

ANNETTE YOSHIKO REED

Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism

*Texts and Studies in
Ancient Judaism*
171

Mohr Siebeck

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Edited by

Maren Niehoff (Jerusalem)

Annette Y. Reed (New York, NY)

Seth Schwartz (New York, NY)

Moulie Vidas (Princeton, NJ)

171



Annette Yoshiko Reed

Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism

Collected Essays

Mohr Siebeck

Annette Yoshiko Reed, born 1973; BA from McGill University; MTS from Harvard Divinity School; MA and PhD from Princeton University; currently Associate Professor in the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies and the Program in Religious Studies at New York University.

ISBN 978-3-16-154476-7 / eISBN 978-3-16-156060-6

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156060-6

ISSN 0721-8753 / eISSN 2568-9525 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

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

© 2018 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Times typeface, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

For KunKun
(Alexander Reed Fleming)

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	IX
Primary Sources	XI
Introduction: Historicizing “Jewish-Christianity”	XII

<i>Prolegomenon: Christian Origins as Jewish History</i>	1
--	---

Part I

“Jewish-Christians” and the Historiography of Early Jewish/Christian Relations

<i>Chapter One: “Jewish-Christianity” after the “Parting of the Ways”</i>	15
The “Parting of the Ways” and the History of Scholarship on the Pseudo-Clementines	22
Historiography and Identity in the Pseudo-Clementines	27
Jews, Gentiles, and Salvation-History in <i>Rec.</i> 1.27–71	30
Two Teachers of Truth: Moses and Jesus in <i>Hom.</i> 8.5–7 and <i>Rec.</i> 4.5	38
Demons, Jews, and Gentiles in <i>Hom.</i> 8–11 and <i>Rec.</i> 4–6	42
“Jewish-Christianity” in <i>Hom.</i> 8–11 and <i>Rec.</i> 4–6	48
The Pseudo-Clementines in Their Late Antique Contexts	49
<i>Chapter Two: Beyond “Judaism” and “Christianity” in the Roman Near East</i>	57
Exporting “Christianity” and Other Local Identities	61
Water, Blood, Purity, and Boundaries	67
Mishnah Niddah	69
<i>Didascalia apostolorum</i>	73
Pseudo-Clementine <i>Homilies</i>	76
Blood and Water, Between and Beyond “Religion(s)”	79
Beyond “Judaism” and “Christianity”	81

<i>Chapter Three: “Jewish-Christian” Apocrypha and Jewish/Christian Relations</i>	85
“Jewish-Christian” Apocrypha from the Second and Third Centuries	92
“Jewish-Christian” Apocrypha from the Fourth and Fifth Centuries	104
Revisiting the Problem of “Jewish-Christianity”	110
 <i>Chapter Four: Hellenism and Judaism in “Jewish-Christian” Perspective</i>	117
Greeks vs. “Barbarians” in <i>Homilies</i> 4–6	121
Hellenism in Josephus, Tatian, and <i>Homilies</i> 4–6	125
Judaism in the Debate with Appion and the <i>Homilies</i>	128
<i>Homilies</i> 4–6 and <i>Rec.</i> 10.17–51	132
<i>Homilies</i> 4–6 and the Redaction of the <i>Homilies</i>	136
Remapping “Hellenism” and “Judaism” in Late Antiquity	139
 <i>Chapter Five: Heresy, Minut, and the “Jewish-Christian” Novel</i>	143
The <i>Homilies</i> as Heresiology	148
Histories of “Heresy” in the <i>Homilies</i> and Epiphanius	152
Hellenism and Samaritanism as “Heretical” Paradigms	159
Narrativized Polemics in the <i>Homilies</i> and Rabbinic Literature	166
Heresiology, Identity, and Polemics	173
 <i>Chapter Six: “Jewish-Christianity” as Counterhistory?</i>	175
The Pseudo-Clementines and the History of the Apostolic Age	178
The <i>Homilies</i> and Eusebius’ <i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	182
Apostolic Succession and the Transmission of Truth	186
Primordial Truth, Jewish Succession, and Apostolic Teaching	187
The Apostolic Mission	194
Peter, Paul, and Clement of Rome	196
“Orthodoxy” and “Heresy”	199
“Jewish-Christianity”	202
History and Counterhistory	206

Part II

“Jewish-Christianity” in Jewish History and Jewish Studies

<i>Chapter Seven: Messianism between Judaism and Christianity</i>	217
Messianism and Difference	220
Jewish Messianism and Christian Self-Definition	225

Jewish Identities and “Jewish-Christian” Counterhistories	232
Modern Counterhistories of Christianity and Jewish Messianism	240
Christianity and the Messiahs of Judaism	249

Chapter Eight: Secrecy, Suppression, and the Jewishness of Christian Origins 255

Ferdinand Christian Baur on Petrine “Jewish-Christianity,” Lost and Rediscovered	260
John Toland on Censored “Apocrypha” and the Secret (Jewish) History of Christianity	264
Secrecy and the Transmission of Torah and Truth in the <i>Epistle of Peter to James</i> and the <i>Homilies</i>	269
From the Christian Reception of the <i>Epistle of Peter to James</i> to Its Modern Jewish Afterlives	281
Censorship between Cultural Amnesia and Cultural Creativity	293

Chapter Nine: When Did Rabbis Become Pharisees? 295

Matthew 23 in the “Shadow of Yavneh”	301
Contextualizing Matthew 23: Rabbinic and Epigraphical Data	307
Early Christian Perspectives on Matthew 23 and Pharisees	312
“Jewish-Christian” Re-readings of Matthew’s Pharisees	320
“Jewish-Christian” Evidence for Jewish History?	328

Chapter Ten: Rethinking “Jewish-Christian” Evidence for Jewish Mysticism 331

Christianity in the Historiography of Jewish Mysticism	334
“Jewish-Christian” Evidence for Jewish Mysticism?	341
Rereading Ps.-Clem. <i>Hom.</i> 17.7	346
From Parallels to Contexts	358

Chapter Eleven: The Modern Jewish Rediscovery of “Jewish-Christianity” 361

The Pseudo-Clementines, John Toland, and the Modern Invention of “Jewish-Christianity”	364
Heinrich Graetz and the Jewishness of “Jewish-Christians”	371
Augustus Neander, <i>Gnosis</i> , and “Jewish-Christianity”	377
Remembering and Forgetting “Jewish-Christianity” and <i>Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>	386

<i>Epilogue: After “Origins,” Beyond “Identity,” and Before “Religion(s)”</i>	389
After “Origins”	394
Beyond “Identity”	401
Before “Religion(s)”	422
Looking Ahead	435
 <i>Appendix A: Timeline of Key Texts, Figures, and Events</i>	439
<i>Appendix B: Annotated Bibliography on “Jewish-Christianity”</i>	444
<i>Appendix C: Ioudaios before and after “Religion”</i>	474
<i>Appendix D: “Jew” and the Making of the Christian Gaze</i>	481
 Index of Sources	489
Author Index	503

Abbreviations

AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AJS Review</i>	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
<i>Apoc</i>	<i>Apocrypha</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
<i>CH</i>	<i>Church History</i>
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller
<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
<i>HT</i>	<i>History and Theory</i>
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JAJ</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JJTP</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Jewish Social Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
JTSA	Jewish Theological Seminary of America
<i>MTSR</i>	<i>Method & Theory in the Study of Religion</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NTA</i>	<i>New Testament Apocrypha</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
PL	Patrologia Latina
<i>PT</i>	<i>Poetics Today</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des Études Juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>

SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLSymS	SBL Symposium Series
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses</i>
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia Post-biblica
SUNY	State University of New York
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
TSMJ	Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAC	<i>Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Primary Sources

<i>I Apol.</i>	Justin, <i>I Apology</i>
<i>I Clem.</i>	<i>I Clement</i>
<i>Adv. haer.</i>	Irenaeus, <i>Adversus Haereses</i>
<i>Adv. Jud.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Judaeos</i>
<i>Adv. Marc.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Marcionem</i>
<i>Alm.</i>	Ptolemy, <i>Almagest</i>
<i>Apoc. Pet.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>
<i>Barn.</i>	<i>Epistle of Barnabus</i>
<i>Cels.</i>	Origen, <i>Contra Celsum</i>
<i>Comm. Jo.</i>	Origen, <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i>
<i>Comm. Matt.</i>	Origen, <i>Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei</i>
<i>De mens.</i>	Epiphanius, <i>De mensuris</i>
<i>De myst.</i>	Iamblichus, <i>De Mysteriis Aegyptiorum</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	Justin, <i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i>
<i>Did. apost.</i>	<i>Didascalia apostolorum</i>
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
<i>Ep. Pet.</i>	<i>Epistle of Peter to James</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	Augustine, <i>Epistles</i>
<i>Epist.</i>	Jerome, <i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Haer.</i>	Hippolytus, <i>Refutatio omnium haeresium</i>
<i>Hist. eccl.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>
<i>Hist. Rom.</i>	Cassius Dio, <i>Historia Romana</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Histories</i>
<i>Hom. Cant.</i>	Origen, <i>Homiliae in Canticum</i>
<i>Hom. Matt.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaeum</i>
<i>Hom.</i>	Pseudo-Clementine <i>Homilies</i>
<i>Magn.</i>	Ignatius, <i>Letter to the Magnesians</i>
<i>Mon.</i>	Tertullian, <i>De monogamia</i>
<i>Odes Sol.</i>	<i>Odes of Solomon</i>
<i>Or.</i>	Tertullian, <i>De oration</i>
<i>Paed.</i>	Clement, <i>Paedagogus</i>
<i>Pan.</i>	Epiphanius, <i>Panarion</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	Ignatius, <i>Letter to the Philadelphians</i>
<i>Praep. ev.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>
<i>Praescr.</i>	Tertullian, <i>De praescriptione haereticorum</i>
<i>Prot. Jas.</i>	<i>Protevangelium of James</i>
<i>Ps.-Clem.</i>	Pseudo-Clementine
<i>Ptol.</i>	Ptolemy
<i>Rec.</i>	Pseudo-Clementine <i>Recognitions</i>
<i>Res. mort.</i>	Tertullian, <i>De resurrectione mortuorum</i>
<i>Rom.</i>	Ignatius, <i>Letter to the Romans</i>
<i>Sat.</i>	Juvenal, <i>Satires</i>
<i>Strom.</i>	Clement of Alexandria, <i>Stromateis</i>
<i>Vir. ill.</i>	Jerome, <i>De viris illustribus</i>

Introduction

Historicizing “Jewish-Christianity”

The term “Jewish-Christianity” is a modern invention.¹ Unlike “Jew,” “Christian,” “heretic,” or “Judaizing,” the adjective “Jewish-Christian” finds no ancient counterpart as a self-claimed identity-label or even as a term of accusation.² Today, it is commonly used to denote premodern texts, sects, and figures that cultivated messianic beliefs in Jesus while maintaining some meaningfully central commitment to Jewish practice and the people Israel.³ This phenomenon is

* Parts of this argument were first presented at Fordham University as “Problems in Defining ‘Jewish-Christianity’: Taxonomy and Terminology before ‘Religion’ and beyond ‘Identity,’” 30 November 2016. I am grateful to James Carleton Paget, Andrew S. Jacobs, Jae Han, and Shaul Magid for comments and critiques.

¹ See further F. Stanley Jones, ed., *Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur* (History of Biblical Studies 5; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012).

² An argument for a possible precedent in Jerome, *Comm. Zech.* 3.14.19 is made by Simon Claude Mimouni, *Le judéo-christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1998), 62; that this is based in a misinterpretation of the passage, however, has been shown by James Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish-Christians* (WUNT 251; Tübingen: Mohr, 2010), 289. Oskar Skarsaune argues for some precedents for the term in references to “Jewish believers” (Origen, *Cels.* 2.1), “believing Jews” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.5.2), and related designations (John 8:31; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.22.8; 6.25.4); “Jewish Believers in Antiquity,” in *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 3–6. Even if we were to grant a maximalist reading to this handful of examples as reflecting some set terminology with an established taxonomic sense in ancient times, it remains that – as Edwin Broadhead notes – “we have no examples of the term used as a self-reference in antiquity”; *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity* (WUNT 266; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 29. To be sure, early scholarship on “Jewish-Christianity” often used the term interchangeably with “Ebionism,” but this usage has been abandoned since it imposes an overly monolithic reading on the diverse relevant sources. There are no surviving sources, moreover, that use “Ebionite” as a term of self-definition.

³ Many such definitions treat Torah observance as a necessary condition. Mimouni, for instance, defines the term as denoting those Jews who believe in Jesus as messiah and continue to live by the laws of the Torah; “Pour une définition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme ancien,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 161–86. So too for Patricia Crone: “‘Jewish Christianity’ is a modern term for the beliefs of those followers of Jesus who saw devotion to Jesus as part of God’s covenant with Israel, not as a transfer of God’s promise of salvation from the Jews to the gentiles. Some of them regarded Jesus as a prophet, others saw him as a heavenly power, but all retained their Jewish identity and continued to observe the law”; “Jewish Christianity and the Qur’ān (Part One),” *JNES* 74 (2015): 225. Contrast the more open-ended formulation by Edwin Broadhead: “persons and groups in antiquity whose historical profile suggests that they both follow Jesus and maintain Jewishness and that they do so as a continuation of God’s covenant with Israel” (*Jewish Ways of Following Jesus*, 56).

typically associated with the very earliest stages of Christian history, most proximate to the Jewish origins of Christianity. Appeals to "Jewish-Christianity" often conjure the possibility of recovering something of the Jesus Movement when it still remained culturally and demographically close to its roots in the Land of Israel – prior to the construction of "Christian" identities in contradistinction from "Jewish" identities. Thereafter, "Jewish-Christianity" is figured as a marginal position: those whom late antique Christian heresiologists condemned as *too* "Jewish" to count as *really* "Christian" (e. g., Ebionites; Nazarenes/Nazaraeans) are also those deemed "dangerous ones in between" by modern scholars who wish to retell the early history of Christianity as the tale of its emergence as a "religion" distinct from "Judaism."⁴

The present volume is not a comprehensive synthesis or survey of the data for "Jewish-Christianity."⁵ It is shaped, rather, by three specific aims. First is to bring further attention to a cluster of fascinating but understudied late antique texts and traditions that do not fit neatly into present-day notions of "Christianity" as distinct from "Judaism." Second is to help lay the textual, historiographical, theoretical, and bibliographical groundwork for their further integration into the study of Late Antiquity, on the one hand, and into Jewish Studies, on the other. Third is to use the very rubric of "Jewish-Christianity" as a lens through which to probe the power and limits of our own scholarly practices of sorting and studying "religions."

Recent insights into the continued fluidity and overlaps of "Christian" and "Jewish" identities have sparked new debates about how best to define "Jewish-Christianity" and whether to reject the term altogether.⁶ Scholarship on Christian Origins now emphasizes connections to Jewishness across the entire continuum of the Jesus Movement, thus raising questions about whether the designation is simply superfluous for the early period. The decline in the use of this term in New Testament Studies, in turn, has served to expose some an-

⁴ The relevant heresiological and other Patristic evidence is handily collected in Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn and Gerrit J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NovTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 95–281. The parallel with modern scholarly practice is made already by John G. Gager, "Jews, Christians, and the Dangerous Ones in Between," in *Interpretation in Religion*, ed. Shlomo Biderman and Ben-Ami Scharfstein (Philosophy and Religion 2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 249–57. It is in this sense, moreover, that Daniel Boyarin more recently mounts his argument for dismissing the term "Jewish-Christianity" as irredeemably heresiological in "Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (to Which Is Appended a Correction of My *Border Lines*)," *JQR* 99 (2009): 7–36 – on which see further below.

⁵ For a comprehensive survey, see most recently Dominique Bernard, *Les disciples juifs de Jésus du Ier siècle à Mahomet: Recherches sur le mouvement ébionite* (Paris: Cerf, 2017).

⁶ See further James Carleton Paget, "Jewish Christianity," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 3: *The Early Roman Period*, ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 733–42; Carleton Paget, "The Definition of the Terms Jewish Christian and Jewish Christianity in the History of Research," in Skarsaune and Hvalvik, *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, 22–54.

alytical difficulties in its traditional application to later materials as well. For instance, as common as it has been to read the Jewishness of “Jewish-Christian” as denoting ethnicity, it remains – as Charlotte Fonrobert reminds us – that our texts are rarely forthcoming on issues of genealogical lineage, thus leaving scholars to speculate on the somewhat problematic basis of their own assumptions of the beliefs or practices to which this or that ethnic group might have been more predisposed.⁷ Likewise, as common as it is to tie the Jewishness of “Jewish-Christianity” to Torah-observance, it remains – as James Carleton Paget reminds us – “unclear which parts of the law should be kept in order to make someone a Jewish Christian.”⁸ To set a singular definition of the Jewishness of “Jewish-Christianity,” moreover, is to identify a single feature as “the hard core of a given class of religion” in a manner that denies it “change over time” – as Matt Jackson-McCabe has noted.⁹ And to do so for Jewishness, in particular, bears problematic resonance with longstanding scholarly habits of studying Judaism as the purportedly static background to an evolving Christianity.

Despite these difficulties, Fonrobert has suggested that “our understanding of the formation of Jewish and Christian collective identities as separate identities depends on developing an intelligible way of discussing the phenomenon called ‘Jewish Christianity,’ one that is not marred by Christian theological prejudices, nor by unexamined assumptions about either ‘Jewish’ identity formation or its ‘Christian’ counterpart.”¹⁰ If this task has proved difficult in practice, it is perhaps for reasons that are themselves quite revealing. Scholars have tended to reconstruct the beliefs and practices of “Jewish-Christians” primarily from the New Testament when discussing the early period. For the later period, however, they depend largely on secondhand Patristic reports that denounce such positions to promote their own visions of what should properly be deemed “Christian.”¹¹

⁷ Charlotte Fonrobert, “The *Didascalia Apostolorum*: A Mishnah for the Disciples of Jesus,” *JECS* 9 (2001): 483–509 at 499–502. See also Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 26–28.

⁸ Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 25.

⁹ Matt Jackson-McCabe, “What’s in a Name,” in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Re-thinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 7–38 at 36.

¹⁰ Fonrobert, “*Didascalia Apostolorum*,” 484.

¹¹ My point about heresiology here refers to the narrower definitions of “Jewish-Christianity” which have tended to predominate particularly within studies that include its late antique expressions and which most shape the current discussion. Notably, there is also another line of definition and discussion – from Albert Schweigler in the nineteenth century to Jean Daniélou in the twentieth century – that adopts a more expansive sense of “Jewish-Christianity,” not limited to heresiological tropes but encompassing a broad variety of “thought-forms” as well as practices. This line of research, however, tends to be focused on the first two centuries CE and on claims about the Jewishness of “primitive” Christianity. Accordingly, it has been less influential in recent decades as Christianity’s originary Jewishness has increasingly become a matter of consensus within New Testament Studies. For further examples, see Appendix B below. I thank James Carleton Paget for pushing me on this point.

Normative concerns can be thereby imported unintentionally, together with the crypto-heresiological presumption that "Jewish-Christianity" is ultimately an improper expression of the Jewish heritage of the Church – potentially authentic in the early period but self-evidently anachronistic thereafter. The very selectivity of sources conventionally privileged in the study of "Jewish-Christianity" thus transposes normative claims into historical assertions and predetermines the conclusion of Christianity's diminishing Jewishness. Partly as a result, moreover, even the *Jewishness* of "Jewish-Christianity" has been defined almost wholly from a Christian perspective and in terms of Christian history – typically centered on the depiction of Peter, James, the Jerusalem Church, and "circumcision party" in the New Testament, on the one hand, and the depiction of Ebionites and Nazarenes/Nazoraeans by Epiphanius and other late antique heresiologists, on the other.¹²

The proliferation of publications on the topic attests a renewed interest in "Jewish-Christianity," variously defined.¹³ But it remains that the topic is almost always discussed as part of the diversity or dynamics of Christianity.¹⁴ The vast majority of specialist studies on "Jewish-Christianity" have been penned by and for those trained in the specialist study of the New Testament – and under the assumption that the significance of "Jewish-Christianity" is largely limited to the period of Christian Origins, prior to a presumed "Parting of the Ways" with Judaism in late first or early second century CE.¹⁵ Even the fascinating new lines

¹² That one of the factors that distinguishes "Jewish-Christianity," for instance from "Judaizing," is the continuity with Peter, James, and the Jerusalem Church of the apostolic age is assumed in the conventional narrative of its rise and fall. This narrative is nicely summarized by Georg Strecker: "Jewish Christianity, according to the witness of the New Testament, stands at the beginning of the development of church history, so that it is not the gentile Christian 'ecclesiastical doctrine' that represents what is primary, but rather a Jewish Christian theology. This fact was forgotten quite early in the ecclesiastical heresiological tradition. The Jewish Christians usually were classified as 'Ebionites' in the ecclesiastical catalogues of sects or else, in a highly one-sided presentation, they were deprecated as an insignificant minority by comparison with the 'great church.' Thus implicitly the idea of apostasy from the ecclesiastical doctrine also was applied to them"; "Appendix 1: On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," in Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. and trans. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Kroedel (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 245. Joan Taylor demonstrates the problems with assuming that such continuity is necessary for the Jewishness of "Jewish-Christianity" to be authentic, and she makes a case for extricating them: "There is no doubt that Jewish-Christians, defined as Christian Jews and their Gentile converts who maintained Jewish praxis, existed throughout the first four centuries of the Christian Church, and indeed, for all we know, for many centuries afterward." Taylor argues nonetheless that "Jewish-Christianity was not ... a multi-fibrous strand of heterodox sectarianism unravelling from the Jerusalem community via Pella"; "The Phenomenon of Jewish Christianity," *VC* 44 (1990): 314–15.

¹³ See further Appendix B below.

¹⁴ On the language of "diversity" and what hides and conveys, see Karen King, "Factions, Variety, Diversity, Multiplicity: Representing Early Christian Differences for the 21st Century," *MTSR* 23 (2011): 216–37, as well as my discussion in the Epilogue below.

¹⁵ For a particularly sophisticated example, see Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity Re-*

of research on the modern genealogy of current scholarship on "Jewish-Christianity" have focused almost wholly on Christian thinkers. Surprisingly rare, by comparison, is any sustained engagement with Jewish comparanda and the discourses about identity, history, and difference therein.¹⁶

The present volume collects and extends the results of over a decade of my experiments in reorienting research on "Jewish-Christianity" so as to relativize and recontextualize the representation of Jews and Jewishness in Patristic literature, while also engaging Jewish sources, trajectories of Jewish history, and questions from and about Jewish Studies. I thus set aside the scholarly habit of privileging the secondhand reports about Ebionites and Nazoraeans by late antique heresiologists like Epiphanius.¹⁷ I focus instead on the firsthand witness of those writings that have been traditionally studied under the rubric of "Jewish-Christianity." Instead of assuming the New Testament as my primary reference point for assessing "Jewish-Christianity," I here raise questions about possible links to Rabbinic, Hekhalot, and other Jewish literature as well. Rather than framing my questions solely in terms set by Ferdinand Christian Baur, Adolph von Harnack, and other formative figures for New Testament Studies and Church History, I look also to Heinrich Graetz, Kauffman Kohler, Gershom Scholem, and other formative figures in Jewish Studies.

Foremost among these firsthand sources are the Pseudo-Clementines – a corpus of Greek novels and epistles from fourth-century Syria that have long been studied as the main source for firsthand expressions of "Jewish-Christianity."¹⁸

considered. An important exception to the typical orientation toward "origins," however, is the work of F. Stanley Jones, who has increasingly looked to third-century Syro-Mesopotamia as a locus for the development of "Jewish-Christian" perspectives, especially in tension with Marcionism; see especially now *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 152–71, 359–52.

¹⁶ Charlotte Fonrobert and Burton Visotzky are important exceptions to this general pattern – and much of the inspiration for the present volume. See esp. Visotzky, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish-Christianities in Rabbinic Literature," in Visotzky, *Fathers of the World: Essays in Rabbinic and Patristic Literatures* (WUNT 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 129–49; Fonrobert, "*Didascalia Apostolorum*," 484–87; Fonrobert, "Jewish Christians, Judaizers, and Christian Anti-Judaism," in *A People's History of Christianity*, volume 2: *Late Ancient Christianity*, ed. Virginia Burrus and Rebecca Lyman (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 234–55. As noted below in Chapters Seven, Eight, and Eleven, however, there are a number of precedents in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century research. For more on this dynamic and its ramifications, see my discussion in the Epilogue below.

¹⁷ On Ebionites, see further Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 325–82; Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 513–16.

¹⁸ Strecker is representative in noting that the focus has conventionally fallen on "the legalistic Jewish Christianity situated in Greek-speaking Syria," as attested by "[1] the indirect witness of the *Didascalia* and then [2] the Jewish Christian *Kerygmata Petrou* ('Proclamations' or 'Sermons of Peter'; abbreviated KP) source of the Pseudo-Clementines, and compare our results with [3] the so-called ecclesiastical position, which in this instance means with the statements about Ebionitism made by the ecclesiastical heresiologists"; "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity," 245. Here, I focus on the Pseudo-Clementines in their received forms,

Instead of culling them for clues about the apostolic age, I situate them in Late Antiquity, and I investigate their representations of Jews, Jewishness, and Christianity’s Jewish past. I seek to bring them into conversation with Rabbinic and other Jewish sources from Late Antiquity, and I also ask whether these and other “Jewish-Christian apocrypha”¹⁹ might shed light on topics of enduring interest within Jewish Studies – ranging from messianism, mysticism, and Rabbinization to the politics of the past in *Wissenschaft des Judentums*. In the process, I use a focus on these sources to expose the degree to which past scholarly narratives about Jewish/Christian relations have been structured and constrained by Christian authors – from Eusebius and Epiphanius to Baur and Harnack.

Perhaps precisely because “Jewish-Christianity” is an anachronistic, clumsy, fraught, and contested category, I propose that it proves useful as a site for reassessing some of the interpretative habits that we take most for granted. Its definition has been much debated. Even the perceived need for such a hybrid term points powerfully to the limits of modern taxonomies of “religions” for describing all of our premodern data. Just as the heresiological discourse surrounding Ebionites in Late Antiquity aided in the initial construction of an ideal of a pure “Christianity” separate from “Judaism,”²⁰ so the modern practice of labeling sources as “Jewish-Christian” often permits scholars to marginalize those very sources that most expose the anachronism of our current notions of “Christian” identities and “Jewish” identities as always and inevitably mutually exclusive.

Precisely as a result of this modern marginalization, the premodern materials commonly compartmentalized under the rubric of “Jewish-Christianity” provide an especially powerful reservoir of resources for complicating our modern labeling and sorting of premodern religious identities. Almost by definition, after all, these materials resist reduction to our scholarly narratives about religions as distinct, commensurable, and bounded entities with discrete histories that interact only in moments of conflict, reaction, or influence. Attention to the theorization of identity, history, and difference *within* these sources can thus help to relativize the Christian heresiological and other Patristic discourses of difference-making that presaged the modern Western category of “religion” –

and I also draw upon more recent studies expanding the category to include works like the *Didache* as well as so-called “Old Testament pseudepigrapha” like the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Ascension of Isaiah*, *5 Ezra*, and *6 Ezra*, and “NT apocrypha” like the *Apocalypse of Peter*, *Protevangelium of James*, and *Ethiopian Book of the Cock*. See Chapter Three below.

¹⁹ On the category of “NT/Christian apocrypha” – which, like “Jewish-Christianity,” is in essence a modern category – see my discussion of its genealogy in “The Afterlives of New Testament Apocrypha,” *JBL* 134 (2015): 401–25. On “Jewish-Christian apocrypha,” see Chapters Three and Eight below.

²⁰ See especially Jerome’s description of Ebionites as *semi-christianus* and *semi-iudaeus* in *Comm. Gal.* 3.13–14.

not least by drawing attention to their overwriting of Jewish and other discourses of difference-making.²¹

As a classificatory rubric, the category of “Jewish-Christian” is problematic in many ways. But it is problematic – I here suggest – in some ways that enable its special utility as a heuristic irritant: those premodern sources that most defy our modern notions of “Christianity” as separate, by definition, from “Judaism” can push us to think out and beyond some of the systems and practices of classification that we most take for granted. Even its anachronism may bear some analytical utility, serving as an invitation to revisit the geneologies of the modern notions of “Christianity” and “Judaism” that structure and constrain our current historiographies of “religion(s).”

The Strategic Heurism of “Jewish-Christianity”?

For the purposes of the present volume, I choose to retain the term “Jewish-Christianity” as strategically useful for our current scholarly moment – at least when used with a sharp awareness of its power and limits for our own scholarly practices of [1] reading, writing, and categorizing sources, [2] deciding which sources are representative or otherwise worthy of attention, [3] delimiting which sources do and do not count as relevant contextualizing comparanda for others, and [4] selecting which sources to use as dots to connect in our scholarly narratives about trajectories of change and development (and which to dismiss as outliers). It is critical – as Joan Taylor reminds us – not to imagine the contours of our modern category as mapping directly upon a single unified ancient group or movement.²² And it is also critical – as David Frankfurter stresses – not to use the term as a way to avoid or isolate evidence for the broad range of different types of ways that features of identity that we now deem “Christian” do and do not overlap or draw upon features of identity that we now deem “Jewish.”²³ Likewise – with Daniel Boyarin – we must be wary of the apologetic work that this (and other such) categories can *do*.²⁴

Inasmuch as the term presumes a need to mark certain expressions of “Christianity” as *too* “Jewish” to be called *just* “Christian,” it functions to naturalize

²¹ This issue is taken up in more detail in my Epilogue below.

²² Taylor, “Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity.”

²³ David Frankfurter, “Beyond ‘Jewish-Christianity’: Continuing Religious Sub-cultures of the Second and Third Centuries,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 134–35.

²⁴ So especially Daniel Boyarin, *Judaism* (Key Words in Jewish Studies; New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, forthcoming). Note also my comments in “Categorization, Collection, and the Construction of Continuity: 1 Enoch and 3 Enoch in and beyond ‘Apocalypticism’ and ‘Mysticism,’” *MTSR* 29 (2017): 268–311.

an understanding of "Christianity" as essentially or inevitably distinct from "Judaism." Since the development of academic research on the topic in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German Protestant scholarship, the term has thus served, in practice, either to mark off a distinct "party" and a certain early era in which an overlap could nevertheless "still" exist (e. g., as for F. C. Baur)²⁵ and/or to bracket certain texts, figures, or groups as isolated from a mainstream of development and as irrelevant for understanding the history of "Christianity" *per se* (e. g., as for Adolf Harnack).²⁶

But the more scholars in the later twentieth century came to emphasize that "everyone in the first generation of Christianity was Jewish-Christian" (e. g., as Helmut Koester put it),²⁷ the more postapostolic "Jewish-Christianity" came to be perceived as a "problem" (e. g., as Georg Strecker put it).²⁸ To deploy the term in the context of the scholarly discussion of Christianity is therefore to make a normative judgment about what constitutes the Jewishness that goes beyond the bounds of what *should* be called "Christian" – and *when*.

²⁵ Ferdinand Christian Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulischen Christentums in der alten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4 (1831): 61–206. See further David Lincicum, "F. C. Baur's Place in the Study of Jewish Christianity," in Jones, *Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity*, 137–66.

²⁶ Harnack argues as follows: "[1] Original Christianity was in appearance Christian Judaism, the creation of a universal religion on Old Testament soil The heritage which Christianity took over from Judaism, shews itself on Gentile Christian soil, in fainter or distincter form, in proportion as the philosophic mode of thought already prevails, or recedes into the background. To describe the appearance of the Jewish, Old Testament, heritage in the Christian faith, so far as it is a religious one, by the name 'Jewish Christianity' ... must therefore necessarily lead to error, and it has done so to a very great extent [A]ll Christianity, insofar as something alien is not foisted into it, appears as the religion of Israel perfected and spiritualized There is no boundary here; for Christianity took possession of the whole of Judaism as religion Whenever the universalism of Christianity is not violated in favor of the Jewish nation, we have to recognize every appropriation of the Old Testament as Christian [2] But the Jewish religion is a national religion, and Christianity burst the bounds of nationality, though not for all who recognized Jesus and Messiah. This gives the point at which the introduction of the term 'Jewish Christianity' is appropriate. It should be applied exclusively to those Christians who really maintained in their whole extent, or in some measure, even if it were to a minimum degree, the national and political forms of Judaism and the observance of Mosaic law in its literary sense, as essential to Christianity, at least to the Christianity of born Jews, or who, though rejecting these forms, nevertheless assumed a prerogative of the Jewish people even in Christianity (*Hom.* 11:26). To this Jewish Christianity is opposite, not Gentile Christianity, but the Christian religion ... that is, the main body of Christendom insofar as it has freed itself from Judaism as a nation A history of Jewish Christianity and its doctrines does not, therefore, belong to the history of dogma"; "Appendix: The Christianity of the Jewish Christians," in *History of Dogma*, vol. 1, trans. Neil Buchanan (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1895 [1885]), 287–317.

²⁷ Helmut Koester, "ΤΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of the Early Church," *HTR* 53 (1965): 380.

²⁸ I.e., in the title to his Appendix to the 1964 revised edition of Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934), published in English as "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity."

As noted above, this pattern in the modern usage of “Jewish-Christianity” thus recalls the function of “Ebionites” in late antique Christian heresiology: when Epiphanius and others discuss Ebionites, their task is not descriptively ethnographical, but rather – as Andrew Jacobs has shown – “the question of incorporation and exclusion is paramount: What part of Judaism remains in Christianity?”²⁹ Largely because of this parallel, Boyarin makes a compelling argument to abandon the term “Jewish-Christianity” altogether:

“Jewish Christianity” always functions as a term of art in a modernist heresiology: It is a marker of the too Jewish side of the Goldilocks fairytale that is “ordinary” Christianity I propose that any definition of “Jewish Christianity” implies an entire theory of the development of early Christianity and Judaism My case for abandoning this term is an argument in three movements. In the first movement, I will present evidence and discuss evidence already given for the claim that there is never in premodern times a term that non-Christian Jews use to refer to their “religion,” that *Ioudaismos* is, indeed, not a religion ... and that consequently it cannot be hyphenated in any meaningful way. In the second movement, I will try to show that the self-understanding of Christians of Christianity as a religion was slow developing as well and that a term such as “Jewish Christian” (or rather its ancient equivalents, Nazorean, Ebionite) was part and parcel of that development itself and thus *eo ipso*, and not merely factitiously, a heresiological term of art. In the third movement, I will try to show that even the most critical, modern, and best-willed usages of the term in scholarship devolve willy-nilly to heresiology.³⁰

I will return to discuss his argument about “Judaism,” “Christianity,” and “religion” in more detail in the Epilogue to this volume. For now, it suffices to note that I find the conceptual issues surrounding “Jewish-Christianity” to be especially productive for the same reasons that Boyarin finds them especially problematic.

My concern here is with the range of ways that the term *functions*. Boyarin is certainly correct in describing and diagnosing its most common uses, as we have seen above. And to the degree that these are articulated from within Christian frameworks of difference-making, they may well be fated to “devolve willy-nilly to heresiology.” I would like to suggest, however, that the past and potential functions of the term “Jewish-Christianity” are not necessarily limited to this particular set. When one takes a broader purview on the history of research – looking before Baur and beyond the bounds of nineteenth-century German Protestant NT scholarship and its secular academic heirs – one can glimpse some other possibilities. Accordingly, I would like to make a case for its continued usefulness (at least for the present moment) with reference to the different ways that the category functions in three quite different contexts: [1] early eighteenth-century

²⁹ Andrew S. Jacobs, *Epiphanius of Cyprus: A Cultural Biography of Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016), 91.

³⁰ Boyarin, “Rethinking Jewish Christianity,” 8.

English Deism, [2] *Wissenschaft des Judentums* in nineteenth-century Germany, and [3] Jewish Studies and Reform Judaism in early twentieth-century America.

The first is exemplified by John Toland, who invented the term.³¹ Significantly, he did not do so for heresiological aims or with secondhand reports about Ebionites as his structuring analytical framework. Rather, he privileged the positions in newly-published “apocrypha” at his time like the *Epistle of Peter to James*, Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, and *Gospel of Barnabas*, and he was especially attuned to their blurring of those very boundaries that so concerned the Church Fathers. His coinage of the term was thus intended precisely to destabilize Christianity as a distinct “religion” – and especially to undermine the authority of those late antique ecclesiarchs and early modern clerics who gained power from policing distinctions like “apocrypha”/Scripture, “heresy”/“orthodoxy,” and “Christian”/“Muslim”/“Jew.”³² Toland did so, moreover, at a pivotal moment for the construction of what we now take for granted as the taxonomy of “religions.”³³

It is in this sense that we might look back to Toland for a poignant example of what this category can *do* – and take inspiration to return to rethink the results of the imposition of modern notions of “religion” on our understanding of pre-modern sources. I explore this possibility further in the Epilogue to this volume. For now, it suffices to note that my argument for retaining the term is therefore both complimentary and inverse to Boyarin’s argument to jettison it: whereas he makes the case that “Jewish-Christianity” should be abandoned because “Judaism” is anachronistic, I here suggest that the debate about “Jewish-Christianity” can help us to see some of what is effaced by the imposition of modern senses of “Judaism” and “Christianity” on the full range of our ancient sources – and what is also occluded by the very privileging of classification as an explanatory act. Furthermore, “Jewish-Christianity” was invented at an important modern moment for the construction and naturalization of the very notion of “religions.” Attention to its genealogy may thus prove especially promising as a means by which to revisit and reassess our present presumptions and practices.

The second is exemplified by Heinrich Graetz.³⁴ For his massive and influential *History of the Jewish People*, he drew upon the discussion of “Jewish-Christians” among Baur and other nineteenth-century German Protestant scholars. He did so, however, largely as an entry-point for appropriating early Christian sources for writing Jewish history and reinterpreting Christianity – even beyond

³¹ See the discussion of Toland in Chapters Eight and Eleven below.

³² This aim is not incompatible, in my view, with his aim to recover authentic Christianity from antiquity; see Matt Jackson-McCabe, “The Invention of Jewish Christianity in John Toland’s *Nazarenus*,” in Jones, *Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity*, 69–90, and discussion in Chapters Eight and Eleven below.

³³ See further Peter Harrison, *“Religion” and the Religions in the English Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

³⁴ See the discussion of Graetz in Chapters Seven and Eleven below.

Jesus and after Paul – from within a Jewish framework and perspective. For Graetz, "Jewish-Christians" serve to remap the Jewish people as encompassing some of what Baur et al. took for granted as belonging to Christian Origins and Church History. What "Jewish-Christianity" *does* for Graetz, thus, provides an interesting precedent and model as well. Just as Toland's invention of the term "Jewish-Christianity" subverts the distinction of "religions" at a key moment in their modern reification, so too Graetz writes about "Jewish-Christians" as part of the Jewish people at a key moment for the importation of Christian ideas about "Judaism" into an ostensibly neutral and objective scholarly discourse about the history of "religions." It is perhaps not coincidental that Graetz's use of this hybrid category resists the reduction of Jewishness merely to what was deemed "religious" by analogy to Christianity – not least by turning the tables and retelling parts of the story of Christian Origins as actually a story about the Jewish people.

The third is exemplified by Kaufmann Kohler, who went even further in this direction.³⁵ Whereas Graetz was writing in the wake of Baur, Kohler was writing after Baur's positions had been marginalized by Adolph von Harnack's pointed exclusion of "Jewish-Christianity" from the study of Church History. To the degree that Harnack laid the groundwork for repurposing "Jewish-Christian" as a label for marking, collecting, and isolating those sources that express more or different affiliations to Jewish traditions than those that deemed properly "Christian," he thus facilitated the consultation and use of these very sources by Jewish scholars interested in using Christian sources to fill the gaps in the history of Jewish thought and practice – as did Kohler for the *Didache*, *Didascalia apostolorum*, and the Pseudo-Clementines (and, by extension and most famously, the *Apostolic Constitutions*). And as for Kohler, so too today: the very label "Jewish-Christian" does the opposite work for Jewish Studies than it does for Church History – functioning not as a term of *exclusion* but rather a term signaling those Christian sources that bear the most potential for *inclusion* in the historiography of Jews and Judaism.

I have no aim to define "Jewish-Christianity" in any sense meant to suggest a direct one-on-one correlation to an ancient group or movement. I quite agree with those scholars who have argued against the accuracy of "Jewish-Christianity" as a *descriptive* category. My suggestion, rather, is that it may remain useful as a *redescriptive* category – at least for some purposes. For the purposes of this particular volume, I thus adopt a definition that is oriented toward maximizing its usefulness for reassessing the history of early Jewish/Christian relations, on the one hand, and for rethinking modern scholarly practices and presumptions about "Judaism" and "Christianity," on the other. In what follows, "Jewish-Christian" is used to denote those premodern figures, sects, and sources which can be mean-

³⁵ See the discussion of Kohler and further references in Chapter Eight.

ingfully defined as both "Jewish" and "Christian" and which thus do not fit into a modern taxonomic system that treats "Judaism" and "Christianity" as mutually exclusive. By virtue of this definition, I set aside the task of telling any singular history of "Jewish-Christianity," and I attend instead to the potential of these sources to unsettle the narrowly presentist narratives commonly told of the Jewish and Christian past. In this, my ultimate aim is to try to tell a more capacious tale about identity and difference in Late Antiquity – a tale which is not limited to those particular Patristic perspectives that have most shaped research on Jewish/Christian relations, but which also encompasses other Christian as well as other Jewish perspectives, in part by attending to their overlaps.³⁶

Accordingly, I would not wish to defend my definition of "Jewish-Christianity" as globally applicable or apt for every inquiry. My suggestion, rather, is that the term proves provisionally useful at our present moment precisely due to its status as metalanguage. "Jewish-Christianity" is a term that makes sense and meaning in one specific system of language about language – that is: scholarly discourse about the retrospectively "religious" past.³⁷ It is a modern analytical category defined by its place, function, and interrelation within an academic system of studying the past, as shaped by and within conceptual frameworks that make sense and meaning within those German, British, and American cultures that most shaped scholarship on "religions."³⁸ In using the term, then, I make no claim for any direct one-to-one correspondence to any discrete social group or movement in the premodern eras here under analysis, nor even to any clear-cut discourse surrounding a self-claimed identity in the relevant premodern literature. What I claim, rather, is that a focus on "Jewish-Christianity" may be useful as a lens through which to reconsider the theorization of identity within late antique literature and especially to highlight some cases where premodern data and discourses differ strikingly from those modern modes of theorizing identity now naturalized in our very notions of "Judaism," "Christianity," and "religions." Precisely due to its clumsy hybridity, "Jewish-Christianity" can provide a focus to help us to identify materials conventionally *omitted* in the modern study of the Jewish and Christian past, while also pushing us to ask how premodern conceptualizations of identity might differ from our own.

When we take seriously its modern construction, the category of "Jewish-Christianity" invites reflection on our own historiographical habits: what we choose to see as connected and why, what we compare, what we contrast,

³⁶ I.e., James Carleton Paget is thus quite correct to note my interest in the topic "has less to do with creating a clear definition of the word 'Jewish Christian' and more with seeking to raise questions about older models of Jewish-Christian engagement and interaction in the period following Bar Kokhba"; *Jews, Christians, and Jewish Christians*, 31. I owe the honing of this point to his insightful summary of my work there as well as further conversations with him.

³⁷ I here use this term in the manner suggested by Carsten Colpe, *Das Siegel der Propheten* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 1989).

³⁸ Francophone scholarship has a somewhat different trajectory; see Appendix B.

and how and why we draw lines of continuity to our present. In the process, it may open a productive space for experimenting with more integrative ways to intertwine the historiography of Judaism with historiography of Christianity in a manner not just limited to Jesus or ending with Paul. Inasmuch as this particular category has been used in the past to cordon off a variety of materials deemed *too* “Jewish” to be called “Christian,” moreover, “Jewish-Christianity” can also be used to expose the biases embedded within current research and to identify those materials that are perhaps especially useful for rooting constructive correctives. And inasmuch as these materials include late antique sources that have been imagined to be “too Jewish” to be more than a “survival” within Christianity after the second century CE, they include materials that have been ignored in scholarship on Late Antiquity but might contribute much to the study of this period – perhaps also facilitating the direly needed integration of Jewish materials into discussions of Late Antiquity more broadly.

Chapter Summary and Acknowledgements

The present volume includes revised and updated versions of nine previously published articles, together with three previously unpublished articles, a Timeline and Annotated Bibliography on “Jewish-Christianity,” and an Epilogue reflecting further on the methodological and theoretical issues raised here and below.

I intend the title of this volume in two senses, one of which is explored by the articles in the first section, and the other by the articles in the second. In the essays in the first section, I focus on “Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism” in historiographical terms, showing how “Jewish-Christian” sources can help to expose the predominantly Christian frameworks (and peculiarly Patristic lenses) through which Jewish/Christian relations and post-Christian Judaism have been commonly studied. The first two chapters use “Jewish-Christianity” to question the “Parting of the Ways” and experiment with other approaches to our evidence – the first does so with a focus on self-definition within the Pseudo-Clementine literature, while the second surveys Jewish and “Jewish-Christian” sources from Syro-Palestine that map difference with the rites and rhetorics of blood and water. The third chapter turns to survey a variety of “apocrypha” that have been posited as possibly “Jewish-Christian,” asking how the early history of Jewish/Christian relations might look different if seen through these sources. The fourth and fifth chapters focus on the modes of theorizing difference in the Pseudo-Clementines in particular: one looks to their extension of older Jewish ideas about “Hellenism” and “Judaism,” and the other to their double-pronged participation in Rabbinic and Patristic discourses about *minut* and “heresy” respectively. The sixth chapter compares the treatment of Jewish

and apostolic history in Pseudo-Clementines with that in Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*, using the former to relativize the latter, while also opening more connections with Rabbinic traditions, especially in relation to succession from Moses and the transmission of (Oral) Torah.

In the second section, I experiment with bringing “Jewish-Christian” sources to bear on Jewish Studies, looking more closely, in the process, at nineteenth- and early twentieth-century precedents for more integrative approaches. Chapter Seven integrates “Jewish-Christian” sources into a discussion of messianism as seen from the perspective of Jewish thought and history. Chapter Eight traces ideas about the secrecy and suppression of the Jewishness of Christian Origins in relation to the *Epistle of Peter to James* and its reception by Toland, Baur, Graetz, and Kohler. Chapter Nine brings “Jewish-Christian” sources to bear on questions about Rabbinization and the representation of Pharisees in relation to Rabbis, while Chapter Ten focuses on parallels with Hekhalot literature and their place in the study of Jewish mysticism. In the eleventh chapter, I extend recent insights into the early modern invention of “Jewish-Christianity” by focusing on its modern Jewish reception, attending especially to Graetz but also recovering the influence of Augustus Neander, a Jewish convert to Christianity who was also a prominent scholar of both *Gnosis* and Church History.

The end of the volume includes an Epilogue discussing “Jewish-Christianity” as an example of the limits of the heuristic of categories of “religions,” on the one hand, and modern scholarly discourses about identity and alterity, on the other. Appendix A is a timeline of the major figures, texts, and events mentioned in this volume, and Appendix B is an annotated bibliography that surveys some of the larger discussion surrounding “Jewish-Christianity,” from the apostolic age to early Islam. Appendices C and D reprint two brief online essays on the terms *Ioudaios* and “Jew.”

At various points when preparing this volume, I considered compiling a separate chapter cataloguing Rabbinic parallels to the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and other “Jewish-Christian” literature. Such an approach would fit the usual practice whereby non-Jewish texts or corpora are typically argued to be relevant to Jewish Studies. In the end, however, I decided instead to try to model here a more integrative approach. Rather than addressing the question of the relationship of “Jewish-Christianity” and Rabbinic Judaism in isolation, I here attempt to showcase what I see as the potential value of “Jewish-Christian” texts and traditions for aiding in the integration of Rabbinic and other late antique Jewish texts and traditions into the study of Late Antiquity more broadly. Accordingly, Chapter Two considers ritual purity in “Jewish-Christian” writings in conversation with the Mishnah but also in context of “pagan” and other uses of water in Roman Syria; Chapter Five analyzes “Jewish-Christian” heresiology in triangulation with Epiphanius’ *Panarion* and Rabbinic disputation tales about *minim*; and Chapter Six treats the theme of succession in the Pseudo-Clementines in

contrast with Eusebius' depiction of apostolic succession but in comparison with early Rabbinic ideas about the Oral Torah. Much of my argument for the late antique context of the Pseudo-Clementines throughout this volume, moreover, rests on their connections to distinctively Rabbinic traditions. Chapter Two similarly stresses the special relevance of Rabbinic texts and traditions for understanding the *Didascalia apostolorum* as well as the Pseudo-Clementines, while Chapters Nine and Ten suggest, in turn, that these "Jewish-Christian" works might help us to contextualize Rabbinic and Hekhalot traditions respectively. In addition, in Chapters Eight and Eleven, I point to precedents among nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars of Jewish Studies for reading "Jewish-Christian" and Rabbinic materials in concert, prior to trends in the mid- and late twentieth century towards modes of academic specialization that have fostered more isolationist reading practices. Attention to such precedents, in turn, may help us to look ahead – not least to recover the relevance of both "Jewish-Christian" and non-Christian Jewish materials for the study of Late Antiquity.

* * *

Research for this volume was generously supported by grants from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Substantial portions were completed during two fellowship years at the Katz Center for Advanced Judaic Studies (2007–2008, 2014–2015). I am grateful to Henning Ziebritzki, Peter Schäfer, and the current editorial board of TSAJ for the opportunity to publish this volume as well as to the publishers that granted permission for reprinting articles herein: Mohr Siebeck, Éditions du Cerf, Éditions du Zèbre, Indiana University Press, Oxford University Press, and Marginalia Review of Books.

I benefited much from delivering related lectures at Duke University, Fordham University, Indiana University Bloomington, New York University, Princeton University, Université François-Rabelais de Tours, Université de Lausanne, University of California Los Angeles, University of Ottawa, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale University. Over the years, I have had the pleasure of discussing this project with many generous intellectual interlocutors there and elsewhere, whom I acknowledge in specific chapters below. I would be remiss, however, not also to express my special appreciation for those who have helped to shape the project as a whole through their continued support and continued challenges: John G. Gager, Peter Schäfer, Daniel Boyarin, Adam H. Becker, James Carleton Paget, Andrew S. Jacobs, David Stern, F. Stanley Jones, Natalie Dohrmann, Dominique Côté, Pierluigi Piovaneli, and Bob Kraft.

I wrote these materials while at Princeton University, McMaster University, and the University of Pennsylvania, and I hope that the results bear some imprint of my deep intellectual debts to each institution. In particular, the ideas and argu-

ments herein have been forged and honed in the crucible of conversations with my graduate students, especially Karl Shuve, Lily Vuong, and Susan Wendel at McMaster and Matthew Chalmers, Phillip Fackler, Jae Han, Alex Ramos, Jillian Stinchcomb, and Phillip Webster at Penn. To Alex, I am further indebted for the gleeful perfectionism with which he proofread this volume. For indexing, I am grateful to Patrick Angiolillo at NYU. Special thanks also to Coach Kate Allen-Cottone, Coach Mary Bee, Coach Neal Santos, Coach Zachary Ferris, and our “dawn patrol” crew at VIII Limbs Academy for providing the perfect writing breaks.

For many varieties of inspiration during the final stages of this project, I remain ever grateful to Shaul Magid. I dedicate this volume to my son, KunKun (Alexander Reed Fleming), who never ceases to remind me – as he likes to put it – that “Life is just so interesting all the time ...”

Prolegomenon

Christian Origins as Jewish History*

Do Christian sources have a place within the study of Jews and Judaism? Aren't Christian sects and sources by definition not Jewish? And isn't part of the point of Jewish Studies, as a discipline, to create a space for the study of the history, literature, and religion of Jews apart from the dominant Christian frameworks that have informed so much of what universities teach as "religion," "ethics," "history," "literature," etc.?

Throughout most of the twentieth century, the answers to such questions seemed obvious. A popular sense of the mutual exclusivity of "Jewish" and "Christian" identities was mirrored by a disciplinary separation even in secular academic scholarship on their ancient sources and histories. Among scholars of both Judaism and Christianity, it was common to treat Jesus as the founder of a new "religion" that was essentially and inevitably distinct from Judaism. And if not Jesus, then certainly Paul. Consistent with the Christian theological training of most early twentieth-century scholars of the New Testament, their studies typically took for granted a supersessionist model of history: the rise of Christianity was read as the restoration of the religion of ancient Israel from the corruption of postbiblical/postexilic Judaism.¹

More recent trends in research have inspired a renewed understanding of the Jesus Movement as an integrated (and perhaps even integral) part of the history of the Jews.² Whether Jesus himself is termed a Jewish wisdom teacher, political

* An earlier and much shorter Hebrew version of this essay appeared in Yirmiyahu Yovel, ed., *A New Jewish Time – Jewish Culture in a Secular Age: An Encyclopedic View* (Jerusalem: Keter, 2007), 200–4.

¹ This position is exemplified by the older practice in New Testament Studies of periodizing post-exilic Jewish history as *Spätjudentum* ("Late Judaism"), especially as outlined by Wilhelm Bousset. See, e. g., Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums in neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin: Ruether and Reichard, 1903); Anders Gerdmar, *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism: German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Studies in Jewish History and Culture 20; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 146–61; also Susannah Heschel, "The Image of Judaism in Nineteenth Century New Testament Scholarship in Germany," in *Jewish-Christian Encounters over the Centuries; Symbiosis, Prejudice, Holocaust, Dialogue*, ed. Marvin Perry and Frederick M. Schweitzer (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 215–40. There were early critiques even among Christian scholars – most notably: George Foot Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism," *HTR* 14 (1921): 197–254 – but this pattern nevertheless predominated well into the 1960s.

² I stress "renewed" here because there are ample precedents in the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century, on which see below. Shaul Magid notes that "Jewish writing

revolutionary, or apocalyptic prophet, there is now a scholarly consensus that the Jesus Movement was one of many similar Jewish movements in the first century CE.³ Studies have even reconsidered the Jewishness of Paul, reassessing the image of this apostle as the founder of Gentile Christianity and the author of Christian anti-Judaism.⁴

Particularly in North America, the emergence of these new approaches was enabled both by a paradigm shift in research on the New Testament since World War II and by concurrent changes in the dominant institutional settings in which Judaism and Christianity are studied.⁵ A number of Christian historians and theologians responded to the horrors of the Holocaust by grappling with the images of Jews and Judaism in the New Testament and by addressing the possible place of these texts in the prehistory of modern anti-Semitism.⁶ The last half of the twentieth century also saw the establishment of departments of Religious Studies in secular universities across the United States and Canada, facilitating the non-confessional study of Christianity as well as the growing participation

about Jesus in America, with a few exceptions, ended after the ‘Jesus Controversy’ in 1925,” which was sparked by Joseph Klausner’s *Yeshu ha-Notsri* (Jerusalem: Shtibl, 1922). It was only “toward the end of the twentieth century,” Magid further notes, that “numerous Jewish scholars and theologians, mostly in North America, came to articulate new approaches to the question of a Jewish Jesus”; *American Post-Judaism: Identity and Renewal in a Postethnic Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 134–35. On the shifting place of Jewishness in American ideas about Jesus, see also Stephen Prothero, *American Jesus: How the Son of God Became a National Icon* (New York: Macmillan, 2003), 229–66.

³ For the latter point, see Richard A. Horsley with John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus* (2nd ed.; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999). On key elements in the ample discussion on the Jewish Jesus, see Zev Garber, ed., *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2011).

⁴ E.g., Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Mark D. Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm, eds., *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015); Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul’s Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996); Jacob Taubes, *The Political Theology of Paul* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004). For a survey of premodern and early modern precedents, see now John G. Gager, *Who Made Early Christianity? The Jewish Lives of the Apostle Paul* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), 37–52.

⁵ On these shifts, see esp. John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

⁶ E.g., Gager, *Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 11–34; Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l’Empire Romain (135–42)* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 166; Paris: Editions de Boccard, 1948); Jules Isaac, *Jésus et Israël* (Paris: A. Michel, 1948); Isaac, *Genèse de l’antisémitisme: Essai historique* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1956); Isaac, *L’enseignement du mépris: vérité historique et mythes théologiques* (Paris: Fasquelle, 1962); Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Seabury, 1974); Alan Davies, ed., *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York: Paulist, 1979). Note also the parallel discussion among Christian theologians such as Paul Van Buren; see, e.g., *Discerning the Way: A Theology of the Jewish-Christian Reality* (New York: Seabury, 1980) and the review-essay by David Novak in *Judaism* 31 (1982): 112–20.

of Jewish and other non-Christian scholars in New Testament Studies.⁷ Together, these developments have helped to foster a scholarly discourse that is more attuned to the biases of the past and seeks further to situate the New Testament in its historical and cultural contexts, as distinct from its status for Christians as Scripture.⁸

New institutional settings have also helped to inspire further experimentation with models and approaches from disciplines ranging from Classics to Sociology, thereby opening fresh perspectives on the history of Christianity in relation to Jews and Judaism.⁹ Statements about Jews in the New Testament, for instance, have been reassessed in light of more sophisticated understandings of identity, alterity, and the anachronism of our modern sense of “religions”: not only have philological studies destabilized any solely “religious” interpretation of the Greek term *Ioudaioi* (“Jews,” “Judaean”),¹⁰ but even its polemical usage has been increasingly reread in terms of the ambivalent rhetorics of communal identity-formation and the complex sociocultural dynamics of self-definition. Among the results has been a recognition of the *inner*-Jewish orientation of some of the seemingly *anti*-Jewish statements about Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, and other Jews in the NT Gospels.¹¹

The past fifty years have also been marked by the emergence of a new awareness and appreciation of the diversity of Judaism in the Second Temple period (536 BCE–70 CE), catalyzed in large part by the discovery of the Dead Sea

⁷ As much as recent trends in the history of research on ancient Judaism, ancient Christianity, and Jewish/Christian relations are often discussed in terms of the inclusion of “*both Jews and Christians*,” it is worth remembering that these disciplinary and institutional shifts have also resulted in the participation of others, including some scholars (like me) with no cultural or confessional connection to *either* tradition.

⁸ These shifts are discussed in more detail in Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam H. Becker, “Introduction: Traditional Models and New Directions,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. Becker and Reed (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 1–34.

⁹ See esp. John G. Gager, *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1975). As Helmut Koester notes, postwar German scholarship on the historical Jesus and the NT has taken a somewhat different trajectory, due in part to the enduring influence of Rudolf Bultmann; “Epilogue: Current Issues in New Testament Scholarship,” in *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), esp. 469–73.

¹⁰ See esp. Steve Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512; see also the contributions by myself and others in Timothy Michael Law and Charles Halton, eds., *Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts* (Los Angeles: Marginalia Review of Books, 2014), <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/>.

¹¹ E.g., Douglas Hare, “The Rejection of the Jews in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts,” in *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity*, ed. Alan Davies (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2004), 27–46.

Scrolls.¹² The publication of these long-lost texts helped to highlight the rich multiplicity of pre-Rabbinic Judaism. In the process, research on Second Temple Judaism has shed doubt on the traditional image of the Pharisees as the *de facto* leaders of the Jewish people prior to the destruction of the Temple.¹³ Far from being proto-Rabbis with authority ratified by popular support, Pharisees are now seen as one of many sects. Together with the adoption of more critical approaches for studying the classical Rabbinic literature, this new emphasis on the diversity in Second Temple Judaism has largely undermined the notion of a single, “mainstream” Judaism that led directly to the Rabbis.¹⁴ At present, our picture of pre-Rabbinic Judaism is more like a tapestry made up of many different, intersecting strands. Partly as a result, the story of the Rabbis’ rise to power is now told as a more prolonged process.¹⁵

The ramifications of such insights have rippled through the study of Judaism, but the effects on the study of Christianity are no less marked. Scholars of Jewish history and Christian Origins were long complicit in asserting a monolithic Judaism from which Christianity sprung and with which it could make a clean break.¹⁶ But this is no longer the case. The recovery of a multiform Second Temple Judaism has opened our eyes to the broad continuum of biblically-based belief and practice of which Jesus and his followers formed a part. Accordingly, historical inquiries into the Jewish “background” of Christianity have gradually led to the recognition that the Jesus Movement fits surprisingly well *within* what we know as Second Temple Judaism. Increasingly, the New Testament is thus consulted by historians and archaeologists – alongside the writings of Philo and Josephus, the Dead Sea Scrolls, “pseudepigrapha,” etc. – for information about Judaism and the Land of Israel in the late Second Temple period.¹⁷

¹² See further Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Second Temple Judaism,” *Oxford Bibliographies Online*, 2012 [DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780195393361-0087].

¹³ See Chapter Nine below.

¹⁴ Peter Schäfer, “Die sogenannte Synode von Jabne: Zur Trennung von Juden und Christen im ersten/zweiten Jahrhundert n. Chr.,” *Judaica* 31 (1975): 54–64, 116–24; Schäfer, “Der vor-rabbinische Pharisäismus,” in *Paulus und das antike Judentum: Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters*, ed. Martin Hengel and Ulrich Heckel (WUNT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), esp. 172–75; also, Shaye J.D. Cohen, “The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism,” *HUCA* 55 (1984): 36–38. Note already Jacob Neusner’s notion of “Judaisms,” e.g., in “Jewish Studies in the American University,” *Journal of General Education* 13 (1961): 160–66; cf. Seth Schwartz, “How Many Judaism Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization,” *JAJ* 2 (2011): 208–38.

¹⁵ See, e.g., Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 BCE to 640 CE* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); Hayim Lapin, *Rabbis as Romans: The Rabbinic Movement in Palestine, 100–400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

¹⁶ See further Reed and Becker, “Introduction.”

¹⁷ This project of rereading the New Testament in terms of Jewish history and literature is exemplified – and many of its results synthesized – by Marc Brettler and Amy-Jill Levine, eds., *The Jewish Annotated New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

The task of rereading the New Testament as a source for Jewish Studies has been most popular in relation to Jesus himself. Jewish thinkers at least since Abraham Geiger have been interested in Jesus from a specifically Jewish perspective.¹⁸ These Jewish approaches to Jesus were founded on a sharp distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith: the former a Galilean Jew whose actions and teachings during life shed light on the history and culture of the Jews, the latter a figure whose significance is tied to faith-claims about his resurrection and divine status.¹⁹ The two tend to be inextricable in older writings about Jesus penned from a confessional Christian perspective. With the maturation of the study of Christianity within Religious Studies, however, their distinction has come to shape historical scholarship on the New Testament by Christians, Jews, and others. Jewish scholars, from David Flusser to Amy Jill Levine, have written celebrated studies of the historical Jesus in his Jewish context.²⁰ And, especially in recent years, even Christian scholars have been surprisingly open to the idea of a Jewish Jesus.²¹ William Arnal, in fact, suggests that the Jewishness of Jesus is now so much of a matter of consensus that “the non-Jewish historical Jesus is a straw man.”²²

Much about this ostensibly “new” realization of the Jewishness of Christianity’s messiah was already anticipated by nineteenth-century Jewish thinkers like Geiger.²³ It is certainly the case, as Shaul Magid notes, that the first wave

¹⁸ Especially in Abraham Geiger, *Das Judentum und Seine Geschichte* (3 vols.; Breslau: Schletter, 1864–1871); see further Susannah Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). Other early and influential examples include Claude Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels* (2 vols.; London: Macmillan, 1909); Israel Abraham, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917–1924); Joseph Klausner, *Yeshu ha-Notsri* (Jerusalem: Shtibl, 1922). Shaul Magid notes a precedent already in Baruch Spinoza, albeit flowering especially in the nineteenth century concurrent “with the rise of the search for the historical Jesus among liberal Protestants”; *Hasidism Incarnate: Hasidism, Christianity, and the Construction of Modern Judaism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015), 113–14.

¹⁹ This formulation is typically credited to Martin Kähler, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christ* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1892). For reflections on its context, heuristic, and limits in relation to academic research on the historical Jesus, see John P. Meier, “The Historical Jesus: Rethinking Some Concepts,” *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 3–24.

²⁰ E.g., David Flusser, *Jesus in Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1968); Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009).

²¹ E.g., Bruce Chilton, *Rabbi Jesus: An Intimate Biography* (New York: Random House, 2002).

²² William Arnal, *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity* (New York: Equinox, 2005), 19.

²³ That said, the intervening period was marked in part by efforts to interpret Jesus as not Jewish, sometimes appealing to his Galilean roots; see further Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

of Jewish efforts at rereading Jesus from within Judaism often aimed “to separate Jesus *from* Christianity” or to assert “Judaism as the religion *of* Jesus while Christianity is the religion *about* him.”²⁴ For Geiger, Claude Montefiore, Kaufmann Kohler, and others, moreover, this apologetic aim vis-à-vis Christianity was coupled with an appeal to Jesus as a precedent for their own efforts to reform Judaism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.²⁵ Nevertheless, it remains that there is a wealth of evidence in our ancient sources for Jesus’ Jewishness, to which their writings helped to draw sustained scholarly attention.²⁶

In the earliest accounts of his life in the NT Gospels, we find no hint that Jesus saw himself as anything other than a Jew. The Gospels themselves were written decades after Jesus’ death, at a time when some members of the Jesus Movement were attempting to distinguish themselves from their Jewish contemporaries. Nevertheless, these texts preserve traditions about Jesus as preaching in synagogues, visiting the Temple, celebrating Passover, interpreting the Hebrew Bible, and debating halakhic issues with Pharisees. Furthermore, Jesus teaches by means of parables that recall in form and content the *meshalim* of the Jewish Wisdom literature and Rabbinic Midrash.²⁷ Even his apocalyptic and messianic pronouncements fit well within the Judaism of his time, an age of uncertainty and upheaval when many charismatics worked wonders and warned of impending Eschaton.²⁸ We also find hints that he may have understood his message as oriented solely towards his fellow Jews: according to the Gospel of Matthew, for instance, he notes that he was sent “only to the lost sheep of Israel” (15:24; also 10:6).

Jesus’ Jewishness is evident even in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5–7), a set of teachings traditionally seen by Christians as exemplifying his break from Judaism. Yet, here too, we find exhortations to observe the whole of the Torah (5:17–20). Such statements shed an interesting perspective on his fierce polemics against the Pharisees, raising the possibility that he and his followers saw themselves as engaged in inner-Jewish debates akin to the arguments between

²⁴ So Magid, *Hasidism Incarnate*, 114.

²⁵ See further Donald Hagner, *The Jewish Reclamation of Jesus* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1997); Matthew B. Hoffman, *From Rebel to Rabbi: Reclaiming Jesus and the Making of Modern Jewish Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007).

²⁶ Likewise, even despite the apologetic force of assertions about the necessity of training in Rabbis for studying the New Testament, the results contributed greatly to the compilation of relevant Jewish intertexts that help to contextualize Jesus and earliest Christianity.

²⁷ David Stern, “Midrash and Parables in the New Testament,” in Brettler and Levine, *Jewish Annotated New Testament*, 565–68.

²⁸ See, e.g., Horsley and Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs*; Martha Himmelfarb, “Afterlife and Resurrection,” in Brettler and Levine, *Jewish Annotated New Testament*, 549–51; Geza Vermes, “Jewish Miracle Workers in the Late Second Temple Period,” in Brettler and Levine, *Jewish Annotated New Testament*, 536–37; Matthew V. Novenson, *Christ among the Messiahs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). See also discussion and further references in Chapter Seven in this volume.

other sects in Second Temple times. We also find parallels between his teachings and later Rabbinic traditions. Most famously, the Gospels attribute to Jesus a version of the “Golden Rule” (Matt 7:12) that parallels a saying that the Talmud attributes to Hillel (*b. Shabbat* 31a).²⁹

By separating the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith, a surprising number of Jewish thinkers have been able to embrace Jesus as a part of Judaism’s history and heritage. Martin Buber could call him a brother;³⁰ Joseph Klausner could term him the “most Jewish of Jews.”³¹ For modern Jewish thought as well as secular academic scholarship in Jewish Studies, however, it has proved more challenging to integrate Paul.³² Paul’s own letters tell us of the vision of the resurrected Christ that prompted this Pharisee to change his name from Saul to Paul and to proclaim himself the “apostle to the Gentiles.” Although remembered as a student of Rabban Gamaliel the Elder (Acts 22:3), it was Paul who first argued that Gentiles can be saved through faith in Christ apart from observance of the Torah (e.g., Rom 1–9; Gal 1–3), and he is often thus credited with inaugurating the Christian negation of the requirements of Jewish law and the Church’s rejection of the chosenness of the Jewish people. Both within scholarship and within modern Jewish thought, those who accept a Jewish Jesus thus often do so with appeal to Paul’s alleged apostasy, which is touted as the real catalyst for Christianity’s break with Judaism.³³

One line of recent research, however, has proposed that Paul’s approach to the Torah and Judaism may have been more positive. Even after his self-claimed commission to be “apostle to the Gentiles,” the apostle still considers himself a Jew and a Pharisee (Gal 2:15; Phil 3:5; Acts 22:3; 26:4–5). According to scholars like Lloyd Gaston and John G. Gager, Paul may maintain the chosenness of the Jews and the efficacy of Torah observance for them, even as he charts a separate path for Gentiles that does not entail circumcision or Torah observance.³⁴ Scholarly debates about Paul’s attitudes towards the Torah and Jewish salvation have

²⁹ P. S. Alexander, “Jesus and the Golden Rule,” in *Hillel and Jesus: Comparisons of Two Major Religious Leaders*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Loren L. Johns (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 363–88.

³⁰ Martin Buber, *Two Types of Faith*, trans. Norman P. Goldhawk (New York: Macmillan, 1951), 12. See further Magid, *Hasidism Incarnate*, 113–36; Magid, “Defining Christianity and Judaism from the Perspective of Religious Anarchy: Martin Buber on Jesus and the Ba’al Shem Tov,” *JJTP* 25 (2017): 36–58.

³¹ Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life, Times, and Teaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1925), 363.

³² See further Daniel R. Langton, “Modern Jewish Identity and the Apostle Paul: Pauline Studies as an Intra-Jewish Ideological Battleground,” *JSNT* 28 (2005): 217–58; Langton, “The Myth of the ‘Traditional Jewish View of Paul’ and the Role of the Apostle in Modern Jewish-Christian Polemics,” *JSNT* 28 (2005): 69–104; Langton, *The Apostle Paul in the Jewish Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

³³ On this pattern and its genealogy, see Chapter Eight in this volume.

³⁴ Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987); John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). This posi-

thus served to highlight the surprisingly broad range of Second Temple Jewish approaches to the question of the fate of Gentile/Jewish difference in the messianic age.³⁵ In the process, such debates have also helped to open the way for the study of other NT texts in terms of a continuing relationship with Judaism – or even an ongoing place within it.³⁶

Much of the New Testament focuses on the issue of Gentile salvation. It also contains fiercely polemical statements about Jews that served to fuel later forms of anti-Semitism. The medieval demonization of Jews was buttressed, for instance, by the Gospel of John's statement that the Devil is their father (8:44) and by Revelation's references to the "synagogue of Satan" (2:9; 3:9). Likewise, the notion of Jewish collective guilt for the death of Jesus found precedent in the account of the crucifixion in the Gospel of Matthew, at which the crowd cries out: "His blood be upon us and our children!" (27:25; also 1 Thes 2:14–16).³⁷

When one reads the New Testament only in light of later developments in Christianity, however, one misses the degree to which concerns among Jesus' followers resonated with concerns among Jews in Second Temple times and beyond. Commonalities can be found on topics ranging from purity to eschatology, halakhic observance to biblical interpretation.³⁸ Early debates in the Jesus Movement, moreover, were not framed in terms of the relationship between "Christianity" and "Judaism." What is later reread in those terms, in fact, is a debate about the practical challenges of including Gentiles in a Jewish messianic movement. Best remembered are those Jewish followers of Jesus, like Paul, who took the opportunity to rethink the meaning of Torah for Gentiles in what they saw to be the messianic age. But the New Testament also preserves some clues

tion is partly presaged already in E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

³⁵ E. g., Paula Fredriksen, "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2," *JTS* 42 (1991): 532–64; Terence Donaldson, "Prose-lytes or 'Righteous Gentiles'? The Status of Gentiles in Eschatological Pilgrimage Patterns of Thought," *JSP* 7 (1990): 3–27; Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007); Michael E. Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-Gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006).

³⁶ Most notably for Revelation; see above and John W. Marshall, "John's Jewish (Christian?) Apocalypse," in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 233–56.

³⁷ As noted above, recent literary studies of the New Testament have suggested that many of these statements refer only to specific groups of Jews at the time, hold different meanings when read in context, and/or make sense when framed as inner-Jewish debate. On the challenges of keeping both Jewish origins and anti-Jewish reception in view, see Paula Fredriksen and Adele Reinhartz, eds., *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism: Reading the New Testament after the Holocaust* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002).

³⁸ Recent examples include Nina Collins, *Jesus, the Sabbath and the Jewish Debate: Healing on the Sabbath in the First and Second Centuries CE* (London: T&T Clark, 2014); Cecilia Wassen, "The Jewishness of Jesus and Ritual Purity," *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis* 27 (2016): 11–36.

about other Jewish followers of Jesus, who conceptualized Gentile inclusion as necessarily predicated on circumcision and some degree of Torah-observance (e. g., Gal 2:12; Acts 15:1–5).

Nor is this situation limited to pre-70 materials that speak to the era in which the Jerusalem Church remained dominant. Across the NT literature, in fact, one finds a range of representations of Jewishness. Among the Gospels, Matthew exhibits the strongest and most explicit connections with Judaism.³⁹ Jesus is there defended as the Jewish messiah, and there is a persistent interest in the Torah and the Jewish people. But the other Gospels also contain clues about the Jesus Movement's complex relationships to its Jewish cultural contexts and literary heritage. Luke is often deemed most "Hellenized," and it is largely concerned with Gentile inclusion and a horizon toward the Roman Empire; nevertheless, its language and form exhibit striking parallels with Hellenistic Jewish literature.⁴⁰ John is infamous for its virulent anti-Jewish statements, but even these may reflect a break with a Jewish community of which its own group was originally a part.⁴¹ As for the rest of the New Testament, a nascent supersessionism may be apparent in some texts, such as the Epistle to the Hebrews. But others articulate devotion to Christ in a manner that overlaps in different ways with a distinctively Jewish self-definition, as with Revelation's coupling of apocalyptic Christology with a commitment to ritual purity.⁴²

It is perhaps not surprisingly, then, that so much of the New Testament can be profitably read alongside Jewish intertexts. Hence, conversely, a good case can be made for reading at least some of the New Testament as direct evidence for the Jewish thought and culture of its time.⁴³ Whatever their precise relationship with Jews and Judaism, many NT texts also remain rich sources for Jewish history. Paul's letters provide interesting clues about the cultural assumptions of first-century Jews. In the course of telling the story of Jesus' life, the Gospels of-

³⁹ E. g., Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Donald Hagner, "Matthew: Christian Judaism or Jewish Christianity?" in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research*, ed. S. McKnight and G. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 263–82.

⁴⁰ E. g., Gregory Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

⁴¹ On this approach to John – and its challenges – see Adele Reinhartz, *Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John* (New York: Continuum, 2005); cf. Raimo Hakola, "The Johannine Community as Jewish Christians? Some Problems in Current Scholarly Consensus," in Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered*, 181–201.

⁴² David Frankfurter, "Jews or Not? Reconstructing the 'Other' in Rev 2:9 and 3:9," *HTR* 94 (2001): 414–16; John W. Marshall, *Parables of the War: Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001).

⁴³ Most recently: Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels* (New York: New Press, 2012). Note also, e. g., the inclusion of the Gospel of Matthew in George Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 303–5, and the treatment of Revelation in Martha Himmelfarb "'A Kingdom of Priests': The Democratization of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism," *JJTP* 6 (1997): 89–104 at 90.

for a wealth of information about the Land of Israel in the first century. Likewise, the Book of Acts tells us much about the Diaspora Jewish communities whose synagogues were visited by the earliest Christian missionaries.

In the decades after Jesus' death – and especially after the failure of the first Jewish Revolt against Rome – the Jesus Movement became more geographically and demographically displaced from its original Galilean and Judaeian settings. Nevertheless, the beliefs and practices of his followers (whether ethnic Jews or Gentile converts) continued to be infused by the diverse forms of Jewish belief and practice that flourished in the Land of Israel and the Diaspora. In the New Testament and Patristic literature, one can discern the first traces of a long process by which some of Jesus' followers distinguished themselves first from other Jewish groups and progressively from what they thereby constructed as "Judaism." Nevertheless, a profound continuity often served as the very ground for these innovations, thus opening potential lines for contact, conflict, and competition for centuries thereafter.

The overlaps remain notable enough into Late Antiquity, moreover, that it is impossible to pinpoint any single, decisive, or irreversible moment at which the study of Jewish sources and self-definition becomes globally irrelevant for understanding Christian sources and self-definition.⁴⁴ Those interested in teleologically constructing an origin myth for our current sense of the mutual exclusivity of "Judaism" and "Christianity" can certainly find a set of sources to tell that presentist story. It has been common, in fact, to pluck NT and Patristic sources from diverse locales to create a globalized and monolithic image of the "Parting of the Ways" – from Paul's mission as "apostle to the Gentiles," to Ignatius' coining of "Christianity" as a term distinct from "Judaism," to Justin Martyr's argument for the church as the new Israel, to John Chrysostom's rabidly anti-Jewish/anti-Judaizing sermons. But such selectivity hides as much as it reveals, not least through its erasure of local difference and its imposition of a unilinear chronology.

Even seemingly unequivocal evidence for "Parting," for instance, occurs side-by-side with evidence for continued connection, blurring, or overlap. Paul's argument about Gentile salvation apart from the Torah is attested in precisely the same sources that bear witness to the "circumcision party" within the Jesus Movement and its association with James, Peter, and the Jerusalem Church; Justin innovates a supersessionist reading of the Torah but also knows and accepts Jews who believe in Jesus and remain Torah-observant, as long as they don't compel Gentiles to do the same (*Dial.* 47); Ignatius and Chrysostom both hail from Syria, the very region in which one also finds the greatest density of writings that scholars label "Jewish-Christian" (e. g., *Didascalia apostolorum*;

⁴⁴ See further Becker and Reed, *The Ways That Never Parted*, as well as discussion below in Chapter Two.

Pseudo-Clementines).⁴⁵ Nor is there a clear chronology of increasing Christian distance from Jews or disinterest in Judaism. Just as Ignatius frets about the temptations posed by “Judaizing” in the early second century, so too with Chrysostom in the fourth century. The latter’s lament about Christian interest in Jewish festivals and synagogues, moreover, echoes Origen’s complaints in the third but, if anything, answers a situation that is far more extensive.⁴⁶ Likewise, far from diminishing as time goes on, our evidence for “Jewish-Christianity” – both firsthand and secondhand – clusters in the fourth and fifth centuries CE.

The majority of scholars continue to study Judaism and Christianity in isolation, sometimes even in the early period. There is a case to be made, however, for experimenting with rereading some Christian sources as evidence for Jewish history even into Late Antiquity, extending the same trends that are now increasingly common for the New Testament. For doing so, moreover, “Jewish-Christianity” may have a special utility: these are the very sources, after all, which have most frustrated modern Christian scholarly narratives about the church’s universalistic “transcendence” of its particularistic Jewish roots and which have therefore been compartmentalized and marginalized in research on Christian thought and history precisely through this labeling as “Jewish-Christian.”⁴⁷

As with the recovery of a Jewish Jesus, one finds precedents for this too among nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Jewish thinkers: for his history of the Jewish people, for instance, Heinrich Graetz did not just mine the New Testament to discuss Jesus and Paul, but he also culled information about Peter from the Pseudo-Clementines and information about Ebionites from the writings of Irenaeus, Origen, and Epiphanius.⁴⁸ In this, Graetz continued a practice already begun in his dissertation on Judaism and *Gnosis*, wherein he cited materials from Pseudo-Clementines alongside the Mishnah, Talmud, Sefer Yetzirah, and the Zohar.⁴⁹ Nor was this pattern limited just to nineteenth-century Germany. Kaufman Kohler, writing in America in the early twentieth century, took an even more

⁴⁵ See further Judith Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), esp. 39–56; Robert Louis Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), esp. 66–94; John G. Gager, “Jews, Christians, and the Dangerous Ones in Between,” in *Interpretation in Religion*, ed. Shlomo Biderman and Ben-Ami Scharfstein (Philosophy and Religion 2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 249–57; Dominique Côté, “Le problème de l’identité religieuse dans la Syrie du IV^e siècle: Le cas des Pseudo-Clémentines et de l’*Adversus Iudaeos* de S. Jean Chrysostome,” in *La croisée des chemins revisitée: Quand l’Église et la Synagogue se sont-elles distinguées?*, ed. Simon Claude Mimouni and Bernard Pouderon (Patrimoines Judaïsme antique; Paris: Cerf, 2012), 339–70.

⁴⁶ E. g., Origen, *Homilies on Leviticus* 5.8; Chrysostom, *Homilies Against the Jews*.

⁴⁷ This pattern is clearest – and most influential – in the case of Adolph von Harnack, on whom see the discussion above in the Introduction.

⁴⁸ See Chapter Seven in this volume.

⁴⁹ See Chapter Ten in this volume.

expansive approach, lamenting Paul as the founder of a non-Jewish Christianity but asserting the post-Pauline continuance of more Jewish approaches among Elchasites and Ebionites. Kohler did so, moreover, by re-appropriating “Jewish-Christian apocrypha” like the *Didache*, *Didascalia apostolorum*, and Pseudo-Clementines as resources for recovering the full history of ancient Judaism.⁵⁰ As with the New Testament, thus, perhaps so too for Late Antiquity: rereading some retrospectively “Christian” or “Jewish-Christian” materials as sources for Jewish history may help to open up new perspectives for the study of Judaism and Christianity alike.

⁵⁰ See Chapter Eight in this volume.

Part I

“Jewish-Christians” and the Historiography
of Early Jewish/Christian Relations

Chapter One

“Jewish-Christianity” after the “Parting of the Ways”*

What is “Jewish-Christianity,” and how do we know a “Jewish-Christian” text when we see one? Our answers to these questions may tell us as much about our own assumptions concerning the definition, development, and interrelation of Judaism and Christianity as about the broad continuum of biblically-based approaches to belief and worship in Late Antiquity.

From our literary and archaeological evidence,¹ we know of a variety of texts and groups that cannot be readily categorized as either “Jewish” or “Christian” – or, at least not by a modern schema that treats the two as different by definition and uses Rabbinic Judaism and Western Christian orthodoxy as the standards for judging “Jewishness” and “Christianness.” Contrary to our common understanding of early Christian self-definition as inextricably tied to supersessionism, triumphalism, and antinomianism, some late antique authors and communities appear to have accepted Jesus as a special figure in salvation-history, without seeing this belief as inconsistent with Torah observance and/or the continued validity of God’s eternal covenant with the Jews.² And, contrary to the tendency to treat the Rabbis as the sole arbiters of halakhah in late antique Judaism, some

* An earlier version of this chapter appeared in 2003 as “‘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. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003; revised paperback reprint: Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 188–231. Earlier versions were presented at the 2001 workshop and 2002 conference on “The Ways That Never Parted” at Princeton University; it was much shaped by feedback in these fora, especially from Adam H. Becker, John G. Gager, Martha Himmelfarb, Bob Kraft, and Peter Schäfer. It is reprinted here with permission from Mohr Siebeck. This version has been revised and updated.

¹ The bulk of our evidence for postapostolic “Jewish-Christianity” has been surveyed in Simon Claude Mimouni’s weighty volume *Le Judéo-christianisme ancien: Essais historiques* (Paris: Cerf, 1998); see esp. his treatment of non-literary sources on pp. 317–452. For the relevant Patristic references, see Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn and Gerrit J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1973), 95–281. For a more recent survey and synthesis of the potentially relevant data, see Edwin K. Broadhead, *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity* (WUNT 266; Tübingen: Mohr, 2010). See also Appendix B below.

² See below for examples from the Pseudo-Clementine literature.

of these same individuals seem to have been no less preoccupied with matters such as dietary restrictions and ritual purification.³

Scholars most often use the label "Jewish-Christian" (as opposed, for instance, to "Judaizing" Christian or just "Christian") to designate ethnically Jewish and/or Torah-observant Christ-believers⁴ – albeit with varying degrees of sensitivity to the problematic presupposition that the two categories are coterminous, as well as to the difficulties involved in defining "Christian."⁵ For our present pur-

³ Note, for instance, the instructions in the Pseudo-Clementine *Hom.* 7.8 for Gentiles not only "to be baptized for the remission of sins," but also "to abstain from the table of devils – that is, from food offered to idols – from dead carcasses, from animals that have been suffocated or caught by wild beasts, and from blood" and "not to live any longer impurely; to wash after intercourse; that the women on their part should keep the law of purification [i.e., after menstruation]." For other examples from the Pseudo-Clementine literature, see, e.g., *Ep. Pet.* 4.1–2; *Rec.* 2.71–72; 6.9–11; 7.29, 34; 8.68; *Hom.* 11.28–30; 13.4, 9, 19. See further Chapter Two in this volume.

⁴ A handy survey of scholarly attempts at definition can be found, together with analysis and bibliography, in James Carleton Paget, "Jewish Christianity," in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 3: *The Early Roman Period*, ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 733–42. To summarize, "Jewish-Christian" has been typically taken to mean: [1] a Christ-believing Jew (i.e., using the adjective "Jewish" primarily in an ethnic sense, although usually with a qualification to include Jews by conversion); [2] a person of any ethnicity who combined elements of Judaism and Christianity (most frequently with the former consisting of Torah observance and the latter of belief in Jesus as the Messiah – "Jewish" in practice and "Christian" in belief – so as to distinguish this approach from the combinations thereof accepted as "orthodox" in the "Great Church"); and/or [3] a person who articulates his/her Christianity in Jewish cultural or literary forms (a category that encompasses Jean Daniélou's radically broad definition of "Jewish-Christianity" as "l'expression de christianisme dans les formes du *Spätjudentum*" in *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* [Paris: Desclée & Cie, 1958], 19, but also more widespread views, such as the notion that to be "Jewishly" Christian is to have a low Christology). Most often, we find combinations and conflation of the three (esp. due to the often unquestioned assumption, in much research on the New Testament and early Christianity that only an ethnic Jew would voluntarily choose to keep the precepts of the Torah). Each of these three modes of definition, as Carleton Paget and others have shown, is methodologically problematic in its own way – not least because #1 is the only criteria that clearly distinguishes these "Jewish-Christians" from Judaizers (esp. #2) or Christians in general (esp. #3). For important developments in the debate on definition since 2003, see Daniel Boyarin, "Rethinking Jewish Christianity: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category (To Which is Appended a Correction of My Border Lines)," *JQR* 99 (2009): 7–36; Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, eds., *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), esp. James Carleton Paget, "The Definition of the Terms Jewish Christian and Jewish Christianity in the History of Research," 22–54; Matt Jackson-McCabe, ed., *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), esp. Jackson-McCabe, "What's in a Name," 7–38.

⁵ Accordingly, some scholars have eschewed the use of the term "Jewish-Christianity," citing both its vagueness and its problematic use as a rubric under which to conflate a broad variety of different groups, texts, and figures, primarily on the basis of our own inability to fit them into (our own) categories of "Jew" and "Christian"; see, e.g., Joan Taylor, "The Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity: Reality or Scholarly Invention?" *VC* 44 (1990): 313–34; David Frankfurter, "Beyond 'Jewish Christianity': Continuing Religious Sub-cultures of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents," in Becker and Reed, *The Ways That Never Parted*,

poses, the vexed question of definition proves less pressing than the fact that, by their very existence, these texts, groups, and figures complicate commonplace assumptions about Christianity's so-called "Parting of the Ways" from Judaism. Whether we speak of "Jewish-Christianity" or "Jewish-Christianities,"⁶ distinguish the former from "Christian Judaism,"⁷ or limit our discussions to specific groups like Nazarenes/Nazoraeans and Ebionites,⁸ it remains that the sources traditionally studied under the rubric of "Jewish-Christianity" shed doubt on any tidy narrative about an unavoidable, mutual, and final split between Christianity and Judaism in the first or second century CE.

The "Parting of the Ways" is typically depicted as an inexorable development from Jesus' revolutionary teachings, Paul's preaching of a law-free Gospel for the Gentiles, and/or the de-Judaization of the church's base of converts in the wake of the Jewish revolts against Rome. To these proposed catalysts for the purported "Parting," many add the alleged demise of "Jewish-Christianity,"⁹

131–43. There is no doubt a problem in using this label to denote a cohesive movement or phenomenon, as made clear by the reception of Jean Daniélou's *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, particular after its translation into English (*The Theology of Jewish Christianity* [trans. J. Baker; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964]); see esp. Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, "The Study of Jewish Christianity," *NTS* 20 (1973–1974): 419–31; Robert A. Kraft, "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and Its 'Theology': Problems of Definition and Methodology," *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses* 60 (1972): 81–96. Personally, I am not quite ready to jettison the term. I feel that it still holds some value, not least of all as a heuristic irritant; for, when read with some awareness of the scholarly debate about "Jewish-Christianity," the term serves to disturb – literally by definition – any unquestioned assumptions that we might harbor about the essential incompatibility and inevitable "parting" of Judaism and Christianity, while also reminding us that we have yet to settle some basic definitional issues about "Judaism" and "Christianity" and that our scholarly categories (even the ones with ancient counterparts) are exactly that: categories shaped by our scholarly aims and modern experiences that we choose to impose, for better or worse, on our ancient evidence. See discussion above in the Introduction to this volume as well as Chapter Two.

⁶ See, e.g., Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, AD 135–425* (trans. H. McKeating; London: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 1996), 240; Burton Visotzky, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish-Christianities in Rabbinic Literature" in *Fathers of the World: Essays in Rabbinic and Patristic Literatures* (WUNT 80; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 130.

⁷ See, e.g., Bruce Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a Hypothetical Definition," *JJS* 7 (1976): 46–50.

⁸ This approach is admirably sensitive to the fact that the term "Jewish-Christianity" is a wholly modern invention, whereas our ancient accounts speak of specific groups. Yet, the task of reconstruction proves difficult, due to the tendentious, muddled, and inconsistent nature of our secondhand testimonies to these groups (i.e., writings of Christian heresiologists), from which it proves difficult to draw any concrete conclusions; see discussion in Klijn and Reinink, *Patristic Evidence*, 67–73, and more recently and in more depth, Boyarin, "Rethinking Jewish Christianity."

⁹ Interestingly, this is especially the case in accounts of the "Parting of the Ways" as approached from the Jewish perspective. See, e.g., Gedalia Alon's chapter on this theme – aptly entitled: "Jewish Christians: The Parting of the Ways" – in *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age, 70–640 CE* (trans. G. Levi; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1980–1984), 1:288–307; Lawrence

opining that this movement lost its single stronghold either during the first Jewish Revolt (66–70 CE), when members of the Jerusalem Church reportedly fled to Pella,¹⁰ or after the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 CE), when a defeated Jewish Jerusalem became a pagan city closed to all Jews.¹¹ Some go on to speculate that the "Jewish-Christian" message was simply rendered obsolete with the establishment of the mutual exclusivity of Christ-belief and Judaism, as allegedly proclaimed from both sides (i.e., by proto-orthodox Christians and early Rabbinic Sages, each of whom are presumed to speak for all of their respective coreligionists).¹² Others go even further, suggesting that, by the close of the first century, "Jewish-Christianity" had already ceased to be a viable and vital religious option that could compete with the Rabbinic movement for Jewish adherents or, for Gentile converts, with the law-free forms of Christianity proclaimed in the name of Paul.¹³

Schiffman, "At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 2: *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*, ed. E. P. Sanders, Albert I. Baumgarten, and Alan Mendelson (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 156; P. S. Alexander, "'The Parting of the Ways' from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways, AD 70 to 135*, ed. J. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 3, 20–24. For a recent iteration from a Christian perspective, see James D. G. Dunn, *Christianity in the Making*, vol. 3: *Neither Jew nor Greek: A Contested Identity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), esp. 509–74.

¹⁰ The notion of a flight to Pella is based on Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, 3.5.3; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 1.29.7–30.7; *De mens.* 15. Although this tradition has long been a mainstay of scholarly reconstructions of the history of "Jewish-Christianity," some scholars question its historicity; e.g., Gerd Lüdemann, "The Successors of Pre-70 Jerusalem Christianity: A Critical Evaluation of the Pella Tradition," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 1: *The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries*, ed. E. P. Sanders (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 161–73, Lüdemann, *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity* (trans. E. Boring; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 200–12; J. Verheyden, "The Flight of Christians to Pella," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 66 (1990): 368–84; Taylor, "Phenomenon of Early Jewish-Christianity," 315–16; Johannes Munck, "Jewish Christianity in Post-Apostolic Times," *NTS* 6 (1959): 103–4. Cf. Marcel Simon, "La migration à Pella: Légende ou réalité?" *RSR* 60 (1972): 37–54; Jürgen Wehnert, "Die Auswanderung der Jerusalemer Christen nach Pella – historische Faktum oder theologische Konstruktion?" *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 102 (1991): 231–55; Carleton Paget, "Jewish Christianity," 746–48.

¹¹ So Schiffman, "At the Crossroads," 155–56.

¹² See, e.g., Carleton Paget, "Jewish Christianity," 750. Here, when concluding his summary of our evidence for "Jewish-Christianity" (see pp. 742–50), Carleton Paget admits that "we know little about the historic fate of Jewish Christianity," notes that proto-orthodox/orthodox Christian heresiological comments are "not, of course, proof positive that they were perceived in such a way [i.e., as 'heretics'] everywhere," and even allows for the possibility that groups like the Nazarenes "might in certain quarters have been regarded as orthodox [i.e., orthodox Christians] even up to the middle of the fourth century." It is thus particularly striking that he goes on to assert: "What is clear is that, excluded from both Church and synagogue . . . it [i.e., 'Jewish-Christianity'] declined dramatically" – and, moreover, associates this decline with "the late second century onwards" (or, as he further specifies on p. 752: "by the 160s").

¹³ E.g., Simon, *Verus Israel*, 268–69.

Our extant evidence for so-called "Jewish-Christianity," however, frustrates scholarly attempts to tell the story of Christian origins as simply a tale of the inevitable separation of Christianity (in all its varieties) from its theological, social, and cultural ties to Judaism (both without and within). Following the "Parting" model, for instance, one would expect a proto-orthodox Christian like Justin Martyr – who wrote so soon after the Bar Kokhba Revolt and who so strenuously argued the church's supersession of the "old" Israel – to denounce those who retained Jewish observance alongside a belief in Christ, as part of his own construction of a Christianity in radical distinction from Judaism. Justin, however, readily embraces such individuals as authentic Christians (*Dial.* 47).¹⁴ However tempting it is to imagine that early Christian polemics against Judaism were accompanied by equally strident efforts to purge the church of "Jewish-Christianity," our sources make clear that the situation was not so simple.¹⁵

Modern theories about the early split between Christianity and Judaism might also lead us to imagine that our evidence for "Jewish-Christian" groups should be strongest for the first two centuries of Christianity and then progressively peter off, as Christ-believing Jews were replaced by new Gentile converts to an increasingly dominant orthodoxy and as "living" forms of Judaism were allegedly rendered irrelevant for the Christians of all stripes. This, indeed, is the story told by most historians.¹⁶ It remains the case, however, that much of our extant data about "Jewish-Christians" – both firsthand and secondhand – comes from the third, fourth, and fifth centuries CE.¹⁷

¹⁴ Notably, Justin here expresses concern that some Christ-believing Jews wish to convert Gentiles to a Torah-observant Christianity.

¹⁵ Indeed, in the second and third centuries CE, it seems that Marcion's complete rejection of Christianity's Jewish heritage was perceived as much more of a threat by proto-orthodox Christian authors than so-called "Jewish-Christians"; see e.g., Justin, *I Apol.* 26.5–8; 58.1; *Dial.* 38.6 (also Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4.6.9, on Justin's no longer extant treatise against Marcion); Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.1.2–4, 3, 23, 30.9; 3.3.4, 4.3, 11.2; 4.8–13, 29–34; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* See now F. Stanley Jones, *Pseudoclementina Elchasaiticaque inter Judaeochristiana: Collected Studies* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 203; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), esp. 152–71, on the importance of Marcionism for understanding "Jewish-Christianity" in Syria in particular.

¹⁶ Not surprisingly, the classical formulation of this perspective can be found in Adolf von Harnack's influential works (see, e.g., *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* [Gloucester: Smith, 1972], 44–72). For a summary of the history of scholarship on "Jewish-Christianity," see, e.g., Carleton Paget, "Jewish Christianity," 731–75; Klijn, "Study of Jewish-Christianity," 419–26; Simon Claude Mimouni, "Le Judéo-Christianisme ancien dans l'historiographie du XIX^e et du XX^e siècle," *REJ* 151 (1992): 419–28; Lüdemann, *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*, 1–34. For more recent interventions, which point to the precedents already in the eighteenth century, see F. Stanley Jones, ed., *Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity: From Toland to Baur* (History of Biblical Studies 5; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), as well as Chapter Eleven below.

¹⁷ From even a glance at the collection of Klijn and Reinink (*Patristic Evidence*), it is clear that our secondhand data cluster in these centuries. It is notable that the first author to mention the Nazoraeans/Nazarenes is Epiphanius (*Pan.* 29); it is no less striking that authors of his time seem far more preoccupied with the Ebionites than their heresiological predecessors (note,

This makes it especially ironic that regnant assumptions about the "Parting of the Ways" are perhaps nowhere more evident than in research on "Jewish-Christianity." Most striking is the contrast between scholarly approaches to "Jewish-Christian" tendencies in the New Testament literature and approaches to postapostolic evidence exhibiting the same tendencies.¹⁸ When dealing with the pre-"Parting" period, scholars (now, at least) see "Jewish-Christian" characteristics as authentic, widespread, and even normative, viewing them as important evidence for the Jewish heritage of the church and the vibrant diversity of the earliest Christ-believing communities. After the second century CE, however, "Jewish-Christianity" becomes a problem for the church historian: a phenom-

e.g., Irenaeus' very brief comments about this group at *Adv. haer.* 1.26.2; 3.11.7, 21.1; 4.33.4; 5.1.3, in contrast to his copious comments about Marcionites, Valentinians, etc.). Moreover, the *Didascalia apostolorum* appears to date from the third century, whereas the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* are both from the fourth (see discussion below).

The three "Jewish-Christian gospels" that scholars have reconstructed from comments of proto-orthodox/orthodox Christian authors – the so-called *Gospel of the Nazoraeans*, *Gospel of the Ebionites*, and *Gospel of the Hebrews* – are all commonly dated to the first half of the second century (so Philip Vielhauer and Georg Strecker, "Jewish-Christian Gospels," in *NTA* 1:134–78, esp. 159, 169, 176). But, as with the evidence for these gospels in general, their early dating is based on a very particular reading of a set of data that admits multiple explanations and enables very little certainty (as clear from the summary in Vielhauer and Strecker, "Jewish-Christian Gospels," 1:136–151). For instance, the second-century dating of the *Gospel of the Ebionites* is based on the statements of Irenaeus (ca. 180 CE) about the Ebionites' use of a Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew redacted to fit their own beliefs (*Adv. haer.* 1.26.2; 3.11.7, 21.1; 5.1.3). Arguments about a similarly early date for the *Gospel of the Nazoraeans* and the *Gospel of the Hebrews* are based on Eusebius' statement that Hegesippus (ca. 180) must be a convert from Judaism since "he quotes from both the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac" (*Hist. eccl.* 4.22.8). In light of the widespread traditions about Matthew composing his gospel in Hebrew and the early Christian application of the label "Gospel of/according to the Hebrews" to a broad variety of works – including the Gospel of Matthew itself (Epiphanius, *Pan.*, 30.3.7) and Tatian's *Diatesseron* (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 46.1) – none of these arguments prove terribly persuasive, particularly if we follow Klijn, Reinink, and others in questioning the overconfidence with which some scholars reconstruct the beliefs and practices of the Ebionites and the Nazoraeans/Nazorenes from our heresiological witnesses (see *Patristic Evidence*, esp. 67–73). Rather, what is striking about the secondhand evidence adduced by Vielhauer and Strecker is that so many Christian authors in the centuries following the so-called "Parting of the Ways" (i.e., especially the fourth and fifth centuries, but even well into the Middle Ages) seem to know of gospels written in Hebrew or Hebrew letters (i.e., Hebrew or Aramaic), gospels circulated among "the Jews," and gospels that generally strike them as τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν. For a more recent attempt to recover early strata from these materials, however, see now Petri Luomanen, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels* (VCSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

¹⁸ This is perhaps most clear in the work of Jean Daniélou. As mentioned above, Daniélou offers a very broad definition of "Jewish-Christianity." Nevertheless, he still remains firm in limiting this phenomenon to the period before mid-second century CE. Afterwards, in his view, there could only be "secondary contributions, Jewish traditions incorporated into a whole that was no longer Jewish" (*Theology of Jewish Christianity*, 8–10). Hence, he treats the evidence for later attempts to combine Jewish and Christian elements under the title "Heterodox Jewish-Christianity," and he deems these efforts significant only insofar as they "preserve certain elements which they had in common with Jewish-Christianity (i.e., the earlier, orthodox variety)" (p. 55).

non in need of explanation, whose spread and influence can ideally be limited to a narrow geographical scope or constrained into tiny "heretical" sects huddled on the periphery of the "Great Church."¹⁹

Within most modern studies of "Jewish-Christianity" after the "Parting of the Ways," one detects a notable sense of disbelief at the possibility that, after the second century CE, anyone might be attracted to varieties of Christianity that still "clung" to Jewish observance – let alone the possibility that there could be varieties of Judaism that granted some special role to Jesus.²⁰ Even Marcel Simon – who so incisively critiqued the tendency to see "Jewish-Christianity" as "an aberrant manifestation of early Christianity" and who stressed the diversity of "Jewish-Christian" groups and the diversity of the Judaism from which they drew – described late antique "Jewish-Christianity" as a "fossilized form of Christianity," a stunted "survival" left in the wake of the decisive evolution of the church away from its Jewish origins.²¹ The implications are striking: Christianity's early "Parting" from Judaism was allegedly so decisive as to transform certain normative variations in biblically-based belief and practice into bizarre anachronisms, at best, and pernicious heresies, at worst. In other words, the narratives told in modern research echo proto-orthodox/orthodox Christian historiography in asserting that "Jewish-Christian" forms of belief and worship should have never survived – let alone thrived – long beyond the apostolic age. Accordingly, scholars largely follow the lead of the heresiologists, by minimizing, marginalizing, and explaining away the evidence to the contrary.

Insofar as the "Problem of Jewish-Christianity" resonates with very basic questions about how assumptions about religious identity shape the modern categorization of ancient groups (as well as the scholarly reconstruction of the relationships between them), this issue proves particularly relevant for experimenting with approaches to Judaism and Christianity as "Ways that Never Parted."

¹⁹ On the traditional tendency to insist upon the limited regional scope of "Jewish-Christian" tendencies and their complete lack of influence on orthodox Christianity, see Klijn, "Study of Jewish-Christianity," esp. 421–25. Here too we can discern the influence of Harnack, who accepted the existence of a variety of "Jewish-Christian" groups in both the apostolic and postapostolic periods, but stridently emphasized that they had no impact on the "Great Church" (see, e.g., *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* [repr. ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1965], 317).

²⁰ It should be noted that "Jewish-Christianity" has usually been studied as a variety of Christianity, rather than a variety of Judaism; an important exception is Charlotte Fonrobert, "The *Didascalia Apostolorum*: A Mishnah for the Disciples of Jesus," *J ECS* 9 (2001): 483–509. See further Visotzky, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish-Christianities," 129–49, and studies of Rabbinic traditions about *minim* ("heretics" or "sectarians" – a category that sometimes includes "Jewish-Christians"), particularly: Daniel Boyarin, "A Tale of Two Synods: Nicaea, Yavneh, and Rabbinic Ecclesiology," *Exemplaria* 12 (2000): 55–60; Boyarin, "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism," *CH* 70 (2001): 438–49; Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Divinations; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); also Richard Kalmin, "Christians and Heretics in Rabbinic Literature of Late Antiquity," *HTR* 87 (1994): 155–69, esp. 163–65.

²¹ Simon, *Verus Israel*, 238–44.

Towards this goal, I will here focus on the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, two fourth-century texts widely recognized as our most important and extensive sources for reconstructing a first-hand account of "Jewish-Christianity."²² I will begin by considering how assumptions about the "Parting of the Ways" have shaped modern scholarship on the Pseudo-Clementines. Then, I will turn to examine three selections from the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* (*Rec.* 1.27–71; 4–6; *Hom.* 8–11), attempting to elucidate the self-understanding of their final authors/redactors. Finally, I will try to locate these texts in their late antique context, offering some tentative suggestions about their broader significance for our understanding of the history of Jewish/Christian relations more broadly.

Due to the complex literary history of the Pseudo-Clementines, this inquiry will raise more questions than it can answer. Nevertheless, I here hope to highlight the diversity of viewpoints that the modern category of "Jewish-Christianity" conflates, by drawing attention to the range of perspectives expressed and preserved, even within a single corpus. In the process, I hope to show the special value of so-called "Jewish-Christian" sources – and the Pseudo-Clementines in particular – for a fresh approach to the relationship between Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity, pursued apart from traditional assumptions about their allegedly "parted ways." New approaches, I will argue, are nowhere more needed than in the study of late antique "Jewish-Christianity," due to the dissonance between our ancient evidence and the modern frameworks used to interpret it. And, for precisely this reason, the sources studied under the rubric of "Jewish-Christianity" may provide particularly heuristic foci for forging and testing fresh approaches to the interactions between Jews and Christians – and the continuing ambiguities in "Jewish" and "Christian" identities – in the multiple geographical, social, intellectual, and political worlds of Late Antiquity.²³

The "Parting of the Ways" and the History of Scholarship on the Pseudo-Clementines

In form, the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* are composite texts that integrate ample material from earlier sources. Insofar as the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* share the same basic structure and contain many parallels, most

²² For an extensive, accessible, and generally invaluable survey of the scholarship on this literature, see F. Stanley Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines: A History of Research," *Second Century* 2 (1982): 1–33, 63–96 – now extended in Jones, ed., *Rediscovery of Jewish Christianity*.

²³ This potential is tapped to brilliant effect in Fonrobert, "*Didascalia Apostolorum*" (see esp. her comments on pp. 484–87, 508–9). As Fonrobert rightly stresses there, "Our understanding of the formation of Jewish and Christian collective identities as separate identities depends on developing an intelligible way of discussing the phenomenon called 'Jewish Christianity,' one that is not marred by Christian theological prejudices, nor by unexamined assumptions about either 'Jewish' identity formation or its 'Christian' counterpart" (p. 484).

scholars accept that they rework the same Basic Source (or *Grundschrift*), which most scholars date to the early third century CE.²⁴ The earlier of the two appears to be the *Homilies* (ca. 300–320 CE), for which the original Greek is still extant.²⁵ The *Recognitions* is commonly dated to the middle of the fourth century, but it only survives in full in Rufinus' Latin translation (ca. 407 CE).²⁶ The Syriac version of the Pseudo-Clementines integrates selections from both (i.e., *Rec.* 1–4.1.4; *Hom.* 10–14) and is extant in a manuscript from 411 CE.²⁷ In addition, we have later epitomes of the *Homilies* and/or *Recognitions* in many languages, including Greek, Arabic, Georgian, and Armenian, as well as fragments in Slavonic and Ethiopic.²⁸

Both the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* legitimize their teachings by means of an overarching narrative about the conversion and early career of Clement of Rome. In both, exhortations and instructions are attributed to Clement's distinguished mentor, the apostle Peter. Among these are statements emphasizing the importance of Moses, the Torah, and halakhic observance (especially ritual purity and dietary laws), asserting the continued chosenness of the Jews, and depicting the Mosaic Torah and the teachings of Jesus as equal sources of salvific knowledge.²⁹ In addition, the *Homilies* and *Recognitions* appeal to the authority of this apostle to promote an account of early church history that counters the epistles

²⁴ See further Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 8–14. This source is generally dated to before 220 CE, due to its apparent dependence on Bardaisan. Jones' many insights into this source are handily collected now in *Pseudoclementina*, esp. 114–206.

²⁵ For the text of the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*: Bernhard Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, vol. 1: *Homilien* (GCS 42; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969), on which all citations in this article are based. The edition is prefaced with a discussion of its date and provenance, the relationship between the two extant Greek MSS ("P" and "O") and the two Greek Epitomes ("e" and "E"), and its text-history (pp. vii–xxiii).

²⁶ For the text of the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*: Bernhard Rehm, *Die Pseudoklementinen*, vol. 2: *Rekognitionen in Rufinus Übersetzung* (GCS 51; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969), on which all citations in this article are based. Notably, *Recognitions* is extant in a greater number of MSS than is *Homilies* (i.e., over a hundred, dating from the fifth to fifteenth centuries; see pp. xvii–xcv, cix–cxi).

²⁷ I.e., British Museum add. 12150. For a preliminary edition of the Syriac of this and a later MS, together with reconstructed Greek, see Wilhelm Frankenberg, *Die syrischen Clementinen mit griechischem Paralleltext: Eine Vorarbeit zu dem literargeschichtlichen Problem der Sammlung* (TU 48.3; Leipzig: Henrichs, 1937). It is notable that the selections from *Rec.* 1–4 in this version seem to come from a different translator than the selections from *Hom.* 10–14 (pp. viii–ix). On the importance of this understudied version for our knowledge about the Greek *Vorlage* of Rufinus' Latin *Rec.*, see F. Stanley Jones, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27–71* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 39–49. See now Jones, *Pseudoclementina*, 207–305; Jones, trans., *The Syriac Pseudo-Clementines: An Early Version of the First Christian Novel* (Apocryphes 14; Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), a translation based on Jones' forthcoming edition.

²⁸ See Jones, "Pseudo-Clementines," 6–7, 80–84, and references there.

²⁹ See discussion below.