

# Jewish-Christian Relations in Barnabas and Justin Martyr

by

WILLIAM HORBURY

The ways have parted already, for the writers considered here. The author of the Epistle of Barnabas saw Christian and Jews as 'us' and 'them' (αὐτοί, ii 7, xiv 1, 4; the more adverse ἐκείνοι, iii 6, viii 7, x 12, xiii 1, xiv 5). Justin Martyr wrote that Christians who adopted Judaism had 'gone over' (μεταβάντας) to the polity of the law (*dial.* xvii 4). For both authors, however, the ways still run close together.

To proceed from these writings to the relations of Jews and Christians in the second century is not, of course, straightforward. A. von Harnack, for example, allowed that Justin's *Dialogue* reflected genuine Jewish-Christian contact, and that it therefore formed one of the exceptions to his view that most writing *adversus Iudaeos* was really for internal consumption or *adversus gentes*; but he thought that the Judaism described in the Epistle of Barnabas was indeed abstract, standing for the influence of the scriptures inherited by Christians rather than the way of life of flesh-and-blood Jews<sup>1</sup>. His judgment remains influential in the study of patristic anti-Jewish writing in general and of Barnabas in particular, for instance in the commentaries by H. Windisch (1920) and K. Wengst (1984); but reasons for a different opinion in this instance have often been noted, perhaps especially fully and creatively in S. Lowy's reconstruction of a Jewish situation to which the Epistle responds<sup>2</sup>. Some of the arguments are reconsidered below, and it is urged here that Barnabas as well as Justin probably reflects the importance of the contemporary Jewish community for

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Harnack, *Die Altercatio Simonis et Theophili nebst Untersuchungen über die anti-jüdische Polemik in der alten Kirche* (TU iii 1, Leipzig, 1883), 73–4, 78 n. 59; Harnack, *Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1897, 1904), i, 415–6.

<sup>2</sup> H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief* (1920), in W. Bauer, M. Dibelius, R. Knopf, H. Windisch, *Die apostolischen Väter* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband, Tübingen, 1920–23), 299–413 (322–3); K. Wengst, *Didache (Apostellehre), Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* (Darmstadt, 1984), 112 (Wengst's view of the aims of the Epistle, as advanced in his earlier *Tradition und Theologie des Barnabasbriefes* (Berlin & New York, 1971), is criticized by Scorza Barcellona (as cited in n. 4, below), 166–170); S. Lowy, 'The Confutation of Judaism in the Epistle of Barnabas', *JJs* xi (1960), 1–33.

the early Christians; but Harnack's view serves to underline the truth that the writings in question are literature, not slices of life.

### Barnabas and Justin as Christian Authorities

First, then, it may be noted that Barnabas and Justin have an importance for Jewish-Christian relations in antiquity, and in the second century in particular, simply by virtue of their places in the Christian *literary* inheritance. The Epistle of Barnabas went up to a very high place, being venerated as the work of an apostle or an apostolic man, and accordingly transmitted, as in Codex Sinaiticus and the biblical text followed in Jerome's *Hebrew Names*, at the end of the New Testament books; its wide circulation and high repute are confirmed by the early Latin version, and by remarks in Origen and Jerome<sup>3</sup>. Its striking judgment that the ritual and dietary laws were never meant to be kept literally was taken in a refined form through Origen into the Alexandrian stream of Christian assessment of the Old Testament, and it must be reckoned a considerable influence on early Christian views of Judaism and the Jewish scriptures<sup>4</sup>. Its specifically second-century éclat is marked by Clement of Alexandria's acceptance of the attribution to Barnabas (n. 3, above), and by the making of the Latin version in the early third century, or even before Tertullian<sup>5</sup>; moreover, its transmission with the New Testament books in the fourth century, despite the currency of criticism like that expressed by Eusebius, is most easily understood if its repute for apostolicity had been widespread since early times.

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius, *H. E.* iii 24, 4 reckons it himself among the νόθοι, but when later writing on Clement of Alexandria (vi 13, 6; 14, 1) puts it higher, among the ἀντιλεγόμενα γραφαί – this is probably a tribute to the respectable company shared by Barnabas in Clement – in the course of recording how Clement of Alexandria cited some of these, including Barnabas, in his *Stromateis* (Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Hebrews, Barnabas, I Clement, Jude) and in his *Hypotyposes* (Jude, the other catholic epistles, Barnabas and the Revelation of Peter); apostolic authorship is affirmed by Clement of Alexandria, *strom.* ii 20 (116–7) and elsewhere; Origen, *contra Celsum* i 63, quotes 'the general epistle of Barnabas' without comment, as if it were undisputed, going directly on to cite Luke and I Timothy, and envisaging that Celsus might himself have known the Epistle of Barnabas; according to Jerome, *vir. ill.* vi, the epistle is read among the apocrypha, but the apostle Barnabas was the author – and when commenting on Ezek xliii 19 Jerome finds it natural to say that the bullock offered for us is mentioned in 'many places of the scriptures, and especially the Epistle of Barnabas, which is included among the apocryphal scriptures'.

<sup>4</sup> The success of the Epistle in the early church was emphasized by J. Armitage Robinson (with Preface by R. H. Connolly), 'The Epistle of Barnabas and the Didache', *JTS* xxxv (1934), 113–46 (122–3).

<sup>5</sup> J. M. Heer, *Die Versio Latina des Barnabasbriefes* (Freiburg i. B., 1908), 59 (before Cyprian, probably after Tertullian) (references to the Latin text below are to this edition); Wengst, *Didache* . . . , 105, n. 4 notes that Heer later (*RQ* xxiii (1909), 224) allowed with caution that the version might possibly be earlier than Tertullian; F. Scorza Barcellona, *Epistola di Barnaba* (Turin, 1975), ascribes the version to the second or third century.

Justin's lower place among the Christian authors was still the honourable position of a philosopher-martyr, and his works, including writings now lost, were current among 'many of the brethren' in the time of Eusebius (*H. E.* iv 18, 8–9). Tatian and Irenaeus had quoted Justin, and for the present purpose it is also notable that his biblical interpretation often overlaps with that of Irenaeus and Tertullian; there is a fair case for literary debt on the side of Tertullian, but in any case Justin is clearly representative of widespread second-century exegesis<sup>6</sup>. The writings here considered, therefore, all had a high repute among Christians in the second century; Barnabas was then widely accorded the lofty rank of an apostolic epistle, and Justin's work was both well-known and representative. These writings will have been correspondingly influential in forming second-century Christian attitudes to the Jews and Judaism.

### Questions to be Considered

Secondly, however, it can be asked what pre-existing attitudes these writings reflect, and how far they illuminate Jewish-Christian relations in the earlier second century. These are the main questions considered below. Barnabas and Justin can reasonably be reviewed together, for although the Epistle of Barnabas is probably about fifty years earlier than Justin's writings (see below) they share so much in subject-matter and biblical testimonies that it is asked whether Justin used the Epistle<sup>7</sup>. (With different aims, but with a comparable linkage, Barnabas and Justin's Dialogue were translated and issued together in Switzerland towards the end of the Second World War as the two earliest post-biblical Christian statements on Christian as opposed to Jewish understanding of the scriptures<sup>8</sup>.)

Justin is generally considered, as by Harnack, to reflect genuine contact with Jews, and so to promise some light not only on the Christian but also, with due allowance for his limited candle-power as an outsider, on the Jewish side of the

<sup>6</sup> A. Lukyn Williams, *Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho. Translation, Introduction and Notes* (London, 1930), p. xiv (overlaps with Tertullian and Irenaeus not amounting to clear evidence for literary dependence); T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian* (Oxford, 1971), 106–8 (Tertullian did not use Justin's *Dialogue* for his *Adversus Iudaeos*, but did use the *First Apology* in his own *Apology*).

<sup>7</sup> O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy* (Supplements to *NT* lvi, Leiden, 1987), 110–113 (on shared Old Testament quotations), 307–11 (on similar treatments of the Day of Atonement) and 393–9, with n. 61 (on similar treatments of Amalek and the brazen serpent), concluding that Justin has never copied an Old Testament quotation from Barnabas, inclines to the view that for testimonies and other material too they had shared sources rather than direct contact.

<sup>8</sup> K. Thieme, *Kirche und Synagoge. Die ersten nachbiblischen Zeugnisse ihres Gegensatzes im Offenbarungsverständnis: Der Barnabasbrief und der Dialog Justins des Märtyrers, neu bearbeitet und erläutert* (Olten, 1945).

relationship. On the Epistle of Barnabas opinions diverge, as already noted. It is not a defence of Christianity 'against the Jews', although such defence forms a large part of its content, but a scriptural instruction which is also an earnest exhortation to a moral life, appropriately concluded by a version of the Two Ways. Despite the clear internal direction of its teaching and exhortation, the series of lively and embittered references to 'us' and 'them' cited from it above form one of the main grounds for thinking it a source for Christian attitudes not just to the scriptures and morality, but also and especially to the flesh-and-blood Jewish community.

With regard to Christian attitudes, it will be urged here that all these writings evince an outlook which, despite anti-Judaism, is formed by Jewish culture and influenced by Jewish public opinion. The Jews are in the majority as compared with the Christians: unlike the Christians, they are recognized as an ancient nation loyal to their ancestral laws and customs: and despite their revolts (themselves no small proof of Jewish strength and numbers) they enjoy a public prestige symbolized by the general knowledge of their assemblies for the reading of the law ('palam lectitant . . . vulgo aditur sabbatis omnibus', Tertullian, *Apology* xviii 8).

In the Epistle of Barnabas, after the suppression of the first Jewish revolt against Rome, and probably before those which broke out under Trajan, the writer thinks that Christians are in danger of going over to the Jewish community, and for Justin too this is a live possibility. Christians accordingly share in prevailing moods of Jewish communal feeling, notably in excitement at the prospect of a rebuilt temple and in the related patriotic hopes for the redemption of Israel current during this epoch of Jewish upheavals (66–70, 115–8, 132–5). It seems likely that differences in attitude among Christians on these subjects correspond to contemporary differences in the Jewish community.

The less-documented Jewish side of the relationship with the Christians has left some traces in Barnabas, but is much more fully documented in Justin. His writings, like the Epistle of Barnabas, evince a marked share in Jewish public opinion. A brief reassessment of his knowledge of the Jewish community leads to consideration of his report of Jewish reaction to Christianity. The Jewish measures against Christian dissent which he describes (measures thought by Justin to be of long standing) resemble those suggested by some New Testament passages. They will have derived their effectiveness, it is suggested, from a communal solidarity which was no doubt enhanced by the strong patriotic feeling already noted, but in any case involves intercommunal communication and cohesion.

## Dating

The works of Justin considered here, the Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho, were written between 151 and Justin's death, which occurred when Junius Rusticus was prefect of Rome (162–8)<sup>9</sup>. The Dialogue was probably composed after the First Apology, and has many links with it, especially in proof-texts. Both these works refer to the 'war in Judaea', Bar Cocheba's revolt of 132–5; in the First Apology (xxxii) it is spoken of as recent, and the Dialogue is envisaged as taking place not long after it had broken out (i 3, cf. ix 3; xvi 2 seems to presuppose the suppression of the revolt). These evocations of the wartime and post-war situation underline the significance of the works, despite their later date, for the period (ending in 135) primarily considered in this volume. Jewish questions are important in the First Apology, but become the main subject of the Dialogue, which according to Eusebius (*H. E.* iv 18, 6) was set in Ephesus. The interchanges of the speakers are marked by a striking and lifelike contrast between the personal courtesy for the most part maintained by Justin (and especially by Trypho), and the bitterly harsh remarks of Justin (and occasionally of Trypho too) when they are speaking as representative of their communities. The Dialogue is an artistically contrived literary work, and one which has not survived in its entirety; but behind it there are genuine Jewish-Christian communal contacts, and the author had his own experience of them<sup>10</sup>.

The date of the Epistle of Barnabas cannot be treated so rapidly. The *genius loci* honoured at the Durham symposium, J. B. Lightfoot, states that 'it was certainly written after the first destruction of Jerusalem under Titus to which it alludes, and it was almost as certainly written before the war under Hadrian ending in the second devastation, about which it is silent, but to which it could hardly have failed to refer, if written after or during the conflict'<sup>11</sup>. Attempts at greater precision in dating turn mainly on two pairs of passages. First, there are possible but not certain allusions at xi 9, to the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch lxi 7 (this passage from Barnabas is taken over without reference to a source by Clement of Alexandria, *strom.* iii 12 (86)); and at xii 1, to II Esdras iv 33 and v 5, but with a clause not in our II Esdras v 5. Literary contact between Barnabas

<sup>9</sup> Harnack, *Chronologie*, i, 274–84; H. Chadwick, 'Justin Martyr's Defence of Christianity', *BJRL* xlvii (1965), 275–97 (277–8); G. Visonà, *S. Giustino, Dialogo con Trifone* (Milan, 1988), 18–19 (with discussion of recent literature).

<sup>10</sup> For discussion see Williams, *Dialogue*, xi–xix (on the text and its sources); Chadwick, 'Defence', 281–2 (testimony-collections probably used in both Barnabas and Justin); G. N. Stanton, 'Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic', *NTS* xxxi (1985), 377–92 (378), P. R. Trebilco, *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1991), 29–30, and especially Visonà, 46–57 (the Dialogue includes genuine reflection of Jewish-Christian contacts in general and in Justin's own experience).

<sup>11</sup> J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part I. S. Clement of Rome* (end edn, 2 vols., London, 1890), ii, 505.

and these two apocalypses is indeed far from certain; at xi 9 there is a fair argument for allusion, rather, to Ezek xx 6, 15, for a later chapter in Ezekiel is clearly in view in verse 10, and at xii 1 an apocryphal Jeremiah may be the source<sup>12</sup>. Even if the two allusions were certain, however, the dates of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch and II Esdras iii–xiv could only be said to be soon enough after A.D. 70 for the destruction of Jerusalem to be acutely resented, with a strong argument for placing the eagle vision of II Esdras xi–xii in the reign of Domitian (81–96)<sup>13</sup>. More important than the limited significance of these passages for dating is their manifestation of some kinship in the choice of material between Barnabas and Jewish apocalypses from the years after 70.

Secondly, another pair of passages in Barnabas probably refer to contemporary events. At iv 3–5 the epistle gives a prophecy, veiled in the language of Dan vii 7f., 24, and recalling the oracle based on this passage in Sib iii 396–400, that three horns out of ten horns will be humbled under one ‘little horn’. The ‘little horn’ in Daniel is illomened, and strong candidates for identification with it are therefore Vespasian, destroyer of Jerusalem and humbler of the three emperors who preceded him in quick succession, or Nero redivivus, awaited as humbler of the triad of Flavian emperors; but the passage cannot be confidently assigned to a particular reign. The second of the two passages offers more hope in this respect. In xvi 3–4 the writer holds that the prophecy ‘they who destroyed this temple shall themselves rebuild it’ (an adaptation of Isa xlix 17 LXX) is now being fulfilled; ‘because they [the Jews] went to war, it was destroyed by the enemy; now they themselves, the servant of the enemy, will build it up again’. The reference (further discussed in section II, below) is probably to the temple of the Jews at Jerusalem. If so, the passage can be associated with the reign of Nerva (18.ix.96–27.i.98), who favoured the Jews by removing the ‘calumny of the Jewish exchequer’, and was well remembered by Christians too (Eusebius, *H. E.* iii 20, 8–9); a belief that the temple would be rebuilt can readily be envisaged in his reign<sup>14</sup>. The early years of Hadrian are often suggested (especially on the basis of the praises of Hadrian at the beginning of the fifth Sibylline), and they are certainly likely to have revived Jewish hopes; but Nerva’s reign seems preferable, not only because his CALVMNIA

<sup>12</sup> The evidence is set out and discussed by Heer 67–8, Scorza Barcellona, 151–2, and Wengst, *Didache* . . . , 171 n. 185, 200 n. 189; the suggestion of Ezek xx 6 at xi 9 goes back at least to the early eighteenth-century W. Lowth, cited by J. Potter, ed., *Clementis Alexandrini Opera* (2 vols., Oxford, 1715), ii, 550, n. 2. That no literary dependence on the two apocalypses can be established was the conclusion of J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London, 1976), 318, n. 34.

<sup>13</sup> On the date of II Esdras, E. Schürer, G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, M. D. Goodman & P. Vermes, *A History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, iii, 1 (Edinburgh, 1986), 297–300.

<sup>14</sup> For the importance of Nerva’s action to the Jews, see M. D. Goodman, ‘Nerva, the *fiscus Judaicus* and Jewish Identity’, *JRS* lxxix (1989), 40–44.

SVBLATA coinage was a particularly clear public sign of favour to the Jews, but also because the growth of the great reputation of the epistle as apostolic is easier to understand if its date is earlier than the time of Hadrian<sup>15</sup>. If this is right, the interpretation of Daniel in iv 3–5 will have been re-applied from Vespasian to Nerva, who does not suit the bad character of the little horn, but is as well qualified as Vespasian (for neither could claim to rule by right of descent) to be called an offshoot ‘on the side’<sup>16</sup>. The epistle could then be assigned, with fair probability, to the very end of the first century.

## Barnabas

### (i) *The Epistle and the Sources*

The Christian outlook on Judaism represented in Barnabas and Justin can now be considered further. An attempt to reconstruct something of this outlook from Barnabas will be made through attention, first, to the fear of assimilation manifest, it will be argued, especially in a controverted passage, iii 6; then to the radical theory of the Jewish scriptures developed throughout chapters ii–xvi; and finally to the dependence of the writer on Jewish culture and opinion.

The wide differences in estimate of Barnabas have been noted already. Rabbinic students have repeatedly suggested a Jewish background for its exegesis, and have also noted rabbinic responses to the polemical positions it represents; notable predecessors of S. Lowy (n. 2, above) include M. Güdemann, K. Kohler, A. Marmorstein and G. Al(l)on, and at least one New Testament student with strong rabbinic interests, Adolf Schlatter<sup>17</sup>. This posi-

<sup>15</sup> Theories of dating are reviewed, with preference (following Lightfoot) for Vespasian’s reign, by J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating*, 313–9, and with preference (following A. Hilgenfeld) for Nerva’s reign, by P. Richardson & M. B. Shukster, ‘Barnabas, Nerva, and the Yavnean Rabbis’, *JTS* NS xxxiv (1983), 31–55; the argument for the early years of Hadrian (following W. Volkmar and J. G. Müller, with L. W. Barnard and others noted by Wengst, *Tradition*, 107–8, nn. 25–6) is put by G. Al(l)on, *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age* (edited and translated by G. Levi, repr. Cambridge, Mass., 1989), 448–52. M. Hengel, ‘Hadrians Politik gegenüber Juden und Christen’, in *Ancient Studies in Memory of Elias Bickerman* [= *JANES* xvi–xvii (1984–5)] (1987), 153–82 (160 & n. 36), gives no special discussion of the date of Barnabas and regards xvi 4 as obscure (‘dunkel’), but accepts it as one of the indications that Jews between 117 and 130 possibly hoped for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple.

<sup>16</sup> The argument is more fully presented by the present writer (arguing that Ber. R. lxiv 10, an anecdote also implying belief that the temple would be rebuilt by Roman permission, more probably reflects conditions under Nerva than under Hadrian) in ‘The Jewish Revolts under Trajan and Hadrian’, forthcoming in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, iv.

<sup>17</sup> M. Güdemann, *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Leipzig, 1876), 99–131, known to me only as reported by K. Kohler, ‘Barnabas’, *JE* i (1902), 537–8 and J. Muilenburg, *The Literary Relations of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (Marburg, 1929), 98–100; A. Marmorstein, ‘L’Épître de Barnabé et la polémique juive’, *REJ* lx (1910), 213–20 [rabbinic polemic attacks positions which are represented in Barnabas]; G. Allon, ‘The

tion is reflected in H. Veil's introduction (in E. Hennecke's handbook to the New Testament apocrypha), G. Hoennicke's book on Jewish Christianity, B. Reicke's study of early Christian 'zeal'<sup>18</sup>, and, in fuller treatments of the Epistle, in the work of J. Muilenburg (n. 15, above) and F. Scorza Barcellona (n. 4, above). On the other hand, Harnack's position was developed in Germany not only in the commentaries by Windisch and Wengst (n. 2, above), but also in the church history of Hans Lietzmann (who saw the writer of the Epistle as a 'learned manikin', unable to resist composing a pamphlet); it has also influenced the French commentary by R. A. Kraft and P. Prigent<sup>19</sup>. In England, however, the importance of the Jewish community for the author found greater recognition; W. J. Ferrar summed up the setting of the Epistle in the words 'Its bitterness and contempt for the Jewish polity must have been stirred by real danger of a relapse to Judaism among Christians', and Armitage Robinson, although he found no bitterness or animosity in the severe things said about the Jews as a people, agreed that the writer's situation was one in which Judaism might be perceived as 'after all a nobler and more sustaining creed than the Christianity which, since it had broken away from its original stock, was already shewing signs of decay' in moral decadence<sup>20</sup>.

The literary basis for this disagreement over the setting of Barnabas lies especially in the possibility of distinguishing between the framework of the Epistle, with its emphasis on the right understanding of the scriptures by the writer's spiritual 'sons and daughters' and on godly living (for example at i 1,5–8; iv 9–14; xviii–xxi), and the more polemical contents of chapters ii–xvi, the anti-Judaism of which may then be assigned to the past setting of the sources employed (especially the testimonies) rather than to the present situation of the author (the argument is concisely stated by Windisch, 322–3 and Wengst, 112–3).

The author as well as his source seems to be involved in anti-Judaism, however, for example at iii 6 (considered in the following paragraph), iv 6, xv

---

Halakhah in the Epistle of Barnabas' [in Hebrew], *Tarbiz* xi (1939), 23–8; A. Schlatter, *Die Tage Trajans und Hadrians* (1897), reprinted in id., *Synagoge und Kirche bis zum Barkochba-Aufstand* (Stuttgart, 1966), 9–97 (63f.).

<sup>18</sup> H. Veil, 'Barnabasbrief', in E. Hennecke (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (2nd edn., Tübingen, 1924), 503–18 (503–4, with a brief criticism of Windisch); G. Hoennicke, *Das Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1908), 95–7, 284–6 (inclining to the view that the author of Barnabas was Jewish); B. Reicke, *Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der christlichen Agapenfeier* (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1951:5, Uppsala, 1951), 378–82.

<sup>19</sup> H. Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Christian Church* (E. T., 2nd edn, London, 1949, repr. 1961), 217; P. Prigent & R. A. Kraft, *L'Épître de Barnabé* (Paris, 1971), 29 & n. 1.

<sup>20</sup> W. J. Ferrar, *The Early Christian Books* (London, 1919), 38–9; Armitage Robinson, 'Barnabas', 121, 125–6, 145–6 (his stress on the writer's moral concern coheres with his view that the author of Barnabas originally composed the treatise on the Two Ways; the present writer would view the treatise as a pre-Christian Jewish work taken over in the Epistle).

8–9, xvi 1, and, although he certainly presents his teaching as ‘knowledge’ in general, it often involves rebuttal of the Jews in particular, and his own attitude cannot readily be distinguished from that which emerges from the whole series of passages on ‘us’ and ‘them’ noted already. It is perhaps unlikely, in any case, that so much lively polemic should have been gathered together in circumstances to which it did not speak. Accordingly, the repeated assertion in Barnabas of the Christian claim to the Jewish scriptures should not be too confidently assessed as an academic exercise, for this assertion was fundamental *adversus Iudaeos*, as Justin shows (Dialogue xxix 2). In general, it is worth noting that the view represented by Harnack, Windisch and Wengst originated when an early and decisive separation of the Christians from the social influence of the large Jewish population in the eastern Roman provinces was more widely accepted than would now be the case<sup>21</sup>. Lastly, as Armitage Robinson stressed, the author’s concern with moral exhortation coheres with his anxiety about Judaism, for it presupposes a precarious state of Christian morals which might well have made the Jewish community appear more honourable in life-style as well as prestige.

### (ii) *Fear of Christian Assimilation to the Jews*

A striking characteristic of the outlook on Judaism in the Epistle, then, can provisionally be identified as a combination of evident fear of Christian assimilation to the Jews with the radical view of the ritual laws noted already. Fear of assimilation, the first point to be considered, emerges when the initial argument of the Epistle that sacrifices were never needed and are done away (chapter ii) culminates in a section on fasting (chapter iii). Here the declaration of the fast which the Lord has chosen (consisting of charitable works) in Isa lvii 6–10 is taken as a manifestation of God’s will beforehand ‘to us’ (the Christians), ἵνα μὴ προσρησώμεθα ὡς ἐπήλυτοι τῷ ἐκείνων νόμῳ, ‘lest we be shipwrecked as (if) proselytes to their law’ or ‘lest we be dashed against their law as (if) proselytes’ (iii 6). (Compare the Latin ‘ut non incurramus tamquam proselyti ad illorum legem’, ‘that we may not rush in as (if) proselytes to their law’ or ‘that we may not run up against their law (if) proselytes’.) The clause is sometimes understood, as by Windisch and Wengst in their comments ad loc., as a warning against Judaistic Christianity rather than lapse into Judaism. It is certainly likely that Judaizers within the Christian fold are among envisaged here, for in the next chapter (iv 6) there is a condemnation of those who say that ‘the

<sup>21</sup> Thus, in a reprintation of Harnack’s general view of the *adversus Iudaeos* texts, live Jewish-Christian polemic is allowed for up to the middle of the second century by D. Rokeah, *Jews, Pagans and Christians* (Jerusalem & Leiden, 1982), 9–10, 61–5; there is of course a strong case for important contacts throughout the patristic period, as J. Juster, Marcel Simon, B. Blumenkranz and others have shown.

covenant is theirs and ours' (not 'ours' only, as the author would maintain). In this instance, however, as is shown by the context of 'us' and 'them' (iii 1, 3, 6; iv 6–8), any Judaistic Christianity known to the writer would clearly be not simply a response to the literal sense of the ritual and dietary laws, but a response made in awareness of 'them', the Jewish community, and in the knowledge that this is the way in which the Jews observe 'their law'.

This observation is underlined by the consideration that fasting, the matter in view, was much more prominent in ancient Jewish custom than it is in the Pentateuchal laws. Fasting is not a main subject of the Pentateuch, apart from the fast of the Day of Atonement, Lev xvi 29, xxiii 26–32 and elsewhere, and the recognition that women's private vows may involve fasting, Num xxx 13. Although the Day of Atonement is not mentioned in Barn iii (a point emphasized by Lowy [n. 25, below]), it is indeed likely that fasting owes its original connection with the sacrifices here in Barnabas to that Day, with which an underlying testimony-chain will have linked the sacrifices, newmoons and sabbath condemned in Isa i 11–13 (Barn ii 4–6); this is suggested not only by the inclusion of the Day of Atonement in Isa i 13 LXX (the quotation in Barn ii 5 stops just before the relevant words)<sup>22</sup>, but also by the use made of Isa lviii in comparable sections of Justin's Dialogue (xl 4, and in the scheme underlying xii 3–xv) and of Irenaeus (*Haer* iv 17, 3)<sup>23</sup>. Nevertheless the choice of this text from Isa lviii on fasting as the final link in the underlying chain implies a view of the Day of Atonement as 'the Fast' par excellence (the name of the Day as found for example in Philo, *SpecLeg* ii 193, 200; Acts xxvii 9) which itself reflects the great importance of fasting in general in current Jewish practice<sup>24</sup>. Moreover, this chapter of Barnabas as it now stands is on fasting in general rather than on the unmentioned Day of Atonement in particular, although the Day will become the main subject, with emphasis again on the fast, in chapter vii; and the space given to fasting in chapter iii is accordingly best understood, as Lowy showed, against the background of other regular (probably weekly) communal fasting by Jews, such that the fasts, of which the unmentioned Day of

<sup>22</sup> I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden, 1948), 102–3, on ἡμέραν μεγάλην and νηστείαν.

<sup>23</sup> Skarsaune, 168–9, 179.

<sup>24</sup> Compare, for instance, Philo's statement that sacrifices are offered 'some daily, some on the seventh day, some on new moons and holy days, some at fast-days (νηστείαις), some at the three seasonal festivals' (*SpecLeg* i 168); Philo apparently is thinking principally of 'the Fast', the Day of Atonement (*ibid* 186), but his language recalls the association of sacrifices, festivals and fasting in Barnabas ii–iii, and suggests the general importance of fasts, on which see also the following footnote. Similarly, the spiritual interpretation of fasting and its association with the Day-of-Atonement laws as a Pentateuchal focus is illustrated by Philo, *Post. Caini* 48, taking the commandment 'to humble the souls on the tenth of the month' (Lev xxiii 27) in an inward and moral sense.

Atonement would simply form the supreme example, could seem to belong to the staple of 'their law'<sup>25</sup>.

Lastly, the importance of Jewish custom in the setting of Barn iii is further suggested by Jewish use of the prophetic passage which forms the Christian proof-text. The prophecy in Isa lviii, quoted at length in Barnabas iii and Justin, Dialogue xv, and forming the standard proof-text here and elsewhere in Barnabas and Justin for the Christian interpretation of fasting, was used, according to the Tosefta, in a form of the admonition to be addressed by the elders to a community beginning a fast (TosTaanith i 8); it was also read, as is still the case, on the Day of Atonement (baraita in Meg 31a, designating the passage beginning Isa lvii 15). These passages probably represent usage well established in the early third century, and likely to go back at least to the second. The liberal second-century Christian recourse to Isa lviii on fasting therefore corresponded to contemporary and later Jewish association of this passage with communal fasts, an association which, when the second-century and earlier Christian material is viewed in conjunction with the rabbinic texts, seems not unlikely to be pre-Christian<sup>26</sup>.

Rebuttal of Christian Judaizing in respect of fasts, which was probably one object of the warning in Barnabas here, would therefore necessarily have been at the same time an attempt to neutralize the overshadowing presence of the Jewish community. To summarize, Christian awareness of the Jews is already plain in the contextual references to 'us' and 'them' (iii 1, 3, 6); further, the remarkable prominence of fasting in Barnabas iii corresponds not to its relatively modest place in the Pentateuchal laws, but to its high importance in contemporary Jewish custom; lastly, the prophetic text used in Barnabas to justify Christian deviation from this custom was one associated in Jewish usage with communal fasts. These points together confirm that the Jews themselves, not simply Christian Judaizers, concern the author. It is therefore reasonable to take iii 6 in the sense which its vigorous language most naturally suggests:

<sup>25</sup> Among the material considered by Lowy, 2–10 note Josephus, *Ap* ii 282 (Jewish pious observances widely adopted in Greek and barbarian cities are specified as the sabbath rest, fasts, lighting of lamps and many of the dietary customs); the inclusion of material under the healing 'fasting' (Taanith, Taaniyoth) in the Mishnah and Tosefta, and the assumption therein that Monday and Thursday are appropriate days for a fast (M. Taanith i 6, TosTaanith ii 4); and Didache viii 1 (fast on Wednesdays and Fridays, for 'the hypocrites' fast on Mondays and Thursdays). Lowy well suggests, following and adapting G. Al(1)on, that the Jewish custom of Monday and Thursday fasting reflected in the Didache is attested in a baraita in Shabb. 24a, and is also in view in Barnabas; he adds that it is likely to have had special significance as the accompaniment of urgent prayer for messianic redemption. Compare Luke xviii 12 (the devout Pharisee thought to fast twice weekly), Matt vi 16–18 (Christian fasting).

<sup>26</sup> The association of Isa lviii with the Day of Atonement explains the incorporation of Isa lviii 6 into the quotation of Isa lxi 1–2 (linked with Atonement as the beginning of Jubilee) at Luke iv 18, according to C. Perrot, 'Luc 4, 16–30 et la lecture biblique de l'ancienne synagogue', in J.-E. Ménard (ed.), *Exégèse biblique et judaïsme* (Strasbourg, 1973), 170–86 (178–9).

namely that, although the writer would certainly condemn Judaizing practices, one of his main purposes was to ward off the danger of Christian lapse to the Jewish community; the Greek, followed in this by the Latin, neatly combines the thoughts of violent and disastrous motion to, and of becoming a proselyte to, 'their law'.

Finally, there is a good case for supposing that the assimilation feared in iii 6 was encouraged not just by the attraction of the old paths and the more honoured society, but also by active propaganda. Reicke, noting that the ethical interpretation of the unclean beasts, fishes and birds in chapter x of the Epistle recalls vices often attributed to political intriguers, finds that internal agitation and propaganda by Christian Zealots is being countered in chapters vi, xv and xvi<sup>27</sup>. His view is supported by the clear indication of internal strife at iv 6. It is by no means inconsistent with Lowy's suggestion of propaganda by Jews themselves; for Lowy, the lawlessness leading to the final stumbling-block (iv 1–3) is constituted by Jewish movements towards national messianic redemption, accompanied by propaganda which is the *πλάνη* to be resisted at all costs (ii 10, iv 1, cf. iv 10–13), and was very possibly voiced by Jewish prophets in oracles like those preserved in the apocalypses and the Jewish Sibyllines<sup>28</sup>. This view is supported by the association of *πλάνη* and its cognates elsewhere, from the LXX Pentateuch onwards, with false prophecy and mutual Jewish and Christian charges of false teaching, notably in the strong sense of seduction to apostasy<sup>29</sup>. Lowy's interpretation would cohere closely, also, with G. W. H. Lampe's later suggestion that Jewish anti-Christian propaganda, including prophecy, is to be discerned behind I Clement, Ignatius, the Johannine Epistles, and many of the later New Testament writings (Lampe does not discuss Barnabas)<sup>30</sup>. The content of the propaganda denounced in Barnabas could be envisaged partly as argument for the law, the land and the temple-service (central points in the author's own apologetic), and partly, perhaps, as criticism of the teaching of Christ and the disciples, such as is attested in Justin and Celsus (the references in Barnabas to Christ's expected advent (vii 9, xii 9, xv 5–7) and his love for Israel (v 8) on the one hand, and to the lawless character of his disciples (v 9) on the other, might then represent, respectively, response and concession to such polemic). However the content is to be envisaged, propaganda from Jews and from Christians close to their position is likely to have strengthened the tendency towards assimilation to the Jews evident at iii 6.

<sup>27</sup> Reicke, 378–82.

<sup>28</sup> Lowy, 9–10, 13–17, 26, 31.

<sup>29</sup> W. Horbury, 'I Thessalonians ii.3 as Rebutting the Charge of False Prophecy', *JTS NS* xxxiii (1982), 492–508 (497–9, on seduction to apostasy); Stanton, 'Aspects' [n. 10, above], 379–82 (on Jewish anti-Christian polemic).

<sup>30</sup> G. W. H. Lampe, "'Grievous Wolves" (Acts 20:29)', in B. Lindars & S. S. Smalley (edd.), *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule* (Cambridge, 1973), 253–68.

The Epistle therefore reflects a Jewish encouragement of proselytes which is often ruefully attested from the early Christian standpoint. Justin in the Dialogue represents Trypho as exhorting him to join the Jews (viii 3–4); Justin himself exhorts Trypho ‘and those who wish to be proselytes’ (to the Jews, probably, rather than the Christians)<sup>31</sup> to come over (xxiii 3, xxviii 2), and complains that proselytes blaspheme the name of Christ twice as much as born Jews (cxxii 2); proselytes, says Tertullian gloomily, usually hope not in Christ’s name, but in Moses’s ordinance, and the ‘large people’ (‘populus amplius’) to be confuted by the new law in Christ going forth from Zion (Isa ii 3–4) is ‘first of all that of the Jews and their proselytes’ (*Adv Marc* iii 21, 3); comparably, Tertullian envisages in his *Adversus Iudaeos* that the Jewish case is being argued with a Christian by a proselyte.

Such early Christian evidence supplies part of a fuller picture of Jewish-Christian missionary rivalry, in competition for the same potential non-Jewish adherents, and not without hope for converts from the other side<sup>32</sup>. These attitudes emerge clearly from the passages just cited from Justin’s Dialogue. In Barnabas, however, the stance is notably defensive. Hopes for fresh adhesion by Jews are not expressed. The overriding necessity is to justify the position of ‘us’ vis-à-vis ‘their’ law, and to ward off the peril of assimilation to and absorption in the Jewish community. The attack on the Jewish position represented by the Epistle’s exclusive claim to the Jewish scriptures can be classified, in the context provided by the Epistle, as the best form of defence.

### (iii) *Theory of the Jewish Scriptures*

The anxiety at the prestige and influence of the Jews among the Christians evident at iii 6 thus in turn helps to explain the second characteristic of the Epistle to be considered here, its radicalism on the Jewish scriptures. For this author, the seemingly literal sense of the ritual laws was never divinely intended, and within the law and the prophets this truth, now recognized by ‘us’, was continually indicated in vain to ‘them’.

The covenant, indeed, according to this Epistle, belonged to the Jews only

<sup>31</sup> Arguments for this view of Dialogue xxiii 3 are set out by Skarsaune, 258–9; Jewish προσήλυτοις to Christianity is envisaged at xxviii 2, and the phrase ‘Christ and his proselytes’ occurs at cxxiii 5 in a deliberate contrast with the Jewish proselytes who are being discussed, but comparison of xxiii 3 with the opening of the Dialogue, and Justin’s usage of ‘proselyte’ simply for Jewish proselytes (as in cxxii 1–cxxiii 2), support the view that Jewish proselytes are intended at xxiii 3.

<sup>32</sup> See Simon, *Versus Israel*, 271–305, 390–5, with special reference to rivalry at 135, 284; B. Blumenkranz, ‘Die christlich-jüdische Missionskonkurrenz (3. bis 6. Jahrhundert)’, reprinted from *Klio* xxxix (1961), 227–233 in id., *Juifs et Chrétiens: Patristique et Moyen Age* (London, 1977); W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1965), 186–93.

for the brief time until they worshipped the golden calf and Moses broke the tables (Exod xxxii 7, Deut ix 12 as interpreted in Barn iv 4–6, 14 and xiv 3–6); the Christian inheritance of the covenant was prophesied in what the scripture says concerning Isaac and Rebekah, Ephraim and Manasseh, and Abraham himself (xiii). The ceremonies, biblical and post-biblical, of the Day of Atonement were simply intended to foretell the Lord's passion and kingdom (vii); the same applies to the related rite of the Red Heifer (viii)<sup>33</sup>; an evil angel misled the Jews to understand circumcision carnally, despite biblical injunctions on the circumcision of the heart (ix 4–5; does this view depend on an unmentioned interpretation of the giving of 'statutes that were not good' in Ezek xx 25, on the lines of that given by Origen, *Contra Celsum* vii 20<sup>34?</sup>); the dietary laws were never meant to be literally observed, as again the biblical text itself indicates (Deut iv 1, 5 and perhaps 14 interpreted in Barn x 2 as 'I will make a covenant of my ordinances with *this* people', cf. Barn i 2); on the other hand, the scriptures (here mainly in the prophets and the Pentateuch) clearly foretell the Christian rite of baptism in its association with the cross (Barn xi–xii); the sabbath commandment in the Decalogue cannot be observed now, during 'the era of the lawless one', because (as Gen ii 2 shows) it refers forward to the time of the Lord's Advent, and Christians can accordingly meanwhile observe their own 'eighth day' (xv, cf. vi 19).

This series of radically spiritual and ecclesiastical interpretations suggests that already in chapter ii the testimony-chain is probably understood in a particularly negative way when, after a typical Christian application of Isa i 11–14, it is added that the Jews always erred in offering sacrifices rather than the oblation of a godly life (Jer vii 22–3 taken, no doubt in the light of Amos v 25, as a *question* whether the forefathers who came out of Egypt were commanded to offer sacrifices, and interpreted in Barn ii 7–9 as a divine declaration 'to them'). The linked testimonies from Isa i and Jer vii would be later used elsewhere to show that the sacrificial laws, literally intended, were a concession to the Jews' weakness (Justin, *dial.* xxii 1–6; Irenaeus, *haer.* iv 17, 1–3)<sup>35</sup>; but in Barnabas it seems likely that the true meaning of the sacrificial laws is thought to have been, from the beginning, their moral significance (compare x 27). A contrast with Justin comparable with that which has been suggested

<sup>33</sup> For illustrations (including Mishnah, Parah iii 1) of the association between the Red Heifer and the Day of Atonement assumed at Heb ix 13 see W. Horbury, 'The Aaronic Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews', *JSNT* xix (1983), 43–71 (51–2).

<sup>34</sup> Christian exegesis of this verse in Ezekiel as signifying a divine punishment of the Jews is reviewed by F. Dreyfus, 'La condescendance divine (*synkatabasis*) comme principe herméneutique de l'Ancien Testament dans la tradition juive et dans la tradition chrétienne', in J. A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume, Salamanca 1983* (SVT xxxvi, Leiden 1985), 96–107 (98–9); this chapter of Ezekiel was probably used at Barn xi 9 (n. 12, above). On Barn ix 5 see n. 44, below.

<sup>35</sup> Dreyfus, 97–9, 102–3.

regarding Barn ii 7–9 comes out more plainly at Barn ix 6. An objection to the interpretation of circumcision noted above is there envisaged as: ‘the people received circumcision as a seal’ (the mystical description of circumcision also attested at Rom iv 11, and applied to baptism in Christian tradition). The objector’s view of circumcision is in fact a view accepted by Justin in the Dialogue (xvi 2, xix 2), with the harsh polemical twist that it was meant to permit the Jews to be singled out for their present sufferings (in the aftermath of the Bar Cocheba revolt). In Barnabas, however, the possibility that circumcision was a divine mark of distinction is wholly and contemptuously dismissed (ix 6) with the argument that, if so, even Syrians, Arabs and Egyptians, circumcised as they are, should all be regarded as heirs of the covenant. In this remark, perhaps a sign of the Egyptian setting of the Epistle<sup>36</sup>, there is a hostility which recalls the scorn for Jewish ‘bragging about circumcision’ in the Epistle to Diognetus (iv 1, 4). Comparably, the author can adopt the adverse phrase ‘*their law*’ in iii 6, considered above; here it will mean the law as understood and observed by Jews, but in the anger of the moment this qualification is left unspoken.

How then is the theory of the Jewish law in Barnabas to be classified? Its exceptional character has probably sometimes been over-emphasized. P. Prigent assessed it as much more moderate than the attitude taken in the Epistle to Diognetus<sup>37</sup>, and it certainly allows to the ritual laws an abiding value – but only as encoded moral commandments and prophecies, the meaning of which was declared in vain to the Jews in the law and the prophets, but is now understood by the Christians. Herein Barnabas takes up a primitive Christian theme classically expressed in II Cor iii 12–16<sup>38</sup>, and becomes the forerunner of the harmony of the Old and New Testaments as it was achieved by Origen and his successors in Alexandria and the west; for them the hidden spiritual sense of the law was that primarily envisaged by Moses, its true *raison d’être*, and in this truest sense the law was fulfilled by Christ<sup>39</sup>. The Epistle of Barnabas can

<sup>36</sup> Syrians, named first in ix 6, were disliked by the Greeks in Egypt (E. J. Bickermann, *The Jews in the Grek Age* (Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1988), 184; compare the mockery of Agrippa I by the Alexandrians as a Syrian king, Philo, *Flacc* 39); ‘all the priests of the idols’, mentioned without reference to nationality after Syrians and Arabs, can well be understood as Egyptian priests; and the crowning absurdity of pride in circumcision here is the fact that ‘even Egyptians’ – particularly despised by Greeks and Jews in Egypt – are circumcised.

<sup>37</sup> Prigent & Kraft, *Barnabé*, 158–9, nn. 4 & 5 (also contrasting the comparably scornful Tertullian, *AdvMarc* v 5).

<sup>38</sup> In its context in II Corinthians this passage subserves Paul’s self-defence, as shown by E. Bammel, ‘Paulus, der Moses des Neuen Bundes’, *Theologia* liv (Athens, 1983), 399–408 (401–2), but its reference of testimony-linked commonplaces on Jewish hardening (and blinding, iv 4, which may still refer to Jews, cf. Rom xv 31) to Jewish (mis-)understanding of the law is paralleled at Acts vii 51–3, and is likely to be pre-Pauline; II Cor iii and Acts vii 1–53 are both Moses-centred passages (Bammel, 399; M. Simon, *St Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church* (London, 1958), 44–5).

<sup>39</sup> Among passages from Origen, Didymus the Blind, Cyril of Alexandria, the Ambrosias-

perhaps be detected in the background of the passages in Origen (cited in the previous footnote) in which it is recalled that the giving of the Mosaic law was followed by the sin of the calf, but Jesus gave the second law and covenant, or in which it is stressed that Moses himself intended the spiritual sense when he spoke of circumcision, Passover, new moons and sabbaths, and when he broke the tables of the *written* law. However that may be, the continuity between the Epistle and later Alexandrian and western exegesis in attitude to the law might seem to lend support to the view that its theory is relatively moderate, because of its great respect for the scriptures; although the strongly anti-Jewish aspect of this later exegesis would itself suggest that in the Epistle too this theory could subserve anti-Jewish polemic. At any rate, Barnabas can be seen to offer an early example of the allegorical and timeless harmonization of the testaments, as opposed to the more historical harmonization (adumbrated in Justin and developed by Irenaeus and others, following Gal iii–iv) which divides the legislation into moral and ceremonial laws, and allows that the latter were valid in their literal sense for a limited time<sup>40</sup>.

Important though it is to notice how Barnabas's view suited the later Christian mainstream, these observations so far do less than justice to the anti-Jewish aspects of the theory, as the contrasts with Justin sketched above may already have suggested. First, the theories such as this, which have contributed towards resolution of the inner-Christian problem of the harmony of the testaments, all betray in their early history a considerable tension over the law as understood by the Jews; thus, in the 'historical' solutions just noticed, the ceremonial laws can be harshly designated, as in Irenaeus, as bonds of servitude imposed on the Jews as a punishment<sup>41</sup>. A similar tension is likely to have affected Barnabas, and it seems to appear especially in the historical element of the Epistle's theory, the contention that the breaking of the tables of the law cancelled the covenant with Israel (iv 7–8, xiv 1–4), but the Beloved gave the covenant to 'us' (iv 8, xiv 4). This second making of the tables of the commandments and the

ter and Marius Victorinus gathered by M. F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle* (Cambridge, 1967), 64–6, note Origen, *Hom. in Num* v 1 (PG xiii 603 'Moyses intelligebat sine dubio quae esset vera circumcisio', etc.) and *Comm. in Rom* ii 14 (PG xiv 917 'Moyses et spreuit, et abiicit, et contrivit litteras legis, hoc sine dubio iam tunc designans, quod honor et virtus legis non esset in litteris, sed in spiritu'). On the sin of the Calf as response to the law-giving, and the second law and covenant given by Christ, see also Origen, *Contra Celsum* ii 74–5. Origen's treatment of the law is discussed with reference to predecessors, including Barnabas, by C. P. Bammel, 'Law and Temple in Origen', in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel* (Sheffield, 1991), 464–76 (469, n. 22 gives a more negative interpretation of 'their law' in Barn iii 6 than that ventured in the text above).

<sup>40</sup> An attempt to sketch these two approaches to the harmony of the testaments is made by the present writer, 'Old Testament Interpretation in the Writings of the Church Fathers', in M. J. Mulder & H. Sysling (edd.), *Mikra* (Assen & Philadelphia, 1988), 727–87 (746, 759–61).

<sup>41</sup> Irenaeus, for example at *haer* iv 16, 5; see Horbury, 'Interpretation', 760–1, Dreyfus, 'Condescendance', 99, and, for surveys of the development of theories of the ritual law in the context of anti-Jewish polemic, M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (E. T. Oxford, 1986), 85–91, 163–9.

associated covenant, including festival and sabbath laws (Exod xxxiv 1–28, cf. Deut x 1–5) is not expressly mentioned in Barnabas, as Simon emphasizes<sup>42</sup>; but it seems likely that, as Simon also argued<sup>43</sup>, it is assumed to be the covenant given by the Beloved, which was at the same time the ritual law misunderstood by the Jews. This assumption could arise naturally from Exod xxxiv 27–8 (linking the renewed covenant with the Decalogue rewritten by God and with mainly ritual laws written by Moses).

On such an interpretation, Barnabas would be familiar with the concept of a 'second law', but would differ from the treatment of it in the Didascalia, and the closely allied views of the ritual law in Justin and Irenaeus; it was widely held, following biblical hints like that in Deut iv 14 noted above in connection with Barn x 2, that the second law-giving by Moses himself after the incident of the Golden Calf, a legislation marked especially by the ritual and dietary laws, was punitive, disciplinary or educative (so Irenaeus, *haer.* iv 15, 1 & 5, appealing to the interpretation of the Calf incident in Stephen's speech, Acts vii 38–43).

In Barnabas, then, it may be suggested, the familiar concept of this second law, which according to Exod xxxiv 10–28 was given together with the renewed covenant, is unmentioned but assumed; and it is identified with the legislation constantly misunderstood by the Jews, but really *ab initio* meant for the Christians and accompanying the covenant given to *them*. Consequently, although the Epistle seeks the inward meaning of the ritual law and refrains from scoffing at its superstition, this respect for scripture takes the form of a Christian claim to this law and its associated covenant, which is also an exclusion of any Jewish claims whatever to the covenant and the law.

Secondly, the Epistle is concerned not only with the scriptures inherited by the church, but also with the customs currently observed by the Jews, and in line with Jewish practice it treats the scriptures and the customs as a unity, as already noted in connection with the fasts, the Day of Atonement and the Red Heifer. (There is a striking contrast here with such New Testament passages as Mark vii 3–15, Matt xv 1–9.) This way of thinking is back-handedly exemplified, the present writer would suggest, in the angry reference at iii 6 to 'their law' – 'the law as they keep it'. It is accepted that, for those who think differently from the author, the standard interpretation of the law is summed up by the contemporary Jewish polity. The theory of the law sketched in the Epistle, therefore, is not just a theory of the Christian Old Testament, but a theory of the whole Jewish constitution and way of life, of what Justin would

<sup>42</sup> Simon, *Verus Israel*, 88 treats failure to mention the second law-giving as the main weakness of the Epistle's argument, but his stricture seems to be implicitly modified by his suggestion that the remaking of the tables is perhaps envisaged in references to the testament of the Beloved (see the following footnote).

<sup>43</sup> This view was briefly put forward by Simon, *Verus Israel*, n. 125 to p. 88, and p. 149 (Barnabas seems to find in Exod xxxiv 1–10 a symbolic prefiguration of Christianity; it is the testament of the Beloved), and stated more fully by Simon, *Stephen*, 106.

later call 'the polity of the law' (ἡ ἔννομος πολιτεία, *dial.* xlvii 4). Thus defined, however, the Epistle's theory seems more strongly anti-Jewish as well as Jewish; if accepted, it exposes the Jewish way of life as a demonic illusion (see Barn ix 5), and validates the Christian polity<sup>44</sup>.

Thirdly, in accord with this conclusion, the theory is accompanied by hostile comments on 'them'; in accord with their regular failure to understand, *they* smote the shepherd of Zech xiii 7 (v. 12, adapting the second person plural imperative of LXX; contrast with Barnabas the first person singular divine subject given to the verb (now in the indicative) when the text is quoted in the New Testament, and Justin's second person *singular* imperative<sup>45</sup>). Similarly, they bound the righteous man of Wisd ii 12 (vi 8), their circumcision is no seal of election (ix 6), and their temple was heathenish (xvi 2). Correspondingly, the radical and influential theory of the scriptures in Barnabas can be seen to have anticipated the golden age of patristic exegesis in securing a significance, albeit a Christian one, for the whole Mosaic code as currently interpreted by Jews; but at the same time it excludes the Jews from the covenant and law they think to be theirs, and can be seen to have arisen from the Christian need for justification vis-à-vis the Jews, and to present a sharply anti-Jewish cutting edge.

#### (iv) *Dependence on Jewish Culture and Opinion*

The anxiety about assimilation to the Jews which is one aspect of this theory of the scriptures is consistent with the last characteristic of the Epistle to be reviewed, its marked dependence on Jewish culture and public opinion. Some signs of literary dependence on ultimately Jewish material have already appeared, notably in the use of the Two Ways (Barn xviii–xxi)<sup>46</sup> and of descriptions of the rites of the scapegoat<sup>47</sup> and the Red Heifer (vii–viii). A sharing in contemporary Jewish opinion is also evident, as the passages considered above for guidance on dating show. It was clear that Barnabas xi 9 and xii 1 have material in common with Jewish apocalypses of the end of the first century A.D., and a

<sup>44</sup> A paper on ix 5 by Mr J. N. B. Carleton Paget of Queens' College, Cambridge, with whom I have had the benefit of discussing the Epistle, is forthcoming in *Vigiliae Christianae*.

<sup>45</sup> Skarsaune, 121; for the likely origin of the New Testament wording in emphasis on a divine plan when the text was quoted in isolation, see B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London, 1961), 131.

<sup>46</sup> See S. P. Brock, 'The Two Ways and the Palestinian Targum', in P. R. Davies & R. T. White (edd.), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes* (JSOT Supplement Series, 100, Sheffield, 1990), 139–52 (distinguishing the form of the treatise used in Barnabas as presupposing not only a link between Jer xxi 8 and Deut xxx 15, 19 to give the concept of two ways, as found in the Didache, but also a description of the ways in dualistic terms of light and dark, as found in a developed form (lacking the idea of just *two* ways) in 1QS).

<sup>47</sup> Barn vii 6, Justin, *Dial* xl 4, and Tertullian, *AdvIudaeos* xiv 9–10 = *AdvMarc* iii 7, 7–8 state without express biblical warrant that the two goats must resemble one another; this practice is recommended in M. Yoma vi 1.

similar bond emerges from the passage on the Roman emperors in iv 3–5, interpreting Dan vii; here the Epistle, like the book of Revelation, expects the imminent fall of Rome, to be followed by the messianic reign of the saints, when the Beloved comes to his inheritance (iv 3); and it therefore shares the outlook of Jewish apocalypses such as II Esdras xi–xii, xiii and Sib v 403–33.

Future expectations which the writer shares with the Jews and assumes that his readers also share reappear elsewhere in the Epistle. Thus, the Son of God will tear up Amalek by the roots at the end (Exod xvii 14 as interpreted in Barn xii 9). This passage in Exodus received comment in the name of rabbis of the turn of the first and second centuries; Elizer ben Hyrcanus and Joshua ben Hananiah both ascribe the cutting-off of Amalek to the time when the kingdom of God is established (Mekhilta, Beshallah, Amalek, ii, on Exod xvii 14 & 16, respectively)<sup>48</sup>. Amalek can stand in rabbinic thought for Rome or for the power of evil, and a similar range of meaning seems possible in Barnabas, in the light of Justin's association of Amalek both with the demons and with the earthly authorities whom they influence<sup>49</sup>. Similarly, when Barnabas looks forward to the true sabbath-rest of the messianic millennium (xv 5–8), sabbath observance is indeed being rebutted, but the expectation of a thousand-year sabbath to come is shared with the Jews<sup>50</sup>.

The extent of the dependence in Barnabas on Jewish culture and opinion goes far to explain the vigour of the Epistle's argument for divergence from the Jews on points thought vital for the continuance of the Christian community. One strand of this argument suggests strong Christian attraction to the patriotic Jewish outlook glimpsed in the shared expectations just discussed, in a development described by Reicke as an 'anti-Roman Zionism'<sup>51</sup>. In vi 8–19 the command to enter the 'good land, flowing with milk and honey' (Exod xxxiii 1, 3) leads to the thought of the Christians as a new creation, so that 'the

<sup>48</sup> J. Z. Lauterbach, *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*, ii (Philadelphia, 1933), 158–60; that the exegesis ascribed in the text (Lauterbach, ii, p. 158, line 155) to Eleazar (of Modin) should be in the name of Eliezer (ben Hyrcanus), for Eleazar's exegesis is given immediately before, is shown by W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, i (2nd edn, Straßburg, 1903, repr. Berlin, 1965), 142, n. 1.

<sup>49</sup> L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, vi (1928, repr. Philadelphia, 1968), 24–5, nn. 141, 147; Justin, *dial* xlix 8, cxxxi 4–5 with Williams, 99, n. 3.

<sup>50</sup> For example, in the interpretations of the title of Ps xcii 'for the sabbath day', in S. Buber (ed.), *Midrash Tehillim* (Wilna, 1891, repr. Jerusalem, 1977), 402 foot (ii 22, the seventh age is all sabbath and rest), 405 (v, the day when Isa xxxii 15 is fulfilled, and wars cease), cited among other passages including Barn xv 4 by Ginzberg, *Legends*, v (1925, repr. Philadelphia, 1968), n. 140. A. Hermans, 'Le Pseudo-Barnabé est-il Millénariste?' (*Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia* iii 15), *ETL* xxxv (1959), 849–76 gives the answer No, but 7–8 can be read without difficulty as envisaging a millennial sabbath leading to a new world beginning, like the old, on the first (eighth) day.

<sup>51</sup> Reicke, *Diakonie*, 381–2; this aspect of early Christian thought is further studied by R. L. Wilken, 'Early Christian Chiliasm, Jewish Messianism, and the Idea of the Holy Land', *HTR* lxxxix (1986), 298–307.

habitation of our heart is a holy temple to the Lord' (vi 15); this passage probably counters Jewish emphasis on the duties of possessing the land and building the temple, such as is seen, close to the probable date of Barnabas, at the beginning of the summary of the law in Josephus's *Antiquities*<sup>52</sup>. In xvi 4–10, also discussed in section I, above, the writer takes pains to show that opinions of this kind on the Jerusalem temple should not be shared. The presupposition here is that Jews are rebuilding the temple, with Roman sanction, and therefore as 'servants of the enemy' (xvi 4). The Romans are 'the enemy', as in chapter iv. The author of Barnabas insists that the true temple is inward and spiritual, as at vi 15, probably attempting, in line with the interpretation of iii 6 advanced above, to check Christians who are attracted to the Jewish community when its hopes appear to be fulfilled by the prospective revival of the temple-service<sup>53</sup>. Jewish hopes centred on the land and the temple are rejected, therefore, but assumptions about Rome as 'the enemy' are still unquestioningly shared, as in iv 3.

(v) *The Christian and Jewish Settings of Barnabas's Outlook*

These impressions of fear of assimilation to the Jews, of an anti-Jewish theory of the Jewish polity, and of a dependence on Jewish culture and public opinion in Barnabas together suggest a reasonably coherent outline of the defensive outlook on the Jewish community manifest in the Epistle. Admittedly, it represents only one section of Christian opinion. The Christians form a divided minority over against the Jews; some Christians admit that the Jews are the people chosen to receive the covenant, and simply claim for the Christians a share in it (iv 6); some, perhaps an overlapping group, are strongly attracted to go over to the Jewish community (iii 6; Christians in this position are probably also envisaged in xvi). This division of the Christian community into Judaizers, non-Judaizers and potential Jewish proselytes is reflected again in Justin's Dialogue (xlvii 1–4); the author of the Epistle was not far from the opinion of those mentioned by Justin who thought that Judaizing Christians could not be saved, and those attracted to Judaism in Barnabas may be compared with those in Justin who have gone over to the polity of the law. Christian Judaizers reappear in Celsus and Origen (Origen, *Contra Celsum* v 61, cf. ii 1), and the

<sup>52</sup> Josephus, *ant* iv 199–201 (when you have conquered the land, found one city chosen by God, with one temple and one altar); similar emphasis is later exemplified in the developments of Exod xv 16–17 into different versions of a saying 'Let Israel come into the land and built the temple', in Mekhilta, Beshallah, Shirata, ix & x (Lauterbach, ii, 75–6, 78).

<sup>53</sup> The present writer has argued this more fully in 'Messianism among Jews and Christians in the Second Century', *Augustinianum* xxviii (1988), 71–88 (82–3); the widely-held view that the reference is to Hadrian's construction of a temple of Zeus, mentioned by Cassius Dio lxix 12, 1 (so Wengst, *Didache* . . . , 114–5), makes the text in Barnabas so harshly paradoxical that one would have expected a phrase of elucidation.

various positions emerging in Barnabas doubtless long continued to be represented among the Christians, although the proportion of Christians who took the Judaistic view was probably declining, like the (not identical) proportion of Christians who were of Jewish birth, during the second century<sup>54</sup>.

At the time of the Epistle, however, these divisions are likely to have involved considerable proportions of the small Christian population. The Epistle can give some guidance to the outlook on the Jews even among Christians whose view the author rejects, for these Christian divisions are all determined by the attitude taken to the Jewish polity. They will have contributed accordingly to a sense that the Christians were weak and upstart by comparison with the large, ancient and determinative Jewish body. This sense, in conjunction with the cultural dependence of the Christians on the Jews and the experience of propaganda by Jews and Judaizers, explains the fear of assimilation to the larger body evident in Barnabas.

Correspondingly, the Epistle's theory of the Jewish law is a justification of the non-Judaizing practice which rapidly became the Christian norm, denying the Jews' claim to their ancestral covenant and law in a vigorous attack by the smaller body on the greater. Its thoroughgoing adoption of the law made it a particularly useful key to scripture in later Alexandrian exegesis, and a particularly powerful instance of the widespread ante-Nicene assertion that the Christians have replaced the Jews as the elect people of God<sup>55</sup>. As in some other polemic of this period, the name 'Israel' is conceded without hesitation to the Jews, as at v 8 (one more example of the Epistle's indebtedness to Jewish usage)<sup>56</sup>; but the Christian claim to the Jewish heritage is nonetheless total and exclusive, and (by contrast with a good deal of anti-Jewish writing, including Justin's work) there is no explicit reference to a return of Israel, whether in the near future by baptism or in the last days; it is particularly notable that this theme is not mentioned in chapter xi, on baptism, where the refusal of Israel to accept baptism is the point of departure. The setting of this lively contention is a

<sup>54</sup> The variety of Christian attitudes is emphasized by B. L. Visotzky, 'Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish-Christianities in Rabbinic Literature', *AJS Review* xiv (1989), 47–70 (49–63), and (with special reference to the Nazoraeans) by W. Kinzig, "'Non-Separation': Closeness and Co-operation between Jews and Christians in the Fourth Century', *VC* xlv (1991), 27–53 (35).

<sup>55</sup> The argument is important in Justin's Dialogue (xii 4–5 and elsewhere); in Tertullian, Cyprian, the pseudo-Cyprianic *adversus Iudaeos* and *de montibus Sina et Sion* (see W. Horbury, 'The Purpose of Pseudo-Cyprian, *Adversus Iudaeos*', *Studia Patristica* xviii.3 (1989), 291–317 (302–3, 305); and in Aphrahat and Ephrem Syrus (R. Murray, *Symbols of Church and Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1975, corrected repr. 1977), 56–60, 67).

<sup>56</sup> This usage recurs in Melito's Paschal Homily, in the later second century, and the pseudo-Cyprianic *adversus Iudaeos*, probably of the early third century. Lowy, 29 urges that 'Israel' in Barnabas is always linked with scripture rather than contemporary life, and is on the way to being appropriated as a Christian title, but this may be too much to conclude from a text in which it is never easy to find anything unconnected with scripture; as occurrences bearing on the present, note especially v 2 ('Israel' contrasted with 'us'), xvi 5.

dependence on Jewish culture such that, when there is no reason to differ, Jewish opinion remains the norm, as has emerged from passages on the fall of Rome and the hope for redemption. Hence, although with regard to Justin it seems appropriate to speak of Jewish-Christian missionary rivalry, Barnabas seems primarily a work of defence.

The success of the Epistle in the later church should not obscure the connections between its outlook on the Jews and its contemporary setting. These appeared especially in the writer's need to counter excitement at the prospect of a rebuilt temple. If the Epistle was written for a readership in Egypt, as suggested by its early attestation and perhaps also by internal evidence (ix 6 and n. 36, above), it would have formed a suitable response to currents of Jewish opinion in Egypt towards the end of the first century. The temple of Onias at Leontopolis formed such a focus of Jewish unrest that it was closed by imperial order in 73 (Josephus, *B. J.* vii 420–35), and comparable zeal for national redemption would have been stirred again among Egyptian Jews by hope for the rebuilding of the Jerusalem temple twenty-five years later; in Sib v 403–33, cited above, and probably reflecting Egyptian Jewish thought before the revolt under Trajan, the messiah is to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple. It is likely that the inner-Christian divisions apparent in Barnabas are themselves related to differences of opinion in the Jewish body; and on this view of the setting, the writer's check on excitement over the temple could be compared up to a point with attempts by the Alexandrian Jewish communal leadership to quell enthusiastic Jewish reception of refugee Sicarii and their message in 72–3 (Josephus, *B. J.* vii 409–19). Similarly, the treatment of the laws in Barnabas is to some extent comparable with an attitude deplored by Philo, allegorical interpretation treated as justifying neglect in observance (*Migr. Abr.* 89–93). The Judaizing Christians, again, will reflect within the Christian community the zeal of the Jewish multitude who, according to Philo (*ibid.*, 93), would censure such neglect.

These possible links between the Epistle's outlook and various currents of opinion among Jews in Egypt would not lose all their force if the setting were in fact to be sought elsewhere, for they relate to trends which can be envisaged as widespread in the Jewish community. A similar consideration applies to Lowy's suggestion, followed here in many respects, that the Jewish messianic movement which looked for national restoration forms the background of the Epistle; the view would suit an Egyptian setting, given the Egyptian manifestations of this way of thinking noted above, but the Jewish hopes concerned were very widespread, as is confirmed by the far-flung Jewish revolts under Trajan, and the centrality of redemption in the Eighteen Benedictions<sup>57</sup>.

<sup>57</sup> On prayer for redemption in the Amidah, W. Horbury, 'The Benediction of the *Minim* and Jewish-Christian Controversy', *JTS NS* xxxiii (1982), 19–61 (38–9, 47, 49–50).

## Justin Martyr

(i) *Overlap with Jewish Opinion*

Justin evinces a similar cultural debt and a similar overlap with Jewish public opinion. His cultural dependence is most obvious when he has to come to terms with Jewish revision of the LXX in the First Apology (xli) and the Dialogue (lxvi–lxviii, lxxi–lxxiii, lxxxiv, cxx), and when in the Dialogue (vii–viii) he presents his conversion as a learning to know the prophets. In both cases, however, he makes an independent Christian contention from within his indebtedness. He argues for Jewish doctrinal alteration and mutilation of the LXX, and himself quotes the text together with Christian interpolation, notably in Ps xcvi<sup>58</sup>; and he says that he was possessed by love of the prophets ‘and of those men who are the friends of Christ’ (Dialogue viii 1).

His overlap with Jewish opinion can be traced, as in the case of Barnabas, with regard to future hopes and with special reference to the fate of Rome. Here again there are distinctive Christian touches. So Amalek is fought ‘with hidden hand’ (Exod xvii 16 LXX), and Justin assumes that Trypho will agree that this will take place at the war of the glorious Advent, for Christians the second Advent; but in the cause of Christianity Justin goes on to ask how this interpretation can satisfy the expression ‘with *hidden hand*’, especially as the text describes a victory over Amalek in the past. He therefore applies it, rather, to the hidden power of God which was at work in the crucified Christ, before whom demons and all powers and authorities tremble (Dialogue xlix 8, resumed in cxxxi 5).

This Christian exegesis as presented by Justin includes phrases recalling the New Testament, but seems ultimately to depend on the all-important interpolated text of Ps xcvi (xcv), in which Christ reigns from the tree (verse 10), terrible over all demons (verses 4–5) and worshipped by the nations of the whole earth (verses 7–9)<sup>59</sup>. Two aspects of the interpretation are notable here. First, with the Epistle of Barnabas (notes 48–9, above), but independently of it (n. 7, above), Justin here treats a Pentateuchal narrative on which comparable vestiges of early rabbinic commentary survive<sup>60</sup>; both Barnabas and Justin draw on very early Christian comment of the Amalek episode, and their interpretations suggest, as noted already, that Christian and Jewish comments were

<sup>58</sup> R. Petraglio, ‘Le interpolazioni cristiane del salterio greco’, *Augustinianum* xxviii (1988), 89–109 (101–5 on Ps xcvi).

<sup>59</sup> This suggestion, supported by the association elsewhere in the Dialogue (lxxxiii 4) of Ps xcvi 5 with Ps cx as a prophecy of the power of Christ, may perhaps be added to the discussion of the Jewish background of this exegesis by Skarsaune, 394–5.

<sup>60</sup> Bacher, *Tannaiten*, i, 141 (Exod xvii 16 interpreted of the messianic age, in the name of Joshua b. Hananiah; cf. n. 48, above); 196–7 (remains of early rabbinic commentary preserved).

closely similar, Christians and Jews alike in this case setting the overthrow of Amalek in the messianic age. Secondly, Justin's alternative and preferred exegesis keeps the thought of divine victory over the powers, implicitly including the present Roman order, which belongs to his first exegesis and to Jewish interpretation of Amalek.

Dan vii, once more, is quoted at length in the Dialogue (xxxi–xxxii) to include the downfall of the Fourth Beast<sup>61</sup>; and the event symbolized by this downfall is in mind in the First Apology (xii 7), when the Word – in scripture and in Christ's sayings – is said to foretell that Rome cannot stop the Christian movement. Correspondingly, the Romans are told a little later in the First Apology (xlv) that Ps cx foretells the apostolic preaching of the powerful word; but if they want to read these words (that is, the prophecy of David, as the context suggests, rather than Justin's own words) from a hostile viewpoint, they may – presumably then taking the psalm as a militant prophecy of the kingdom of Christ. When Justin uses this boldness of speech, he has just mentioned Roman suppression of prophecies, specifying the books of Hystaspes, the Sibyl and the biblical prophets as prohibited on pain of death by the agency of the demons (First Apology xlv, cf. xx). We read them none the less, he says, and submit them for inspection by the Romans; and he evidently takes the prophets of Israel to have the downfall of Rome as a main subject, in the manner of Hystaspes and the Sibyl<sup>62</sup>. The downfall is no doubt implied in the many references in the Dialogue to the millennial reign of Christ in Jerusalem (notably at xl 4, lxxx–lxxxi, lxxxiii 3, lxxxv 7, cxxxviii 3, cxxxix 4–5)<sup>63</sup>. Their political aspect is indicated by Justin's Christian reapplication of a nationalist Jewish exegesis of Micah iv 1–7, on future restoration and reign in Jerusalem; the text is said in the Dialogue (cix–cx) to apply to the Christians' persecution and glorious millennium rather than to Jewish suffering, with a view to divinely aided messianic restoration, after the war of Bar Cocheba.

Justin shares with Barnabas, therefore, a general dependence on Jewish culture and a particular accord with Jewish hopes for redemption, evident especially in expectations of the fall of Rome and of a millennial reign in Jerusalem (the latter theme is present but not so strongly emphasized in Barnabas (n. 50, above)). Justin is nearer to the Jews than Barnabas in one important respect: he allows the legitimacy of Christian observance of the ritual

<sup>61</sup> This explanation of the long quotation is accepted, and linked with the alternations between discretion and *parrhesia* on Rome in the First Apology, by E. dal Covolo, "Regno di Dio" nel Dialogo di Giustino con Trifone Giudeo', *Augustinianum* xxviii (1988), 111–23 (117–19, with n. 34), following and discussing E. Bodenmann, *Naissance d'une Exègèse* (Tübingen, 1986), 227–31, on Dan vii in Justin.

<sup>62</sup> A brief conspectus of these works as 'resistance literature' is given by G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World* (London, 1981), 442–3, with nn. 7–8.

<sup>63</sup> Justin's millenarianism is considered (not with special reference to this aspect) by Skarsaune, 401–9 (cf. 338–44).

law (Dialogue xlvii 1–1). What is striking is the extent to which both authors, amid their engagement with Christian modification of Jewish tenets and customs, unquestioningly accept a Christian form of Jewish ‘zeal’, a messianism in contact with the anti-Roman feeling behind contemporary Jewish upheaval. It is striking less perhaps in its contrast with the emphasis also placed by Justin on the complementary biblically-derived commonplaces on obedience to rulers, for the contrasting emphases are equally held together in the scriptures, than in its reflection of characteristics which seem to have marked the Jews more clearly than other subjects of the Roman empire: a consistently sustained mood of opposition to Rome and readiness for revolt, and a self-awareness resembling nationalism in the modern sense<sup>64</sup>.

The attitude shared by Barnabas and Justin may shed light on the fate of Christians under Bar Cocheba, as the writer has tried on the basis of this evidence to argue elsewhere<sup>65</sup>. Justin says in the First Apology (xxxi) that the Jewish leader punished Christians, if they would not deny Christ and ‘blaspheme’. In view of the Christian share in Jewish hopes and Jewish hostility to Rome considered here, it would not have been unreasonable for participants in the revolt to expect that some Christians in Judaea would come over to the Jewish community at the time of its apparent success. The view expressed in Eusebius’s Chronicle, Hadrian xvii, that Bar Cocheba killed ‘Christians who were unwilling to help him against the Roman army’ perhaps therefore conveys less of the inwardness of the transaction than Justin’s report in the First Apology. In the Dialogue, as already noted, Justin condemns Christians who go over to the Jews (xlvi 4); and in Judaea under Bar Cocheba, a situation in many ways comparable with that addressed in Barn xvi, some are likely to have done so, whereas others refused to ‘blaspheme’ by uttering the curse-formula which will have been the effective sign of the transition from the first century onwards (as suggested by Acts xxvi 11, on compulsion ‘to blaspheme’ in the purging of Christians from the synagogues, viewed in conjunction with the formula ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, I Cor xii 3)<sup>66</sup>.

### (ii) Jewish Reaction to Christianity

The report in the First Apology on Christians under Bar Cocheba introduces the second main topic in Justin to be considered, his notices of Jewish reaction to Christianity; but it also raises the frequently-considered question of his sources for Jewish and Palestinian matters, and his personal knowledge of the

<sup>64</sup> The Jews were unique in combining a common culture with traditions of political unity, and in mounting a general revolt in 66 after prolonged acquiescence in Roman rule, according to P. A. Brunt, *Roman Imperial Themes* (Oxford, 1990), 517–9 (cf. 126–8).

<sup>65</sup> Horbury, ‘Messianism’, 83–4.

<sup>66</sup> Horbury, ‘Benediction’, 53–4.

Jews and Palestine<sup>67</sup>. O. Skarsaune thinks it likely that existing Jewish-Christian material was used for his passages on the cursing of Christ by Jews and on the revolt under Hadrian, and suggests that it could have come to Justin through his Christian education; this might well have included teaching from Palestinian gentile Christians who had themselves made Jewish-Christian exegetical traditions their own<sup>68</sup>. Similarly, Justin would have used possibly Palestinian gentile traditions for his emphasis on the exclusion of Jews from Jerusalem when the revolt was suppressed, although these traditions are also in touch with Jewish exegesis, and it is hard to distinguish between gentile material and Justin's own contribution<sup>69</sup>. A strength of Skarsaune's proposals lies in their allowance for Justin's personal involvement in these subjects as well as his indebtedness to earlier teaching. Justin certainly used sources, especially the testimony traditions illuminatingly reconstructed by Skarsaune, but on some of these topics his personal contribution is also likely to have been important. The Bar Cocheba war, for instance, figures in his own narrative framework in the Dialogue (i 3, ix 3), and as a Palestinian he could have had his own information about it. Again, the subject of cursing crops up so many times, in varied ways but always with vehemence of expression, that it is natural to think that Justin himself, as well as his source, knew something of it.

To recall his background, he says at the beginning of the First Apology that his father and grandfather were 'from Flavia Neapolis, a city of Palestinian Syria', present-day Nablus. He could associate himself in the Dialogue with the Samaritans (cix 6), and he names in the First Apology (xxvi 3–4) the villages from which the Samaritans Simon and Menander came; he himself, however, was an uncircumcised gentile (Dialogue xxviii 2, xli 3). He mentions various Palestinian localities, including the cave of Bethlehem (Dialogue lxxviii 5). He gives the name of Bar Cocheba (in the report discussed above); this becomes a notable point when one considers that Cassius Dio, to judge by the account of fair length and detail surviving in epitome (lxi 12–14), described the whole Jewish revolt under Hadrian without mentioning the name of the Jewish leader. Justin's specifically Jewish knowledge ranges in the Dialogue from the description of a phylactery (the lettering of which 'we [the Christians] assuredly consider holy', xlvi 5) to what sounds like an early form of the mystical reckoning of the divine stature later known as Shi'ur Qomah (cxiv 3, denouncing Jewish anthropomorphism in connection with Ps viii 3)<sup>70</sup>. It seems likely

<sup>67</sup> Studies of Justin's contacts with Judaism, including A. Harnack, *Judentum und Judentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho* (TU 39, Leipzig, 1913), are listed by Visonà, 72–3; on the haggadah, see also Ginzberg, *Legends*, vii (Index by B. Cohen, 1938), 594–5 (index of passages in Justin).

<sup>68</sup> Skarsaune, 290–5, 371–4.

<sup>69</sup> Skarsaune, 372–3, 428–9.

<sup>70</sup> Second-century figures discussed in connection with the origins of the Shi'ur Qomah include Elchasai and the Gnostic teacher Marcus. Origen's comments on anthropomorphism,

that he learned even his Platonism in a school which was sympathetic to Jewish teaching<sup>71</sup>. His Palestinian and Jewish knowledge should not be exaggerated, but it is not negligible, and it is aided by Justin's own considerable overlap with Jewish ways of thinking<sup>72</sup>. If compared with the knowledge exhibited by a slightly later Palestinian gentile Christian, Julius Africanus of Aelia, in his letters on biblical subjects preserved by Origen and Eusebius, it can perhaps be said to show less classical and historical erudition bearing on the Jews, but a fuller acquaintance with Jewish exegesis and ethos<sup>73</sup>.

Justin's notices of Jewish reaction to Christianity can therefore be approached in the expectation that, although defective reporting is inevitable in the circumstances, he will have had some good sources and some personal knowledge. Special interest attaches to his indignant remarks on specific communal measures. In the present context two aspects of them only can be considered: first, their witness to the great importance of corporate Jewish reaction for the Christians; secondly, the contact between Justin and other sources in the allegations of particular measures<sup>74</sup>.

First, there are traces of a probably testimony-linked tradition on an organized Jewish rebuttal of the apostolic preaching; the passages are comparable and sometimes co-ordinated with the prominent tradition of the apostolic mission, already noticed in connection with Ps cx in the First Apology (xlv), and have a similar air of legendary development. Twice in the Dialogue (xvii 1–2, cviii 2, recalled at cxvii 3) Justin asserts that, after the crucifixion, the Jews sent chosen men throughout the world to denounce the appearance of the godless sect of the Christians, whose teaching is deception. Justin links the apostolic mission which they rebutted not only with Ps cx, but also with Isa ii 3 'out of Zion shall go forth the law', a text appearing as a quotation in the First Apology (xxxix) but only as an allusion in the Dialogue (xxiv 1, cf. xi 2), although the

---

Jewish and Christian, at one point seem to echo this passage in Justin (N. R. M. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge, 1976), 44); but they are circumstantial enough to make it possible that they preserve authentic information on a Jewish mystical practice (M. S. Cohen, *The Shi'ur Qomah* (Lanham & London, 1983), 40, n. 65, on Origen, in *Gen hom* i 13). The same can be said of Justin here.

<sup>71</sup> M. J. Edwards, 'On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr', *JTS* NS xlii (1991), 17–34, argues that Justin's Platonism belongs to the school represented by his contemporary Numenius of Apamea in Phrygia, cited by Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius as a philosopher who honoured Jewish beliefs and writings (e. g. Clem Alex, *Stromateis*, i 22, 150 (Numenius calls Plato 'Moses Atticizing'); Origen, *Contra Celsum* i 15, iv 51).

<sup>72</sup> Justin's inherited material shows that he was strongly influenced by Christianity evincing close gentile-Christian contact with Jewish exegesis (Skarsaune, e. g. 326, 429), and he continued to breathe this atmosphere.

<sup>73</sup> On Africanus's letter to Origen, see M. Harl & N. R. M. de Lange, *Origène, Philocalie I–20, sur les Écritures, et la Lettre à Africanus sur l'Histoire de Suzanne* (SC 302, Paris, 1983); on his letter to Aristides (in Eusebius, *H. E.* i 7), R. Bauckham, *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh, 1990), 355–63.

<sup>74</sup> For further discussion see Horbury, 'Benediction' and Stanton, 'Aspects'.

parallel Micah iv 2 is quoted in this connection at cix 2, shortly after the passage on Jewish criticism in cviii. The counter-mission is linked at xvii 2 with the texts Isa iii 9–11 and v 18–20, used in connection with the death of Christ and Jewish criticisms of Christianity in the First Apology (xlvi–xlix)<sup>75</sup>, but it seems likely that it also became attached to Isa xviii 1–2, which in the LXX becomes a woe on those responsible for the despatch of papyrus letters overseas. In Eusebius's commentary on Isa xviii 1–2, and in an exegesis of this passage in the tract on Antichrist in the name of Hippolytus (58), the counter-mission envisaged by Justin is conducted by Jewish emissaries sent overseas with letters. One may suspect a testimony-registration of the story of the anti-Christian emissaries, using texts from Isaiah, a book widely read as a prophecy of Jewish-Christian relations.

The connection of an imagined scene of organized Jewish response with the testimony tradition suggested here may be compared with early Christian treatment of the complementary theme of the repentance of the Jews and their acceptance of Christianity by baptism. This theme complements the denunciation of their hostility in Justin's Dialogue, as in other Christian writings, often on the pattern of the testimony Isa i 14–16 (e. g. xii 3–xiii 1, xiv 1 (based on Isa i 14–16); cviii 3, immediately after the story of the counter-mission, cf. cxviii 3); and the elaboration of an imagined testimony-based scene in which Jews in fact seek Christian baptism can be traced in Cyprian<sup>76</sup>. It seems likely, then, that the story of organized Jewish denunciation twice told by Justin had similarly gained incorporation into the testimony traditions, and thereby into catechesis as well as apologetic. If so, the weight attached by the Christians to Jewish response makes itself most plainly felt.

Secondly, however, these passages are among a number of references to organized and corporate Jewish reaction which have some contact with other sources<sup>77</sup>. The story of official denunciation immediately after the crucifixion is told in the context of complaints about contemporary Jewish criticisms, which the Christians think to be disseminated among the gentiles by the community as a body (Dialogue xvii 1–2, cviii 2, cf. First Apology xlix). Despite the legendary character of this story, it corresponds to the currency of Jewish anti-Christian statements from an early period, as suggested by Matt xxviii 15; items of propaganda listed at cviii 2 recur elsewhere, and overlap with the rabbinic tradition according to which Jesus was executed because he practised sorcery and deceived and led astray Israel (Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 43a)<sup>78</sup>.

<sup>75</sup> On their possibly Jewish-Christian background see Skarsaune, 290–1; Jerome comparably refers to Jewish cursing of Christians in his comment on Isa v 18.

<sup>76</sup> Horbury, 'Pseudo-Cyprian', 304–5.

<sup>77</sup> They are surveyed by Harnack, *Trypho*, 78–81 and Horbury, 'Benediction', 19–23, 48–59.

<sup>78</sup> For the details see Horbury, 'Benediction', 54–8.

Comparably, other references to communal measures in Justin find external correspondence. The curses on *Christians* in the synagogues often mentioned in the Dialogue (especially xvi 4, xcvi 2) can be compared either with the Birkath ha-Minim or with cursing such as that associated with the cursing of Haman at Purim<sup>79</sup>. The blasphemy or anathematization of *Christ* in the synagogues (xxxv 8, xlvi 4) can be connected, as noted already, with a long-established purgation formula indirectly attested in Acts xxvi 11 and I Corinthians xii 3; what appears to be a related practice is described in the Dialogue as reviling of the Son of God and mockery of the king of Israel, 'such things as your rulers of synagogue (ἀρχισυνάγωγοι) teach, after the prayer' (cxxxvii 2). This too may be compared, following T. C. G. Thornton, with Purim cursing<sup>80</sup>; but Justin alleges a frequently-followed practice, and it is therefore also worth noting, despite its late date, a midrashic reference to curses uttered with scroll in hand at the end of the Eighteen Benedictions<sup>81</sup>. The prohibition of converse with Christians decreed by Jewish teachers (διδασκαλοι, xxxviii 1, cxii 4) is comparable with the prohibition of dealings with *minim* attested at Tos Hullin ii 20–21.

From Justin, therefore, it emerges that corporate Jewish rejection of Christianity had so deeply impressed itself on Christians as to find a place in the testimony tradition, and that it was possible in his time to point to specific Jewish measures which expressed this corporate attitude. Further, his statements on these matters find some support in other sources, Jewish as well as Christian. It can be added that some kind of corporate Jewish antagonism to the Christians would accord with two features of the Jewish situation which, as noted already, were strikingly reflected and reproduced in the Christian subgroup itself: the zeal and national solidarity of the period of the Jewish revolts, and the welcome being extended to proselytes. These features reappear in the Eighteen Benedictions, in which prayer for national redemption (especially in

<sup>79</sup> T. C. G. Thornton, 'Christian Understanding of the *Birkath ha-Minim* in the Eastern Roman Empire', *JTS NS* xxxviii (1987), 419–31 (429 and n. 5) prefers the second possibility, and envisages spasmodic and informal cursing on the lines of the cursing of Christ later attested in probable connection with Purim; he stresses the lack of evidence, apart from Jerome, for later Christian understanding of the Benediction of the Minim as including a curse on the Christian body in general. The intensity of the Christian reaction reflected in Justin speaks, however, for a regularly-encountered Jewish response, and Justin and inner-Jewish evidence on the Benediction point to the same setting, the synagogues of the second century. I would therefore still incline to find the Benediction reflected in the Dialogue, and to associate later Christian silence on it with silence on the synagogue service in general, but the main point asserted in the text above – the correspondence of Justin's evidence with other sources – is not affected if Thornton's explanation is preferred.

<sup>80</sup> T. C. G. Thornton, 'The Crucifixion of Haman and the Scandal of the Cross', *JTS NS* xxxvii (1986), 419–26 (425).

<sup>81</sup> Midrash Panim Aherim on Est iii 8, quoted in Yalkut Shimeoni ad loc; one of the midrashic versions of Haman's anti-Jewish charges, discussed by S. Krauss in connection with the Benediction of the Minim, but of interest here as presupposing curses 'after the prayer' (Horbury, 'Benediction', 29–30).

the Tenth Benediction and onwards) includes a blessing on proselytes and a curse on apostates, oppressors, and heretics (*minim*) (the Eleventh and Twelfth Benedictions). Is it possible, however, to go beyond this appeal to the general atmosphere, and to attempt, on the basis of the specific allegations in Justin, more precise suggestions on organized Jewish reaction?

A start could perhaps be made with the suggestion that Justin's references to 'ruler of synagogue' and 'teachers' point to two related but distinct inter-communal networks of communication. *Archisynagogi* held an office which could involve supervision of the synagogue service (including a kind of teaching in the synagogue, according to Justin here), but was distinguished enough to be suitable for leading members of the community. So, to take one famous example, the Theodotus inscription shows a priest and *archisynagogus* wealthy enough to build a synagogue with appurtenances, and proud enough of his title to record that it was held by his father and grandfather before him<sup>82</sup>. Holders of this office would often be among the group of principal persons in the community, those *πρώτοι* who are envisaged in the case of the Roman Jews in Acts as being in a position to receive 'letters from Judaea' or messengers concerning Jewish visitors (Acts xxviii 21). Such diaspora contacts with the Holy Land did not necessarily come to an end in 70, and it would be speculative but not unreasonable to envisage communication by way of Caesarea between western diaspora notables and the patriarchate emerging in Galilee<sup>83</sup>.

'Teachers', on the other hand, are said to have decreed the prohibition of converse. The authority ascribed to them recalls that claimed in Justin's time by members of the nascent rabbinic movement. In the Fourth Gospel, *διδάσκαλος* is given as the rendering of the title Rabbi (John i 38, cf. xx 16); and the Greek title also occurs in Jewish inscriptions, while the respect it engendered is strongly suggested by the Aphrodisias inscription recording members of a Jewish group of *φιλομαθεῖς*<sup>84</sup>. It is likely that diaspora teachers would have had some direct or indirect contact with the rabbinic schools of Galilee and Judaea; Trypho is represented in Justin's Dialogue, presumably not implausibly, as a refugee from Judaea in Greece and Corinth (i 3), Aquila is depicted in the haggadah as a proselyte of Pontus who travels to the Holy Land to get instruction, and a practice of making journeys to the diaspora will underly the legends of rabbinic travel<sup>85</sup>.

<sup>82</sup> E. L. Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (London, 1934), 69–70 and Plate XVIa.

<sup>83</sup> For the probably third- or fourth-century Beth She'arim epitaph of a 'Caesarean *archisynagogos*, [a native] of Pamphylia' see M. Schwabe & B. Lifschitz, *Beth She'arim* (Jerusalem, 1967), 91, no. 203.

<sup>84</sup> J. Reynolds & R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge, 1987), 30–34.

<sup>85</sup> A. E. Silverstone, *Aquila and Onkelos* (Manchester, 1931), 24–6, 30–31, quoting Tanhuma Buber on Exod xxi 1 and Sifra Lev xxv 7; the anecdotes of Akiba's journeys are

The Jewish communal recognition of such measures will have depended not only on these networks of inter-communal contact, but also on the constituency of the more zealous in each place. Their importance as watchdogs on law-breaking is chillingly evoked by Philo; with *Migr. Abr.* 93, cited above, compare *Spec Leg ii 253*, on the thousands of watchful 'zealots of the law, most exact guardians of the ancestral traditions'. In Acts xxi 20–21 a comparable group among the Christian Jews of Jerusalem is mentioned in order to induce Paul to demonstrate his own observance, although it is Jews from Asia who then accuse him (verse 27). The continuation of this mood of zeal after the First Revolt is both reflected and reproduced in Barnabas and Justin, as noted above.

Groups of synagogues and communities are likely, therefore, to have put these measures into action, partly by the authority of office-holders and teachers, partly through the solidarity of the more zealous. Cursing and prohibition of converse will have built on and reinforced earlier measures against the Christians, notably the exclusion from synagogue complained of the New Testament (Luke vi 22; John ix 22, xii 42, xvi 2). Although the ancient constitutional rule of high priest and king was lost, except for a brief revival under Bar Cocheba, it is likely that Diaspora contact with the Holy Land continued, and that office-holders and teachers in the communities began to form links with the nascent patriarchate and rabbinic movement.

Justin therefore witnesses not only to the profound significance of the Jewish reaction in Christian eyes, but also to continuity and cohesion in the second-century Jewish community. At the same time he presents a Christianity which is as much determined by Jewish culture and thought as that of Barnabas, but which breathes a less strictly defensive atmosphere, despite the context of missionary rivalry with the Jews. Justin can allow the validity of varied positions in the Christian camp, thereby drawing nearer than Barnabas to observant Jewish attitudes, and he can express hopes for Jewish conversion where Barnabas is preoccupied with resisting the strength of Jewish influence. The Christian future was with Barnabas's claim to the entire Jewish scriptures in their spiritual sense, but there would be an important place too for the more historical approach of Justin. Yet, for all their contribution to the Christian inheritance, the Epistle of Barnabas and Justin's works in their second-century setting are Jewish as much as Christian documents. Despite and partly because of their anti-Judaism, they attest the overshadowing spiritual power of the Jewish polity, and could properly be assigned to a Christian sub-section of Jewish literature.

---

examined by P. Schäfer, 'Rabbi Aqiva and Bar Kokhba', in W. S. Green, ed., *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, ii (Chico, 1980), 113–130 (114–7).