Jewish and Christian

---

1333 An attempt to answer the question was undertaken by Dan Cohn-Sherbok (*Modern Hebrew Christianity and Judaism Messianic*, in: *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, 288–298).

1334 "Judaism and Christianity, I want to claim, are categories somewhere on the boundaries between categories like *red* and categories like *tall*"; D. Boyarin; *Semantic Differences; or, „Judaism" / „Christianity,"*82.

perspective. The progress which has been made in this field in the last few decades cannot be overestimated. It is reflected in mutual relations between the followers of both religions. Fortunately, an increasing number of Christians, when they think about Jews – they think of "the nation of Jesus" and not of "the nation of Judas." Also the Jewish believers who for centuries noticed many anti-Jewish texts in the New Testament, more and more often admit that the New Testament is to a large extent a collection of books proving the existence of the intrareligious polemic within the Jewish community. In the same way the Hebrew Bible includes fragments expressing criticism aimed at the Jews who broke the covenant.

Fortunately, for an increasingly wider circle of Christians and Jews, it is clear that further studies on the parting of the ways between Church and Synagogue and the emergence of the two major monotheistic religions should be conducted in the atmosphere of dialogue which Benedict XVI called for in his speech in the Synagogue of Cologne in 2005: "Consequently, I would encourage sincere and trustful dialogue between Jews and Christians, for only in this way will it be possible to arrive at a shared interpretation of disputed historical questions, and, above all, to make progress towards a theological evaluation of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity. This dialogue, if it is to be sincere, must not gloss over or underestimate the existing differences: in those areas in which, due to our profound convictions in faith, we diverge, and indeed, precisely in those areas, we need to show respect and love for one another."

Abbreviations

AB	The Anchor Bible
ABD	The Anchor Bible Dictionary, I-VI, D.N. Freedmann (ed.), New York–London–Toronto–Sydney–Auckland 1992
AJA	American Journal of Archeology
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AK	Ateneum Kapłańskie
AL	Attende Lectioni
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AnBibLub	Analecta Biblica Lublinensia
AnCrac	Analecta Cracoviensia
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BBR	Bulletin for Biblical Research
BE	Biblische Enzyklopädie
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJRL	Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament
BOK	Biblioteka Ojców Kościoła
BPT	Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia
BRS	The Biblical Resource Series
BSHJ	Baltimore Studies in the History of Judaism
BSJS	Brill's Series in Jewish Studies
BT	Babylonian Talmud
BVChr	Bible et Vie Chrétienne
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wiessenschaft
CBNTS	Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblica Quarterly Monograph Series
CH	Church History
CJR	Christian-Jewish Relations
CRJNT	Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CT	Collectanea Theologica
DRLAR	Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion
ECCA	Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity
Est Bib	Estudios Biblicos
ETL	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
Fil	Filomata
HB	Hebrew Bible
HJ	Hermeneutica et Judaica

HThK NT	Handtheologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
IAH	Iuris Antiqui Historia. An International Journal on Ancient Law
IBS	Irish Biblical Studies
JAAR	Journal of the American Academy of Religion
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JCPS	Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JES	Journal of Ecumenical Studies
JESCT	Journal of the European Society for Catholic Theology
JETS	Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society
JHS	Journal of the Histor 6, y of Sexuality
JJMJS	Journal of the Jesus Movement in ts Jewish Setting
JJML	Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy
JJS	Journal for Jewish Studies
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	Journal for the Studies of the New Testament
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series
JSP	Journal for the Study of Pseudoepigrapha
JT	Jerusalem Talmud
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JTS	Journal of the Theological Studies
HK	Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
LA	Liber Annuus
MT	Myśl Teologiczna
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NKBNT	Nowy Komentarz Biblijny. Nowy Testament
NTS	New Testament Studies
NTR	New Testament Review
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
PJAC	The Polish Journal of the Arts and Culture
QD	Quaestiones Disputatae
RB	Revue Biblique
RBL	Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny
RH	Roczniki Humanistyczne
RHE	Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique
RHPR	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosphie Religieuses
RT	Roczniki Teologiczne
RTK	Roczniki Teologiczo-Kanoniczne

RQ	Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte
RSB	Rozprawy i Studia Biblijne
RSLR	Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa
SAC	Studia Antiquitatis Christianae series nova
SB	Studi Biblici
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature. Monographs Series
SBP	Series Biblica Paulina
SCJR	Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations
ScL	Scripturae Lumen
ScTh	Scripta Theologica
SDR	Studia Diecezji Radomskiej
SEÅ	Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok
SH	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJC	Studies in Judaism and Christianity
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SM	Salvatoris Mater
SNTS MS	Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series
SPB	Studia Post-Biblica
SPNT	Studies of Personalities of the New Testament
SS	Scriptura Sacra
ŚSHT	Śląskie Studia Historyczno-Teologiczne
ST	Studia Theologica
StBib	Studia Biblica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPatr	Studia Patristica
SVC	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
TMSJ	The Master's Seminary Journal
TS	Theological Studies
TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
USQR	Union Seminary Quarterly Review
VC	Veritati et Caritati
VP	Vox Patrum
VV	Verbum Vitae
WPT	Wrocławski Przegląd Teologiczny
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

The Mishnah and the Talmud

Av. zar.	*Avoda zara*
Baw. mec.	*Bawa metzia*
Ber.	*Berakhot*
Git.	*Gittin*
Hul.	*Hullin*
Jew.	*Jewamot*
Yom.	*Yoma*
Ket.	*Ketuvot*
Kid.	*Kidushin*
Naz.	*Nazir*
Nid.	*Niddah*
Pes.	*Pesahim*
Sab.	*Sabbath*
Sanh.	*Sanhedrin*
Sot.	*Sotah*
Suk.	*Sukka*
Suk.	Sukka
Taan.	*Taanit*

Qumran Texts

1QIs	Great Isaiah Scroll
1QM	Rule of War
1QpHab	Habakkuk Commentary or Pesher Habakkuk
1QS	Community Rule
1QSa	Rule of the Congregation
4Q271	Damascus Document (fragment f)
4Q322	Mishmarot Ca
4Q323	Mishmarot Cb
4Q324	Miszmarot Cc
4Q521	On Resurrection
4QFlor	Florilegium, also Midrash on Eschatology
4QMMT	Some Commandments of the Law
11Q	Apocryphal Psalms (fragment a)
11QT	Temple Scroll
CD	Damascus Document

Midrash, Judeo-Hellenic and Latin Writings

5/6Hev 44-46	*Manuscripts from Nachal Chewer*
Arist.	*Letter of Aristeas or Letter to Philocrates*
CantRab	*Canticum Rabba*

EstRab	*Esther Rabba*
ExRab	*Exodus Rabba*
GenRab	*Genesis Rabba*
KohRab	*Kohelet Rabba*
LamRab	*Lamentationes Rabba*
Mekh. Ex	*Mekhilta to the Exodus*
NumRab	*Numeri Rabba*
Pir. ab.	*Pirke avot*
Til.	*Tillin*
ZohTer	*Zohar Terumah*

Apocryphal Literature

1 Esd	*First Book of Esdras*
1 Hen	*First Book of Enoch (The Book of Enoch, Ethiopian)*
2 Hen	*Second Book of Enoch*
3 Esd	*Third Book of Esdras*
3 Mch	*Third Book of Maccabees*
4 Esd	*Fourth Book of Esdras*
4 Mch	*Fourth Book of Maccabees*
Ac. Bar.	*Acts of Barnabas*
Ac. P.	*Acts of Peter*
ApAbr	*Apocalypse of Abraham*
ApBar	*Apocalipse of Baruch*
ApPt	*Apocalypse of Peter*
Asc. Is.	*Ascension of Isaiah*
Asc. Mo.	*Assumption of Moses*
Bar.	*Epistle of Barnabas*
Jub.	*Book of Jubilees*
OrSib	*Sibylline Oracles*
ProtEvJ	*Gospel of James, or the Protoevangelium of James*
Ps 151	*Psalm 151*
PsSal	*Psalms of Solomon*

Ancient Christian Writers

1 Clem.	Clement of Alexandria, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*
2 Apol.	Justin Martyr, *Apology II*
Ad Magn.	Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*
Ad nat.	Tertullian, *Ad nationes*
Adv. Haer.	Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*
Adv. Iud.	Tertullian, *Adversus Iudaeos*
Adv. Marc.	Tertullian, *Against Marcion*
Adv. Prax.	Tertullian, *Adversus Praxeam*

Ap.	Tertullian, *Apologeticus*
Apol.	Justin Martyr, *Apology*
Cels.	Origen, *Contra Celsum*
Chron.	Sulpicius Severus, *Cronicle*
Coh. Grae.	Pseudo-Justinian, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*
Const. Ap.	*Apostolic Constitutions*
De fid. orth.	John of Damascus, *De fide orthodoxa*
Dem.	Eusebius of Caesarea, *Demonstratio evangelica*
De spect.	Tertullian, *De spectaculis*
De vir.	Jerome, *De viris illustriis*
Dial.	Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*
Did.	*Didache*
Did. ap.	*Didascalia apostolorum*
Diog.	*Epistle to Diognetus*
Ep. Bar.	*Epistle of Barnabas*
Ep. Cor.	Clement of Rome, *Letter to the Corinthians*
Eph.	Ignatius, *To the Ephesians*
Fil.	Ignatius, *To the Philadelphians*
Haer.	Epiphanius, *Panarion seu adversus LXXX haereses*
Haeret.	Theodoret of Cyrus, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*
Hist.	Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Hist. adv. pag	Paulus Orosius, *Historiae Adversus Paganos*
Hom.	Pseudo-Clement, *Homilies*
Hom. ad Jer.	Origen, *Homilies on Jeremiah*
In Ioan.	Origen, *Homilies on the Gospel of John*
Magn.	Ignatius, *To the Magnesians*
Onom.	Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onomasticon*
Peri Pascha	Melito of Sardis, *Peri Pascha (English title On the Pascha)*
Past.	Hermas, *Shepherd*
Quest. in Gen	Theodoret of Cyrhus, *Questiones in Genesim*
Rom.	Ignatius, *To the Romans*
Smyr.	Ignatius, *To the Smyrnaeans*
Strom.	Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*

Other Ancient Writers

An.	Tacitus, *Annales*
Ant.	Josephus Flavius, *Antiquitates judaicae*
Ap.	Josephus Flavius, *Contra Apionem*
Bell.	Josephus Flavius, *De bello judaico*
Caes.	Valerius Catullus, *Caesar*
Cher.	Philo of Alexandria, *De cherubim*
Contempl.	Philo of Alexandria, *De vita contemplativa*
De Abr.	Philo of Alexandria, *De Abrahamo*

Decal.	Philo of Alexandria, *De decalogo*
De sup.	Seneca the Younger, *De superstitione*
De vita caes.	Suetonius, *De vita caesarum*
Diss.	Epictetus, *Dissertationes* (*Diatribai*)
Div. Aug.	Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*
Ep.	Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae*
Ep. moral.	Seneca the Younger, *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*
Flac.	Philo of Alexandria, *Flakkus*
Geogr.	Strabo, *Geographica*
Graec. Des.	Pausanias, *Graeciae Descriptio*
Hist.	Tacitus, *Historiae*
Hist. rom.	Dio Cassius, *Historia romana*
Leg.	Plato, *Leges*
Legat.	Philo of Alexandria, *Legatio ad Gaium*
Mosis	Philo of Alexandria, *De vita Mosis*
Oct. Aug.	Suetonius, *Octavianus Augustus*
Praem.	Philo of Alexandria, *De praemis et poenis, de exsecrationibus*
Prob.	Philo of Alexandria, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*
Quest. conv.	Plutarch, *Quaestiones convivales*
Quaest. in Ex.	Philo of Alexandria, *Quaestiones convivales*
Rem. am.	Ovid, *Remedia amoris*
Sat.	Juvenal, *Satires*
Spec.	Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus*
Virt.	Philo of Alexandria, *De virtutibus*

Bibliography

Abegg M., *Paul, „Works of the Law" and MMT*, *Biblical Archeologist Reader* 20 (1994), p. 52–55.

Abrahamsen V., *Kobieta*, in *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, ed. B.M. Metzger, M.D. Coogan, Polish ed. W. Chrostowski, trans. P. Pachciarek, Warszawa 2004, p. 310–312.

Abusch R., *Negotiating Difference: Genital Mutilation in Roman Slave Law and the History of the Bar Kokhba Revolt*, in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt Against Rome*, ed. P. Schäfer, Tübingen 2003, p. 71–91.

Adamczewski B., *List do Filemona. List do Kolosan. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKB NT XII, Częstochowa 2006.

Adamiak S., *Żydzi w rzymskiej Afryce Północnej*, *BPT* 7 (2014) 1, p. 98–113.

Agus A.R.E., *Das Judentum in seiner Entstehung – Grundzüge rabbinisch-biblischer Religiosität, Judentum und Christentum*, Stuttgart–Berlin–Köln 2001.

Aharoni Y., *The Land of the Bible. A Historical Geography*, Philadelphia 1979.

Aichele G., *Fantasy and Myth in the Death of Jesus*, *Cross Currents* 44 (1994), p. 85–97.

Aland B., *Marcion*, *ZTK* 70 (1973), p. 420–447.

Alexander P.S., *„The Parting of the Ways" from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism*, in *Jews and Christians; The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 1–25.

Alon G., *The Jews in Their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.)*, t. 1, Jerusalem 1980.

Alonso J.M., Schoonenberg P., *La concepción virginal de Jésus, historia o legenda? Un diálogo teológico*, *Ephemerides Mariologicae* 21 (1971), p. 161–216.

Altaner B., Stuiber A., *Patrologia. Życie, pisma i nauka Ojców Kościoła*, trans. P. Pachciarek, Warsawa 1990.

Amit D., Adler Y., *The Observance of Ritual Purity after 70 CE: A Reevaluation of the Evidence in Light of Recent Archeologica Discoveries,* in *'Follow the Wise': Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honour of Lee I. Levine*, ed. Z. Weiss, O. Irshai, J. Magness, S. Schwartz, Winona Lake 2010, p. 121–143.

Amstrong E.A., *The Gospel Parables*, London 1967.

Appelbaum S., *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene*, Leiden 1979.

Appelbaum S., *Prolegomena to the Study of the Second Jewish Revolt*, British Archeological Reports Supplement Series 7, Oxford 1976.

Armstrong K., *Biblia. Biografia*, trans. A. Dzierzgowska, Warszawa 2009.

Armstrong K., *Jerozolima. Miasto trzech religii*, trans. B. Cendrowska, Warszawa 2000.

Ascough R.S., *Paul, Synagogues, and Assiciations: Reframing the Question of Models for Pauline Christ Groups*, *JJMJS* 2 (2015), p. 27–52.

Ashton J., *The Identity and Function of the Ioudaioi in the Fourth Gospel*, *NT* 27 (1985), p. 40–75.

Ashton J., *La religione dell'apostolo Paolo*, Brescia 2002.

Assemani J.S., *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, 3/2 (*De Syris nestorianis*), Romae 1728.

Attridge H.W., *Chrześcijaństwo od zburzenia Jerozolimy do cesarza Konstantyna (lata 70–312)*, in *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, p. 249–316.

Augé M., *La domenica. Festa primordiale dei cristiani*, Cinisello Balsamo 1995.

Aune D.E., *Christian Prophecy and the Messianic Status of Jesus*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 404–422.

Avemarie F., *Jesus and Purity*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 255–279.

Aviam M., Syon D., *Jewish Ossilegium in Galilee*, in *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish and Christian Art, and Archeology in Honor of Gideon Forster*, ed. L.V. Rutgers, Leuven 2002, p. 151–187.

Avi-Yonah M., *The Jews of Palestine: A Political History from the Bar Kohba War to the Arab Conquest*, Oxford 1976.

Avi-Yonah M., *The Jews under Romans and Byzantine Rule*, Jerusalem 1984.

Bacchiocchi S., *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*, Biblical Perspectives 1, Rome 1977.

Balagué M., *La prueba de la Resurrección (John 20, 6–7)*, *Est Bib* 25 (1966), p. 169–192.

Ballarini L., *Paolo e il dialogo Chiesa – Israele. Proposta di un cammino esegetico*, SB 312, Bologna 1997.

Bamberger B.J., *Proselytism in the Talmudic Period*, Cincinnati 1939, p. 267–273.

Baraniak M., *Mojżesz a Taheb Samarytan*, in *Oto idę. Księga pamiątkowa dla Biskupa Profesora Jana Bernarda Szlagi w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2005, p. 94–116.

Baraniak M., *Prorok jak Mojżesz (Pwt 18,9–22). Hermeneutyka prawa o urzędzie proroka w Izraelu*, Warszawa 2005.

Baraniak M., *Targumy rabiniczne a chrześcijaństwo*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 105–124.

Barclay J.M.G., *Diaspora. I giudei nella diaspora mediterranea da Alessandro a Traiano (323 a. C.–117 d. C..)*, Brescia 2004.

Barclay J.M.G., *Paul among Diaspora Jews: Anomaly or Apostate? JSNT* 60 (1995), p. 89–120.

Bardski K., *Chrześcijańska lektura Starego Testamentu w kluczu symboliki literackiej*, *RT* 57 (2015) 4, p. 447–457.

Bardski K., *Izrael i nawrócenie narodów pogańskich w symbolach biblijnego starożytnego chrześcijanstwa*, VV 10 (2006), p. 157–172.

Bardski K., *Teksty z tradycji hebrajskich dotyczących Jezusa*, in *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu. Ewangelie apokryficzne*, t. 1, *Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, p. 163–169.

Bar-Kochva B., *An Ass in Jerusalem Temple – The Origins and Developement of the Slander*, in *Josephus' Contra Apionem. Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*, ed. L.H. Feldman, J.R. Levison, Leiden–New York–Köln 1996, p. 310–326.

Barnes T.D., *Trajan and the Jews*, *JJS* 40 (1989), p. 145–162.

Baron A., Pietras H., *Chrześcijaństwo*, in *Religie starożytnego Bliskiego Wschodu*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, J. Drabina, Kraków 2008, p. 447–522.

Baron W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, t. 1, New York[2] 1952.

Barrett C.K., *The Gospel of John and Judaism*, London 1975.

Barrett C.K., *Jews and Judaizers in the Epistles of Ignatius*, in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*, ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly, R. Scroggs, Leiden 1976.

Bartnicki R., *Dzieje głoszenia Słowa Bożego. Jezus i najstarszy Kościół*, Kraków 2015.

Bartnicki R., *Ewangelie synoptyczne. Geneza i interpretacja*, Warszawa 2003.

Barton W.E., *Jakob ben Aaron. The Messianic Hope of the Samaritans*, *Open Court* 21 (1907), p. 272–296.

Basser H.W., *The Gospels and Rabbinic Literature*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 78–99.

Bauckham R., *Jews and Christians in the Land of Israel at the Time of Bar Kochba War with Special Reference to the Apocalypse of Peter*, in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. G.N. Stanton, G.G. Stroumsa, Cambridge 1998, p. 228–238.

Bauckham R., *The Origin of the Ebionites*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 162–181.

Bauckham R., *The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why*, *ST* 47 (1993), p. 135–151.

Bauckham R., *The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan: Jesus' Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses*, *NTS* 44 (1998), p. 475–489.

Bauer W., *Ortodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, Philadelphia 1971.

Baumgarten A., *Literary Evidence for Jewish Christianity in the Galilee*, in *The Galilee in Late Antiquity*, ed. L.I. Levine, New York 1992, p. 39–50.

Baus K., *Von der Urgemeinde zur frühchristlichen Grosskirche*, *HK* 1, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1963.

Beagley A.J., *The 'Sitz im Leben' of the Apocalypse with Particular Reference to the Role of the Church Enemies*, *BZAW* 50, Berlin–New York 1987.

Beauchamp P., *Propositions sur l'alliance de l'Ancien Testament comme structure centrale*, *RSR* 58 (1970), p. 161–163.

Becker A.H., *Beyond the Spatial and Temporal Limes. Questioning the „Parting of the Ways" Outside the Roman Empire*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 374–392.

Bednarz M., *Biblia na cenzurowanym*, Szczecinek 2006.

Bednarz M., *Pisma św. Jana*, Academica, Tarnów 1997.

Bekken P.J., *Election, Obedience, and Eschatology: Deuteronomy 30:2–14 in Romans 9–11 and the Writings of Philo*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 315–331.

Ben-Chorin S., *Bruder Jesus. Der Nazarener in jüdischer Sicht*, Gütersloh 2005.

Ben-Chorin S., *Jesus in Judentum*, Wuppertal 1970.

Bendowska M., Żebrowski R., *Kadysz*, in *Słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, I, Warszawa 2003, p. 734–735.

Benoît S., *Giudaismo e cristianesimo. Una storia antica*, trans. A. Giardina, Economica Laterza 373, Roma–Bari 2005.

Berard W.-D., *When Christians Were Jews (That Is, Now): Recovering the Lost Jewishness of Christianity with the Gospel of Mark*, Cambridge 2006.

Beyerle S., Die Apokalyptik als „Mutter alle christlichen Theologie" – die Apokalyptik im Alten und Neuen Testament, *RT* 57 (2015) 4, p. 491–505.

Bielicki M., *Zapomniany świat Sumerów*, Warszawa 1996.

Binder D.D., *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*, *SBLDS* 169, Atlanta 1999.

Birdsall J.N., *A Note on the Textual Evidence for the Omission of Matthew 9:34*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 117–122.

Black M., *The Patristic Accounts of Jewish Sectarianism*, *BJRL* 41 (1959), p. 285–303.

Blass F., Debrunner A., *Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento*, trans. U. Mattioli, G. Pisi, Brescia 1982.

Boddens Hosang F.J.E., *Establishing Boundaries: Christian-Jewish Relations in Early Council Texts and the Writings of Church Fathers*, Leiden 2010.

Boer C.D., *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*, Kampen 1996.

Boers H., *The Form-Critical Study of Paul's Letters: 1 Thessalonians as a Case Study*, *NTS* 22 (1975–1976), p. 140–158.

Bogacz R., *Dzieło zbawienia w ludzkiej krwi Jezusa według Listu do Hebrajczyków*, List do Hebrajczyków 3, Kraków 2007.

Bogacz R., *Misja Chrystusa w świetle hapax legomenów*, List do Hebrajczyków 2, Kraków 2006.

Bogacz R., *Problem autorstwa*, List do Hebrajczyków 1, Kraków 2006.

Bohak G., *Magical Means for Handling* Minim *in Rabbinic Literature*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 267–279.

Bokser B.M., *Messianism, the Exodus Pattern, and Early Rabbinic Judaism*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 239–258.

Booth R.P., *Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition History and Legal History in Mark 7*, Trowbridge 1986.

Borgen P., *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, Edinburgh 1996.

Borgen P., *Proselytes, Conquest, and Mission*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 57–77.

Bornhäuser K., *Die Leidens-und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu*, Gütersloh 1947.

Bornkamm G., *Jesus of Nazareth*, New York 1960.

Borsch F.H., *Further Reflections on 'The Son of Man': The Origins and Developement of the Title*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 131–144.

Borzymińska Z., *Eliezer ben Hyrkanos*, in *Polski słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, t. 1, ed. Z. Borzymińska, R. Żebrowski, Warszawa 2003, p. 383

Borzymińska Z., *Tarfon*, in *Polski słownik judaistyczny. Dzieje, kultura, religia, ludzie*, t. 2, ed. Z. Borzymińska, R. Żebrowski, Warszawa 2003, p. 696.

Bosetti E., *Cristo e la Chiesa nella Prima Lettera di Pietro*, Bologna 1990.

Boslooper T., *The Virgin Birth*, Philadelphia 1962.

Bottini G.C., *Introduzione all'opera di Luca. Aspetti teologici*, Jerusalem 1992.

Bourgel J., *The Jewish Christians' Move from Jerusalem as a Pragmatic Choice*, in *Studies in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. D. Jaffé, Leiden 2010, p. 107–138.

Boustan R., *Rabbi Ishmael's Miraculous Conception. Jewish Redemption History in Anti-Christian Polemic*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 307–343.

Bowman J., *Samaritan Studies*, *BJRL* 40 (1958), p. 298–327.

Bowman J., *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews. A Study in R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John*, Pittsburgh 1975.

Boyarin D., *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, DRLAR, Philadelphia 2004.

Boyarin D., *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*, Stanford 1999.

Boyarin D., *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ*, New York 2012.

Boyarin D., *Justin Martyr Invents Judaism*, *CH* 70 (2001) 3, p. 427–461.

Boyarin D., *Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*, *JECS* 6 (1998), p. 577–627.

Boyarin D., *Semantic Differences; or, "Judaism"/"Christianity"*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 65–86.

Boys M.C., *Doing Justice to Judaism: The Challenge to Christianity*, *JES* 49 (2014) 1, p. 107–110.

Bradshaw P.F., *The Search of the Origins of Christian Worship*, Oxford 2002.

Brawley R.L., *Luke-Acts and Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, SBLMS 33, Atlanta 1987.

Broadhead E.K., *Teaching with Authority. Miracles and Christology in the Gospel of Mark*, *JSNT* Supp 74, Sheffield 1992.

Broshi M., *Qumran and the Essenes: Purity and Pollution. Six Categories*, *RQ* 87 (2006), p. 463–474.

Brown R.E., *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, New York–London–Toronto–Sydney–Auckland 1993.

Brown R.E., *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*, New York 1979.

Brown R.E., *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York 1997.

Brown R.E., *The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus*, New York 1973.

Brown T.S., *Onesicritus. A Study in Hellenistic Historiography*, Berkeley 1949.

Brownrigg R., *Wszystkie postacie Nowego Testamentu*, trans. R. Stiller, Warszawa 2003.

Bruce B., *Jezus. Dowody zbrodni*, trans. J. Mastalerz, Warszawa 2011.

Bruce F.F., *Chronological Questions in the Acts of the Apostles*, *BJRL* 68 (1985), p. 273–295.

Bruce F.F., *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament*, London 1974.

Bruce F.F., *The Spreading Flame*, Grand Rapids 1958.

Bruce F.F., *Wiarygodność pism Nowego Testamentu*, [brak tłumacza], Katowice 2003.

Bruce I.A.F., *Nerva and the Fiscus Iudaicus*, Palestine Exploration Quarterly 96 (1964), p. 34–45.

Buchanan G.W., *The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John*, in *Religions in Antiquity. Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenouth*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1968, p. 149–175.

Bucur B.G., *Justin Martyr's Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies and the Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism*, *TS* 75 (2014) 1, p. 34–51.

Burkitt F.C., *Early Eastern Christianity outside the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 1899.

Burnt P.A., *The 'Fiscus' and its Developement*, *JRS* 56 (1966), p. 75–91.

Buzzi F., *La teologia di Lutero nelle „Lezioni sulla Lettera ai Romani"*, in M. Luter, *La Lettera ai Romani (1515–1516)*, Cinisello Balsamo 1991, p. 25–50.

Byra M., *Powstanie w Judei. 66–74 n.e.*, Bitwy / Taktyka 34, Zabrze 2011.

Bzowski S., *Gratia plena czy gratificata? RBL* 1 (1973), p. 48–49.

Cameron A., *Jews and Heretics – A Category Error?*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 345–360.

Campbell W.S., *„A Remnant of Them Will Be Saved" (Rom 9:27): Understanding Paul's Conception of the Faithfulness of God to Israel*, *JJMJS* 2 (2015), p. 79–101.

Campenhausen H. von, *Ojcowie Kościoła*, trans. K. Wierszyłowski, Warszawa 1998.

Campenhausen H. von, *The Virgin Birth in the Theology of Early Church*, London 1964.

Cappelletti S., *The Jewish Community of Rome. From the Second Century B.C. to the Third Century C.E*, SJSJ 113, Leiden–Boston 2006.

Carlebach A., *Rabbinic References to Fiscus Iudaicus*, *JQR* 64 (1975), p. 57–61.

Carmignac J., *Recherches sur le „Notre Père"*, Paris 1969.

Carroll W.H., *Historia chrześcijaństwa*, 1, *Narodziny chrześcijaństwa*, trans. J. Morka, Wrocław 2009.

Carson D.A., *Matthew*, in *The Expositors Bible Commentary with The New International Version*, ed. F.E. Gaebelein, 8, Grand Rapids 1984, p. 3–602.

Carson D.A., *From Sabbath to Lord's Day*, Grand Rapids 1982.

Carter W., *Matthew's Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?* in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 155–179.

Casey M., *Culture and Historicity: The Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2.23–28)*, *NTS* 34 (1988) 1, p. 1–23.

Casey M., *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, Louisville 1991.

Casey M., *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching*, London 2010.

Causse A., *Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem, du Deutéto-Esaïe à la IIIe Sibylle*, *RHPR* 1 (1938), p. 377–414.

Chajes H.P., *La lingua ebraica nel cristianesimo primitivo*, Florence 1905.

Charles R.H., *The Apocrypha and Pseudoepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913.

Charles R.H., *The Revelation of St. John*, 1, Edinburgh 1920.

Charlesworth J.H., *Christian and Jewish Self-Definition in Light of the Christian Additions to the Apocryphal Writings*, in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, 2, *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*, ed. E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten, A. Mendelson, Philadelphia 1981, p. 27–55.

Charlesworth J.H., *Chrześcijanie i Żydzi w pierwszych sześciu wiekach*, in *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, p. 499–532.

Charlesworth J.H., *Did They Ever Part?* in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 281–300.

Charlesworth J.H., *Gesù nel giudaismo del suo tempo alla luce delle più recenti scoperte*, trans. D. Tomasetto, Torino 1998[2].

Charlesworth J.H., *The Gospel of John: Exclusivism Caused by a Social Setting Different from that of Jesus*, in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium 2000*, ed. R. Bieringer, D. Pollyfeyet, F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, Assen 2001, p. 479–513.

Charlesworth J.H., *The Historical Jesus. An Essential Guide*, Nashville 2008.

Charlesworth J.H., *Jesus within Judaism. New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries*, London 1990.

Charlesworth J.H., *Jesus, Early Jewish Literature, and Archeology*, in *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, New York 1991, p. 177–198.

Charlesworth J.H., *John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 3, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, p. 1–36.

Charlesworth J.H., *A Study in Shared Symbolism and Language: The Qumran Community and the Johannine Community*, in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, p. 97–152.

Chavanis J.M., *Les lettres d'Afrahat, le sage de la Perse, étudiées au point de vue de l'histoire et de la doctrine*, Lyon 1908.

Chester A., *The Parting of the Ways: Eschatology and Messianic Hope*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 239–313.

Chilton B., *Getting It Right: James, Jesus, and Questions of Sanctity*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 107–123.

Chilton B., *Mapping a Place for Jesus*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 41–44.

Chilton B., *The Godfearers: From the Gospels to Aphrodisias*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 55–71.

Chilton B., Neusner J., *Judaism in the New Testament. Practices and Beliefs*, London–New York 1995.

Chmiel J., *Chrześcijaństwo a Qumran*, *CT* 65 (1995) 1, p. 69–78.

Chrostowski W., *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, *CT* 62 (1992) 4, p. 147–176.

Chrostowski W., *„Czyż Bóg odrzucił lud swój?" (Rz 11,1). Refleksja biblijno-teologiczna*, *CT* 75 (2005) 2, p. 39–56.

Chrostowski W., *Czy jest potrzebna nowa chrześcijańska teologia judaizmu? CT* 69 (1999) 2, p. 11–36.

Chrostowski W., *Czy Żydzi „nie podobają się Bogu i są wrodzy wszystkim ludziom" (1 Tes 2,15)? Niewiara w Jezusa Chrystusa a wrogość wobec Niego i Jego wyznawców*, *CT* 70 (2000) 2, p. 47–68.

Chrostowski W., *Jezus a religijna tradycja żydowska*, *CT* 63 (1993) 2, p. 93–95.

Chrostowski W., *Kościół a Izrael*, *CT* 73 (2003) 1, p. 73–94.

Chrostowski W., *Literatura targumiczna a Septuaginta*, *CT* 63 (1993) 3, p. 49–68.

Chrostowski W., *Między Synagogą a Kościołem. Dzieje św. Pawła*, Kraków–Ząbki 2015.

Chrostowski W., *Nazarejczycy*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 13, ed. E. Gigilewicz[i in.], Lublin 2009, p. 859–860.

Chrostowski W., *Nowy Testament a judaizm. Materiały z V Sympozjum Teologicznego 'Kościół a Żydzi i judaizm'. Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, Warszawa, 18–19 V 1993*, *CT* 64 (1994) 2, p. 5–10.

Chrostowski W., *Rabiniczny wizerunek Jezusa i chrześcijaństwa w kontekście dialogu Kościoła z Żydami i judaizmem*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 341–357.

Chrostowski W., *Samarytanin na drodze z Jerozolimy do Jerycha (Łk 10,30–37). O możliwych związkach Samarytan z Qumran*, in *Mów, Panie, bo sługa Twój słucha. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Ryszarda Rubinkiewicza SDB w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1999, p. 50–67.

Chrostowski W., *Wizerunek Żydów i judaizmu a chrześcijańskie czytanie i objaśnianie Biblii*, in *Stworzył Bóg człowieka na swój obraz. Księga pamiątkowa dla Biskupa Profesora Mariana Gołębiewskiego w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, Warszawa 2002, p. 71–90.

Chrostowski W., *Wokół kwestii natchnienia Biblii Greckiej*, in *Żywe jest słowo Boże i skuteczne. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Ks. Prof. Bernarda Wodeckiego SVD w 50. rocznicę święceń kapłańskich*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2001, p. 89–110.

Chrostowski W., *Żydowskie tradycje interpretacyjne pomocą w zrozumieniu Biblii*, *CT* 66 (1996) 1, p. 39–54.

Chrostowski W., *Żydowskość Jezusa*, *CT* 63 (1993) 2, p. 46–60.

Chrostowski W., *Żydzi a religia żydowska i Jezus Chrystus*, *AK* 136 (2001) 1, p. 7–21.

Chrostowski W., *Żydzi i religia żydowska a Maryja Matka Jezusa*, *SM* 2 (2000) 1, p. 215–233.

Ciecieląg J., *Kogo uważano za Żyda w starożytności? SJ* 8 (2005) 1–2, p. 35–52.

Ciecieląg J., *Palestyna w czasach Jezusa. Dzieje polityczne*, Prace Monograficzne 285, Kraków 2000.

Ciecieląg J., *Powstanie Bar Kochby. 132–135 po Chr.*, Bitwy / Taktyka 23, Zabrze 2008.

Ciecieląg J., *Żydzi pod rządami Sasanidów*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 165–177.

Ciecieląg J., *Żydzi w europejskiej części Cesarstwa Rzymskiego*, Kraków 2013.

Claussen C., *Meeting, Community, Synagogue – Different Frameworks of Ancient Jewish Congregations in the Diaspora*, in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 144–167.

Claussen C., *Versammlung, Gemeinde, Synagoge. Das hellenistich-jüdische Umfeld der frühchristlichsten Gemeinden*, Göttingen 2002.

Cohen A., *The Parting of the Ways: Judaism and the Rise of Christianity*, London 1954.

Cohen A., *Talmud. Syntetyczny wykład na temat Talmudu i nauk rabinów dotyczących religii, etyki i prawodawstwa*, trans. R. Gromacka, Warszawa 1997.

Cohen S.J.D., *Epigraphical Rabbis*, *JQR* 72 (1981), p. 1–17.

Cohen S.J.D., *In Between: Jewish-Christians and the Curse of the Heretics*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 207–236.

Cohen S.J.D., *Judaism without Circumcision and 'Judaism' Without Circumcision in Ignatius*, *HTR* 95 (2002), p. 395–415.

Cohen S.J.D., *Judaizm do czasu opracowania Miszny (lata 135–220)*, in *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny*, ed. H. Shanks, Polish ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2013, p. 317–354.

Cohen S.J.D., *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1999.

Cohen S.J.D., *The Place of the Rabbi in the Jewish Society of the Second Century*, in *Galilee in Late Antiquity. Cambridge History of Judaism, 3, The Early Roman Period*, ed. W. Horburyi in., Cambridge 1999, p. 922–990.

Cohen S.J.D., *The Significance of Yavneh*, *HUCA* 55 (1984), p. 27–53.

Cohen S.J.D., Stalow M., *Dominacja rzymska. Powstanie żydowskie i zburzenie drugiej świątyni*, in *Starożytny Izrael. Od Abrahama do zburzenia świątyni jerozolimskiej przez Rzymian*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2007, p. 385–430.

Cohn-Sherbok D., *Modern Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Judaism*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 288–298.

Collins J.J., *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, BRS, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 2000^2.

Collins J.J., *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture. Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*, SJSJ 1000, Leiden–Boston 2005.

Collins J.J., *Natural Theology and Biblical Tradition: The Case of Hellenistic Judaism*, *CBQ* 60 (1998), p. 1–15.

Collins J.J., *Sibylline Discourse*, in *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. Tigchelaar, BETL CCLXX, Leuven–Paris–Walpole 2014, p. 195–210.

Comby J., Lémonon J.-P., Massonnet J., Richard F., *Il mondo dove visse Gesù*, 2, *La civiltà greco-romana e la civiltà giudaica*, trans. C Palazzi, Bologna 2005.

Connolly R. H., *Aphraates and Monasticism*, *The Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1906), p. 10–15.

Conzelmann H., *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in Greco-Roman Era*, Minnepolis 1992.

Conzelmann H., *The Pauline School*, in *Theologia crucis – Signum crucis*, ed. C. Andersen, G. Klein, Tübingen 1979, p. 177–190.

Couroyer B., *La tablette du coeur*, *RB* 90 (1983), p. 416–434.

Cowley A.E., *The Samaritan Liturgy*, Oxford 1909.

Cross F., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, Grand Rapids 1980.

Cross F.L., Livingstone E.A., *Encyklopedia Kościoła*, 1–2, trans. T. Głogowski, Warszawa 2004.

Crossan J.D., *Historyczny Jezus. Kim był i czego nauczał*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 1997.

Crossan J.D., *Kto zabił Jezusa. Korzenie antysemityzmu w ewangelicznych relacjach o śmierci Jezusa*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 1998.

Crüsemann M., *Irredeemably Hostile to Women: Anti-Jewish Elements in the Exegesis of the Dispute about Women's Right to Speak (1 Cor. 14.34–35)*, *JSNT* 79 (2000), p. 19–36.

Crüsemann M., *Unrettbar frauenfeindlich: Der Kampf um das Wort von Frauen in 1 Kor 14 (33b)34–35 im Spiegel antijudaistischer Elemente der Auslegung*, in *Von der Wurzel getragen: Christlich-feministische Exegese in Auseinandersetzung mit Antijudaismus*, ed. L. Schottroff, M.-T. Wacker, BIS 17, Leiden 1996, p. 199–223.

Cumont F., *La lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins*, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 91 (1925) p. 3–6.

Cunningham P.A., *Jesus and the Evangelists. The Ministry of Jesus and Its Portrayal in the Synoptic Gospels*, New York 1998.

Cytowska M., Szelest H., *Literatura rzymska. Okres cesarstwa*, Warszawa 1992.

Czajkowski M., *„Cały Izrael będzie zbawiony" (Rz 11,26). Rz 9–11 w kontekście całego Listu do Rzymian*, *Perspectiva* 21 (2012) 1, p. 5–22.

Czajkowski M., *Co to znaczy, że Jezus jest Żydem? CT* 60 (1990) 3, p. 31–41.

Czajkowski M., *Czy jest antyżydowska Ewangelia najbardziej żydowska? CT* 64 (1994), p. 43–52.

Czajkowski M., *Czy Żydzi mają diabła za ojca? Przyczynki do dialogu chrześcijańsko-żydowskiego*, Warszawa 2013.

Czajkowski M., *Galilejskie spory Jezusa. Struktura kerygmatyczna Mk 2,*1–3,*6*, Warszawa 1997.

Czajkowski M., *Katechizacja – judaizm – ewangelizacja. Dokument Kościoła*, in *Kto spotyka Jezusa, spotyka judaizm*, ed. S. Kołtan, M. Rosik, Wrocław 2009, p. 34–48.

Czerski J., *Modlitwa „Ojcze nasz" w wersji Mt 6,9–13*, in *Służcie Panu z weselem. Księga Jubileuszowa ku czci kard. Henryka Gulbinowicza z okazji 50-lecia kapłaństwa, 30-lecia biskupstwa, 25-lecia posługi w archidiecezji wrocławskiej i 15-lecia kardynalatu*, 2, *W służbie teologii*, ed. I. Dec, Wrocław 2000, p. 25–38.

Dąbrowski E., *Dzieje Pawła z Tarsu*, Warszawa 1953.

Dahl N.A., *Messianic Ideas and the Crucifixion of Jesus*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 382–403.

Dalman G., *Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache*, Leipzig 1898.

Daniel-Rops H., *Kościół pierwszych wieków*, trans. K. Ostrowska, Warszawa 2013.

Daniel-Rops H., *Życie w Palestynie w czasach Chrystusa*, trans. J. Lasocka, Warszawa 2001.

Das A.A., *Solving the Romans Debate*, Minneapolis 2007.

Davies W.D., *The Jewish Sources of Matthew's Messianism*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 494–511.

De Vries S.P., *Obrzędy i symbole Żydów*, trans. A. Borowski, Kraków 1999.

Deines R., *The Social Profile of the Pharisees*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 111–132.

Dellarte A., *Gamart*, Lyon 1985.

Devillers L., *La fête de l'Envoyé. La section johannique de la fête des Tentes (Jean 7,1-10,21) et la christologie*, Paris 2002.

Dickson J., *Alla ricerca di Gesù. Le indagini di uno storico*, trans. G. Casella, Cinisello Balsamo 2011.

Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E to 60 C.E., ed. J. Neusner, W. Scott Green, Peabody 1999.

Diez Macho A., *Apocrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, Madrid 1984.

Dimant D., *Hebrew Pseudoepigrapha at Qumran*, in *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. Tigchelaar, BETL CCLXX, Leuven–Paris–Walpole 2014, p. 89–104.

Dimier C., *The Old Testament Apocrypha*, New York 1964.

Docherty S., *New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in Its Early Jewish Context. Reflections on the Status Quaestionis and Future Directions*, *NT* 57 (2015), p. 1–19.

Doering L., *Sabbath Laws in the New Testaments Gospels*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 207–253.

Dohmen C., Stemberger G., *Hermeneutyka Biblii żydowskiej i Starego Testamentu*, Myśl Teologiczna, trans. M. Szczepaniak, Kraków 2008.

Donaldson T.L., *„The Gospel that I Proclaim among the Gentiles" (Gal 2,2): Universalistic or Israel-Centered*, in *Gospel in Paul. Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, JSNT SS 108, Sheffield 1994, p. 166–193.

Donaldson T.L., *Jewish Christianity, Israel's Stumbling and the* Sonderweg *Reading of Paul*, *JSNT* 29 (2006) 1, p. 27–54.

Donaldson T.L., *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*, Minneapolis 1997.

Dormeyer D., *Die Passion Jesu als Verhaltensmodell. Literarische und theologische Analyse der Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte der Markuspassion*, Münster 1974.

Douglas M., *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London 1966.

Downey G., *A History of Antioch in Syria*, Princeton 1961.

Drączkowski F., *Patrologia*, Pelplin–Lublin 1999.

Draper J.A., *The Holy Vine of David Made Known to the Gentiles through God's Servant Jesus: 'Christian Judaism' in the Didache*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 257–284.

Dufay R., *Le dimanche hier et aujourd'hui*, Paris 1979.

Dunn G.D., *Tertullian*, *The Early Church Fathers*, London–New York 2004.

Dunn J.D.G., *Christianity in Making, 1, Jesus Remembered*, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 2003.

Dunn J.D.G., *Christianity in Making, 2, Beginning from Jerusalem*, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 2009.

Dunn J.D.G., *Concluding Summary*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 362–368.

Dunn J.D.G., *From the Crucifixion to the End of the First Century*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 27–54.

Dunn J.D.G., *Messianic Ideas and Their Influence on the Jesus of History*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 365–381.

Dunn J.D.G., *The New Perspective on Paul*, Tübingen 2005.

Dunn J.D.G., *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London 2006.

Dunn J.D.G., *The Question of Anti-semitism in the New Testament Writings of the Period*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 177–211.

Dunn J.D.G., *„Righteousness from the Law" and „Righteousness from Faith": Paul's Interpretation of Scripture in Rm 10:1–10*, in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, ed. G.F. Hawthorne, O. Betz, Grand Rapids 1987, p. 216–228.

Dunn J.D.G., *The Spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome: 30–70 C.E*, in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2011, p. 93–138.

Dunn J.D.G., *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, London–New York 2005.

Dupont-Sommer A., *Aperçus présur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris 1950.

Dupont-Sommer A., *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*, Paris 1959.

Dyson S.L., *Native Revolt Patterns in the Roman Empire*, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2/3, ed. H. Temporini, Berlin 1975, p. 138–175.

Dyson S.L., *Native Revolts in the Roman Empire*, *Historia* 20 (1971), p. 239–274.

Dziura R., *Mandaizm*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 12, ed. S. Wilk[i in.], Lublin 2008, p. 273–274.

Edrey A., Mendels D., *Social Organization and Parting in East and West*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 269–279.

Ehrman B.D., *Przeinaczanie Jezusa. Kto i dlaczego zmieniał Biblię*, trans. M. Chowaniec, Warszawa 2009.

Eichrodt W., *Theology of the Old Testament*, 1, Old Testament Library, trans. J. Baker, London 1961[6].

Elgvin T., *Eschatology and Messianism in the „Gabriel Inscription"*, *JJMJS* 1 (2014), p. 5–26.

Elliott J.H., *1 Peter. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York 2000.

Elliott J.H., *Phases in the Social Formation of Early Christianity: From Faction to Sect – A Social Scientific Perspective*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 273–313.

Ellis P.E., *Matthew: His Mind and His Message*, Collegeville 1974.

Elwell W.A., *Wybranie a predestynacja*, in *Słownik teologii św. Pawła*, ed. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, D.G. Reid, ed. Polish ed. polskiego K. Bardski, Warszawa 2010, p. 937–940.

Engberg J., *Condemnation, Criticism and Consternation. Contemporary Pagan Authors' Assessment of Christians and Christianity*, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 201–227.

Eppstein V., *The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple*, *ZNW* 65 (1964), p. 42–58.

Evans C.A., *Introduction: Finding a Context for Jesus*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 1–9.

Evans C.A., *The Misplaced Jesus. Interpreting Jesus in a Judaic Context*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 11–39.

Everts J.M., *Conversion and Call of Paul*, in *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters*, ed. G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin, D.G. Reid, Leicester 1993, p. 156–163.

Falk H., *Jesus the Farisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus*, New York 1985.

Falkenberg R., *Tatian*, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 67–79.

Feldman L.H., *Judaizm palestyński i diaspory w I wieku*, in *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny. Historia początków oraz wczesnego rozwoju*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Podręczniki Biblijne, Warszawa 2013, p. 25–88 (wersja angielska: L.H. Feldman, *Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism in the First Century*, in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2011, p. 1–44).

Feldman L.H., *Jews and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton 1993.

Feldman L.H., *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*, SJSJ 107, Leiden–Boston 2006.

Feldman L.H., *Philo's View on Music*, *JJML* 9 (1986–1987), p. 36–54.

Feldman L.H., *Proselytism and Syncretism*, in *World History of the Jewish People. The Diaspora in the Hellenistic-Roman World*, ed. M. Stern, Z. Baras, Jerusalem 1984, p. 188–207.

Feldman L.H., *The Jews and the Gentiles in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*, Princeton 1993.

Ferguson E., *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, Cambridge 2003.

Ferrero M., *Competition between Judaism and Christianity: Paul's Galatians as Entry Deterrence*, *Kyklos* 67 (2014) 2, p. 204–226.

Ferron J., *Epigraphie juive*, *Cahiers de Byrsa* 6 (1956), p. 99–102.

Filipiak M., *Problematyka społeczna w Biblii*, Warszawa 1985.

Fine S., *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archeology*, Cambridge 2010.

Fine S., *Jewish Identity at the Limus: The Jews of Dura Europos between Rome and Persia*, in *Cultural Identity and the Peoples of the Ancient Mediterranean*, ed. E.S. Gruen, Los Angeles 2011, p. 289–306.

Fine S., *Non-Jews in the Synagogues of Late-Antique Palestine. Rabbinic and Archeological Evidence*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 198–214.

Fine S., *The Complexities of Rejection and Attraction, Herein of Love and Hate*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 237–253.

Finn T.M., *The God-Fearers Reconsidered*, *CBQ* 47 (1985), p. 75–84.

Fitzmyer J.A., *Romans*, AB 33, New York 1992.

Fitzmyer J.A., *The Languages of Palestine in the First Century*, *CBQ* 30 (1972), p. 501–531.

Fitzmyer J.A., *The Languages of Palestine in First Century AD*, in *The Languages of the New Testament: Classic Essays*, JSNTSup 60, ed. S.E. Porter, Sheffield 1991, p. 126–162.

Fitzmyer J.A., *The One Who is to Come*, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 2007.

Florkowski E., *Aryston z Pelli*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 1, ed. F. Gryglewicz, R. Łukaszyk, Z. Sułowski, Lublin 1973, kol. 962.

Flusser D., *4QMMT and the Benediction anainst the Minim*, in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period*, 1, *Qumran and Apocalypticism*, Grand Rapids 2007, p. 70–118.

Flusser D., *Chrześcijaństwo religią żydowską. Esseńczycy a chrześcijaństwo*, trans. M. Wodnar, Warszawa 2003.

Flusser D., Sandt H. van de, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*, CRJNT, Minneapolis 2002.

Flusser D., *The World History of the Jewish People*, Jerusalem 1977.

Fonrobert C., *The* Didascalia Apostolorum: *A Mishnah for the Disciples of Jesus*, JECS 9 (2001), p. 483–509.

Fonrobert C., *When Women Walk in the Way of Their Fathers: On Gendering the Rabbinic Claim for Authority*, *JHS* 10 (2001) 3–4, p. 398–415.

Foot Moore G., *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim*, 2, New York 1974[2].

Foster P., *The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch*, in *The Writing of the Apostolic Fathers*, ed. P. Foster, Edinburgh 2007.

Foucault M., Kritzman L.D., *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, trans. L.D. Kritzman, London 1998.

Frankfurter D., *Beyond „Jewish Christianity". Continuing Religious Sub-Culture of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 131–144.

Frankfurter D., *Jews or Not? Reconstructing the 'Other' in Rev 2:9 and 3:9*, *HTR* 94 (2001), p. 414–416.

Frankowski J., *List Arysteasza czyli legenda o powstaniu Septuaginty*, *RBL* 1 (1972), p. 12–22.

Fredriksen P., *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Image of Jesus*, Yale 1988.

Fredriksen P., *Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 209–245.

Fredriksen P., *„What Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 35–64.

Freed E.D., *Did John Write His Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts? NT* 12 (1970), p. 241–256.

Freed E.D., *Samaritan Influence in the Gospel of John*, *CBQ* 30 (1968), p. 580–587.

Freedman H., *Talmud. Biografia*, trans. A. Czwojdrak, Kraków 2015.

Frend W.H.C., *A Note on Tertulian and the Jews*, *StPatr* 10 (1970), p. 291–296.

Frend W.H.C., *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, New York 1967.

Frend W.H.C., *Tertuliano e gli Ebrei*, *RSLR* 4 (1968), p. 3–10.

Fuller R.H., *The Virgin Birth: Historical Fact or Kerygmatic Truth? Biblical Research* 1 (1956), p. 1–8.

Funk R.W., *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millenium*, San Francisco 1997.

Furlani G., *La civiltà babilonese e assira*, Roma 1929.

Gądecki S., *Święty Paweł – świadek Słowa między Azją a Europą*, in *Mártyres tū Lógū*, ed. Korzec C., Studia i Rozprawy 7, Szczecin 2006, p. 27–44.

Gądecki S., *Wstęp do pism Janowych*, Gniezno 1991.

Gafni I., *The Historical Background*, in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT 2/2, Assen 1984, p. 1–31.

Gafni I.M., *Land Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*, Sheffield 1997.

Gafni I.M., *Świat Talmudu. Od Miszny do podboju arabskiego*, in *Chrześcijaństwo a judaizm rabiniczny*, ed. H. Shanks, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2013, p. 355–424.

Gager J.G., *Did Jewish Christians See the Rise of Islam?*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 361–372.

Gager J.G., *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, New York–Oxford 1985.

Gager J.G., *The Parting of the Ways; A View from the Perspective of Early Christianity: 'A Christian Perspective'*, in *Interwoven Destinies: Jews and Christians Through the Ages*, ed. E. Fisher, New York 1993, p. 62–73.

Gagnon R.A.J., *Why the „Weak" at Rome Cannot Be Non-Christian Jews*, *CBQ* 62 (2000), p. 64–85.

Gamba G.G., *Struttura letteraria e significato dottrinale di Marco 2,23-28 e 3,1–3*, *Salesianum* 40 (1978), p. 529–582.

Garzetti E., From Tiberius to the Antonines. A History of the Roman Empire AD 14–192, London 1974.

Gaventa R.B., *From Darkness to Light*, Philadelphia 1986.

Geiger J., *The Ban of Circumcision and the Bar-Kokhva Revolt*, *Zion* 41 (1976), p. 143–145.

Gemser B., *The rîb- or Controversy Pattern in Hebrew Mentality*, in *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, VT.S 3, Leiden 1955.

Geoltrain P., *La violation du Sabbat. Une lecture de Marc 3,1-6*, *Foi et Vie* 69 (1970), p. 70–90.

Geraty L.T., *From Sabbath to Sunday: Why, How and When*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 255–268.

Gerhardsson B., *Memory and Manuscript*, Uppsala 1961.

Gerleman G., *ms' – finden*, in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, ed. E. Jenni, C. Westermann, 1, München 1971, p. 925.

Gero S., *The Stern Master and His Wayward Disciple: A 'Jesus' Story in the Talmud and in Christian Hagiography*, *JSJ* 25 (1994), p. 287–311.

Gheorgita R., *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3-4 in Heb 10:37-38*, Tübingen 2003.

Gibson E.L., *Jewish Antagonism or Christian Polemic: The Case of the* Martyrdom of Pionius, *JECS* 9 (2001), p. 339–358.

Gibson E.L., *The Jews and Christians in the* Martyrdom of Polycarp. *Entangled or Parted Ways?* in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 145–158.

Gieniusz A., *„Identity markers" czy „solus Christus" – o co toczy się bój w Pawłowej nauce o usprawiedliwieniu przez wiarę?* in *„Duch i Oblubienica mówią: Przyjdź". Księga pamiątkowa dla Ojca Profesora Augustyna Jankowskiego OSB w 85. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2001, p. 118–137.

Giversen S., *The Covenant – Theirs or Ours?* in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody 1997, p. 14–18.

Glasenaap H. von, *Judaizm*, in *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, trans. S. Łypacewicz, Kraków 1990, p. 9–38.

Głuchowski R., *Nawrócenie dworzanina królowej etiopskiej typem ewangelizacji bez granic. Społeczno-geograficzny wymiar Łukaszowego uniwersalizmu zbawczego w Dz 8,25-40*, Studia Biblica Lublinensia 5, Lublin 2010.

Gnilka J., *Jezus z Nazaretu. Orędzie i dzieje*, Teologia żywa, trans. J. Zychowicz, Warszawa 1997.

Gnilka J., *Marco*, Assisi 1991.

Gnilka J., *Paweł z Tarsu. Apostoł i świadek*, trans. W. Szymona, Kraków 2001.

Gnilka J., *Pierwsi chrześcijanie. Źródła i początki Kościoła*, trans. W. Szymona, Kraków 2003.

Goodman J., *Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of Roman Empire*, Oxford 1994.

Goodman M., *Diaspora Reactions to the Destruction of the Temple*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways. A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, Grand Rapids 1999, p. 27–39.

Goodman M., *The Fiscus Judaicus and Gentile Attitude to Judaism in Flavian Rome*, in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, J. Rives, Oxford 2005, p. 167–177.

Goodman M., *Judaism in the Roman World. Collected Essays*, AJEC 66, Leiden–Boston 2007.

Goodman M., *The Meaning of 'Fisci Judaici Calumnia Sublata' on the Coinage of Nerva*, in *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism*, ed. S.J.D. Cohen, J.J. Schartz, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 67, Leiden–Boston 2007, p. 81–89.

Goodman M., *Modeling the „Parting of the Ways"*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 119–129.

Goodman M., *Nerva, the Fiscus Judaicus and Jewish Identity*, *JRS* 79 (1989), p. 40–44.

Goodman M., *Pilgrimage Economy of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period*, in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. L.I. Levine, New York 1999, p. 71–75.

Goodman M., *Rzym i Jerozolima. Zderzenie antycznych cywilicacji*, trans. O. Zienkiewicz, Warszawa 2007.

Goodman M., *Sadducees and Essenes after 70 CE*, in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, ed. S.E. Porter[i inni], Leiden 1994, p. 347–56.

Goodman M., *Trajan and the Origins of the Bar Kokhba War*, in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome*, ed. P. Schäfer, Tübingen 2003, p. 23–29.

Gottheil R., Kraus S., *Pappus*, in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, 9, ed. I.K. Funk, A.W. Wagnalls, New York 1906, p. 512.

Grant R.M., *The Apostolic Fathers*, 4, *Ignatius of Antioch*, Camden 1966.

Graupner A., *Ewiger Bund (Gen 17) oder neuer Bund (Jer 31,31–34)? Überlegungen zu einem Grundproblem der Theologie des Alten Testaments im Horizont gesamtbiblischer Theologie*, *RT* 57 (2015) 4, p. 473–489.

Grech P., *Le idee fondamentali del Nuovo Testamento. Compendio di teologia biblica*, trans. A. Corticelli, Modena 1970.

Grech P., *Początki teologii chrześcijanskiej*, in *Historia teologii*, 1, *Epoka patrystyczna*, ed. A. di Bernardino, B. Studer, trans. M.J. Gołębiowski, J. Łukaszewska, J. Ryndak, P. Zarębski, Kraków 2003, p. 39–116.

Green J.B., *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 1997.

Grossberg D.M., *Orthopraxy in Tannaitic Literature*, *SJS* 41 (2010), p. 517–561.

Gruell T., Benke L., *A Hebrew / Aramaic Graffito and Poppea's Alleged Jewish Sympathy*, *JJS* 62 (2011), p. 37–55.

Gruen E.S., *Diaspora. Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*, Cambridge–London 2002.

Gryglewicz F., *Najemny robotnik w Palestynie za czasów Chrystusa Pana*, Lublin 1951.

Grypeou E., *Daniel Boyarin, „Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity" (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 2004)*, *SCJR* 1 (2005–2006), p. 7–8.

Grzybek E., M. Sordi, *L'edit de Nazareth et la politique de Neron à l'égard des chrétiens*, ZPE 120 (1998), p. 279–291.

Gugenheim E., *Il giudaismo dopo la rivolta di Bar-Kokheba*, in *Storia dell'ebraismo*, ed. H.-C. Puech, trans. M.N. Pierini, Roma–Bari 1993, p. 185–190.

Gundry R.H., *Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul*, *Bib* 66 (1985), p. 1–38.

Hadas-Lebel M., *Józef Flawiusz. Żyd rzymski*, Warszawa 1997.

Hagner D.A., *Paul and Judaism. The Jewish Matrix of Early Christianity: Issues in the Current Debate*, *BBR* 3 (1993), p. 111–130.

Hagner D.A., *A Positive Theology of Judaism from the New Testament*, *SEÅ* 69 (2004), p. 9–28.

Hakola A., *The Johannine Community as Jewish Christians? Some Problems in Current Scholarly Consensus*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 181–202.

Hałas S., *Pierwszy List św. Piotra. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKB NT XVII, Częstochowa 2007.

Halsberghe G.H., *The Cult of Sol Invictus*, Leiden 1972

Hamman A.G., *Życie codzienne pierwszych chrześcijan* (*95–197*), trans. A. Guryn, U. Sudolska, Warszawa 1990.

Hanson P.D., *Messiahs and Messianic Figures in Proto-Apocalypticism*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 67–75.

Haran H., *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*, Oxford 1978.

Hardy E.G., *Christianity and Roman Government*, New York 1971.

Hare R.D., *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, Cambridge 1967.

Harrington D.J., *The Jewishness of Jesus: Facing Some Problems*, in *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, New York 1991, p. 123–152.

Harrington D.J., *L'emergere graduale della Chiesa e la „separazione ('the parting of the ways') tra ebraismo e cristianesimo"*, in *Gesù Cristo e il popolo ebraico: Inerrogativi per la teologia di oggi*, ed. P.A. Cunningham, J. Sievers, M.C. Boys, H.H. Henrix, J. Svartvik, Roma 2012, p. 149–164.

Harrington J., *What Are They Saying About Hebrew?* New York 2005.

Hartin P.J., *The Religious Content of the Letter of James*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 203–232.

Hasel G.F., *Sabbath*, *ABD* V, p. 849–856.

Hasenfuss J., *Die Jungfrauengeburt in der Religionsgeschichte*, in *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute*, Mariologische Studien IV, Essen 1969, p. 11–23.

Hayman A.P., *The Problem of Pseudonymity in the Ezra Apocalypse*, *JSJ* 6 (1975), p. 42–56.

Hayward C.T.R., *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings. From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion*, Oxford 2005.

Hedner Zetterholm K., *Alternate Visions of Judaism and Their Impact on the Formation of Rabbinic Judaism*, *JJMJS* 1 (2014), p. 127–153.

Heemstra M., *How Rome's Administration of Fiscus Judaicus Accelerated the Parting of the Ways between Judaism and Christianity. Rereading 1 Peter, Revelation, the Letter to the Hebrews, and the Gospel of John in their Roman and Jewish Context*, Groningen 2009.

Heemstra M., *The Fiscus Judaicus and the Parting of the Ways*, Tübingen 2010.

Heil J.P., *The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Themei in Mark*, *CBQ* 59 (1997), p. 77–100.

Heinemann J., Petuchowski J.J., *The Literature of the Synagogue*, New York 1975.

Hengel M., *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, Philadelphia 1977.

Hengel M., *Die vier Evangelien und das eine Evangelium von Jesus Christus*, Tübingen 2008.

Hengel M., *Jews, Greek and Barbarians: Aspects of Hellenisation of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period*, Philadelphia 1980.

Hengel M., *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, 1–2, Philadelphia 1974.

Hengel M., *The Johannine Question*, Londyn–Philadelphia 1989.

Hengel M., *The Septuagint as a Collection of Writings Claimed by Christians: Justin and the Church Fathers before Origen*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways. A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, Grand Rapids 1999, p. 39–83.

Hengel M., *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, London 1976.

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

Hergesel T., Rosik M., *„Posłany, aby zaświadczyć o światłości" (J 1,8). Postać Jana Chrzciciela we współczesnej literaturze egzegetycznej, RBL* 2 (2002), p. 146–152.

Hergesel T., *Rozumieć Biblię, 1, Stary Testament. Jahwizm*, Kraków 1992.

Herr M.B., *The Historical Significance of the Dialogues between Jewish Sages and Roman Dignitaries*, *SH* 22 (1971), p. 121–150.

Herr M.D., *The History of Eretz Israel. The Roman Byzantine Period*, Jerusalem 1985.

Heschel A.J., *Prorocy*, trans. A. Gorzkowski, Kraków 2014.

Hess H., *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*, Oxford Early Christian Studies, Oxford 2002.

Hezser C., *The Impact of Household Slaves on the Jewish Famili in Roman Palestine*, JSJ 34 (2003) 4, p. 375–424.

Hill C.C., *The Jerusalem Church*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 39–56.

Hillmann J., *Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas kritisch untersucht*, *Jahrbuch für Protestantische Theologie* 17 (1891), p. 53–57.

Himmelfarb M., *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, New York–Oxford 1993.

Himmelfarb M., *The Parting of the Ways Reconsidered: Diversity in Judaism and Jewish-Christian Relations in the Roman Empire. 'A Jewish Perspective'*, in *Interwoven Destinies: Jews and Christians through the Ages*, ed. E. Fisher, New York 1993, p. 47–52.

Hirschberg H., *Allusions to the Apostle Paul in the Talmud*, *JBL* 62 (1943), p. 73–87.

Hoffmann R.J., *Marcion, on the Restitution of Christianity*, Chico 1984.

Hollander H.W., Der Hout G.E. van, *The Apostel Paul Calling Himself an Abortion: 1Cor 15,8 within the Context of 1Cor 15,8–10*, *NT* 38 (1996), p. 224–236.

Horbury W., *Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian*, Cambridge 2014.

Horbury W., *The Benediction of the Minim and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy*, *JTS* 33 (1982), p. 19–61.

Horbury W., *The New Testament and Rabbinic Study – An Historical Sketch*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 3–42.

Horrell D.G., *The Product of Petrine Circle? A Reassessment of the Origin and Character of 1. Peter*, *JSNT* 86 (2002), p. 29–60.

Horsley R.A., *'Messianic' Figures and Movements in First-Century Palestine*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 276–295.

Horsley R.A., *Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome, A.D. 66–70*, *CBQ* 43 (1981), p. 409–432.

Horsley R.A., *Conquest and Social Conflict in Galilee*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 129–168.

Horsley R.A., *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Historical Jesus*, in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 3, The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, p. 37–61.

Horst P. van der, *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*, Kampen 1991.

Horst P. van der, *Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship before 70 CE?* in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 16–37.

Houlden J.L., *Ewangelia według św. Jana*, in *Słownik hermeneutyki biblijnej*, ed. R.J. Coggins, J.L. Houlden, Polish ed. W. Chrostowski, trans. B. Widła, Warszawa 2005, p. 181–182.

Hruby K., *La fête de la Pentecôte dans la tradition juive*, *BVChr* 63 (1965), p. 47.

Hübner H., *Das Gesetz bei Paulus. Ein Beitrag zum Werden der paulinischen Theologie*, Göttingen 1978.

Hulen A.B., *The Dialogues with the Jews as Sources of Early Jewish Argument against Christianity*, *JBL* 51 (1932), p. 58–70.

Hull W.E., *John*, The Broadman Bible Commentary 9, Londres 1970.

Hultgren A.J., *The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23–28*, *JBL* 91 (1972), p. 38–43.

Humphries M., *Early Christianity*, London–New York 2006.

Hurley D.W., *Suetonius: Divus Claudius*, Cambridge 2001.

Hurtado L.W., *First-Century Jewish Monotheism*, *JSNT* 71 (1998), p. 3–26.

Hurtado L.W., *One God, One Lord. Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*, London 1998.

Iluk J., *„Toledot Jeszu" – przekaz talmudyczny o Jezusie i chrześcijanach w żydowskiej recepcji*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 181–217.

Iluk J., *Żydowska politeja i Kościół w Imperium Rzymskim u schyłku antyku*, 2, *Żydowska antyewangelia. Antyczna tradycja i nowożytne trwanie*, Gdańsk 2000.

Inowlocki S., *Eusebius of Caesarea's* Interpretatio Christiana *of Philo's 'De vita contemplativa'*, *HTR* 97 (2004), p. 305–328.

Instone-Brewer D., *Traditions of the Rabbis from the Era of the New Testament*, 1, *Prayer and Agriculture*, Grand Rapids–Cambridge 2004.

Isaac B., Roll I., *Judea in the Early Years of Hadrian's Reign*, in *The Near East under Roman Rule: selected Papers*, Leiden 1998, p. 182–197.

Isbouts J.-P., *Wspólne korzenie. Od Mojżesza do Mahometa*, trans. J. Korpanty, Warszawa 2009.

Jackson M., *The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross*, *NTS* 33 (1987), p. 23–31.

Jackson-McCabe M.A., *Ebionites and Nazoraeans: Christians or Jews?* in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 187–205.

Jackson-McCabe M.A., *What's in a Name? The Problem of „Jewish-Christianity"*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 7–37.

Jacob E., *Theology of the Old Testament*, London 1974.

Jacobs A.S., *The Lion and the Lamb. Reconsidering Jewish-Christian Relations in Antiquity*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 95–118.

Jacobsen A.-Ch., *Athenagoras*, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 81–100.

Jaeger W., *Wczesne chrześcijaństwo i grecka paideia*, trans. K. Bielawski, Bydgoszcz 2002.

Jaruzelska I., *Własność w prawie biblijnym*, Warszawa 1999.

Jędrzejewski S., *Apokaliptyka jako rodzaj literacki*, *RBL* 51 (1998) 1, p. 29–35.

Jędrzejewski S., *Judaizm diaspory w okresie Drugiej Świątyni*, *Seminare* 27 (2010), p. 9–27.

Jędrzejewski S., *Peszer jako metoda egzegetyczna*, *Seminare* 24 (2007), p. 1–17.

Jędrzejewski S., *Septuaginta – Biblia helleńskiego judaizmu*, *RBL* 58 (2005) 4, p. 245–262.

Jelonek T., *Schemat Miszny*, Kraków 2001.

Jensen R.M., *The Dura Europos Synagogue, Early-Christian Art., and Religious Life in Dura Europos*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 154–167.

Jensen R.M., *Understanding Early Christian Art*, London 2000.

Jeremias J., *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, London 1967.

Jervell J., *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*, Cambridge 1996.

Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period, 2, *Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT, Philadelphia 1984.

Jochum U., *Der Urkonflikt des Christentums. Paulus – Petrus – Jakobus und die Entstehung der Kirche*, Innsbruck 2011.

Jocz J., *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*, London 1949.

Johnson P., *Historia Żydów*, trans. M. Gody, M. Wójcik, A. Nelicki, Warszawa 2000.

Johnson S.E., *Asia Minor and Early Christianity*, in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, 2, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, p. 77–145.

Johnson W.G., *The Pilgrimage Motif in the Book of Hebrews*, *JBL* 97 (1978) 2, p. 239–251.

Jonas H., *Ewangelia Markiona*, *Gnosis* 3 (1992), p. 18–22.

Jonas H., *The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Begginings of Christianity*, London 1992.

Jones F. Stanley, *The Pseudo-Clementines*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 285–304.

Jones F. Stanley, *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies*, OLA 203, Leuven 2012.

Jones P.R., *1Cor 15:8: Paul the Last Apostole*, *TynBul* 36 (1985), p. 5–34.

Jonge M. de, *The so-called Pseudoepigrapha of the Old Testament and Early Christianity*, in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody 1997, p. 59–71.

Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period, ed. F. Parente, J. Sievers, SPB 41, Leiden–New York–Köln 1994.

Joubert S.J., *A Bone of Contention in Recent Scholarship: The 'Birkat ha-Minim' and the Separation of Church and Synagogue in the First Century AD*, *Neotestamentica* 27 (1993) 2, p. 351–363.

Juel D.H., *The Future of a Religious Past: Qumran and Palestinian Jesus Movement*, in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, p. 61–74.

Jurzyk P., *Wybrane elementy napastliwej polemiki antyariańskiej w* Orationes contra Arianos *św. Atanazego Wielkiego na tle literackiej tradycji inwektywy*, *WPT* 14 (2006) 2, p. 179–195.

Juster D., *Powrót do korzeni. Podstawy teologii biblijnej judaizmu mesjanistycznego*, trans. K. Dubis, [brak miejsca i roku wydania].

Juster J., *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain. Leur condition juridique, économique et sociale*, 1, Paris 1914.

Kadman L., *Coins of Aelia Capitolina*, Jerusalem 1956.

Kalmin R., *Jewish Babilonia between Persia and Roman Palestine*, Oxford 2006.

Kameraz-Kos N., *Święta i obyczaje żydowskie*, Warszawa 2000[2].

Kasher A., *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic Cities during the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70 CE)*, Tübingen 1990.

Katz S.T., *Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C.E.: A Reconsideration*, *JBL* 103 (1984), p. 43–76.

Kazen T., *Jesus, Scriptue, and Paradosis: Response to Friedrich Avemarie*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 281–288.

Kearney P.J., *He Appeared to 500 Brothers (1Cor 15:6)*, *NT* 22 (1980), p. 264–284.

Kee H.C., *Defining the First-Century CE Synagogue: Problems and Progress*, *NTS* 41 (1995), p. 481–500.

Keener C.S., *Komentarz historyczno-kulturowy do Nowego Testamentu*, trans. Z. Kościuk, Polish ed. K. Bardski, W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000.

Kempiak R., *Paweł i essenizm qumrański*, in *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testamentem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, p. 271–283.

Kerkeslager A., *The Jews in Egypt and Cyrenaica, 66-c. 235*, in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, 4, ed. S.T. Katz, Cambridge 2006, p. 53–67.

Kessler E., *An Introduction to Jewish-Christian Relations*, New York 2010.

Kieling M., *Kościół wobec idolatrii na podstawie dokumentów synodów w latach 50–381*, *VP* 30 (2010) 55, p. 275–292.

Kimbrough S.T., *The Concept of the Sabbath at Qumran*, *RQ* 20 (1966), p. 483–502.

Kimelman R., *Birkat Ha-Minim and the lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity*, in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. E.P. Sanders, 2, London 1981, p. 226–244.

Kimelman R., *R. Yohanan of Tiberias of the Social and Religious History of Third Century Palestine*, Ann Arbor 1980.

Kimelman R., *Rabbi Yohanan and the Professionalization of the Rabinate*, Annual of the Institute for Research in Jewish Law 9–10 (1982–1983), p. 329–358.

Kingsbury J.D., *Matthew, the Gospel According to*, in *Harper's Bible Dictionary*, ed. P. Achtemeier, San Francisco 1985, p. 613–615.

Kistemaker S.J., *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles*, Grand Rapids 1990.

Kister M., *Some Early Jewish and Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism*, *JSJ* 37 (2006) 4, p. 548–593.

Klassen W., *To the Hebrews or Against the Hebrews? Anti-Judaism and the Epistle to the Hebrews*, in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, 2, *Separation and Polemic*, ed. S.G. Wilson, Waterloo 1986, p. 1–16.

Klausner J., *Jesus von Nazareth*, Berlin 1934[2].

Klawans J., *Heresy without Orthodoxy: Josephus and Rabbis on the Dangers of Illegitimate Jewish Beliefs*, *JJMJS* 1 (2014), p. 99–126.

Klawans J., *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*, Oxford 2006.

Klijn A.F.J., *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, SVC 17, Leiden–New York–København–Köln 1992.

Klinkowski J., *Aktualizacja biblijnej idei jubileuszów*, in *Na progu trzeciego tysiąclecia. Refleksja teologiczna w środowisku legnickim*, ed. B. Drożdż, Legnica 2001, p. 117–142.

KlostergaardPetersen A., *Heaven-borne in the World: A Study of the* Letter to Diogenetus, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 125–138.

Knohl I., *The Apocalyptic and Messianic Domensions of the Gabriel Revelation in Their Historical Context*, in *Hazon Gabriel. New Readings of the Gabriel* Revelation, M. Henze, SBLMS 29, Atlanta 2011, p. 39–59.

Knohl I., *The Gabriel Revelation*, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture. Proceedings of the internatiownal conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July* 6–8, 2008), ed. A.D. Roitman[i inni], Leiden 2011, p. 435–467.

Knohl I., *The Messiah Before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Jerusalem 2000.

Knox J., *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, New York 1950.

Koehler L., Baumgartner W., Stamm W., *Wielki słownik hebrajsko-polski i aramejsko-polski Starego Testamentu*, 2, Polish ed. P. Dec, trans. zespół, Warszawa 2008.

Koester C., *The Origin and Significance of the Flight to Pella Tradition*, CBQ 51 (1989), p. 90–106.

Koltun-Fromm N., *Zipporah's Complaint. Moses is Not Conscientious in the Deed! Exegetical Traditions of Moses' Celibacy*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 283–306.

Kondracki A., *Niewolnicy w Starym i Nowym Testamencie*, in *Życie społeczne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1998, p. 269–290.

Konikoff A., *Sarcophagi from the Jewish Catacombs of Ancient Rome: A Catalogue Raisonée*, Stuttgart 1990.

Korner R.J., *Ekklēsia as a Jewish Synagogue Term: Some Implications for Paul's Socio-Religious Location*, *JJMJS* 2 (2015), p. 53–79.

Korus K., *Plutarch z Cheronei*, in *Literatura Grecji starożytnej*, 2, *Proza historyczna, krasomówstwo, filozofia i nauka, literatura chrześcijańska*, ed. H. Podbielski, Źródła i monografie 255, Lublin 2005, p. 241–270.

Kotecki D., *Kościół w świetle Apokalipsy św. Jana*, SBP 6, Częstochowa 2008.

Kozyra J., *Modlitwy Maryjne w Nowym Testamencie*, *SS* 7 (2003), p. 149–169.

Kozyra J., *Nowy Testament a Żydzi na podstawie dokumentu Papieskiej Komisji Biblijnej (2001)*, in *Pieśniami dla mnie Twoje przykazania. Księga pamiątkowa*

dla Księdza profesora Janusza Frankowskiego w 50. rocznicę święceń kapłańskich i 75. rocznicę urodzin, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2003, p. 136–168.

Kraabel A.T., *Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context*, in *Studies Presented to George M.A. Hanfmann*, ed. D.G. Mitten[i in.], Mainz 1971, p. 77–85.

Kraemer R.S., *On the Meaning of the Term „Jew" in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions*, *HTR* 82 (1989), p. 35–53.

Kraft R.A., Luijendijk A., *Christianity's Rise after Judaism's Demise in Early Egypt*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 179–185.

Kraft R.A., Nickelsburg G., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreter*, Philadelphia–Atlanta 1986.

Kraft R.A., *The Weighing of the Parts. Pivots and Pitfalls in the Study of Early Judaisms and their Early Christian Offspring*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 87–94.

Krašovec, *Vergebung und neuer Bund nach Jer 31,31–34*, *ZAW* 105 (1993), p. 428–444.

Krawczyk R., *Diaspora żydowska. Tożsamość narodowa i religijna w warunkach emigracji*, in *Jak śmierć potężna jest miłość. Księga pamiątkowa ku czci Księdza Profesora Juliana Warzechy SAC (1944–2009)*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Ząbki 2009, p. 241–249.

Kręcidło J., *Duch Święty i Jezus w Ewangelii świętego Jana. Funkcja pneumatologii w chrystologicznej strukturze czwartej Ewangelii*, SBP 2, Częstochowa 2006.

Kudasiewicz J., *Ewangelie synoptyczne dzisiaj*, Ząbki 1999.

Kudasiewicz J., *Matka Odkupiciela*, Kielce 1991.

Kudasiewicz J., *Odkrywanie Ducha Świętego. Medytacje biblijne*, Kielce 1998.

Kuhn H.-W., *The Impact of Selected Qumran Texts on the Understanding of Pauline Theology*, in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 3, The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, p. 153–186.

Kumaniecki K., *Literatura rzymska. Okres cyceroński*, Warszawa 1977.

Kutscher E.Y., The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study, *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1858), p. 1–35.

Kyle McCarter P., *Okres patriarchów. Abraham, Izaak i Jakub*, in *Starożytny Izrael. Od czasów Abrahama do zburzenia Jerozolimy przez Rzymian*, trans. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1994, p. 25–68.

Łach J., *Dziecię nam się narodziło. W kręgu teologii dziecięctwa Jezusa*, Częstochowa 2001.

Lachs S.T., *R. Abbahu and the Minnim*, *JQR* 60 (1970), p. 197–212.

Laible H., *Jesus Christ in the Talmud, Midrash, Zohar and Liturgy of the Synagogue*, Cambridge 1893.

Lake K., *Proselites and God-Fearers*, in *The Beginning of Christianity*, 5, ed. F. Jackson, K. Lake, Michigan 1965, p. 74–96.

Lambers-Petry D., *Verwandte Jesu ale Referenzpersonen für das Judenchristentum*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 32–52.

Landesmann P., *Anti-Judaism on the Way from Judaism to Christianity*, Wiener Vorlesungen: Forschungen 5, Frankfurt am Main–Berlin–Bern–Bruxelles–New York–Oxford–Wien 2012.

Lange N.R.M. de, *Origen and the Jewp. Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third Century Palestine*, Cambridge 1976.

Langston S., *Dividing It Right. Who Is a Jew and What is a Christian*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 125–134.

Läpple A., *Od egzegezy do katechezy*, 2, *Nowy Testament*, trans. B. Białecki, Warszawa 1986.

Läpple A., *Od Księgi Rodzaju do Ewangelii. Wprowadzenie do lektury Pisma świętego*, trans. J. Zychowicz, Kraków 1983.

Latham H., *The Risen Master*, Cambridge 1901.

Lauterbach J.Z., *Rabbinical Essays*, Cincinnati 1951.

Le Donne A., *Historical Jesus. What Can We Know and How We Know It?* Grand Rapids 2011.

Le Donne A., *The Historiographical Jesus. Memory, Typology, and the Son of David*, Waco 2009.

Legowicz J., *Judaizm i filozofia grecko-rzymska*, in *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, Warszawa 1990, p. 203–221.

Lemański J., *W oczekiwaniu na Mesjasza? ScL* 7 (2015), p. 35–67.

Lemański J., *Żydzi w oczach ewangelisty Mateusza*, *RBL* 2 (2004), p. 117–126.

Lempa H., *Modlitwa codzienna w judaizmie*, *WPT* 4 (1996) 1, p. 47–61.

Lempa H., *Ojcowska miłość Boga wobec swojego ludu w świetle starotestamentowego prawodawstwa jubileuszowego*, in *Ojciec – Bóg. Materiały z IV Forum popularyzacji teologii i kultury chrześcijańskiej (Wrocław–Kiełczów, 11. grudnia 1999 r.)*, ed. S. Rosik, Wrocław 2000, p. 9–14.

Léon-Dufour X., *Chrystofanie*, in *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, trans. K. Romaniuk, Poznań–Warszawa 1973.

Léon-Dufour X., *Résurrection de Jésus et message pascal*, Paris 1971.

Leszczyński R.M., *Marcjonici*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 11, ed. S. Wilk, E. Ziemann, R. Sawa, K. Góźdź, J. Herbut, S. Olczak, R. Popowski, Lublin 2006, kol. 1254–1255.

Levine A.B., *In the Presence of the Lord*, Leiden 1974.

Levine A.-J., *The Misunderstood Jew. The Church and the Scandal of Jewish Jesus*, San Francisco 2006.

Levine L.I.A., *Jerusalem: Portrait of the City in the Second Temple Period (538 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.)*, Philadelphia 2002.

Levine L.I.A., *Judaism from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the End of the Second Jewish Revolt: 70–135 C.E.*, in *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism. A Parallel History of Their Origins and Early Development*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2011, p. 139–166.

Levine L.I.A., *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, New Haven 2005.

Levine L.I.A., *The First Century C.E. Synagogue in Historical Perspective*, in *The Ancient Synagogue From Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 1–26.

Levinskaya I.A., *The Inscription from Aphrodisias and the Problem of God-Fearers*, *TynBul* 41 (1990) 2, p. 312–318.

Lewis N., Meyer R., *Roman Civilization Sourcebook, 2, The Empire*, New York 1966.

Leyraud A.F., *Les catacombes africaines Sousse – Hadrumète*, Alger 1922.

Lichtenberg H., *Syncretistic Features in Jewish and Jewish-Christian Baptism Movements*, in *Jews and Christians; The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 85–97.

Lieu J., *„The Parting of the Ways": Theological Construct or Historical Reality?*, *JSNT* 56 (1994), p. 101–119.

Lieu J., *Neither Jew nor Greek? Constructing Early Christianity*, London 2002.

Lieu J., *The synagogue and the Separation of the Christians*, in *The Ancient Synagogue From Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 189–207.

Linke W., *Od szabatu do niedzieli. Ciągłość i nieciągłość tradycji świętowania*, in *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Waldemara Chrostowskiego w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, 2, ed. B. Strzałkowska, Warszawa 2011, p. 1020–1033.

Lipiński E., *Pandera & Stada and Jehoshua bar Perachya*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 51–66.

Lipiński E., *Pandera and Stada*, *SJ* 11 (2008) 2, p. 205–213.

Lodahl M.E., *Shekhinah / Spirit. Divine Presence in Jewish and Christian Religion*, SJC, New York 1992.

Lohfink G., *Antijudaismus bei Paulus? Die Kirche und Israel in 1 Thess 2, 14–16 und Rom 9, 11*, in *Radici dell'antigiudaismo in ambiente cristiano. Colloquio Intra-Ecclesiale. Atti del Simposio Teologico-Storico. Città del Vaticano, 30 ottobre – 1 novembre 1997*, Vaticano 2000, p. 163–196.

Lohfink G., *Jesus von Nazaret. Was er wollte, wer er war*, Freiburg 2011.

Lohse E., *Jesu Worte über den Sabbat*, in *Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments. Exegetische Studien zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, ed. E. Lohse, Göttingen 1973, p. 62–72.

Longosz S., *Zarys historii inwektywy wczesnochrześcijańskiej*, *RT* 3 (1996) 2, p. 363–390.

Longsdorf J.R., *The Virgin Birth. Mystery or Myth?* Bloomington 2004.

López Martin J., *El domingo, fiesta de los cristianos*, Madrid 1992.

Lowy S., *The Confutation of Judaism in the Epistle of Barnabas*, *JJS* 11 (1960), p. 1–33.

Lüdemann G., *Early Christianity according to Acts*, Minneapolis 1986.

Lüdemann G., *The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella-Tradition*, in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, 1, ed. E.P. Sanders, Philadelphia 1980, p. 161–173.

Luomanen P., *Ebionites and Nazarenes*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 81–118.

Mach M., *Concepts of Jewish Monotheism in the Hellenistic Period*, in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, ed. C.C. Newman, J.R. Davila, G.S. Lewis, Leiden 1999, p. 21–42.

Maciołka M., *Dziewictwo Maryi*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 4, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1983, p. 612–613.

Maier J., *Beobachtungen zum Konfliktpotential in neutestamentlichen Aussagen über den Tempel*, in *Jesus und das jüdische Gesetz*, ed. I. Broer, Stuttgart–Berlin–Köln 1992, p. 173–213.

Maier J., *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*, Darmstadt 1978.

Maier J., *Między Starym a Nowym Testamentem. Historia i religia w okresie Drugiej Świątyni*, MT, trans. E. Marszał, J. Zakrzewski, Kraków 2002.

Making History. Josephus and Historical Method, SJSJ 110, ed. Z. Rodgers, Leiden–Boston 2007.

Malina A., *Gli scribi nel Vangelo di Marco. Studio del loro ruolo nella sua narrazione e teologia*, Katowice 2002.

Mancini I., *Archeological Discoveries Relative to the Judaeo-Christians: Historical Survey*, Jerusalem 1970.

Mann J., *Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service*, *HUCA* 2 (1925), p. 269–338.

Manns F., *Jewish Interpretations of the Song of Songs*, *LA* 68 (2008), p. 277–296.

Manns F., *John and Jamnia: How the Break Occured between Jews and Christians c. 80–100 A.D.*, Jerusalem 1988.

Manns F., *L'Évangile de Jean, réponse chrétienne aux decisions de Jabne*, *LA* 30 (1980), p. 47–92.

Manns F., *L'Évangile de Jean, réponse chrétienne aux decisions de Jabne. Note complémentaire*, *LA* 32 (1982), p. 85–108.

Marcinkowski R., *Kobieta i mężczyzna w ujęciu Talmudu*, *SJ* 5–6 (2002–2003), p. 1–30.

Marcus J., *Mark – Interpreter of Paul*, *NTS* 46 (2000), p. 473–487.

Marshall J.W., *John's Jewish (Christian?) Apocalypse*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 233–256.

Martin V., *A House Divided: The Parting of the Ways between Synagogue and Church*, New York 1995.

Martyn J.L., *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, New York 1979.

Marxen W., *Die Auferstehung Jesu als historisches und als theologisches Problem*, Gütersloh 1964.

Marxen W., *Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth*, Gütersloh 1968.

Mason S., *Josephus and the New Testament*, Peabody 1993.

Massi P., *La domenica nella storia della salvezza. Saggio liturgico–pastorale*, Napoli 1967.

Mc Namara M., *I Targum e il Nuovo Testamento. Le parafrasi aramaiche della bibbia ebraica e il loro apporto per una migliore comprensione del nuovo testamento* [zachowana oryginalna pisownia małych liter], Studi biblici, Bologna 1978.

McArthur H.K., *Son of Mary*, *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973), p. 37–58.

McGing B.C., *Population and Proselytism. How Many Jews Were There in the Ancient World?* in *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*, ed. J.R. Barlett, London 2002, p. 88–106.

McHugh J., *„In Him was Life": John's Gospel and Parting of the Ways*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 123–158.

McKay H.A., *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism*, Leiden 2001.

McKenzie J.L., *The New Testament without Illusion*, Chicago 1980.

Mędala S., *Chrystologia Ewangelii św. Jana*, Kraków 2001.

Mędala S., *Ewangelia według św. Jana. Rozdziały 1-12. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKB 4/1, Częstochowa 2010.

Mędala S., *Le camp des Esséniens de Jérusalem à la lumière des recentes recherches archéologiques*, *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989), p. 67–74.

Mędala S., *Wprowadzenie do literatury międzytestamentalnej*, Biblioteka zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 1, Kraków 1994.

Mędala S., *Znaczenie rękopisów znad Morza Martwego dla studium Nowego Testamentu*, Fil 391 (1989), p. 225–252.

Meecham H.G., *The Epistle to Diogenetus. The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes*, Manchester 1949.

Meeks W.A., *In Search of the Early Christians. Selected Essays*, New Haven–London 2001.

Meier J.P., *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking a Historical Jesus*, 2, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, New York–London–Toronto–Sydney–Auckland 1994.

Meier J.P., *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, 4, *Law and Love*, London 2009.

Meier J.P., *Reflections on Jesus-of-History Research Today*, in *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, New York 1991, p. 84–107.

Meier J.P., *The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans. What Can Be Said?* Bib 81 (2000), p. 202–232.

Meigne M., *Concile ou collection d'Elvire*, *RHE* 70 (1975), p. 361–387.

Mélèze-Modrzejewski J., *Żydzi nad Nilem od Ramzesa II do Hadriana*, Biblioteka zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 3, trans. J. Olkiewicz, Kraków 2000.

Meshorer Y., *A Treasury of Jewish Coins. From the Persian Period to Bar Kokhba*, Jerusalem–New York 2001.

Metzger B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart 1994^2.

Meyers E.M., Chancey M.A., *Alexander to Constantine: Archeology of the Land of the Bible*, New Haven 2012.

Meyers E.M., *Living Side by Side in Galilee*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 133–150.

Meyers E.M., Meyers C.L., *Response to Jodi Magness's Review of the Final Publication on Nabratein*, *BASOR* 359 (2010), p. 67–76.

Meyers E.M., *The Problem of Scarcity of Synagogues from 70 to ca. 250 C.E.: The Case of Synagogue I at Nabratein (2nd–3rd Century C.E.)*, in *'Follow the Wise': Studies in Jewish History and Culture in Honour of Lee I. Levine*, ed. Z. Weiss, O. Irshai, J. Magness, S. Schwartz, Winona Lake 2010, p. 435–448.

Meyers E.M., *The Torah Shrine in the Ancient Synagogue. Anothe Look at the Evidence*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 178–197.

Miazek J., *Msza Święta pierwszych chrześcijan*, in *Eucharystia pierwszych chrześcijan. Ojcowie Kościoła nauczają o Eucharystii*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Biblioteka Ojców Kościoła, Kraków 1997, p. 27–44.

Michl J., *Die Jungfrauengeburt im Neuen Testament*, *Mariologische Studien* 4 (1969), p. 145–184.

Mickiewicz F., *Jezus Chrystus jako cel i wypełnienie Prawa (Rz 10,4; Ga 6,2)*, *ScL* 7 (2015), p. 217–228.

Mickiewicz F., *Świadkowie zbawczego posłannictwa oraz mesjańskiej i boskiej godności Jezusa w pismach św. Łukasza i św. Jana*, Ząbki 2003.

Miduch M., *Apokaliptyka żydowska – o nadziei*, HJ 7, Kraków 2012.

Mikołajczak M., *Teologia świątyni w dwudziele św. Łukasza*, Lublin 2000.

Mildenberg L., *The Coinage of the Bar Kokhba War*, Aarau–Frankfurt am Main–Salzburg 1984.

Milgrom J., *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*, Leiden 1983.

Milik J.T., *Dziesięć lat odkryć na Pustyni Judzkiej*, trans. Z. Kubiak, Kraków 1999.

Millar F., *The Fiscus in the first two centuries*, *JRS* 53 (1963), p. 29–42.

Millar F., *Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome*, in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*, ed. J. Edmondson, S. Mason, J. Rivers, Oxford 2005, p. 101–128.

Millard A., *Skarby czasów Biblii. Odkrycia archeologiczne rzucają nowe światło na Biblię*, trans. M. Stopa, Warszawa 2000.

Miller S.S., *Stepped Pools, Stone Vessels and Other Identity Markers of 'Complex Common Judaism'*, *JSJ* 41 (2010), p. 214–243.

Miller S.S., *The Rabbis and the Not Existent Monolithic Synagogue*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 50–61.

Mimouni S.C., *Le judéochristianisme ancien*, Paris 1998.

Mimouni S.C., *Les elkasaïtes: états des questions et des recherches*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 209–229.

Mimouni S.C., *Les Nazoréens. Recherche étymologique et historique*, *RB* 105 (1998), p. 208–262.

Misiarczyk L., *Pierwsi apologeci greccy. Kwadratus, Arystydes z Aten, Aryston z Pelli, Justyn Męczennik, Tacjan Syryjczyk, Micjades, Apolinary z Hierapolis, Teofil z Antiochii, Hermiasz*, BOK 24, Kraków 2004.

Misiurek J., *Ebionici*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 4, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1983, kol. 636.

Misiurek J., Paprocki H., *Cerynt*, in *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, 3, ed. R. Łukaszyk, L. Bieńkowski, F. Gryglewicz, Lublin 1979, kol. 24–25.

Molland E., *Die litteratur- und dogmengeschichtliche Stellung des Diogenetbriefes*, *ZNW* 33 (1934), p. 289–312.

Montefiore S.S., *Jerozolima. Biografia*, trans. M. Antosiewicz, W. Jeżewski, Warszawa 2011.

Moore G.F., *The Definition of the Jewish Canon and the Repudiation of Christian Scriptures*, in *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader*, ed. S. Leiman, New York 1974, p. 115–141.

Mrozek A., *Chrześcijaństwo jako herezja judaizmu*, *PJAC* 5 (2013) 2, p. 9–27.

Mrozek A., *Chrześcijaństwo syryjskie w starożytności w kontekście powstania Gemary babilońskiej*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 125–141.

Muchowski P., *Nowe dane w kwestii misznaickiego w II wieku n.e.*, in *Pan moim światłem. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Jerzego Chmiela w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, p. 274–285.

Munck J., *Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times*, *NTS* 6 (1959–1960), p. 103–116.

Munck J., *Paulus tanquam abortivus, 1Cor 15:8*, in *NT Essays: Studies in Memory of T.W. Manson*, ed. A.J.B. Higgins, Manchester 1959, p. 180.

Murphy-O'Connor J., *Paul. A Critical Life*, Oxford 1996.

Murphy-O'Connor J., *Tradition and Redaction in 1Cor 15:3-7*, *CBQ* 43 (1981), p. 582–589.

Murray R., *The Parting of the Ways*, *CJR* 20 (1987), p. 42–44.

Muszyński H., *Chrystus – fundament i kamień węgielny Kościoła w świetle tekstów qumrańskich*, Warszawa 1982.

Najda A.J., *Historiografia paradygmatyczna w Dziejach Apostolskich*, RSB 39, Warszawa 2011.

Nanos D., *Paul and the Jewish Tradition: The Ideology of the Shema*, in *Celebrating Paul. Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.*, ed. P. Spitaler, CBQMS 48, Washington 2012, p. 62–80.

Nanos D., *Paul's Non-Jews Do Not Become 'Jews,' But Do They Become 'Jewish'?: Reading Romans 2:25–29 Within Judaism, Alongside Josephus*, *JJMJS* 1 (2014), p. 26–53.

Nanos D., *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, Minneapolis 2002.

Nanos M.D., *The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans*, *CBQ* 61 (1999), p. 283–304.

Napiórkowski A., *Bogactwo łaski a nędza człowieka. Zróżnicowany konsens teologii katolickiej i luterańskiej o usprawiedliwieniu osiągnięty w dialogu ekumenicznym*, Kraków 2000.

Naród żydowski i jego Święte Pisma w Biblii chrześcijańskiej, trans. R. Rubinkiewicz, Kielce 2002.

Nativ G., *Jewish and Christian Bible Reading*, *RT* 57 (2015) 4, p. 507–512.

Neusner J., *Aphrahat and Judaism. The Christian – Jewish Argument in Fourth Century Iran*, Leiden 1971.

Neusner J., *Contexts of Comparison: Reciprocally Reading Gospels' and Rabbis' Parables*, in *The Missing Jesus. Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament*, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, J. Neusner, Boston–Leiden 2002, p. 45–46.

Neusner J., *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism*, Missoula 1979.

Neusner J., *The Conversion of Adiabene to Judaism*, *JBL* 83 (1964), p. 60–66.

Neusner J., *The Emergence of Judaism*, London 2004.

Neusner J., *The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100*, in *Principat: Religion*, ed. W. Haase, Aufstieg and Niedergang der Römischen Welt, Berlin 1979, p. 3–42.

Neusner J., *The Three Stages in the Formation of Judaism*, Brown Judaic Studies, Chico 1985.

Newman H.I., *The Normativity of Rabbinic Judaism: Obstacles on Path to the New Consensus*, in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, ed. L.I. Levine, D.R. Schwartz, Tübingen 2009, p. 165–171.

Neyrey J.H., *The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts: „They Turn the World Upside Down"*, in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. J.H. Neyrey, Peabody 1991, p. 271–304.

Nickelsburg G.W.E., *An ektrōma, Thaough Appointed from the Womb: Paul's Apostolic Self-Description in 1Cor 15 and Gal 1*, *HTR* 79 (1986), p. 198–205.

Nickelsburg G.W.E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah. A Historical and Literary Introduction*, Minneapolis 2005.

Nickelsburg G.W.E., *Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times*, in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran*

Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus, ed. M.E. Stone, CRJNT 2/2, Assen 1984, p. 33–88.

Niehoff M.R., *The Implied Audience of the Letter of James*, in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, ed. G.A. Anderson, R.A. Clements, D. Satran, Leiden 2013, p. 57–77.

Nola A. di, *Ebraismo e giudaismo*, Roma 1996.

Nolland J., *Classical and Rabbinic Parallels to 'Physician, Heal Yourself' (Luke 4,23)*, *NT* 21 (1979), p. 193–209.

Nongbri B., *The Concept of Religion and the Study of the Apostle Paul*, *JJMJS* 2 (2015), p. 1–26.

Novak D., *The Image of the Non-Jew in Judaism: An Historical and Constructive Study of the Noahide Laws*, Toronto 1983.

Nowy leksykon judaistyczny, ed. J.H. Schoeps, W.J. Kasper, B. Vogt, O. Glöckner, trans. S. Lisiecka, Warszawa 2007.

O'Connor D.W.M., *Peter in Rome*, in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, 2, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, p. 146–160.

O'Grady J.F., *According to John. The Witness of the Beloved Disciple*, New York 1999.

O'Quin C., *The Growing Split between Synagogue and Church in the 1st Century*; http://www.torahresource.com/EnglishArticles/Fiscus%20Judaicus.pdf (15.03.2013).

O'Toole R., *Are There Passages in Acts of the Apostles which Could Lead to Anti-Jewish Interpretation?* in *Radici dell'antigiudaismo in ambiente cristiano. Colloquio Intra-Ecclesiale. Atti del Simposio Teologico-Storico. Città del Vaticano, 30 ottobre – 1 novembre 1997*, Vaticano 2000, p. 147–162.

O'Toole R.F., *L'unità della teologia di Luca. Un'analisi del Vangelo di Luca e degli Atti*, Torino 1994.

Oegema G.S., *„The Coming of the Righteous One" in 1 Enoch, Qumran, and the New Testament*, in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Waco 2006, p. 381–396.

Olsson B., *The Origins of the Synagogue: An Introduction*, in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 27–36.

Oppenheimer A., *Messianismus in römischer Zeit. Zur Pluralität eines Begriffes bei Juden und Christen*, in *Between Rome and Babylon. Studies in Jewish Leadership and Society*, ed. A. Oppenheimer, Tübingen 2005, p. 263–282.

Oppenheimer A., *The Ban on Circumcision as a Cause of the Revolt. A Reconsideration*, in *Between Rome and Babylon. Studies in Jewish Leadership and Society*, ed. A. Oppenheimer, Tübingen 2005, p. 243–255.

Orbe A., *Cristologia gnóstica: Introducción a la soteriologia de los silos II y III*, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos 384, Madrid 1976.

Ordon H., *Pawłowa argumentacja na rzecz niesienia pomocy potrzebującym*, *VP* 16 (1996), p. 75–83.

Ortiz de Urbina I., *Die Gottheit Christi bei Afrahat*, Rom 1933.

Osborn E., *Przeciwgnostycka teologia Ireneusza i Hipolita*, in *Historia teologii*, 1, *Epoka patrystyczna*, ed. A. di Bernardino, B. Studer, trans. M.J. Gołębiowski, J. Łukaszewska, J. Ryndak, P. Zarębski, Kraków 2003, p. 163–195.

Osborn E., *Wejście w świat grecko-rzymski*, in *Historia teologii*, 1, *Epoka patrystyczna*, ed. A. di Bernardino, B. Studer, trans. M.J. Gołębiowski, J. Łukaszewska, J. Ryndak, P. Zarębski, Kraków 2003, p. 117–162.

Otero T., La 'nueva perspectiva sobre Pablo' y la justificatión por la fe, *ScTh* 41 (2009) 3, p. 889–898.

Overman J.A., Scott Green W., *Judaism in the Greco-Roman Period*, in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3, ed. D.N. Freedmann, New York–London–Toronto–Sydney–Auckland 1992, p. 1037–1054.

Pacifici R., *Midrashim. Fatti e personaggi biblici nell'interpretazione ebraica tradizionale*, Milano 1997.

Paciorek A., *Człowiek bez Chrystusa w soteriologii Listu św. Pawła do Rzymian*, Tarnów 1995.

Paciorek A., *Ewangelia umiłowanego ucznia*, Lublin 2000.

Paciorek A., *Ewangelia według świętego Mateusza. Rozdziały 1–13. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKBNT 1/1, Częstochowa 2005.

Paciorek A., *Jezus z Nazaretu. Czasy i wydarzenia*, Częstochowa 2015.

Paciorek A., *Najstarsze święta w Izraelu*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, p. 307–330.

Paciorek A., *Pozostałe słowa Jeremiasza*, in *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 1999, p. 3–11.

Paciorek A., *Psalmy Salomona*, in *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, ed. R. Rubinkiewicz, Warszawa 1999, p. 109–128.

Paciorek A., *Wydarzenie pod Damaszkiem w świetle nowotestamentowych wypowiedzi*, in *Mów, Panie, bo sługa Twój słucha. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Ryszarda Rubinkiewicza SDB w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1999, p. 163–175.

Paget J.C., *Jews, Christians and Jewish-Christians in Antiquity*, WUNT 251, Tübingen 2010.

Painter J., *Just James. The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*, SPNT, Columbia 2004.

Palla A.J., *Skarby świątyni*, Rybnik 1999.

Parchem M., *Pojęcie królestwa Bozego w Księdze Daniela oraz jego percepcja w pismach qumrańskich i w apokaliptyce żydowskiej*, RSB 9, Warszawa 2002.

Parchem M., *Postać Mesjasza w literaturze międzytestamentalnej: zwoje z Qumran i apokryfy Starego Testamentu*, *ScL* 7 (2015), p. 69–86.

Parchem M., *Wprowadzenie do apokaliptyki*, in *Apokryfy Starego Testamentu. Pisma apokaliptyczne i testamenty*, ed. M. Parchem, Kraków 2010, p. 21–116.

Park J.S., *Conceptions of Afterlife in Jewish Inscriptions: With Special Reference to Pauline Literature*, Tübingen 2000.

Parkes J., *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, New York 1934.

Parkes J., *Rome, Pagan and Christian*, in *Judaism and Christianity*, ed. H. Loewe, New York 1937, p. 115–144.

Pearson B., *1 Thessalonians 2,13–16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation*, *HTR* 64 (1971), p. 79–91.

Pedersen N.A., *Aristides*, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 35–49.

Penna R., *Les Juifs a Rome au temps de l'apôtre Paul*, *NTS* 28 (1982), p. 321–347.

Pesce M., *Centrum duchowości hebrajskiej u progu naszej ery w Palestynie*, in *Duchowość Nowego Testamentu*, 2, ed. R. Fabris, trans. K. Stopa, Kraków 2003, p. 15–52.

Pick B., *Jesus in the Talmud. His Personality, His Disciples and His Sayings*, Chicago 1913.

Pierwsi świadkowie. Wybór najstarszych pism chrześcijańskich, Ojcowie żywi 8, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 1998.

Piétri C., *Konstantin und die Christianisierung des Reiches*, in *Die Geschichte des Christentums*, 2, *Das Entstehen der einen Christenheit (*250–430), ed. C. i L. Piétri, Freiburg im Breisgau 2005, p. 193–241.

Pilarczyk K., *Literatura żydowska od epoki biblijnej do haskali. Wprowadzenie religioznawcze, literackie i historyczne*, Kraków 2009[2].

Pilarczyk K., *Rabinizacja judaizmu we wczesnym okresie pobiblijnym*, in *Pan moim światłem. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Jerzego Chmiela w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, p. 286–304.

Pilarczyk K., *Religia Izraela*, in *Religie starożytnego Bliskiego Wschodu*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, J. Drabina, Kraków 2008, p. 357–446.

Pilarczyk K., *Talmud i jego drukarze w Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej. Z dziejów przekazu religijnego w judaizmie*, Kraków 1998.

Pines S., *An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications*, Jerusalem 1971.

Piper O.A., *The Virgin Birth: The Meaning of the Gospel Accounts*, *Interpretation* 18 (1964), p. 131–148.

Piwowarczyk P., *Negatywny obraz Żydów w starożytności klasycznej i jego uwarunkowania*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 143–163.

Poniży B., *Drugorzędne akty kultu*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, p. 239–256.

Poniży B., *Kiedy powstała Księga Mądrości?*, in *„Słowo Twoje jest prawdą" (J 17,17). Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Stanisława Mędali CM w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, p. 264–277.

Poniży B., *Między judaizmem a hellenizmem. Σοφία Σαλωμώνος księgą spotkania*, Studia i Materiały 166, Poznań 2013.

Poole F.J.P., *Metaphors and Maps: Towards Comparison in the Anthropology of Religion*, *JAAR* 54 (1986) 3, p. 411–457.

Popielewski W., *Alleluja! Liturgia godów Baranka eschatologicznym zwycięstwem Boga (Ap 19,1-8)*, StBib 1, Kielce 2001.

Porter S.E., *Did Jesus Ever Teach in Greek? Tyndale Bulletin* 44 (1993) 2, p. 224–233.

Porter S.E., *Jesus and the Use of Greek in Galilee*, in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, New Testament Tools and Studies 19, ed. B. Chilton, C.A. Evans, Leiden 1994, p. 123–154.

Potterie I. de la, *Marie dans le Mystère de l'Alliance*, Paris 1988.

Prasad J., *Foundations of the Christian Way of Life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25. An Exegetico-Theological Study*, AnBib 146, Roma 2000.

Pritz R.A., *Nazarene Jewish Christianity. From the End of the New Testament Period until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century*, Jerusalem 1988.

Pryor J.W., *Jesus and Israel in the Forth Gospel – John 1:11*, *NT* 32 (1990) 3, p. 201–218.

Puech É., *Les Psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme (11Q 11)*, in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of International Organization for Qumran Studies. Oslo 1998*, ed. D. Falk, F. García Martínez, E. Schuller, STDJ 35, Leiden–Boston–Köln 2000, p. 160–181.

Puech É., *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego a Nowy Testament. Mistrzowie i nadzieje*, in *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testementem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009.

Puech É., *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego a Nowy Testament. Nowy Mojżesz czyli o kilku praktykach Prawa*, in *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym*

Testementem, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, p. 205–225.

Puech H.-Ch., *Storia dell'ebraismo*, trans. M.N. Pierini, Cles 1993.

Purpura G., *L'Editto di Nazareth* De violatione sepulchrorum, *IAH* 4 (2012), p. 133–160.

Purvis J.D., *Samarytanie*, in *Encyklopedia biblijna*, ed. P.J. Achtemeier, ed. Polish ed. polskiego W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1999, p. 1079–1081.

Quinzio S., *Hebrajskie korzenie nowożytności*, trans. M. Bielawski, Kraków 2005.

Rabello A.M., *The Ban of Circumcision as Cause of Bar Kokhba's Rebellion*, *Israel Law Review* 29 (1995), p. 192–193.

Räisänen H., *Paul and the Law*, WUNT 29, Tübingen 1983.

Rakocy W., *„Gdzie Duch Pański – tam wolność" (2 Kor 3,17). Pneumatologia wyzwolenia i wolności*, *ScL* 4 (2012), p. 113–126.

Rakocy W., *Elementy argumentacji rabinackiej w Rz 9,6–29*, *CT* 63 (1993) 3, p. 97–102.

Rakocy W., *Paweł Apostoł. Chronologia życia i pism*, Częstochowa 2003.

Ratzinger J., Benedykt XVI, *Jezus z Nazaretu*, 2, *Od wjazdu do Jerozolimy do Zmartwychwstania*, trans. W. Szymona, Kielce 2011.

Reed A.Y., *'Jewish Christianity' as Counter-History? The Apostolic Past in Eusebius' 'Ecclesiastical History' and the Pseudo-Clementine 'Homilies'*, in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Past in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. G. Gardner, K. Osterloh, Tübingen 2008, p. 173–216.

Reed A.Y., *„Jewish Christianity" after the „Parting of the Ways". Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines,* in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 189–231.

Reed A.Y., Becker A.H., *Introduction. Traditional Models and New Directions*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 1–34.

Reed A.Y., *Rabbis, 'Jewish Christians,' and Other Late Antique Jews: Reflections on the Fate of Judaism(s) After 70 C.E.,* in *The Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*, ed. I.H. Henderson, G.S. Oegma, München 2006, p. 323–346.

Reed A.Y., Vuong L., *Christianity in Antioch: Partings in Roman Syria*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 105–132.

Reed J.L., *The Harper Collins Visual Guide to the New Testament*, New York 2007.

Regan F.A., *Dies Dominica and Dies Solis: The Begginings of the Lord's Day in Christian Antiquity*, Washington 1961.

Regul J., *Die antimarcinitischen Evangelienprologe*, Frankfurt 1969.

Reinach S., *La première allusion au christianisme dans l'histoire*, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 90 (1924), p. 108–122.

Reinhartz A., *'Common Judaism', 'The Parting of the Ways', and 'The Johannine Community'*, in *Orthodoxy, Liberalism, and Adaptation. Essays on Ways of Worldmaking in Times of Change from Biblical, Historical and Systematic Perspectives*, ed. B. Becking, Leiden 2011, p. 69–87.

Remaud M., *Vangelo e tradizione rabbinica*, trans. R. Fabbri, Bologna 2005.

RendelHarris J., *Hadrian's Decree of Expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem*, *HTR* 19 (1926), p. 199–206.

Rethinking the Messianic Idea in Judaism, ed. M.L. Morgan, S. Weitzman, Bloomington 2015.

Reymond S., *Paul sur le hemin de Damas (Ac 9,22 et 26)*, *NRT* 118 (1996), p. 520–538.

Reynolds J., Tannenbaum R., *Jews and God-Fearers at Aphrodisias*, Cambridge Philological Society Supplement 12, Cambridge 1987.

Richardson P., *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, SNTS MS 10, Cambridge 1969.

Ringgren H., *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*, Lund 1947.

Rist J.M., *On the Independence of Matthew and Mark*, Cambridge 1976.

Rives J.B., *The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire*, *JRS* 89 (1999), p. 135–154.

Rivkin E., *Defining the Pharisees: the Tannaic Sources*, *HUCA* 40–41 (1969–1970), p. 205–249.

Robbins V.K., *Plucking Grain on the Sabbath*, in *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*, ed. B.L. Mack, V.K. Robbins, Sonoma 1989, p. 107–141.

Roberts C.H., *Manuscript, Society and Relief in Early Christian Egypt*, Oxford 1979.

Robinson J.A.T., *Redating the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1976.

Rokeah D., *Ben Stara Is Ben Pantera – Towards the Clarification of a Philological-Historical Problem*, Tarbiz 39 (1969–1970), p. 9–18.

Rollof J., *Das Kerygma und der historische Jesus*, Göttingen 1970.

Romaniuk K., *Uczniowie i współpracownicy Pawła*, Warszawa 1993.

Rosik M., *„In Christ All Will Be Made Alive" (1 Cor 15:12–58). The Role of Old Testament Quotations in the Pauline Argumentation for the Resurrection*, European Studies in Theology, Philosophy and History of Religions 6, Frankfurt am Main–Bern–Bruxelles–New York–Oxford–Wien 2013.

Rosik M., *Czy* Fiscus Iudaicus *w latach 70/71–98 po Chr. wpłynął na rozejście się dróg judaizmu i chrześcijaństwa? Studium historyczno-teologiczne*, *CT* 83 (2013) 1, p. 71–92.

Rosik M., *Der Tempel von Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, trans. J. Rosik, Jestetten 2008.

Rosik M., *Ewangelia Łukasza a świat grecko-helleński. Perspektywa literacka i ideologiczna*, Bibliotheca Biblica, Wrocław 2009.

Rosik M., *Gesù e il giudaismo. Passando oltre il confine*, Serramazzoni 2006.

Rosik M., *I. Jaruzelska, Własność w prawie biblijnym, Warszawa 1992*, *Życie Konsekrowane* 4 (2003) 42, p. 95–96.

Rosik M., I. Rapoport, *Wprowadzenie do literatury i egzegezy żydowskiej okresu biblijnego i rabinicznego*, Bibliotheca Biblica, Wrocław 2009.

Rosik M., *Jezus a judaizm w świetle Ewangelii według św. Marka*, RSB 15, Warszawa 2004.

Rosik M., *Judaistyczne tło Modlitwy Pańskiej (Mt 6,9–13), Zeszyty Naukowe Centrum Badań im. Edyty Stein* 4 (2008), p. 41–50.

Rosik M., *Judaizm u początków ery chrześcijańskiej*, Bibliotheca Biblica, Wrocław 2008.

Rosik M., *Kłopoty z nawróceniem św. Pawła*, in *Przeznaczeni do głoszenia Ewangelii. Rok Świętego Pawła*, ed. W. Irek, Wrocław 2009, p. 9–26.

Rosik M., *Ku radykalizmowi ewangelii. Studium nad wspólnymi logiami Jezusa w ewangeliach według św. Mateusza i św. Marka*, Wrocław 2000.

Rosik M., *Pierwszy List do Koryntian. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKBNT 7, Częstochowa 2009.

Rosik M., *Zarzewie konfliktu między Kościołem a Synagogą (do 135 roku)*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 69–104.

Rowland C., *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism*, Cambridge 1985.

Rowland C., *The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 213–237.

Rowley H.H., *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, London 1950.

Rubinkiewicz R., *Apokalipsa Abrahama 1–6. Propozycja interpretacji symbolicznej*, *RTK* 29 (1982) 1, p. 79–94.

Rubinkiewicz R., *Midrasz jako zjawisko egzegetyczne*, *CT* 63 (1993) 3, p. 11–26.

Rucki M., *Czy Jezus akceptował rozwód? WPT* 22 (2014) 1, p. 67–86.

Runesson A., Binder D.D., Olsson B., *The Ancient Synagogue fron its Origins to 200 C.E. A Source Book*, Leiden–Boston 2008.

Runesson A., *Inventing Christian Identity: Paul, Ignatius, and Theodosius I*, in *Exploring Early Christian Identity*, ed. B. Holmberg, Tübingen 2008, p. 59–92.

Runia D.T., *Philo in Early Christian Literature*, 3, *A Survey*, CRJNT, Minneapolis 1993.

Rupprecht A.A., *The Cultural and Political Setting of the New Testament*, in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary with the New International Version*, 1, Grand Rapids 1978, p. 483–500.

Russell E.A., *„Antisemitism" in the Gospel of Matthew*, *IBS* 8 (1986), p. 183–196.

Rutgers L.V., *Archeological Evidence for Interaction of Jews and Non-Jews in Antiquity*, *AJA* 96 (1992), p. 101–108.

Rutgers L.V., *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*, Leiden 1995.

Ruzer S., *Mapping the New Testament. Early Christian Writings as a Witness for Jewish Biblical Exegesis*, JCPS 13, Leiden–Boston 2007.

Ruzer S., *Paul's Stance on the Torah Revisited: Gentile Addressees and the Jewish Setting*, in *Paul's Jewish Matrix*, ed. T.G. Casey, J. Taylor, Rome 2011, p. 75–97.

Ruzer S., *The Epistle of James as a Witness to Broader Patterns of Jewish Exegetical Discourse*, *JJMJS* 1 (2014), p. 69–98.

Ryken L., Wilhoit J.C., Longman T. III, *Słownik symboliki biblijnej. Obrazy, symbole, motywy, metafory, figury stylistyczne i gatunki literackie w Piśmie Świętym*, trans. Z. Kościuk, Warszawa 1998.

Sacchi P., *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia*, Brescia 1990.

Safrai S., *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple Period*, *Immanuel* 5 (1975), p. 51–62.

Safrai S., *Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel*, in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, I, ed. S. Safrai, M. Stern, Amsterdam 1976, p. 184–215.

Safrai S., *Temple*, in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, 2, ed. S. Safrai, M. Stern, Amsterdam 1976, p. 865–907.

Salij J., *Poszukiwania w wierze*, Poznań 1991.

Salvesen A., *A Convergence of the Ways. The Judaizing of Christian Scripture by Origen and Jerome*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 232–258.

Sanders E.P., *Common Judaism and the Synagogue in the First Century*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 1–15.

Sanders E.P., *Il giudaismo. Fede e prassi (63 a.C. – 66 d.C.)*, trans. P. Capelli, L. Santini, Brescia 1999.

Sanders E.P., *Jesus and Judaism*, Philadelphia 1985.

Sanders E.P., *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah*, London–Philadelphia 1990.

Sanders E.P., *Judaism. Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE*, London–Philadelphia 1992.

Sanders J.T., *The Jews in Luke-Acts*, Philadelphia 1987.

Sanders P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London 1977.

Sandmel S., *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament*, Philadelphia 1978.

Sandmel S., *Judaism and Christian Beginnings*, New York 1978.

Sandmel S., *The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity*, New York 1969.

Sante C. di, *Jewish Prayer. The Origins of Christian Liturgy*, New York 1991.

Sartan D., *The Lives of the Prophets*, in *Compendium rerum iudaicarum and Novum Testamentum*, 2, *Jewish Writings of Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudoepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone, Assen–Philadelphia 1984, p. 56–60.

Sauer J., *Traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mk. 3:1-6*, *ZNW* 73 (1982), p. 183–203.

Schaeffer M., *Paulus 'Fehlgeburt' oder 'unvernünftiges Kind'? ZNW* 85 (1994), p. 207–217.

Schäfer P., *Jesus in Talmud*, Princeton 2007.

Schäfer P., *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World*, Cambridge–London 1997.

Schäfer P., *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums*, Judaica 31, Leiden 1975.

Schäfer P., *The Jewish Jesus. How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other*, Oxford 2012.

Schechter S., *Genizah Specimens*, *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 10 (1898), p. 657–659.

Schenker A., *Der nie aufgehobene Bund. Exegetische Beobachtungen zu Jer 31,31-34*, in *Der Neue Bund im Alten. Studien zur Bundestheologie der Beiden Testamente*, QD 146, Freiburg–Basel–Wien 1993, p. 85–112.

Schenker A., *Die Tafel des Herzens. Eine Studie über Anthropologie und Gnade im Denken des Propheten Jeremia im Zusammenhang mit Jer 31,31–34*, in *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, ed. A. Schenker, OBO 103, Freiburg–Göttingen 1991, p. 68–81.

Schiffman L.H., *Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls*, in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Minneapolis 1992, p. 116–129.

Schiffman L.H., *The Conversion of the Royal House of Adiabene in Josephus and Rabbinic Sources*, in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. L.H. Feldman, G. Hata, Detroit 1987, p. 293–312.

Schiffman L.H., *The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod*, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 38–49.

Schiffman L.H., *The Halakha at Qumran*, Leiden 1975.

Schiffman L.H., *Who was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*, Hoboken 1985.

Schmidt D., *1 Thess 2,13–16: Linguistic Evidence for an Interpolation*, *JBL* 102 (1983), p. 269–279.

Schmidt D., *Vom „historischen" Jesus, dem „erinnerten" Jesus und darüber hinaus. Zum aktuellen Stand der Jesusforschung*, *JESCT* 6 (2015) 1, p. 65–92.

Schmidt K.L., *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, Berlin 1919.

Schnabel E.J., *Early Christian Mission*, London 2004.

Schnackenburg R., *Das Johannesevangelium*, HThK. NT 4, 2, Freiburg im Breisgau 1984.

Schnelle U., *Das frühe Christentum und die Bildung*, *NTS* 61 (2015) 2, p. 113–143.

Schoeps J.J., *Miszna*, in *Nowy leksykon judaistyczny*, ed. J.H. Schoeps, trans. S. Lisiecka, Warszawa 2007, p. 556–558.

Scholer D.M., *Tertulian on Jewish Persecution of Christians*, *StPatr* 17 (1982), p. 821–828.

Schreckenberg H., *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches Umfeld*, 1, Frankfurt 1982.

Schreiber J., *Theologie des Vertrauens. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Markusevangeliums*, Hamburg 1967.

Schrenk G., *to iverovn*, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3, ed. G. Friedrich, trans. G.W. Bromiley, D. Litt, Grand Rapids 1999, p. 221–284.

Schultess F., *Der Brief des Mara bar Serapion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, *ZDMG* 51 (1897), p. 365–391.

Schürer E., *Storia del popolo giudaico al tempo di Gesù Cristo (175 a.C. – 135 d.C.)*, 2, Biblioteca di storia e storigrafia dei tempi biblici 6, trans. V. Gatti, Brescia 1987.

Schwartz J., *Jewish Settlement in Judea after the Bar Kochba War*, Jerusalem 1986.

Schwarz J., *Ben Stada and Peter in Lydda*, *JSJ* 21 (1990), p. 1–18.

Scott B.B., *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, Edinburgh 1926.

Scott Gleaves G., *Did Jesus Speak Greek? The Emerging Evidence of Greek in First-Century Palestine*, Eugene 2015.

Scramuzza V.M., *The Emperor Claudius*, Cambridge 1940.

Scroggs R., *The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement*, in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, 2, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, p. 1–23.

Segal A.F., *Paul and the Beginning of Christian Conversion*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 79–111.

Seland T., *Once More – The Hellenists, Hebrews, and Stephen: Conflicts and Conflict-Management in Acts 6 – 7*, in *Recruitment, Conquest, and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity, and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. Borgen, V.K. Robbins, D.B. Gowler, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Atlanta 1998, p. 169–207.

Setzer C., *You Invent a Christ! Christological Claims as Points of Jewish – Christian Dispute*, *USQR* 44 (1991), p. 315–328.

Sevenster J.N., *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Century Jewish Christians Have Known?* Leiden 1969.

Shepherd M.B., *Targums, the New Testament and Biblical Theology oft he Messiah*, *JETS* 51 (2008) 1, p. 45–58.

Sherwin B.L., *„A wy za kogo Mnie uważacie" (Mk 8,29) – odpowiedź żydowska*, *CT* 63 (1993) 2, p. 9–25.

Sherwin-White A.N., *The Early Persecutions and Roman Law Again*, JTS 3 (1952–1953), p. 199–213.

Shinnie L., *Meroe, a Civilization in the Sudan*, New York 1967.

Sicker M., *Between Rome and Jerusalem. 300 Years of Roman-Judaean Relations*, London 2001.

Siegert F., *Gottesfürchtige und Symphatizanten*, *JSJ* 2 (1973), p. 109–162.

Siegert F., *Vermeintlicher Antijudaismus und Polemik gegen Judenchristen im Neuen Testament*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 74–105.

Sigal P., *The Halakhah of Jesus of Nazareth according to the Gospel of* Matthew, SBL 18, Atlanta 2007.

Simon M., *Réflexions sur le judéo-christianisme*, in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, 2, *Early Christianity*, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden 1975, p. 53–76.

Simon M., *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'empire Romain (135–425)*, Paris 1948.

Simonsohn S., *The Jews of Italy. Antiquity*, BSJS 52, Leiden–Boston 2014.

Siwek K., *Historyczny wymiar „Mowy o chlebie życia" (J 6,22–71)*, *Seminare* 20 (2004), p. 21–22.

Slawik J., *Stary Testament / Tanach w chrześcijańskiej Biblii*, *RT* 57 (2015) 4, p. 401–426.

Słomka J., *Starotestamentalne przymierza w interpretacji Orygenesa*, VV 4 (2003), p. 213–226.

Sloyan G.S., *Crucifixion of Jesus: History, Myth, Faith*, Minneapolis 1995.

Smallwood E.M., *Addendum*, *Latomus* 20 (1961), p. 93–96.

Smallwood E.M., *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*, SJLA 20, Leiden 1981.

Smallwood E.M., *The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Cicrumcision*, *Latomus* 18 (1959), p. 334–347.

Smith S.H., *Mark 3,1-6: Form, Redaction and Community Function*, *Bib* 75 (1994), p. 153–174.

Solomon R.C., Higgins K.M., *Krótka historia filozofii*, trans. N. Szczucka-Kubisz, Warszawa 1996.

Spencer F.S., *The Portrait of Philip in Acts. A Study of Rules and Relations*, JSNTSup 67, Sheffield 1992.

Stabryła S., *Historia literatury starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu. Zarys*, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 2002.

Stachowiak L., *Ewangelia według św. Jana. Wstęp – przekład – komentarz*, Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu IV, Poznań 1975.

Stanton G.N., *Matthew's Christology and the Parting of the Ways*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 99–116.

Starowieyski M., *Ewangelia Ebionitów*, in *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, 1/1, *Ewangelie apokryficzne. Fragmenty. Narodzenie i dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, p. 114–117.

Starowieyski M., *Pseudoklementyny*, in *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, 2/1, *Apostołowie. Andrzej, Jan, Paweł, Piotr, Tomasz*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2007, p. 525–529.

Starowieyski M., *Św. Barnaba w historii i legendzie*, *An Crac* 23 (1981), p. 391–413.

Starowieyski M., *Z historii wczesnego chrześcijaństwa. Biblia, męczennicy, poganie i inni*, Kraków 2015.

Starowieyski M., *Zaginione Ewangelie*, in *Apokryfy Nowego Testamentu*, 1/1, *Ewangelie apokryficzne. Fragmenty. Narodzenie i Dzieciństwo Maryi i Jezusa*, ed. M. Starowieyski, Kraków 2003, p. 98–125.

Stasiak S., *Komentarz teologiczno-pastoralny do Biblii Tysiąclecia. Nowy Testament*, 2, *Dzieje Apostolskie, List do Rzymian, 1–2 List do Koryntian, List do Galatów*, Poznań 2014.

Stasiak S.J., *Controversia in Galilea e guarigione dell'uomo con la mano inaridita (analisi sincronica di Mc 3,1-6)*, *Antonianum* 77 (2002), p. 617–647.

Stegemann H., *Esseńczycy z Qumran, Jan Chrzciciel i Jezus*, trans. Z. Małecki, A. Tronina, Biblioteka zwojów. Tło Nowego Testamentu 9, Kraków–Mogilany 2002.

Stegemann W., *Jesus und seine Zeit*, BE 10, Stuttgart 2010.

Stemberger G., *Dating Rabbinic Traditions*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 79–96.

Stemberger G., *Die sogenannte „Synode von Jabne" und das frühe Christentum*, *Kairos* 19 (1997), p. 14–21.

Stemberger G., *Il Midrash. Uso rabbinico della Bibbia. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, Bologna 1992.

Stemberger G., *Il Talmud. Introduzione, testi, commenti*, trans. D. Moretti, Bologna 1989.

Stemberger G., *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century*, Edinburgh 1999.

Stendhal K., *Paul among Jews and Gentiles, and Other Essays*, Philadelphia 1976.

Sterling G.E., *Was There a Common Ethic in Second Temple Judaism?* in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001*, STDJ 51, ed. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling, R.A. Clements, Leiden 2004, p. 171–194.

Stern D.H., *Komentarz żydowski do Nowego Testamentu*, trans. A. Czwojdrak, Warszawa 2004.

Stern M., *Fiscus Judaicus*, in *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 7, ed. F. Skolnik, M. Berenbaum, Detroit–New York–San Francisco–New Haven–Waterville–London 2007, p. 57.

Stern M., *The Jewish Diaspora*, in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, 1, ed. S. Safrai, M. Stern, Amsterdam 1976, p. 117–183.

Stern S., *Calendar and Community: A History of Jewish Calendar*, Oxford 2001.

Stökl ben Ezra D., *'Christains' Observing 'Jewish' Festivals of Autumn*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 54–73.

Stökl ben Ezra D., *Whose Fast Is It? The Ember Day of September and Yom Kippur*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 259–282.

Stoops R., *Sobór Apostolski*, in *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, ed. B.M. Metzger, M.D. Coogan, trans. J. Marzęcki, Warszawa 1996, p. 713.

Strack H.L., Billerbeck P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, 1, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, München 1924.

Strange J.F., *Archeology and the Ancient Synagogues up to 200 C.E.*, in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 37–62.

Strathmann H., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Göttingen 1951.

Strotmann A., *Der historische Jesus: eine Einführung*, Paderborn 2012.

Stuhlmacher P., *Jesus von Nazareth und die neutestamentliche Christologie im Lichte der heiligen Schrift*, in *Mitte der Schrift? Ein jüdisch-christliches Gesprach. Texte des Berner Symposions vom 6.-12. Januar 1985*, ed. M. Klopfenstein, U. Luz, S. Talmon, E. Tov, Judaica et Christiana 11, Bern–Frankfurt am Main 1987, p. 81–95.

Stuhlmacher P., *The Understanding of Christ in the Pauline School: A Sketch*, in *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*, ed. J.D.G. Dunn, WUNT 66, Tübingen 1992, p. 159–175.

Sumney J.L., *Paul and Christ-Believing Jews Whom He Opposes*, in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered. Rethinking of Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. M.A. Jackson-McCabe, Minneapolis 2007, p. 57–80.

Svartvik J., *Leggere la Lettera agli Ebrei senza presupporre la teologia della sostituzione*, in *Gesù Cristo e il popolo ebraico: Inerrogativi per la teologia di oggi*, ed. P.A. Cunningham, J. Sievers, M.C. Boys, H.H. Henrix, J. Svartvik, Roma 2012, p. 112–147.

Swancutt D.M., *Paraenesis in Light of Protrepsis. Troubling the Typical Dichotomy*, in *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, ed. J. Starr, T. Engberg-Pedersen, Berlin 2004, p. 113–153.

Swartley W.M., *Niewolnictwo*, in *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, ed. B.M. Metzger, M.D. Coogan, ed. Polish ed. polskiego W. Chrostowski, trans. P. Pachciarek, Warszawa 2004, p. 565–566.

Swartz M.D., *Sage, Priest, and Poet. Typologies of Religious Leadership in the Ancient Synagogue*, in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient*

Synagogue. Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Pariod, BSHJ, ed. S. Fine, London–New York 2005, p. 89–104.

Szczerbiński W., *Obcy wśród Żydów. Od partykularyzmu do uniwersalizmu*, in *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Waldemara Chrostowskiego w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, 3, ed. B. Strzałkowska, Warszawa 2011, p. 1391–1407.

Szulc F., *Syn Boży w „Pasterzu" Hermasa. Świadectwo chrystologii judeo-chrześcijańskiej*, SAC 2, Katowice 2006.

Szwarc U., *Berit ʿolam w wyroczniach proroków niewoli*, *RTK* 38–39 (1991–1992) 1, p. 35–42.

Szwarc U., *Dzieci i ich wychowanie w Starym Testamencie*, in *Życie społeczne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1998, p. 227–247.

Szwarc U., *Jezus a judaizm*, in *Mów, Panie, bo słucha sługa Twój. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Ryszarda Rubinkiewicza SDB w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, Warszawa 1999, p. 198–205.

Szwarc U., *Świątynia jerozolimska*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, p. 79–92.

Szymik S., *Biblijna ekumenia hermeneutyk. Pytanie o specyfikę wczesnochrześcijańskiej egzegezy biblijnej*, *RT* 57 (2015) 4, p. 427–445.

Talbert C.H., *Paul, Judaism, and the Revisionists*, *CBQ* 63 (2001), p. 1–22.

Tanger S.J., *Judaizmy w I w. po Chr.*, in *Słownik wiedzy biblijnej*, ed. B.M. Metzger, M.D. Coogan, Polish ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 1996, p. 275–279.

Taylor J., *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins*, Oxford 1993.

Taylor J., *Parting in Palestine*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013.

Taylor V., *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, London–New York 1966[2].

Tcherikover V., *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, Philadelphia 1966.

Tepper Y., Di Segni L., *A Christian Prayer Hall of the Third Century CE at Kefar ʾOthnay (Legio): Excavations at the Megiddo Prison 2005*, Jerusalem 2006.

The Literature of Sages, 1, *Oral Tora, Halakha, Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud, External Tractates*, ed. S. Safrai, CRJNT, Philadelphia 1987.

The Parting of the Roads: Studies in the Developement of Judaism and Early Christianity, ed. F.J. Foakes Jacksoon, London 1912.

Theissen G., *Czasy Jezusa. Tło społeczne pierwotnego chrześcijaństwa*, trans. F. Wycisk, Kraków 2004.

Theissen G., Merz A., *Der historische Jesus. Ein Lehrbuch*, Göttingen 2014[4].

Thiele F., *Święta religijne żydów, chrześcijan i muzułmanów*, Warszawa 1995.

Thoma C., *Die Christen in rabbinischer Optik: Heiden, Häretiker oder Fromme?* in *Christlicher Antijudaismus und jüdischer Antipaganismus. Ihre Motive und Hintergründe in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Hamburg 1990, p. 23–49.

Thordson T. i M., *Qumran and the Samaritans*, Jerusalem 1996.

Tigchelaar E., *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, in *Old Testament Pseudoepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. Tigchelaar, BETL CCLXX, Leuven–Paris–Walpole 2014, p. 1–18.

Tomson P.J., *Divorce Halakhah in Paul and the Jesus Tradition*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 290–332.

Tomson P.J., *Halakhah in the New Testament: A Research Overview*, in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. R. Bieringer, F.G. Martinez, D. Pollefeyt, P.J. Tomson, SJSJ 136, Boston–Leiden 2010, p. 135–206.

Tomson P.J., *The Wars against Rome, the Rise of Rabbinic Judaism and of Apostolic Gentile Christianity, and the Judaeo-Christians: Elements for a Synthesis*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 1–31.

Torrey C.C., *Documents of the Primitive Church*, New York 1941.

Tov E., *The Text of the Hebrew / Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues*, in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 237–259.

Trebolle Barrera J., *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible. An Introduction to the History of the Bible*, trans. W.G.E. Watson, Leiden–Grand Rapids–New York–Cambridge–Köln 1998.

Tresham A., *The Languages Spoken by Jesus*, *TMSJ* 20 (2009) 1, p. 71–94.

Trevilco P., *The Jews in Asia Minor, 66–235 CE*, in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, 4, *Late Roman-Rabbinic Period*, ed. S.T. Katz, Cambridge 2006, p. 80–81.

Trigg J.W., *Origen*, *The Early Church Fathers*, London–New York 1998.

Tronina A., *Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum (J 19,19)*, *ScL* 7 (2015), p. 191–200.

Tronina A., *Ojcostwo Boga w świetle onomastyki izraelskiej*, in *Stworzył Bóg człowieka na swój obraz. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Biskupa Profesora Mariana Gołębiewskiego w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2002, p. 418–427.

Tropper A., *Tractate* Avot *and Early Christian Succession Lists*, in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. A.H. Becker, A.Y. Reed, Text and Studies in the Ancient Judaism 95, Tübingen 2003, p. 159–188.

Turnau J., *Za co uwielbiam Pawła z Tarsu?* in *Paweł Apostoł. Dzieło i myśl*, ed. J. Turnau, Warszawa 2008, p. 14–18.

Tyloch W., *Rękopisy z Qumran nad Morzem Martwym*, Warszawa 2001.

Tyszkowski W., *Plutarchos*, in *Słownik pisarzy antycznych*, ed. A. Świderkówna, Warszawa 1982, p. 378.

Uciecha A., *Afrahat – mędrzec perski. Stan badań*, *ŚSHT* 33 (2000), p. 25–40.

Ulansey D., *The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark's Cosmic 'Inclusio'*, *JBL* 110 (1991) 1, p. 123–125.

Ulrich J., *Justin Martyr*, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 51–66.

Urbach E.E., *The Repentance of the People of Niniveh and the Discussion Between Jews and Christians*, *Tarbiz* 20 (1950–1951), p. 118–122.

Urbach E.E., *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, Jerusalem 1979.

Usener H., *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen I: Das Weihnachfest*, Bonn 1889.

Uterman A., *Rytuał w życiu Żydów*, in *Judaizm*, ed. M. Dziwisz, trans. J. Zabierowski, Kraków 1990, p. 77–102.

Vallauri E., *L'esegesi moderna di fronte alla verginità di Maria*, Laurentianum 14 (1973), p. 445–480.

Valognes J.-P., *Vie et mort des chrétiens d'Orient. Des origines à nos jours*, Paris 1994.

Van Elderen B., Early Christianity in Transjordan, *TynBul* 45 (1994) 1, p. 97–117.

VanderKam J.C., *Manuskrypty znad Morza Martwego*, trans. R. Gromacka, Warszawa 1996.

Verheyden J., *Epiphanius on the Ebionites*, in *The Image of Judaeo-Christians in Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature*, ed. P.J. Tomson, D. Lambers-Petry, WUNT 158, Tübingen 2003, p. 182–208.

Verheyden J., *The Flight of the Christians to Pella*, *ETL* 66 (1990), p. 368–384.

Vermes G., *Autentyczna Ewangelia Jezusa*, trans. J. Kołak, Kraków 2009.

Vermes G., *Christian Beginningp. From Nazareth to Nicea, AD 30–325*, London 2013.

Vermes G., *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*, London 1993.

Vermes G., *The Jewish Jesus Movement*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 1–25.

Vermes G., *Jesus and the World of Judaism*, Philadelphia 1983.

Vermes G., *Jezus Żyd. Ewangelia w oczach historyka*, trans. M. Romanek, Kraków 2003.

Vermes G., *Twarze Jezusa*, trans. J. Kołak, Kraków 2008.

Vezzol O., *Domenica, giorno del Signore. Percorsi di lettura biblico–teologica*, Interpretare la Bibbia oggi 4. 2, Brescia 1998.

Von der Osten-Sacken P., *Die Apologie des paulinischen Apostolatu in 1 Kor 15:1-11*, *ZNW* 64 (1973), p. 245–262.

Walser G., *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue*, in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 260–276.

Walter N., *Hellenistic Jews of Diaspora at the Cradle of Primitive Christianity*, in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, ed. P. Borgen, S. Giversen, Peabody 1997, p. 37–58.

Walton J.H., House H.W., Thomas R.L., Price R., *Tablice biblijne. Chrześcijańskie tablice encyklopedyczne*, 1, Warszawa 2007.

Warzecha J., *Samarytanie – perspektywa polityczna i religijna*, in *„Słowo Twoje jest prawdą" (J 17,17). Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Stanisława Mędali CM w 65. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2000, p. 332–343.

Warzecha J., *Z dziejów diaspory aleksandryjskiej*, in *Pieśniami dla mnie Twoje przykazania. Księga pamiątkowa dla Księdza profesora Janusza Frankowskiego w 50. rocznicę święceń kapłańskich i 75. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, Warszawa 2003, p. 339–372.

Waterhouse S.D., *The Planetary Week in the Roman West*, in *The Sabbath in Scripture and History*, ed. K. Strand, Washington 1982, p. 308–322.

Watson F., *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*, SNTS Monograph Series 56, Cambridge–New York–Port Chester–Melbourne–Sydney 1986.

Watson F., *The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme*, *JSNT* 24 (1985), p. 49–69.

Watson P., *The Christian Flight to Pella? The Archeological Picture*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 73–86.

Wedderburn A.J.M., *A History of the First Christians*, London–New York 2004.

Weinfeld M., *Deuteronomy 1-11*, AB 5, New York 1991.

Weiss W., *„Eine neue Lehre in Vollmacht". Die Streit- und Schulgespräche des Markus-Evangeliums*, Berlin–New York 1989.

Wengst K., *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus. Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu einer Interpretation*, Neukirchen 1981, p. 28–31.

Wengst K., *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diogenet*, Darmstadt 1984.

Wengst K., *Jesus. Zwischen Juden und Christen*, Stuttgart 1999.

Westerholm S., *Law and Christian Ethics*, in *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman World. The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. P. Richardson, S. Westerholm, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 4, Toronto 1991, p. 75–92.

Westerholm S., *Torah, Nomos and Law*, in *Law in Religious Communities in the Roman World. The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. P. Richardson, S. Westerholm, Studies in Christianity and Judaism 4, Toronto 1991, p. 45–56.

White C., *The Emergence of Christianity*, Greenwood Guides to Historic Events of the Ancient World, Westport–London 2007.

Whittaker M., *Jews and Christians: Graeco-Roman Views*, Cambridge 1984.

Wianowski L., *Bóg i aniołowie w wybranych pismach apokaliptyki żydowskiej*, in *Więcej szczęścia jest w dawaniu aniżeli w braniu. Księga Pamiątkowa dla Księdza Profesora Waldemara Chrostowskiego w 60. rocznicę urodzin*, 3, ed. B. Strzałkowska, Warszawa 2011, p. 1508–1516.

Wiesehöfer J., *Ancient Persia: From 550 BC to 650 AD*, trans. A. Azodi, London–New York 1998.

Wilcox M., *The God-Fearers in Acts – A Reconsideration*, *JSNT* 13 (1981), p. 102–122.

Wilken R.L., *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, Berkeley 1983.

Willert N., *Tertulian*, in *In Defence of Christianity. Early Christian Apologists*, ed. J. Engberg, A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, ECCA 15, Frankfurt am Main 2014, p. 159–183.

Willet T.W., *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, Sheffield 1989.

Williams A.L., *Adversus Judaeos. A Bird's-Eye View of Christian* Apologiae *until the Renaissance*, Cambridge 1935.

Williams F., *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, NHS 35, Leiden 1987.

Williams M.H., *Image and Text in the Jewish Epitaphs of Late Ancient Rome*, *JSJ* 42 (2011) 3, p. 328–350.

Williams M.H., *Jews and Christians at Rome: An Early Parting of the Ways*, in *Partings. How Judaism and Christianity Became Two*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington 2013, p. 151–178.

Williams M.H., *The Jews and Godfearers Inscription from Aphrodisias: A Case of Patriarchal Interference in Early 3rd Century Caria?* Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte 41 (1992) 3, p. 297–310.

Williams M.H., *The Shaping of the Identity of the Jewish Community in Rome in Antiquity*, in *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Models of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome*, ed. J. Zangenberg, M. Labahn, London 2004.

Williams M.H., *The Structure of Roman Jewry Re-Considered – Were the Synagogues of Rome Entirely Homogeneous? ZPE* 104 (1994), p. 129–141.

Williams M.H., *Theosebes gar en – The Jewish Tendencies of Poppea Sabina*, *JTS* 39 (1988), p. 97–111.

Wilson R.M., *The Gnostic Problem*, London 1958.

Wilson R.S., *Marcion*, New York 1980.

Wilson S.G., *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70–170 C.E.*, Minneapolis 1995.

Wilson W.T., *Pauline Parallelp. A Comprehensive Guide*, Louisville 2009.

Windisch H., *Die Christophanie vor Damascus und ihre religionsgeschichtliche Parallelen*, *ZNW* 31 (1932), p. 1–23.

Winniczuk L., *Ludzie, zwyczaje i obyczaje starożytnej Grecji i Rzymu*, Warszawa 2006.

Winston D., *The Wisdom of Salomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York 1979.

Witaszek G., *Centralizacja kultu*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, p. 103–122.

Witaszek G., *Teologia świątyni*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, p. 93–102.

Witczyk H., *Czasy święte*, in *Życie religijne w Biblii*, ed. G. Witaszek, Lublin 1999, p. 288–306.

Witczyk H., *Opozycja „światłość – ciemności" w qumrańskiej Regule Zrzeszenia i w Ewangelii według św. Jana*, in *Qumran. Pomiędzy Starym a Nowym Testementem*, AnBibLub 2, ed. H. Drawnel, A. Piwowar, trans. M. Wróbel, Lublin 2009, p. 241–257.

Wojciechowski M., *Apokalipsa świętego Jana. Objawienie, a nie tajemnica. Wstęp, przekład z oryginału, komentarz*, NKBNT XX, Częstochowa 2012.

Wojciechowski M., *Apokryfy z Biblii greckiej*, RSB 8, Warszawa 2001.

Wojciechowski M., *Jezus jako Święty w pismach Nowego Testamentu*, RSB 2, Warszawa 1996.

Wright C.J.H., *What Happened Every Seven Years in Israel? Old Testament Sabbatical Institutions for Land, Debt and Slaves*, *EvQ* 56 (1984), p. 129–135.

Wróbel M., *„Ja i Ojciec jedno jesteśmy" (J 10,30). Chrystologia Ewangelii św. Jana wobec żydowskiego monoteizmu*, in *Jezus jako Syn Boży w Nowym Testamencie i we wczesnej literaturze chrześcijańskiej*, ed. H. Drawnel, AnBibLub 1, Lublin 2007, p. 53–62.

Wróbel M., *„Żydzi" Janowi jako klucz interpretacyjny w głębszym rozumieniu historii i teologii czwartej Ewangelii*, in *Żydzi i judaizm we współczesnych badaniach polskich*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, Kraków 2010, p. 47–61.

Wróbel M., *„Żydzi", którzy uwierzyli Jezusowi*, VV 5 (2004), p. 117–126.

Wróbel M., *Antyewangelia w źródłach rabinicznych*, VC 2 (2014), p. 219–227.

Wróbel M., *Antyjudaizm a Ewangelia według św. Jana. Nowe spojrzenie na relację czwartej Ewangelii do judaizmu*, Lublin 2005.

Wróbel M., *Birkat ha-Minim and the Process of Separation between Judaism and Christianity*, *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 5 (2006) 2, p. 99–120.

Wróbel M., *Jezus i Jego wyznawcy w Talmudzie. Analiza tekstologiczna, historyczna i socjologiczna*, Lublin 2013.

Wróbel M., *Krytyka tekstologiczna i historyczna passusów Talmudu o Jezusie i chrześcijaństwie*, in *Jezus i chrześcijanie w źródłach rabinicznych. Perspektywa historyczna, społeczna, religijna i dialogowa*, ed. K. Pilarczyk, A. Mrozek, Kraków 2012, p. 15–50.

Wróbel M., *Lektura Ewangelii św. Mateusza w kontekście prześladowanej wspólnoty*, in *„Bóg jest miłością" (1 J 4,16). Studia dla Księdza Profesora Józefa Kudasiewicza w 80. rocznicę urodzin*, ed. W. Chrostowski, RSB 25, Warszawa 2006, p. 429–440.

Wróbel M., *Motywy i formy żydowskich prześladowań pierwotnego Kościoła (I–II w. po Chr.)*, *Biblical Annals* 60 (2013) 3, p. 421–438.

Wróbel M., *Peter Schäfer, The Jewish Jesus. How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other, (Princeton–Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012). Pp.349.$ 30. ISBN 978-0-691-15390-2*, *Biblical Annals* 60 (2013) 3, p. 495–498.

Wróbel M., *Polemika Jezusa z „Żydami" w Ewangelii Janowej*, SDR 7 (2005), p. 221–228.

Wróbel M., *Synagoga a rodzący się Kościół. Studium egzegetyczno-teologiczne Czwartej Ewangelii (J 9,22; 12,42; 16,2)*, Kielce 2002.

Wróbel M., *Terminologia pism rabinicznych w odniesieniu do Jezusa i Jego wyznawców*, *RH* 62 (2014) 8, p. 79–92.

Wróbel M., *The Polemic in Jn 8:31–59 in the Context of Jewish and Christian Literature*, *Roczniki Biblijne* 57 (2010) 2, p. 15–26.

Wróbel M., *Who Is the Liar in Jn 8:44?* in *Żyjemy dla Pana. Księga Pamiątkowa dedykowana S. Profesor Ewie Józefie Jezierskiej OSU w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin*, ed. M. Rosik, Wrocław 2005, p. 751–758.

Wróbel M., *Znaczenie formuły Birkat ha-Minim w procesie rozdziału Synagogi od Kościoła*, *CT* 78 (2008) 2, p. 65–80.

Wysocki M., *Eschatologia okresu prześladowań na podstawie pism Tertuliana i Cypriana*, Lublin 2010.

Załęski J., *Nierozerwalność małżeństwa według św. Pawła. O tzw. przywileju Pawłowym. 1 Kor 7,10–16*, AL 16, Katowice 1992.

Załęski J., *Obraz kobiety w listach Nowego Testamentu*, Ząbki 2005.

Zawiszewski E., *Historia zbawienia*, Pelplin 1993.

Zawiszewski E., *Instytucje biblijne*, Pelplin 2001.

Zeitlin I.M., *Jesus and the Judaism of His Time*, Cambridge 1988.

Zetterholm M., *A Covenant for Gentiles? Covenantal Nomism and the Incident in Antioch*, in *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001*, ed. B. Olsson, M. Zetterholm, CBNTS 39, Stockholm 2003, p. 168–188.

Ziffer W., *Two epithets for Jesus of Nazareth in Talmud and Midrash*, *JBL* 85 (1966), p. 356–357.

Zimmerli W., *Ezechiel*, 1/1, *BKAT* 13, Neukirchen–Vluyn 1969.

Zmarlicki H., *Dekalog dawniej i dziś*, Kraków 2000.

Zolli E., *Historia antysemityzmu*, ed. A. Latorre, trans. B. Bochenek, Kraków 2010.

Zugibe F.T., *The Crucifixion of Jesus: A Forensic Inquiry*, New York 2005.

Index

A
Abegg M. 82, 485
Abrahamsen V. 187, 485
Abusch R. 351, 485
Achtemeier P.J. 112, 151, 512, 527
Adamczewski B. 196, 485
Adamiak S. 412–413, 485
Adler Y. 230, 485
Agus A.R.E. 262, 485
Aharoni Y. 122, 485
Aichele G. 219, 485
Aland B. 295, 387, 485
Alon G. 286, 423, 425, 485
Alonso J.M. 308, 485
Altaner B. 373, 381, 394, 444, 485
Amit D. 230, 485
Ammi R. 190
Andersen C. 97, 496
Anderson G.A. 149, 523
Antosiewicz M. 356, 521
Appelbaum S. 338, 485
Armitage Robinson J. 347
Armstrong K. 71, 142, 349, 431, 486
Arndt W.F. 293–294
Ascough R.S. 97, 486
Ashton J. 91, 316, 486
Attridge H.W. 38, 232, 255, 333, 336, 388, 411, 461, 486
Augé M. 174, 486
Aune D.E. 64, 486
Avemarie F. 76–77, 486, 512
Aviam M. 230, 486
Avi-Yonah M. 355, 436, 486
Azodi A. 435, 541

B
Bacchiocchi S. 174, 181–183, 486
Baker J. 156, 499
Balagué M. 50, 486
Ballarini L. 165, 486
Bamberger B.J. 151, 486
Baraniak M. 56, 66–67, 80, 113, 158, 173, 486–487
Bardski K. 110, 162, 226, 300, 324, 417, 487, 500, 512
Barlett J.R. 86, 518
Barnes T.D. 338, 487
Baron A. 144, 487
Baron W. 212, 487
Barrett C.K. 312, 334, 487
Bartnicki R. 31, 57, 73, 116, 142, 487
Barton W.E. 113, 487
Basser H.W. 264, 487
Bauckham R. 12, 112, 342, 346, 354, 487–488
Bauer W. 341, 488
Baumgarten A.I. 27, 446, 448, 488, 492
Baus K. 309, 488
Beagley A.J. 324, 488
Beauchamp P. 317, 488
Becker A.H. 16–17, 26, 36–37, 87, 222, 299, 392, 438, 443, 448–449, 462–463, 488, 490–491, 502–505, 510, 513–514, 527, 530, 536, 538
Becking B. 326, 528
Bednarz M. 187, 312, 488
Bekken P.J. 163, 488
Ben-Chorin S. (S. ben Chorin) 31, 488
Bendowska M. 280, 488
Benedict XVI: see: Ratzinger J. 213, 476
Benke L. 204, 505
Benoît S. 84, 86, 108, 129, 132, 207, 411, 488
Berard W.-D. 197, 488
Berenbaum M. 244, 535
Bernardino A. di 107, 374, 457, 505, 524
Betz O. 81, 499
Białecki B. 242, 515

Bianchi F. 295
Bielawski K. 87, 510
Bielawski M. 355, 527
Bielicki M. 488
Bieńkowski L. 308, 323, 343, 517, 521
Bieringer R. 75–77, 154, 178, 190, 260, 265, 446, 486, 492, 497–498, 508, 512, 535, 538
Billerbeck P. 370, 536
Binder D.D. 259, 320, 379–380, 489, 529
Birdsall J.N. 35, 238, 489
Black M. 323, 381, 386, 489
Blass F. 288, 489
Bochenek B. 387, 544
Boddens Hosang F.J.E. 205, 489
Boeckhius A. 30
Boer C.D. 311, 489
Boers H. 99, 489
Bogacz R. 72, 222–223, 489
Bohak G. 273, 489
Bokser B.M. 63, 489
Booth R.P. 76, 489
Borgen P. 13, 22, 25, 57, 64, 86, 88, 91, 104, 163, 385, 450, 468, 488–489, 499, 502, 504, 508, 511, 533, 540
Bornhäuser K. 50, 489
Bornkamm G. 112, 489
Borowski A. 351, 497
Borzymińska Z. 77, 376, 489–490
Bosetti E. 247, 490
Boslooper T. 308, 490
Bottini G.C. 125, 490
Bourgel J. 221, 490
Boustan R. 299, 490
Bowman J. 114, 318, 490
Boyarin D. 16, 32–33, 37–38, 67, 109, 263, 268, 274, 289, 374, 386, 475, 490, 505
Boys M.C. 15, 17, 223, 490, 506, 536
Bradshaw P.F. 444, 490
Brawley R.L. 255, 490
Briggs C. 273, 295, 297
Briks P. 295, 297, 320
Broadhead E.K. 178, 490
Broer I. 314, 517
Bromiley G.W. 69, 532
Broshi M. 209, 490
Brown F. 273, 295, 297
Brown R.E. 115, 233, 237, 300, 304–306, 308–309, 311, 490–491
Brownrigg R. 90, 491
Bruce B. 313, 491
Bruce F.F. 83, 131, 135, 184, 244, 491
Bruce I.A.F. 249, 491
Buchanan G.W. 114, 271, 491
Bucur B.G. 381, 491
Bultmann R. 31
Buzzi F. 80, 491
Byra M. 213, 491
Bzowski S. 302, 491

C

Cameron A. 392, 491
Campbell Bonner B. 394
Campbell W.S. 162, 491
Campenhausen H. von 309, 376, 450, 491
Capelli P. 120, 531
Cappelletti S. 133–134, 491
Carlebach A. 248, 491
Carmignac J. 294, 492
Carroll W.H. 77, 125, 151, 323, 335, 349, 357, 380, 392, 492
Carson D.A. 199, 293, 492
Carter W. 233, 242, 492
Casella G. 203, 497
Casey M. 32, 178–179, 298, 492
Casey T.G. 79, 530
Causse A. 59, 492
Cendrowska B. 71, 486
Chajes H.P. 425, 492
Chancey M.A. 435, 519
Charles R.H. 183, 271, 331, 492
Charlesworth J.H. 12, 21, 25, 27, 34, 38–39, 42, 44, 47, 59–60, 62–64, 141,

154, 180, 205–207, 209, 217, 233, 275, 486, 489, 492–493, 497, 499, 506, 508, 511, 514, 519, 523, 532
Chester A. 35, 78, 394, 493, 540
Chilton B. 17, 41, 76, 78, 85, 111, 149, 226, 264, 267, 289, 292, 465, 487, 493, 500, 515, 522, 526
Chmiel J. 206, 493
Chowaniec M. 242, 499
Chrostowski W. 11–13, 16, 19, 21, 26, 31–32, 34, 38, 58, 67–68, 76–77, 80, 83, 87, 91, 93, 98–100, 112–113, 119, 126, 128, 140, 164–165, 168, 192, 212, 217, 219, 233, 240, 265, 286, 289, 299, 303–304, 322, 324, 333, 345–346, 356, 414, 435, 462, 485–486, 492–495, 500, 503–504, 509, 512, 514, 521, 524–527, 536–538, 540, 543
Ciecieląg J. 21, 30, 126, 141–142, 152, 231, 243, 292, 337, 349–352, 416, 434, 494
Cimosa M. 295
Cirbo V. 437
Claussen C. 55, 124, 495
Clements R.A. 149, 523, 535
Coggins R.J. 322, 509
Cohen A. 12, 188, 266, 495
Cohen S.J.D. 21, 38, 42, 59, 212, 215, 248, 264, 270, 273–274, 276, 283, 287–288, 334, 349, 351, 355–356, 377, 382, 403–404, 429, 473, 495, 504
Cohn-Sherbok D. 475, 495
Collins J.J. 22, 27, 109, 149, 160, 176, 283, 298, 329, 495–496, 527, 535
Comby J. 196, 496
Conzelmann H. 97, 450, 496
Coogan M.D. 87, 140, 485, 536–537
Correns D. 404
Corticelli A. 60, 505
Couroyer B. 224, 496
Cowley A.E. 115, 496
Cross F.L. 173, 312, 496
Crossan J.D. 34, 314, 496
Crüsemann M. 187, 496
Cumont F. 129, 496
Cunningham P.A. 15, 63, 70, 201, 223, 496, 506, 536
Cytowska M. 23–24, 496
Czajkowski M. 76, 79, 162, 167–168, 178–179, 190, 496–497
Czerski J. 293, 497
Czwojdrak A. 19, 282, 502, 535

D

Dąbrowski E. 135, 145, 164, 497
Dahl N.A. 62, 497
Dalman G. 272, 497
Daniel-Rops H. 146, 175, 188, 356, 497
Das A.A. 55, 78, 85, 262, 297, 306, 312, 315, 327, 370, 404, 462, 485, 495, 497, 509, 525, 528, 532, 536, 539
Davies W.D. 233, 334, 487, 497
Davila J.R. 160, 517
De Sanctis G. 137
De Vries S.P. 351, 497
Debrunner A. 288, 489
Dec I. 293, 497
Dec P. 272, 513
Deiana G. 295
Deines R. 260, 497
Dellarte A. 96, 497
Der Hout G.E. van 166, 508
Devillers L. 318, 497
Di Segni 437, 537
Dickson J. 203, 218, 497
Diez Macho A. 331, 497
Dimant D. 25, 497
Dimier C. 25, 498
Dittenberger W. 30
Docherty S. 67, 498
Doering L. 178, 498
Dohmen C. 282, 287, 498
Donaldson J. 173–174
Donaldson T.L. 82, 105, 168, 498
Dormeyer D. 69, 498

Douglas M. 123, 259, 498
Downey G. 89, 498
Drabina J. 144, 258, 487, 525
Drączkowski F. 335, 449, 498
Draper J.A. 171, 498
Drawnel H. 154, 206–207, 209–210, 512, 526–527, 542
Driver S. 273, 295, 297
Drożdż B. 195, 513
Dubis K. 162, 511
Dufay R. 174, 498
Dunn J.D.G 12, 35–36, 38, 41, 48–49, 52, 59, 74, 81, 87–88, 90, 98, 104, 142–143, 204, 221, 226, 237–238, 242, 244, 283, 309, 313, 322, 327, 414–415, 485, 489, 493, 498–499, 504, 507, 516, 518, 529, 534, 536
Dupont-Sommer A. 206, 499
Dyson S.L. 212, 499
Dzierzgowska A. 431, 486
Dziwisz M. 109, 141, 265, 504, 515, 539

E

Edmondson J. 215, 248, 504, 520
Ehrman B.D. 242, 252–253, 499
Eichrodt W. 156, 499
Elgvin T. 14, 63, 499
Elliott J.H. 247, 467, 499
Ellis P.E. 241, 500
Elwell W.A. 162, 500
Engberg-Pedersen T. 399, 536
Eppstein V. 314, 500
Evans C.A 76, 78, 111, 149, 264, 267, 289, 292, 487, 493, 500, 515, 522, 526
Everts J.M. 92, 500

F

Fabbri R. 431, 528
Fabris R. 261, 525
Falk D. 210, 526
Falk H. 33, 500
Falkenberg R. 381, 500
Feldman L.H. 21, 38, 61, 86, 108, 151–152, 192, 229, 248, 286, 413, 487, 500, 532
Ferguson E. 124, 500
Ferrero M. 82, 501
Ferron J. 96, 501
Filipiak M. 194, 501
Fine S. 55, 85, 97, 131, 279, 361, 393, 433–434, 459, 501, 509–510, 520, 530, 532, 536
Finn T.M. 124, 501
Fisher E. 17, 503, 508
Fitzmyer J.A. 58, 60, 107, 165, 291, 501, 521
Florkowski E. 353, 501
Flusser D. 29, 31–32, 171, 276–277, 280, 501
Foakes Jackson F.J. 12
Fonrobert C. 274, 445–446, 501
Foster P. 334, 502
Foucault M. 461, 502
Frankfurter D. 26, 392, 502
Frankowski J. 286, 502
Fredriksen P. 17, 32, 104, 339, 362, 391, 412, 460, 502
Freed E.D. 114, 502
Freedman D.N. 265, 477, 524
Freedman H. 19, 266, 290, 415, 431, 502
Frend W.H.C. 151, 335, 412, 502
Frey J.B. 30
Friedrich G. 69, 77, 512, 532
Froehner W. 135
Fuks A. 30
Fuller R.H. 308, 502
Funk I.K. 386, 505
Funk R.W. 298, 502
Furlani G. 387, 502

G

Gądecki S. 164, 323, 502–503
Gaebelein F.E. 293, 492
Gafni I.M. 38, 262, 410, 435–436, 503

Gager J.G. 17, 334, 387, 412, 438–439, 444, 448–449, 463, 503
Gagnon R.A.J. 133, 503
Gamba G.G. 179, 503
Gardner G. 448, 527
Garrone D. 295
Garzetti E. 137, 503
Gaventa R.B. 91, 503
Gawliczek A. 295
Geiger J. 351, 503
Gemser B. 317, 503
Geoltrain P. 178, 503
Geraty L.T. 42, 173, 184, 410–411, 503
Gerhardsson B. 294, 503
Gerleman G. 168, 503
Gero S. 426, 503
Gheorgita R. 223, 504
Giardina A. 84, 488
Gibson E.L. 392–393, 504
Gieniusz A. 80–81, 83, 504
Gigilewicz E. 345, 494
Gingrich F.W. 293–294
Giversen S. 22, 25, 88, 107, 504, 511, 540
Glasenaap H. von 265, 504
Głogowski T. 173, 496
Głuchowski R. 120–122, 124, 504
Gnilka J. 87, 92, 140, 143, 145, 171, 177, 179, 315, 327, 504
Gołębiewski M. 68, 304, 494, 538
Gołębiowski M.J. 107, 374, 457, 505, 524
Goodman M. 16, 21, 30–31, 86, 121, 216, 244, 248–250, 260, 338, 340, 350, 504–505
Gorzkowski A. 102, 507
Gottheil R. 386, 505
Gowler D.B. 13, 57, 64, 91, 104, 163, 468, 488–489, 499, 502, 508, 533
Góźdź K. 387, 516
Grant R.M. 334, 505
Graupner A. 54, 505
Grech P. 60, 107, 505
Green J.B. 295, 505
Groh D.E. 38
Gromacka R. 119, 266, 495, 539
Grossberg D.M. 274, 505
Gruell T. 204, 505
Gruen E.S. 128, 131, 433, 501, 505
Gryglewicz F. 194, 308, 323, 343, 353, 501, 505, 517, 521
Grypeou E. 38, 505
Grzybek E. 135–136, 505
Guarducci M. 137
Gugenheim E. 264, 506
Gulbinowicz H. 293, 497
Gundry R.H. 80, 506
Guryn A. 95, 506

H

Haase W. 264, 522
Hadas-Lebel M. 21, 506
Hagner D.A. 80–81, 83, 93–94, 506
Hakola A. 311, 506
Hałas S. 246, 506
Hall R.G. 142
Halsberghe G.H. 184, 506
Hamerton-Kelly R. 334, 487
Hamman A.G. 95, 506
Haran H. 215, 506
Hardy E.G. 335, 506
Hare R.D. 240, 506
Harrington D.J. 14–15, 88, 105, 223, 506
Hartin P.J. 149, 506
Hasel G.F. 198, 506
Hasenfuss J. 301, 506
Hata G. 152, 532
Hawthorne G.F. 81, 92, 162, 499–500
Hayman A.P. 295, 507
Hayward C.T.R. 398, 461, 507
Hedrick C. 91
Heemstra M. 243, 245, 247–248, 355, 507
Heil J.P. 70, 201, 507
Heinemann J. 280, 507

Henderson I.H. 260, 527
Hengel M. 35, 83, 155, 283, 285, 307, 311, 417, 420, 507
Henrix H.H. 15, 223, 506, 536
Henze M. 14, 513
Herbut J. 387, 516
Herford R.T. 273, 275, 419, 425, 507
Hergesel T. 195, 311, 507
Herr M.D. 435, 438, 507
Heschel A.J. 102, 507
Heschel J. 355
Hess H. 460, 507
Hezser C. 195, 508
Higgins A.J.B. 166, 521
Higgins K.M. 110, 534
Hill C.C. 5, 82, 213, 349, 508
Hillmann J. 306, 508
Himmelfarb M. 17, 59, 508
Hirschberg H. 275, 508
Hoffmann R.J. 387, 508
Hollander H.W. 166, 508
Holmberg B. 105, 530
Horbury W. 35, 268, 283, 352–353, 363, 446, 495, 508
Horrell D.G. 246, 508
Horsley R.A. 13, 60, 207, 213, 508
Horst P. van der 97, 459, 508–509
Houlden J.L. 322, 509
House H.W. 12, 40, 64, 152, 518, 532, 540
Hruby K. 73, 509
Hübner H. 78, 509
Hulen A.B. 353, 509
Hull W.E. 276, 311, 509
Hultgren A.J. 179, 509
Humphries M. 15, 29, 333, 336, 509
Hurley D.W. 132, 509
Hurtado L. 154–156, 161, 509

I
Iluk J. 441, 455–456, 509
Inowlocki S. 131, 509
Instone-Brewer D. 280, 509
Irek W. 92, 529
Irmińska D. 303
Irshai O. 230, 435, 485, 520
Isaac B. 65, 117, 142, 169, 213, 234, 268, 299, 306, 339, 380, 409, 509
Isbouts J.-P. 149, 232, 509

J
Jackson M. 220, 509
Jackson-McCabe M.A 42, 82, 95, 149, 171, 231, 233, 309, 311, 324, 342, 344, 492, 498, 506, 508-511, 517–518, 536
Jacob E. 162, 510
Jacobs A.S. 16, 439, 510
Jacobsen A.-Ch. 170, 335, 347, 373, 381, 400, 414, 500, 510, 513, 525, 539, 541
Jaeger W. 87, 510
Jaffé D. 221, 490
Jankowski A. 80, 504
Jaruzelska I. 194, 510, 529
Jędrzejewski S. 146, 282–283, 330, 510
Jelonek T. 404, 510
Jenni E. 168, 503
Jensen R.M. 433, 459, 510
Jeremias J. 93, 122, 510
Jervell J. 125, 510
Jeżewski W. 356, 521
Jochum U. 144, 510
Jocz J. 278, 510
Johnson S.E. 394, 510
Johnson W.G. 226, 511
Jonas H. 387, 511
Jones F. Stanley 344, 446, 511
Jones P.R 166, 511
Jonge M. de 25, 511
Joubert S.J. 270, 511
Juel D.H. 12, 209, 511
Jurzyk P. 366, 368, 371–372, 511
Juster J. 132, 162, 511

K
Kadman L. 349, 511
Kaduri I. 475

Kalmin R. 355, 511
Kameraz-Kos N. 177, 511
Kasher A. 413, 511
Katz S.T 86, 218, 275, 511–512, 538
Kazen T. 77, 512
Kearney P.J. 166, 512
Kee H.C. 97, 259, 512
Keener C.S. 324, 512
Kempiak R. 206, 512
Kerkeslager A. 218, 512
Kessler E. 110, 394–395, 512
Kieling M. 460, 512
Kimbrough S.T. 177, 512
Kimelman R. 278, 438, 512
Kingsbury J.D. 151, 512
Kistemaker S.J. 120, 512
Kister M. 158–160, 512
Klassen W. 223, 512
Klausner J. 417, 512
Klawans J. 260, 447, 512
Klein G. 97, 496
Klijn A.F.J. 345, 512
Klinkowski J. 195, 513
Klopfenstein M. 98, 536
Klostergaard Petersen A. 400, 513
Knohl I. 14, 62, 513
Knox J. 135, 513
Koehler L. 272, 295, 297, 513
Koester C. 221, 513
Kołak J. 32, 395, 539
Kołtan S. 167, 497
Kondracki A. 194, 513
Konikoff A. 458, 513
Korner R.J. 99, 513
Korpanty J. 232, 509
Korus K. 25, 513
Korzec C. 164, 502
Kościuk Z. 156, 324, 512, 530
Kozyra J. 233, 255, 302, 513
Kraabel A.T. 124, 393, 514
Kraft R.A. 16, 42, 87–88, 129, 218, 341, 466, 514
Krašovec J. 54, 223, 514
Kraus S. 386, 505
Krawczyk R. 126, 514
Kręcidło J. 114, 514
Kritzman L.D. 461, 502
Kubiak Z. 119, 520
Kudasiewicz J. 240–241, 303, 514, 543
Kuhn H.-W. 206, 514
Kumaniecki K. 367, 514
Kutscher E.Y. 265, 514
Kyle McCarter P. 304, 514

L

Labahn M. 459, 541
Łach J. 301, 515
Lachs S.T. 424, 515
Laible H. 418, 515
Lake K. 124, 230, 435, 485, 515, 520
Lambers-Petry D. 71, 129, 149, 258, 273, 342, 344, 475, 488–489, 495, 515, 520, 533, 536, 538–539
Landesmann P 54, 174, 320, 515
Lange N.R.M. de 402, 515
Langston S. 267, 515
Läpple A. 195, 242, 515
Lasocka J. 146, 497
Latham H. 50, 515
Latorre A. 387, 544
Lauterbach J.Z. 418, 515
Le Donne A. 35, 515
Legowicz J. 109, 515
Leiman S. 425, 521
Lemański J. 59, 61, 233, 240, 515
Lempa H. 195, 277, 515
Léon-Dufour X. 48, 92, 515–516
Leszczyński R.M. 387, 516
Levine A.B. 215, 516
Levine A.-J. 76, 89, 189, 235, 241, 272, 280, 317, 320, 516
Levine L.I.A. 38, 97, 133, 205, 230, 259, 516
Levinskaya I.A. 85, 516
Levison J.R. 413, 487
Lewis G.S. 160, 517

Lewis N. 215, 516
Leyraud A.F. 96, 516
Lichtenberg H. 309, 516
Lieu J. 36, 379, 400–401, 516
Linke W. 174–175, 185, 516
Lipiński E. 418–419, 516–517
Lisiecka S. 19, 272, 403, 523, 532
Lisiecki A. 353
Litt D. 69, 532
Livingstone E.A. 29, 173, 312, 496
Lodahl M.E. 78, 431, 517
Loewe H. 13, 525
Loffreda S. 437
Lohfink G. 35, 100, 517
Lohse E. 178, 517
Longman T. III 156, 324, 530
Longosz S. 367, 369, 371, 517
Longsdorf J.R. 309, 517
López Martin J. 517
Lowy S. 365, 517
Lüdemann G. 221, 517
Lüderitz G. 338
Luijendijk A. 42, 129, 218, 341, 514
Łukaszewska J. 107, 374, 457, 505, 524
Łukaszyk R. 308, 323, 343, 353, 501, 517, 521
Luomanen P. 342, 345, 517
Luz U. 98, 536
Łypacewicz S. 265, 504

M

Mach M. 160, 517
Maciołka M. 308, 517
Mack B.L. 179, 528
Magness J. 230, 435, 485, 519–520
Maier G. 303
Maier J. 21, 69, 130, 217, 314, 423, 517
Małecki Z. 26, 535
Malina A. 199, 518
Mancini I. 437, 518
Mann J. 272, 518
Manns F. 318, 418, 452, 455, 518
Marcinkowski R. 187, 518
Marcus J. 69, 337, 353, 402, 518
Marshall J.W. 324–325, 518
Marszał E. 69, 517
Martin R.P. 92, 162, 500
Martin V. 12, 518
Martinez F.G. 75–77, 178, 190, 260, 265, 446, 486, 497–498, 508, 512, 535, 538
Martyn J.L. 311, 518
Marzęcki J. 140, 536
Mason S. 21, 54, 84, 150, 215, 248, 504, 518, 520
Massi P. 174, 518
Mastalerz J. 313, 491
Mattioli U. 288, 489
McArthur H.K. 301, 518
McGing B.C. 86, 518
McHugh J. 313, 316–317, 518
McKay H.A. 97, 174, 519
McKenzie J.L. 332, 519
McNamara M. 25
Mędala S. 28, 119, 206, 311, 316, 332, 519
Meecham H.G. 400, 519
Meeks W.A. 16, 241, 310, 519
Meier J.P. 33, 68, 75, 77, 113, 206, 519
Meigne M. 460, 519
Mélèze-Modrzejewski J. 128, 342, 519
Mendels D. 42, 75, 499
Mendelson A. 27, 492
Merz A. 34, 537
Meshorer Y. 349, 519
Metzger B.M. 87, 140, 252, 485, 519, 536–537
Meyer R. 215, 516
Meyers C.L. 435, 519
Meyers E.M. 434–436, 519–520
Miazek J. 182, 520
Michl J. 309, 520
Mickiewicz F. 77, 83, 311, 520
Miduch M. 330–331, 520
Mieszkowski T. 29, 312
Mikołajczak M. 215, 520
Mildenberg L. 349, 520
Milgrom J. 215, 520
Milik J.T. 119, 520

Millar F. 215, 248, 520
Millard A. 208, 357, 520
Miller S.S. 230, 361, 520
Mimouni S.C. 275, 344, 346, 423, 430, 520–521
Misiarczyk L. 347, 379, 381, 521
Misiurek J. 323, 343, 521
Mitten D.G. 393, 514
Moldenhawer C.D. 22, 107
Molland E. 400, 521
Montefiore S.S. 356, 521
Moore G.F. 76, 265, 425, 502, 521
Moretti D. 19, 535
Morgan M.L. 62, 335, 528
Mrozek A. 6, 20, 56, 277, 354, 413, 415–416, 418, 434, 456, 465, 487, 494, 509, 516, 521, 526, 529, 543
Muchowski P. 205, 265, 296, 521
Munck J. 166, 323, 521
Murphy-O'Connor J. 107, 135, 166, 521
Murray R. 12, 521
Muszyński H. 206, 521

N
Najda A.J. 49, 52, 125, 140, 521
Nanos D. 106–107, 521–522
Napiórkowski A. 80, 522
Nativ G. 264, 522
Neusner J. 16–17, 39, 76, 78, 111, 114, 132, 149, 152, 226, 264, 267, 289, 342, 394, 404, 438, 465, 487, 491, 493, 497, 500, 510, 515, 522–523, 533
Neville Birdsall J. 35
Newman C.C. 160, 517
Newman H.I. 445, 522
Neyrey J.H. 123, 522
Nickelsburg G.W.E. 26, 88, 109, 160, 166, 383, 514, 522
Niehoff M.R. 149, 523
Nola A. di 156, 264, 523
Nolland J. 254, 523
Nongbri B. 94, 523
Novak D. 83, 523

O
O'Callaghan J. 207
O'Connor D.W.M. 132, 523
O'Grady J.F. 116, 523
O'Quin C. 250, 523
O'Toole R.F. 99, 254, 523
Oegema G.S. 63, 523
Olczak S. 387, 516
Olkiewicz J. 128, 519
Olsson B. 30, 55–56, 84, 97, 124, 143, 259, 320, 379–380, 495, 516, 523, 529, 536, 538, 540, 544
Oppenheimer A. 244, 350, 523–524
Orbe A. 312, 524
Ordon H. 186, 524
Osborn E. 374, 457, 524
Osek E. 127
Osten-Sacken P. von der 166, 540
Osterloh K. 448, 527
Ostrowska K. 356, 497
Otero T. 78, 104, 524
Overman J.A. 213, 265, 274, 524

P
Pachciarek P. 373, 394, 485, 536
Pacifici R. 112, 216–218, 408, 524
Paciorek A. 20, 23–24, 29, 72, 79, 93, 218, 271, 293–294, 300–301, 311, 524
Paget J.C. 402, 448, 524
Painter J. 39, 53, 149, 525
Palazzi C. 196, 496
Palla A.J. 217, 525
Paprocki H. 323, 521
Parchem M. 61, 327, 330, 525
Parente F. 21, 511
Park J.S. 459, 525
Parkes J. 12–13, 525
Pearson B. 99, 525
Pedersen N.A. 347–348, 525
Penna R. 132, 244, 525
Pesce M. 261, 525
Petuchowski J.J. 280, 507
Pick B. 418, 525
Pierini M.N. 264, 339, 506, 527

Pietras H. 144, 174, 487
Piétri C. 525
Piétri L. 462, 525
Pilarczyk K. 6, 11, 18, 20, 26, 28, 56, 58, 144, 223, 229, 258, 262, 264, 267, 285, 312, 327, 354, 361, 402, 404, 413, 415–416, 418, 436, 443, 456–457, 487, 494, 509, 516, 521, 525–526, 529, 542–543
Pines S. 83, 526
Piper O.A. 309, 526
Pisi G. 288, 489
Piwowar A. 206–207, 209–210, 512, 526–527, 542
Piwowarczyk P. 413, 526
Podbielski H. 25, 513
Pollefeyt D. 75–77, 178, 190, 260, 265, 446, 486, 497–498, 508, 512, 535, 538
Poniży B. 72, 101, 127, 526
Poole F.J.P. 43–44, 526
Popowski R. 302, 387, 516
Porter S.E. 260, 291–292, 501, 505, 526
Potterie I. de la 301, 526
Prasad J. 246, 526
Price R. 64, 540
Pritz R.A. 24, 343, 526
Pryor J.W. 318, 526
Puech É. 207, 210–211, 526
Puech H.-Ch. 264, 339, 506, 527
Purpura G. 136–137, 527
Purvis J.D. 112, 527

Q
Quinzio S. 355, 527

R
Rabello A.M. 350, 527
Rabinowitz J. 475
Räisänen H. 78, 527
Rakocy W. 78–79, 134–135, 145, 162, 527
Rapoport I. 21, 28, 288, 295–296, 529
Ratzinger J. – Benedict XVI 72, 174, 527
Reed A.Y. 16–17, 26, 36–37, 42, 87, 222, 260, 299, 332, 334, 391, 438, 443, 446–449, 462–463, 472, 488, 490–491, 502–505, 510, 513–514, 527, 530, 536, 538
Reed J.L. 298, 527
Regan F.A. 184–185, 528
Regul J. 387, 528
Reid D.G. 92, 162, 500
Reimarus H.S. 31
Reinach S. 129, 528
Reinhartz A. 326, 528
Remaud M. 431, 528
Rendel Harris J. 355, 528
Reymond P. 295, 297
Reymond S. 91, 528
Reynolds J. 338, 528
Richardson P. 81–82, 347, 374, 392, 528, 541
Rienecker F. 303
Riesenfeldt H. 294
Ringgren H. 159, 528
Rist J.M. 294, 528
Rivers J. 215, 520
Rivkin E. 261, 528
Robbins V.K. 13, 57, 64, 91, 104, 163, 179, 468, 488–489, 499, 502, 508, 528, 533
Roberts A. 173–174
Roberts C.H. 341, 528
Robinson J.A.T. 232, 528
Rodgers Z. 22, 517
Roitman A.D. 62, 513
Rokeah D. 417, 419, 528
Roll I. 339, 509
Rollof J. 315, 528
Romanek M. 265, 539
Romaniuk K. 92, 96, 135, 165, 515, 528
Rosenthal F. 297
Rosik J. 69, 529
Rosik M. 21, 28, 68, 92, 108, 147, 157, 167, 194, 219–220, 242, 261, 280, 288, 295–296, 311, 313, 315, 497, 507, 528–529, 543

Rosik S. 195, 515
Rowland C. 35, 277, 327, 329, 529
Rowley H.H. 529
Rubinkiewicz R. 28–29, 271, 289, 327, 329, 522, 524, 529
Rucki M. 191, 529
Runesson A. 105, 259, 320, 379–380, 529–530
Runia D.T. 22, 530
Rupprecht A.A. 69, 530
Russell E.A. 240, 530
Rutgers L.V. 30, 230, 458, 486, 530
Ruzer S. 59, 79, 149, 190, 530
Ryken L. 156, 324, 530
Ryndak J. 107, 374, 457, 505, 524

S

Sacchi P. 331, 530
Salvesen A. 443, 453, 530
Sanders E.P. 27, 33, 38, 69, 78, 111, 120, 131, 179–180, 221, 278, 314, 492, 512, 517, 530–531
Sanders J.T. 255, 531
Sandmel S. 98, 286, 332, 531
Sandt H. van de 29, 171, 501
Sante C. di 281, 531
Santini L. 120, 531
Sartan D. 383, 531
Satlow M. 212, 215
Satran D. 149, 523
Sauer J. 178, 531
Sawa R. 387, 516
Schaeffer M. 166, 531
Schäfer P. 39–40, 263, 278, 350–351, 417–419, 421, 423–424, 427, 429, 432, 485, 505, 531, 543
Schartz J.J. 248, 504
Schechter S. 270, 277, 531
Schenker A. 54, 223–224, 531
Schiffman L. 55, 59, 152, 213, 276, 532
Schmidt D. 99, 532
Schmidt K.L. 179, 532
Schnabel E.J. 123, 532
Schnackenburg R. 297, 532
Schnelle U. 326–327, 532
Schoeps J.H. 19, 272, 403, 523, 532
Scholer D.M. 412, 532
Schoonenberg P. 308, 485
Schottroff L. 187, 496
Schreckenberg H. 258, 532
Schreiber J. 69, 532
Schrenk G. 69, 532
Schuller E. 210, 526
Schürer E. 58, 60, 130, 532
Schwartz D.R. 446, 522
Schwartz J. 532
Schwartz S. 230, 435, 485, 520
Scott B.B. 113, 533
Scott Gleaves G. 291, 533
Scott Green W. 213, 265, 274, 497, 524
Scramuzza V.M. 134–135, 533
Scroggs R. 39, 334, 487, 533
Segal A.F. 91, 533
Seland T. 57, 533
Sevenster J.N. 58, 533
Shanks H. 38, 41, 44, 48, 61, 75, 85, 93, 129, 131, 173, 192, 212, 217, 221, 229–230, 265, 270, 309, 332–333, 356, 434–436, 486, 492–493, 495, 498–501, 503, 509, 514, 516, 519, 527, 537, 539–541
Shepherd M.B. 66, 533
Sherwin B.L. 198, 533
Sherwin-White A.N. 151, 533
Shinnie L. 120, 533
Sicker M. 215, 349, 533
Siegert F. 124, 129, 533
Sievers J. 15, 21, 223, 506, 511, 536
Sigal P. 190, 261, 533
Simon M. 35, 50, 52, 61, 116, 178, 262, 275, 312, 334, 342, 349, 361, 370, 445, 533–534
Simonsohn S. 49, 264, 276, 362, 534
Siwek K. 272, 534
Skolnik F. 244, 535
Slawik J. 51, 68, 283, 534
Słomka J. 454, 534
Sloyan G.S. 420, 534

Smallwood E.M. 134, 351, 534
Smith S.H. 39, 132, 178, 342, 394, 510, 523, 533–534
Soggin J.A. 295
Solomon R.C. 27–28, 68, 110, 123, 127, 152, 214, 216, 236, 271, 290, 317, 408, 452, 454, 481, 534
Sordi M. 135–136, 505
Spencer F.S. 122, 534
Spitaler P. 107, 521
Spong J.S. 312–313
Spreafico A. 295
Stabryła S. 364, 534
Stachowiak L. 311, 534
Stalow M. 264, 495
Stamm J.J. 272, 295, 297
Staniek E. 395, 406
Stanton G.N. 237, 239, 354, 487, 534
Starowieyski M. 28, 83, 117, 182, 204, 300, 332, 343, 346, 354, 363–364, 377, 383–384, 386, 388–389, 394, 400–401, 446, 456, 487, 520, 525, 534–535
Starr J. 399, 536
Stasiak S. 144, 178, 535
Stegemann H. 26, 57, 274, 535
Stegemann W. 35, 535
Stemberger G. 16, 19, 263, 265, 270, 280, 282, 287, 442, 498, 535
Sterling G.E. 149, 535
Stern D.H. 140, 144, 282, 535
Stern M. 30, 121, 244, 450, 500, 530, 535
Stern S. 410, 535
Stiller R. 90, 491
Stökl ben Ezra D. 71, 402, 438, 536
Stone M.E. 26, 160, 262, 329, 383, 503, 510, 523, 531
Stoops R. 140, 536
Stopa M. 34, 208, 261, 314, 496, 520, 525
Strack H.L. 370, 536
Strand K. 184, 540
Strange J.F. 30, 371, 384, 536
Strathmann H. 312, 536
Strotmann A. 35, 536
Stroumsa G.G. 354, 487
Strzałkowska B. 174, 267, 328, 516, 537, 541
Studer B. 107, 374, 457, 505, 524
Stuhlmacher P. 98, 536
Stuiber A. 373, 381, 394, 444, 485
Sudolska U. 95, 506
Sumney J.L. 95, 536
Svartvik J. 15, 223, 225–226, 506, 536
Swancutt D.M. 399, 536
Swartley W.M. 196, 536
Swartz M.D. 279, 536
Świderkówna A. 25, 401, 539
Syon D. 486
Szczepaniak M. 287, 498
Szczerbiński W. 267, 537
Szczucka-Kubisz n. 110, 534
Szelest H. 23–24, 496
Szulc F. 384, 537
Szwarc U 18, 111, 141, 162–163, 213, 537
Szymik S. 283, 537
Szymona W. 72, 87, 92, 504, 527

T

Talbert C.H. 79, 537
Talmon S. 98, 536
Tannenbaum R. 338, 528
Tanzer S.J. 87
Taylor J. 42, 79, 229, 355–356, 401–402, 530, 537
Taylor V. 459, 537
Tchernikover V.A. 339
Temporini H. 212, 499
Tepper Y. 437, 537
Testuz M. 394
Theissen G. 34, 185, 537
Thiele F. 72, 220, 537
Thoma C. 21, 278, 538
Thomas R.L. 28, 34, 64, 77, 254, 347, 540
Thordson T. and M. 119, 538
Tigchelaar E. 25–27, 496–497, 538

Tomasetto D. 34, 205, 492
Tomson Peter J. 71, 75–78, 104, 129, 149, 178, 190, 230, 258, 260–261, 265, 273, 282, 342, 344, 362, 446, 475, 486, 488–489, 495, 497–498, 508, 512, 515, 520, 533, 535–536, 538–539
Torrey C.C. 425, 538
Tov 56, 98, 536, 538
Trebolle Barrera J. 166, 538
Tresham A. 291, 538
Trevilco P. 86, 538
Trigg J.W. 450, 452, 538
Troiani L. 21
Tronina A. 26, 129, 304, 535, 538
Tropper A. 448, 538
Turnau J. 90, 539
Tyloch W. 205, 539
Tyszkowski W. 25, 539

U
Ulansey D. 219, 539
Ulrich J. 170, 335, 347, 373, 381, 400, 414, 500, 510, 513, 525, 539, 541
Urbach E.E. 159, 438, 539
Usener H. 306, 539
Uterman A. 141, 539

V
Vallauri E. 309, 539
Valognes J.-P. 385, 539
Van Elderen B. 221, 539
Vandecasteele-Vanneuville F. 154, 492
VanderKam J.C. 119, 539
Verheyden J. 221, 342, 539
Vermes G. 32–33, 38, 41, 76, 93, 111, 257, 265, 298, 395, 539
Vezzol O. 174, 540
Vuong L. 42, 332, 334, 446–447, 527

W
Wacker M.-T. 187, 496
Wagnalls A.W. 386, 505
Walser G. 84, 88, 540
Walton J.H. 64, 540
Warzecha J. 112, 219, 337, 540
Waterhouse S.D. 184, 540
Watson F. 69, 78, 106–107, 201, 468, 540
Watson P. 41, 221–222, 540
Watson W.G.E. 166, 538
Wedderburn A.J.M. 116, 149, 540
Weinfeld M. 120, 540
Weiss W. 179, 540
Weiss Z. 230, 435, 485, 520
Wengst K. 312, 400, 540
Westerholm S. 81–82, 541
Westermann C. 168, 503
White C. 149, 541
Wianowski L. 328, 541
Widła B. 322, 509
Wierszyłowski K. 376, 450, 491
Wiesehöfer J. 435, 541
Wietzman S. 62
Wigoder G. 58
Wilcox M. 124, 541
Wilhoit J.C. 156, 324, 530
Wilk S. 387, 499, 516
Wilken R.L. 205, 541
Willert N. 414, 541
Willet T.W. 330, 541
Williams A.L. 541
Williams F. 159, 541
Williams M.H. 42, 85, 131, 203-204, 215, 458–459, 541–542
Wilson R.M. 322, 542
Wilson R.S. 387, 542
Wilson S.G. 223, 263, 512, 542
Wilson W.T. 206, 542
Windisch H. 91, 542
Winniczuk L. 193, 204, 542
Winston D. 127, 542
Witaszek G. 68, 70, 72, 111, 174, 194, 213, 513, 524, 526, 537, 542
Witczyk H. 174, 209, 542
Wodecki B. 286, 494
Wojciechowski M. 157, 183, 287, 324–325, 542

Wright C.J.H. 31, 196, 542
Wróbel M. 40, 66, 112, 114, 154, 206–207, 209–211, 240, 271, 275–277, 312, 317–320, 322, 325, 396, 414–416, 421–424, 426–428, 430, 432, 457, 512, 526–527, 542–543
Wycisk F. 185, 537
Wysocki M. 411–412, 543

Y
Yardeni A. 62

Z
Zabierowski J. 141, 539
Zakrzewski J. 69, 517
Załęski J. 187, 191, 543
Zarębski P. 107, 374, 457, 505, 524
Zawiszewski E. 111, 151, 355, 543–544
Żebrowski R. 77, 280, 376, 488–490
Zeitlin I.M. 111, 201, 544
Zetterholm K.H. 260, 448, 507
Zetterholm M. 30, 55–56, 84, 97, 124, 142–143, 379, 495, 516, 523, 536, 538, 540, 544
Ziemann E. 387, 516
Zienkiewicz O. 338, 505
Ziffer W. 418, 544
Zimmerli W. 94, 544
Zmarlicki H. 195, 544
Zolli E. 367, 387, 544
Zolli I. 475
Zugibe F.T. 420, 544
Zychowicz J. 195, 315, 504, 515

The separation of Church from Synagogue was not a one-time act, but a long-lasting, multilayered, and diversified process. The attempt to explain this process, namely the process of parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity in the years 30-313 AD, constitutes the main research subject of this publication. The aim of this study is the presentation of the dynamism of Christian–Jewish relations in the first three centuries of the existence of the Church, taking into account mainly historical and theological (but not the only) factors which influenced these relations and finally led to the creation of two separate religions. The two religions existing side by side were in many aspects connected with each other mostly because both originated from biblical Judaism.

Mariusz Rosik received his DD in Biblical Theology at the Pontifical Faculty of Theology in Wrocław (Poland) and his SSL at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. He is a professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Pontifical Faculty of Theology and of Jewish History at the University of Wrocław.

ISBN 978-3-631-76005-5

www.peterlang.com