

# CHRISTIAN ANTI-JUDAISM: POLEMICS AND POLICIES

PAULA FREDRIKSEN AND ODED IRSHAI

## I INTRODUCTION

The Church endorsed by Constantine in the early fourth century represented a form of Christianity that drew most directly upon the traditions and Scriptures of Israel. Its Bible rested on the foundation of the Septuagint; its cosmology affirmed the positive relation of the highest deity, God the Father, to material creation; its soteriology anticipated the resurrection of the dead; its Christology asserted the lineal descent of Jesus Christ from the House of David. These common religious points of principle notwithstanding, however, this Church eventually came to persecute Jewish communities with a deliberation that pagan Rome never had. To understand imperial Christianity's policies toward Jews and Judaism requires an appreciation of its foundational history in the second century, when the younger community fought doctrinal diversity within and persecution without. During this earlier period, the seeds of orthodoxy's anti-Judaism, which flourished especially from the late fourth century onward, developed and became established.

## II THE SECOND-CENTURY SEEDBED: THEOLOGY, IDENTITY, AND ANTI-JUDAISM

The core writings of the eventual New Testament canon – the four Gospels and Paul's letters – were all composed in the second half of the first century. They witness that stage of the movement when Christianity was a type of Hellenistic Judaism, and much of the vituperation they display targets fellow Jews, whether Christian or other.<sup>1</sup> As the movement continued, its diversity increased until, by the early second century, the literary evidence

<sup>1</sup> Internal Christian targets: the false prophets (Matt. 7.15–23); false insiders (2 Cor. 11.4–5; Gal. 2.4 and passim; Phil. 3.2). The polemic against scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and (especially in the Passion narrative) the Jerusalem priests lies scattered throughout the Gospels. L. T. Johnson, "The New Testament's Anti-Jewish Slander and the Convention of Ancient Polemic," *JBL* 108 (1989), 419–41.

bespeaks not only different sorts of Jewish Christianities and Judaizing Gentile Christianities<sup>2</sup> but also purely Gentile forms of Christianity. The spokesmen for these latter communities were well-educated, formerly pagan intellectuals. In articulating their respective commitments to Christian revelation, these men necessarily had to make sense of the literary medium of that revelation – the Septuagint and the burgeoning body of specifically Christian writings (gospels, apocalypses, pseudepigraphic epistles) – in light of their shared rhetorical and philosophical culture, *paideia*. The momentous interpretive struggle between these Gentile contestants over the construction of Christianity created the context within which the rhetoric and ideology of classical Christian anti-Judaism took shape.

A major theological principle of *paideia* concerned the nature of the highest god. He – or It – was by definition perfect. This divine perfection entailed several interrelated metaphysical predicates: God was good, unchanging, non-material, impassible, radically transcendent. “All god is good, free from body, free from change.”<sup>3</sup> Although ultimately the source of everything else, the high god of *paideia* was not a creator, a role that would have implicated him too immediately in the imperfections and changefulness of the world of time and matter. (Such engagement was left to a lower deity, the demiurge or “craftsman.”) *Paideia*’s high god thus fit poorly with the active, personified divinities of traditional religious narratives, whether pagan or Jewish; and ancient thinkers with intellectual commitments to high philosophical culture and religious commitments to traditional narratives resolved the resulting tensions by developing allegorical understandings of their myths. Educated Gentiles converting to Christianity only intensified their difficulties by introducing the particular – and relatively recent – appearance of Jesus and the revelations attributed to him into the larger problem of interpreting the God of Jewish Scripture, and the more general problem of making philosophical sense of religion.<sup>4</sup>

Valentinus (fl. 130) and Christian gnostics generally turned to the Septuagint for spiritual guidance but read it *à l’inverse*, renouncing its god as an ignorant, indeed malevolent deity whose function as creator of the material cosmos proclaimed his inferior metaphysical status. The laws that

<sup>2</sup> J. Carleton Paget, “Jewish Christianity,” *CHJ*, 111 731–75; B. L. Visotzki, “Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish Christianity in the Rabbinic Literature,” *AJS Review* 14 (1989), 47–50.

<sup>3</sup> Sallustius, *On the Gods and the World*, 1: *Pagan Monotheism*, ed. P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede (Oxford, 1999).

<sup>4</sup> R. Lamberton, “Language, Text, and Truth in Ancient Polytheist Exegesis,” in J. Whitman (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory* (Brill, 2000), 73–88; D. Dawson, “Plato’s Soul and the Body of the Text in Philo and Origen,” in Whitman (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory*, 89–107; F. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge, 1997).

Scripture contained had to be considered carefully to determine their source and, thus, their application. Only some laws originated with Jesus and therefore pertained to the Christian; others related exclusively to the lower god or to the traditions of the Jews.<sup>5</sup> Marcion (fl. 140) and his community seem to have arrived at their views through a different approach. They read the contrasting pairs of Pauline rhetoric – law and gospel, works and grace, flesh and spirit – as absolute opposites (hence, the title of Marcion’s lost theological work, the *Antitheses*). Accordingly, they repudiated as fleshly and thus intrinsically un-Christian both traditional Jewish religious praxis (the “works of the Law”) and the Scriptures that enjoined them.<sup>6</sup>

Both Gnostics and Marcionites derived from their respective approaches a similar theological structure of mitigated or hierarchical dualism. God the Father of Jesus, a version of the high god of *paideia*, stood above and apart from matter’s fray. His son, assuming a “human likeness” (Phil. 2.7) but not an actual human body, came to redeem those caught in the world of flesh and sin. Those saved in Christ, having shed their fleshly bodies, would ultimately pass through this physical cosmos, the realm of the lower god (whom they identified as the Jewish *kosmokrator* of Genesis), to reach the realm of spirit and light, the kingdom of the Father. Their similar theologies, however, led to distinctly different textual practices. Gnostics, eclectic and inclusive, read broadly within the Septuagint (although Genesis itself was clearly a premier text) and within the expanding and esoteric body of Christian literature, content to retrieve gnosis from a wide range of writings, pagan, Jewish, and Christian. By contrast, the Marcionites, creative in a different way, assembled a new body of religiously authoritative texts and delimited it sharply. On the one hand, they disparaged the biblical god and dismissed the Septuagint, while on the other, they restricted their new canon to a single Gospel and a collection of Paul’s letters. Furthermore, following through on the logic of their construction of Christianity as Judaism’s opposite, and reading the historical Paul’s arguments against halachic observance by Gentiles-in-Christ as the Christian Paul’s condemnation of Jewish law and practice *tout court*, they concluded that all positive reference to Torah in the epistles must have been the work of later judaizing interpolators. Accordingly, they edited these from Paul’s letters, thereby producing an apostle and a Christian message that were consistently de-judaized.

<sup>5</sup> Prolemy, *Epistula ad Floram*, apud Epiphanius, *Panarion* 33.3–7.

<sup>6</sup> Marcion’s positions can be gleaned, cautiously, from Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*; for Marcionite anti-Judaism and the patristic response to it, see D. P. Efroymson, “The Patristic Connection,” in A. T. Davies (ed.), *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York, 1979), 98–117; J. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh, 1996), 261–70.

Against these genres of dualist theologies, a range of other Gentile Christian thinkers stood. They insisted on a positive relationship between material creation and the high god, and thus between the God of Genesis and the revelation of Christ. Against docetic Christologies, they urged that Christ, the Son of the high God, had truly come in the flesh, by physical lineage descending from the House of David. Accordingly, and against a purely spiritual salvation, they also contended that the fleshly body would be raised and thus redeemed. Unlike their opponents, then, this group asserted that the Jewish Scriptures spoke directly and positively to Christian revelation and that a unitary divine will stood behind both the giving of the Law and the coming of Christ.

Together with their opponents, however, these Christians, also Gentiles, repudiated most of the observances of Jewish law. This repudiation inevitably complicated their positive reading of the Septuagint, since they rejected precisely those practices established by the biblical God. They therefore found themselves waging a hermeneutical battle on multiple fronts. They contended for the “true reading” of Scripture against other Gentile Christians, whether Gnostics or Marcionites, who held that the God of the Septuagint was essentially incompatible with the revelation in Christ. They had to respond to Gentile judaizers, whether Christian or pagan, who, themselves observing some aspects of the Law, criticized this group’s claim to the Scriptures when they did not keep the laws that Scripture enjoined.<sup>7</sup> Finally, they disputed with Jewish contemporaries, whether native-born or converts,<sup>8</sup> while they encountered ancient Torah-observant characters every time they turned to the texts that they now claimed as their own.

As with earlier pagan and Jewish efforts to construe religious texts philosophically, so now with the efforts of this third group of Christians, allegory proved a valuable tool. An interpretive style of thinking which aimed to discern what a text truly meant as opposed to what it merely said, allegory provided early Christians with a means of altering the frame of reference for the ancient Jewish Scriptures. Events, objects, or personages in the Septuagint, understood “correctly” or, in the language of these later works, *kata pneuma*, “spiritually,” were revealed to be *typoi*, figurations or

<sup>7</sup> G. N. Stanton, “Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*: Group Boundaries, ‘Proselytes,’ and ‘God-fearers,’” in G. N. Stanton and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge, 1998), 263–78.

<sup>8</sup> Thus, in *Adversus Iudaeos*, Tertullian has the Jewish side of the debate represented by a convert to Judaism; and he acknowledges a large number of Jewish proselytes in *Adv. Marc.* 3.21.3; cf. the earlier remarks of Justin, *Dial.* 23.3; 122.1—123.2, who observes that proselytes, making strenuous efforts to be like the born Jews, “twofold more than yourselves blaspheme [Christ’s] name,” 122.2. See also Stanton, “Justin,” 273–4.

“types” pointing beyond the narrative frame of the biblical story to some metaphysical truth about Christ or his Church. In the later writings in the New Testament canon, for example, the flood story becomes an inferior type of baptism (2 Pet. 3.18–22) and the Jerusalem priesthood an inferior anticipation of the eternal priesthood of Christ (Heb. 9.11–28). The *Epistle of Barnabas* held that the entirety of Jewish Scripture had been misunderstood by the Jews: its intended audience had always been the (Gentile) Church, which understood spiritually, and therefore correctly, that instructions on circumcision, fasting, food laws, sacrifices, Sabbaths, and so on did not prescribe behavior but described moral and Christological truths (chs. 2–17). Melito, in his Easter homily, read in Exodus a prefiguration of Jesus’ passion and resurrection: the narrative details of the former thus referred to, and, when understood correctly, revealed the theological significance of the latter.<sup>9</sup>

The mid-second-century treatise of Justin Martyr, the *Dialogue with Trypho*, offers a comprehensive if unsystematic application of such typology to the text of the Septuagint. Justin opens his work by invoking the high god of *paideia*. God is “that which always maintains the same nature in the same manner and is the cause of all other things,” discernible not to the physical eye but to the spiritual eye of the soul, which is to say, to “the mind alone” (*Dial.* 3) – in other words, without body of any sort. He then moves rapidly from these assertions (which raise no objection from Trypho, his philosophically educated Jewish interlocutor) to criticism of the Jewish mode of interpreting Scripture. Citing Isaiah on the redemption of the nations (51.4–5, LXX) and Jeremiah on the “new covenant” (31.31–2), Justin criticizes Trypho both for not understanding that a “new law” has been given and for poorly understanding the Mosaic “old law” (*Dial.* 11–12). “You have understood all things in a carnal sense” (*kata sarka*, 14), observing the law of Moses in a fleshly, literal way because failing to understand that what seem to be commandments in the Pentateuch are actually disguised allusions to Christ. Thus, purification rituals really speak of baptism into Christ (14); the Passover sacrifice, of the Crucifixion (40); the meal offerings, of the eucharist (41); the twelve bells on the robes of the high priest, of Christ’s apostles (43); and so on (and on). Biblical legislation that does not oblige allegory must be understood as punitive, given on account of the proverbially stony Jewish heart (18, 21, 22, 27, and frequently).

<sup>9</sup> In general: Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 119–39; 195ff. Melito’s *Peri Pascha* (c. 160) offers a glimpse of competitive Christian–Jewish exegesis: see Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 209–35; I. Yuval, *Two Nations in Your Womb* (Tel-Aviv, 2000), 83–105 (Hebrew) suggests that such exegesis affected the evolution of the Haggadah as a midrashic response.

According to Justin, two problems impede the Jews' understanding Scripture *kata pneuma*. The first is their philosophical inadequacy, which leads them to misapprehend biblical theophanies as appearances of the high god. The busy, embodied deity visiting Abraham at Mamre or talking with Moses on Sinai cannot have been the One, the transcendent and radically changeless Father. Rather, another god (*beteros theos*) must have put in these appearances (56). Thus far, Justin's argument recapitulates the broad lines of Valentinus' and Marcion's teaching: they, too, held that only a lower god could have functioned as described in the narratives of Scripture. Whereas their lower god stood in moral and metaphysical contradistinction to the high god, his son, and his gospel, however, Justin's lower god is the Father's son, the source of both law and gospel; he is the pre-incarnate Christ (56–62; cf. Trypho's earlier response to imputed Septuagintal Christophanies in 38). Ignorant of this key datum – the true identity of the god who acts in Scripture – the Jews inevitably misread their own books (126ff.).

The more fundamental explanation for the Jews' deafness or blindness to Christian claims, however, says Justin, is their enduring national character. As the Scriptures themselves display and as the prophets especially proclaimed, Jews are intransigently hard-hearted, carnal, stubborn, sinful, and idolatrous (20). It was because of Jewish transgression and obduracy that the law was given in the first place (18); because of the Jewish tendency to worship idols, that God had tolerated the Temple service (32). Despite all God's efforts and the warnings of the prophets, however, the people always and invariably erred, their trail of crimes leading from the murders of the prophets (39) to the murder of him who spoke through them, that is, Christ (17). For this reason, the Jews, wasted by war and destruction (Justin has in mind both the war in 66–70 and the Bar Kochba Revolt), have been deprived of homeland and Temple. Nevertheless, with amazing obduracy, they continue to reject Christ and *kata sarka* to observe the Law (especially regarding circumcision), thereby facilitating their own continuing isolation and exile (for if they were not circumcised, they could not be singled out as Jews, 16).

Justin asserts that his positions are purely biblical: they were sung by David, preached by Isaiah, proclaimed by Zechariah, and written by Moses: "They are contained in your Scriptures, or rather, not yours, but ours" (29). He adduces Isaiah 42.1–4 – "Jacob is My servant . . . and Israel is My elect . . . In His name shall the Gentiles trust" – to identify the true Israel. "Is it Jacob the patriarch in whom the Gentiles and yourselves shall trust? Is it not Christ? As, therefore, Christ is the Israel and the Jacob, so even we, who have been quarried out from the bowels of Christ, are the true Israelite race" (135; cf. 123). Jews past and present, displaying the enduring moral turpitude lamented by the prophets, continue to cling to the old covenant.

However, the Gentiles, God's true Israel, embracing the new covenant, have superseded the Jews and inherited God's promises. Jews as Jews are past redemption, excluded from salvation utterly, unless they repent the persecution of Christ and join the true (that is, Justin's) Church (26).

Justin's *Dialogue* assembles arguments *adversus Iudaeos* that appear in various earlier writings and bequeaths its polemical template to the centuries of Christian authors to follow.<sup>10</sup> But the range of the mid-second-century Gentile Christian debate was so broad, and the struggle for self-definition so fraught, that this theology of Judaism articulated by Justin and others had a range of application much wider than the *adversus* tradition alone. The non-Gnostic, non-Marcionite, non-judaizing Gentile Christianity that nonetheless claimed the Septuagint as its own, that wanted the Bible but not the Jews, needed to find a way to pry the text free of its native communities and their practices while retaining or retrieving its positive value for the Church.<sup>11</sup>

The tool of choice was an anti-Jewish biblical hermeneutic no less antithetical than Marcion's, a hermeneutic that required God, Christ, the Prophets, even the Law itself (construed as a punitive restraint) to be anti-Jewish as well. Once this interpretive context was established as a way to orient the believer in the Septuagint, the documents eventually comprising the core of orthodoxy's specifically Christian canon – the four Gospels and Paul's letters – could be read the same way: the missions of Jesus and Paul became anti-Jewish as well. In addition, the vicissitudes of Jewish history in this same period, marked by unsuccessful revolts against Rome, the destruction of the Temple, the construction of Aelia with its ban on Jews, and the erasure of Jewish Jerusalem, were exploited to support orthodoxy's claim. The Jews, in rejecting Christ, had sealed their rejection of God; God, in turn, had conclusively rejected them.

As this particular Church matured and consolidated itself intellectually and institutionally in the third century and beyond, growing both in numbers and in self-confidence, its spokesmen could occasionally modulate

<sup>10</sup> S. Krauss and W. Horbury, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy from the Earliest Times to 1789*, 1 (Tübingen, 1995), 27–43; H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Iudaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.–11. Jb.)* (Frankfurt, 1982); W. Horbury, *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy* (Edinburgh, 1998), 127–61; more broadly, R. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York, 1975), 117–82; Efromson, "Patristic Connection"; W. Nicholls, *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate* (Northvale, 1993), 169–87; M. Simon, *Verus Israel* (1948; London, 1996), 215ff.

<sup>11</sup> Hence, Origen characterized the purpose of Jesus' mission as "introducing to mankind a doctrine which did away with the customs of the Jews while reverencing their prophets," *Contra Cels.* 1.29.



its constitutive anti-Judaism for strategic reasons. Especially when dealing with pagan critics (who often repeated earlier pagan attacks on the Hellenistic synagogue), later Christian apologists mobilized traditional Jewish apologies against pagan culture, and indeed identified with Jewish Israel for their own defense.<sup>12</sup> More often, however, “Jew” functioned as a negative code-word within purely Christian internal debate. Tertullian identified Marcion’s prime hermeneutical errors when reading Scripture to be similar in kind to those of “the Jews”; Origen characterized Christian milenarians as interpreting in a peculiarly fleshly, that is, Jewish manner. So too, Athanasius on his ecclesiastical opposition, Ambrose on his, Jerome on his.<sup>13</sup> In these erudite intra-Christian battles over right thinking, to call an opponent a “Jew” was to call him in the most profound and definitive way possible an un-Christian, indeed, an anti-Christian.

That the word “Jew” could convey such opprobrium within purely internal Christian disputes reveals the degree to which its meaning had become intrinsically, emphatically negative. This polemical construction of “Jew,” initially generated within the early second-century matrix of these theological debates, subsequently metastasized throughout all genres of surviving ancient Christian literature. It reappears in apologies and martyr stories, in sermons, in hermeneutical handbooks and books of testimonies, in scriptural commentaries and ecclesiastical histories. As a theological abstraction, it contained great power, serving by means of absolute contrast to focus and define the desiderata of orthodox identity.

What about real Jews, as opposed to Christian theological ideas about them? How did social reality affect the intellectual construct? How did common Gentiles, whether pagan or Christian, relate to their Jewish neighbors, and the Jews to them, in the cities of the Mediterranean? How did these social factors in turn inform and affect the growth and development of Christian anti-Judaism?

<sup>12</sup> G. G. Stroumsa, *Savoir et Salut* (Paris, 1992), 101. Origen, *Contra Cels.* 4.31, excellence of aniconic Jewish worship; 4.36, Moses and Jewish tradition of superior antiquity to Greeks; 5.8, a defense of Jewish monotheism; 5.42–3, superiority of Jewish society and ethics to pagan, and of Jewish worship to pagan philosophy; 5.50, “the supreme god is called the God of the Hebrews even by people alien to our faith”; 6.19, Prophets prior to Plato.

<sup>13</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3 passim; Origen, *De Princ.* 2.11.2; Ambrose, *Ep. Extra* coll. 5 [11].3; D. Brakke, “Jewish Flesh and Christian Spirit in Athanasius of Alexandria,” *J ECS* 9 (2001), 453–81; H. Newman, “Jerome’s Judaizers,” *J ECS* 9 (2001), 421–52; G. Stemberger, “Hieronymus und die Juden seiner Zeit,” in D. A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter: Festschrift für H. Schreckenberg* (Göttingen, 1993), 347–64.



### III THE SOCIAL MATRIX: JEWS AND GENTILES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN CITY

Social life in the ancient city was organized around cult. Seemingly non-religious activities – theatre, rhetorical or athletic competitions, the convening of city council or a court of law – invariably involved some sort of acknowledgment of and offering to traditional deities and, eventually, to the *numen* (“divine power”) of the Emperor. For Jewish populations in the Mediterranean Diaspora concerned about guarding their traditional practices, therefore, enfranchisement into the life of their cities of residence invariably involved negotiating various accommodations and exceptions.<sup>14</sup> Conversely, for the pagan populations native to these cities, whose traditional worship was public and communal, whose festival calendar and meals at civic celebrations enacted and embodied important forms of social solidarity, and whose own religious traditions and temperament were inclusive and pluralistic, perceived Jewish aloofness could trigger resentment or offense.<sup>15</sup>

What of the legal status of the resident Jewish communities, the civic status of their members, the civil as well as religious authority of their courts? No generalization can suffice to describe accurately all these aspects of life in the Diaspora because each case would vary across different cities in the same period, across the same city in different periods, and across economic groups within ostensibly the same community. Neither can one know in any detail the ways that these Diaspora Jews lived their allegiance to their religious traditions. The laws drafted to protect them and the comments (whether hostile or admiring) of Gentile writers (whether pagan or Christian) provide a brief index of those Jewish practices most evident to outsiders: sources mention most frequently Sabbath observance, food laws, festivals, circumcision, and aniconic worship.<sup>16</sup> Generally true for all locales in all periods beginning with the Hellenistic cities and continuing through the late Empire is that ruling authorities were inclined to acknowledge and to protect Jewish religious difference and the Jews’ right to live according to *ta patria ethe*, their “ancestral customs.”<sup>17</sup> By the third century,

<sup>14</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* 12–14 passim; J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l’empire romain*, 2 vols. (Paris 1914); S. Applebaum, “The Legal Status of the Jewish Communities in the Diaspora,” in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Philadelphia, 1974), 420–63; J. Barclay, *Jews in the Western Mediterranean Diaspora, from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Berkeley, 1996); E. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA, 2002), 15–132; *HJPAJC* III 1–178; early imperial legislation in A. Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit, 1987), 99–120.

<sup>15</sup> P. Schäfer, *Judeophobia* (Cambridge, MA, 1997); and *GLAJJ*.

<sup>16</sup> Comprehensively canvassed in *GLAJJ*; analysis in Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 15–103.

<sup>17</sup> M. Pucci ben Zeev, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World* (Tübingen, 1998).

this principle of Jewish exemption from public cult was so well established that emperors, attempting to recruit Jews into onerous service in the civic curiae, stipulated that nothing religiously offensive to them could be requisite to executing the office; and they explicitly excused Jews from emperor-worship.<sup>18</sup>

The general Jewish distance from public cult was offset by the genuine social and religious permeability of the Diaspora community. This was partly due to the visibility of ancient religious celebration; as with contemporary Mediterranean paganism, much of ancient Jewish religious festival (dancing, singing, communal eating, processing) occurred out of doors, inviting and accommodating the participation of interested outsiders.<sup>19</sup> Partly, too, this permeability was an effect of that singular Jewish institution, the synagogue. A designation for “community gathering” more than a reference to a particular building (although it could mean that, too), the Diaspora synagogue or *proseuche*, “prayer house,” was the community institution *par excellence* that focused, articulated, and even disseminated Jewish identity.<sup>20</sup> A prime function of these weekly gatherings centered on providing Jews with instruction, on the Sabbath, in the law. These readings from

<sup>18</sup> Septimius Severus (193–211) encouraged Jews to participate in city councils, which under ordinary circumstances would have involved them in public paganism. “The divine Severus and Antoninus [Caracalla] permitted those that follow the Jewish religion to enter offices [*honores*], but also imposed upon them liturgies such as should not transgress their religion,” *Digesta Iustiniani* 50.2.3.3; translation with discussion, Linder, *Roman Legislation*, 103–7; *HJPAJC* 111/1 126–37; F. Millar, “Empire and City, Augustus to Julian: Obligations, Excuses, and Status,” *JRS* 73 (1993), 76–91. On exemption from emperor-worship, *PT Av. Zar.* 5.4 (44d); S. Lieberman, “The Martyrs of Caesarea,” *Annuaire de l’Institut de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, VII (1939–1944), 405–8.

<sup>19</sup> Philo mentions the celebration on the beach at Pharos, “where not only Jews but also multitudes of others cross the water, to do honor to the place [the site of the seventy-two translators’ labors] . . . and also to thank God” (*De Vita Moysis* 2.41–2); Tertullian, *De Ieiunio* 16, Jews gather on fast days to worship out of doors, by the sea. Chrysostom in his notorious sermons *Against the Judaizers* complains of Christians’ cocelebrating Jewish rituals, fasts, and feasts (“When have they ever celebrated the Pasch with us? When have they shared the day of Epiphany with us?” [4.376]; “Many who belong to us . . . attend their festivals and even share in their celebrations and join their fasts” [1.844]). Jews dancing on Shabbat: Augustine, *Sermones de Vetere Test.* 9.3; *In Iob. Tr.* 3.19; *Enarr. in Ps.* 32.2; 91.2; D. Sperber, “On Sabbath Dancing,” *Sinai* 57 (1965), 122–6 (Hebrew). On the public nature of the Purim festival, *CTb.* 16.8.18.

<sup>20</sup> L. I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, 2000); Gruen, *Diaspora*, 105–32; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 13; F. Millar points out that, at least in the fourth century in Rome, a synagogue could function as a sort of lending library (Jerome, *Ep.* 36.1), “Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora,” in J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians* (London 1992), 97–123, at 115; additional examples in Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 380–1.

the law, interpretations, and instruction were given in the vernacular – in Greek, for most of this period; eventually, later and in the West, in Latin.<sup>21</sup> Among the synagogue's auditors, Gentiles could also be found.

The spectrum of this pagan affiliation was broad. Epigraphical evidence provides glimpses of significant pagan benefactions to Jewish institutions, and some of these benefactors chose to involve themselves in the specifically religious activities of these communities.<sup>22</sup> Spells and incantations found in the Greek books of magical recipes for professionals occasionally relate garbled but recognizable biblical episodes and images; this knowledge of biblical stories could have been easily picked up by hearing Scripture in synagogue.<sup>23</sup> Other Gentiles, vaguely designated as “God-fearers,” went further, voluntarily assuming certain Jewish practices; ancient data speak most often of dietary restrictions, the Sabbath, and festivals.<sup>24</sup> Those pagans who did convert fully to Judaism (and, particularly during its first generation, to the Christian movement) most likely emerged from among these voluntary judaizers collected within the penumbra of Diaspora synagogues.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Greek was by far the best-attested language of Diaspora Jewish communities, although by the fourth and fifth centuries evidence begins to accumulate for a shift to Latin in communities in the West (North Africa, Italy, Spain, Gaul). Millar, “Graeco-Roman Diaspora,” on the Latin tomb inscription of Aurelius Samohil (*CJ* 1 no. 650); on the uncertainty of the Latin Jewish evidence, 97–9. Knowledge of Hebrew in the West persisted, hence Jews could be consulted to verify translations: Augustine, *Ep.* 71.5, although cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 112.20.4. Commodian's jibe about the *medius iudaicus* – the pagan who runs between traditional altars and synagogue – certainly implies Latin usage, *Instructiones* 1.24.1 iff.

<sup>22</sup> Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 121, 479–83; J. Reynolds and R. Tannenbaum, *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge, 1987); S. Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (London, 1999).

<sup>23</sup> E.g., *Paris Magical Papyrus* lines 3,007–85; Origen, *Contra Cels.* 4.33, the Jewish God invoked not only by Jews “but also by almost all of those who deal in magic and spells”; cf. 5.50. P. S. Alexander, “Jewish Elements in Gnosticism and Magic, c. CE 70–c. CE 270,” *CHJ* 111 1052–78.

<sup>24</sup> B. Wander, *Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten*, WUNT 104 (Tübingen 1998); L. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1993), 483–501; J. Lieu, “The Race of the God-fearers,” *JTS* 46 (1995), 483–501; S. J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness* (Berkeley, 1999), 175–97.

<sup>25</sup> Also, famously, Juvenal: “Quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem . . . mox et praepudia ponunt . . . Iudaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius”: the God-fearing father had not only kept the Sabbath but also avoided pork, *Satires* 14.96–101; *GLAJJ* 11 102–7. Acts routinely presents Paul encountering Gentiles in Diaspora synagogues: 13.16; 14.1; 16.14; 17.1–4, and so on. Paul himself nowhere mentions a synagogue context for his mission, but his reliance on arguments drawn from Scripture certainly supports the inference: in the mid-first century, the synagogue would have been the only means for Gentiles to have the familiarity with Scripture that Paul presupposes.

For pagan Gentiles, multiple religious allegiances were entirely normal; indeed, traditional polytheism easily accommodated this sort of openness.<sup>26</sup> These Gentiles freely assumed as much or as little of Jewish practice as they wished, while continuing unimpeded in their own cults. For the Jews' part, welcoming the material support and encouraging interest and even admiration among those of the host Gentile majority simply made good sense, politically and socially. Furthermore, since Jewish tradition regarded Torah, with its demand for exclusive allegiance to the Jewish God, as the defining privilege of Israel, the synagogue would have had little reason theologically or ideologically to impose its own standards of monotheism on these neighbors.<sup>27</sup> Exclusive for insiders (Jews should not worship foreign gods), the synagogue was inclusive for outsiders (interested Gentiles were welcomed). As a result, pagans as pagans could be found together with Jews in the Diaspora synagogue, just as, until 70, they could be found in Jerusalem, in the largest court of the Temple compound. No formal constraint, whether from the pagan or from the Jewish side, abridged this *ad hoc*, improvised, and evidently comfortable arrangement.

In light of this commodious social context, one must consider three often adduced explanations for the origins and growth of Christian anti-Judaism: (1) that Christian anti-Judaism was essentially a continuation of earlier pagan anti-Judaism; (2) that Jews, like Christians, conducted missions to convert pagans, so that Christian anti-Judaism resulted from this heated religious competition; and (3) that Jews took an active role in the pagan anti-Christian persecutions of the early centuries, so that Christian anti-Judaism was the theological residuum of and response to the Jews' own murderous anti-Christian hostility.

To the first point first. Alongside remarks attesting to an admiration of Jewish cult and culture also exist pagan condemnations of Jewish *amixia* ("separateness") and *deisidaimonia* ("superstition"). Pagans accused Jews of having a *misoxenos bios* ("foreigner-hating lifestyle") and of practicing impiety or atheism, evinced by their refusal to respect the gods of other nations.<sup>28</sup> Roman writers in particular could comment with distaste on the

<sup>26</sup> In his recent essay on the pagan cult of *theos hypsistos* ("God most high"), S. Mitchell argues that forms of pagan monotheism also index synagogue influence, "The Cult of Theos Hypsistos between Pagans, Jews, and Christians," *Pagan Monotheism*, 81–48, esp. maps, 81–5.

<sup>27</sup> This issue is relevant to the question of Jewish missions to Gentiles; see the following section.

<sup>28</sup> P. Fredriksen, "What 'Parting of the Ways'? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City," in A. H. Becker and A. Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen, 2003), 1–28.

Jews' customs, their historical traditions, and their religious practices, but such dislike conferred little distinction; they commented with similar scorn on Egyptians, Greeks, Scythians, Gauls, Britons, and Germans. From a distance, what might look like pagan anti-Semitism is frequently, in context, an equal-opportunity dislike of foreigners, all of whom had their own ethnic customs which were, by definition, un-Roman.<sup>29</sup>

Not Judaism itself, but rather the appeal of Judaism to non-Jews as evinced specifically by the phenomenon of conversion, stimulated pagan critics' most hostile remarks. Again, adherence to various religious customs was compatible with the sensibility of Mediterranean paganism; and the idiosyncrasy of any religious culture marked it as specific to a particular people. Seen in this light, the phenomenon of voluntary judaizing was unremarkable. However, exclusively committing to a foreign god to the point of forsaking the gods of one's own people – a condition of conversion unique to Judaism in the pre-Christian period – was perceived as an act of alarming disloyalty. The prime pagan objection to “God-fearing” was therefore not the particular practices themselves but the possibility that they could lead to conversion. In addition, the problem with converts, more so than with “native” Jews, was their principled renunciation of all other cults, including in the converts' case that which had previously been their own.<sup>30</sup>

What, then, is the relation of preventient pagan anti-Judaism to the later Christian versions? Superficial similarities (such as insulting characterizations of Jews and Jewish customs) should not obscure their basic differences.<sup>31</sup> For pagans, Jewish exclusivism, in particular, offended them; for Christians, such exclusivism, which they shared, could only be admired.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>29</sup> On the xenophobia of the Roman literati, see J. Gager, *The Origins of Antisemitism* (New York, 1983), 39–112; and Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 184 (Juvenal), 187 (Tacitus).

<sup>30</sup> Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 98, 180–95. Juvenal accuses Roman converts of “Romanas . . . contemnere leges/Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt ius,” (*Satires* 14.100–1); Tacitus, of having renounced the *religionibus patriis*, disowning their own gods, country and family, *Hist.* 5.1–2.

<sup>31</sup> M. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity* (Leiden, 1995), 115–21.

<sup>32</sup> The insistence, in Christian anti-Jewish writings, that Jews were perennially inclined toward idolatry means that the principle of exclusive worship was itself admired. Origen, *Contra Cels.* 4.31, Jews never made images, nor worshiped heaven (the prohibition against which Origen deems “impressive and magnificent”); by hearing the law on the Sabbath in the synagogue, the entire nation “studied philosophy”; 5.7–9, praising Jewish aniconic worship, not to be confused with the worship of heavenly entities; 5.43, “The philosophers in spite of their impressive philosophical teachings fall down to idols and daemons, while even the lowest Jew looks only to the supreme God.” Augustine, *Contra Faust.* 12.13, “It is a most notable fact that all the nations subjugated by Rome adopted the heathenish ceremonies of Roman worship; while the Jewish nation . . . has never lost the sign of their law.”

Furthermore, pagans, no matter how repugnant Judaism might seem to them, maintained that it was all right for Jews;<sup>33</sup> whereas most orthodox Christian thinkers (Augustine being a notable exception) held that Judaism, in general, and Jewish practice, in particular, were religiously wrong, period. Pagan anti-Judaism, in sum, seems largely the occasional expression of upper-class Graeco-Roman cultural snobbism, and the obverse (particularly in its hostility toward converts) of patriotic pride. In comparison, while Christian writers might avail themselves of themes first sounded by pagan counterparts, their negative critique was minutely developed and sweepingly comprehensive, their condemnation broader and more profound, and their hostile characterization essential to their own view of themselves.

What united earlier pagan and later Christian ideologues was not their dislike of Jewish difference as such, but rather their hostility, despite their insistence on this difference, to the appeal that Jewish communities evidently exercised on Gentile neighbors. Pagans disliked the cultural betrayal implicit in one of their own rejecting his native traditions and embracing the offensive religious exclusivism of the Jews. The orthodox Christian objection was more fundamental: if Christ himself had preached against Judaism, if God himself had repudiated the Jews, if even for Jews Judaism was wrong, then as a religious choice, whether relatively (through judaizing) or absolutely (through conversion), Judaism should be condemned. The stridency of orthodox rhetoric on this point attests to the divergence between the ideological ideal and quotidian reality: Gentiles, whether within the church or without, continued to be drawn to the synagogue.

The next question that arises is “Why?” Was Judaism’s appeal to Gentiles the result of a deliberate effort? In other words, did Jews in antiquity not only accept converts – that much is indisputable – but actually seek them out? Did Jews mount missions to Gentiles in order to convert them?

On this question, current scholarly opinion seems polarized.<sup>34</sup> Those who believe that such missions existed see their success as a fundamental cause of pagan and Christian anti-Judaism as well as a reason for Jewish hostility to early Christianity; the newer community offered superior competition for the same scripturally oriented Gentile market.<sup>35</sup> Those

<sup>33</sup> Celsus *apud* Origen, *Contra Cels.* 5.25–6.

<sup>34</sup> J. Carleton Paget, “Jewish Proselytism at the Time of Christian Origins: Chimera or Reality?” *JSN* 62 (1996), 65–103.

<sup>35</sup> Two classic statements of this position: Simon, *Verus Israel*; B. Blumenkranz, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins* (Basel, 1946). For brief histories of this position, see also Taylor, *Anti-Judaism*, 7–45; J. Carleton Paget, “Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity,” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 1 (1997), 195–225.

who challenge this view allege that it misconstrues the ancient evidence (wherein “conversion” need not entail “mission”) and that it projects on to Judaism a specifically Christian model of behavior and development.<sup>36</sup>

The ancient data are themselves contested. Scholars who think that ancient Jews mounted missions point to a “dramatic increase in Jewish population” from approximately 150,000 people at the time of the destruction of the First Temple to a number between four and eight million a half-millennium later in the mid-first century CE. Since birthrate alone cannot account for such an extreme rise (or so the argument states), these figures “demand further explanation.” Missions provide the answer: Jewish numbers rose so spectacularly thanks to aggressive proselytism.<sup>37</sup> Opposing scholars observe that these numbers – as indeed any estimates of ancient demography – are extremely speculative. As such, they can hardly serve to establish any such dramatic population increase among Jews, much less to support a hypothesis presupposing huge numbers of conversions, and still less a theory of energetic missionary activity to explain these.<sup>38</sup>

Interpretation of more secure evidence is no less fraught. What of the broad range of Jewish writings that exist in Greek? Is this the measure of Jewish efforts to convert Gentiles (hence, evidence of missionary effort and intent), (merely) to impress Gentiles, or rather to edify and amuse other Hellenistic Jews?<sup>39</sup> What about episodes like the expulsions of Jews from Rome in 139 BCE and again, under Tiberius, in 19 CE: were these angry pagan responses to aggressive Jewish proselytizing, or something else?<sup>40</sup>

<sup>36</sup> P. Fredriksen, “Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2,” *JTS* 42 (1991), 532–64; S. McKnight, *A Light Among the Gentiles* (Minneapolis, 1991); M. Goodman, *Mission and Conversion* (Oxford, 1994); and E. Will and C. Orrieux, *Prosélytisme Juif? Histoire d'une erreur* (Paris, 1992), 11–170.

<sup>37</sup> L. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, 293. Feldman has been a leading proponent of the existence of such missions, although he seems to begin to modulate his position, 412.

<sup>38</sup> Fredriksen, “Circumcision of Gentiles,” 538 nn. 16 and 17; Carleton Paget, “Jewish Proselytism,” 70, who notes that Baron – the authority frequently cited for these figures – based his statistics on “a statement by the thirteenth-century chronographer Bar-Hebraeus about the number of Jews at the time of Claudius’ census, a comment in Philo [*Flacc.* 43] about the Jewish population of Egypt being a million, and comments in Josephus about the population in Palestine”; L. V. Rutgers, “Attitudes to Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period: Reflections on L. Feldman’s *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*,” *JQR* 85 (1995) 361–95, repr. in Rutgers, *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism* (Leuven, 1998), 199–234.

<sup>39</sup> Feldman, *Jews and Gentiles*, 305–24, sees this literature as attesting to missionary effort, hence intending a pagan audience; Goodman, *Mission and Conversion*, 78ff., does not. See also E. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism* (Berkeley, 1998); *Diaspora*, 135–231.

<sup>40</sup> M. Stern, “The Expulsions of the Jews from Rome in Antiquity,” *Zion* 44 (1979), 1–27 (Hebrew); L. V. Rutgers, “Roman Policy toward the Jews: Expulsions from the City of Rome during the First Century CE,” *Classical Antiquity* 13 (1994), 56–74;



Do not Jesus' statement in Matthew 23.15 ("You Pharisees cross sea and land to make a single *proselytos*"), and Paul's in Galatians 5.11 ("If I still preach circumcision [sc. as a Jewish missionary], why am I still persecuted?") require as explanation the existence of such missions?<sup>41</sup>

As all the interpretive conflict attests, appeals to the data cannot settle the argument. Some scholars, in an attempt to move the discussion from its impasse, have suggested a theory of "mitigated missions": not all Jews in all places sought converts, but only some Jews in some places and periods did.<sup>42</sup> Whatever this more modest proposal might gain in plausibility, however, it loses in explanatory value for the question at hand. Jewish missions that were only sporadic and occasional cannot have provided the white-hot competition that supposedly accounts for the ubiquity and hostility of the Christian *adversus Iudaeos* tradition.

Two last considerations, one more theoretical, and one more practical, might provide more purchase on this question of Jews, Gentiles, and missions. The first one relates to speculations concerning the ultimate fate of Gentiles, a theme arising within apocalyptic or messianic Jewish traditions. These traditions, and this theme, appear variously in literature ranging broadly in period, provenance, and genre: the classical Prophets, apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, Philo and Paul, rabbinic disputes in the *Bavli*.<sup>43</sup> Nonetheless, this textual attestation cannot provide any information on whether, and to what degree, such speculations had any impact or influence on the day-to-day life of ancient Jews and their various Gentile associates. One cannot, for example, extrapolate Jewish missions from prophetic statements about Israel as a light to the nations, or about Israel's God as the God of the whole universe. Furthermore, while speculations about the Gentiles' ultimate fate appear throughout this literature, they diverge: some texts speak of the ultimate subordination of Gentiles to Israel (or of their destruction, dejection, defeat); others, of their participation with Israel at the End (such as worshiping at the Temple Mount or observing

H. Botermann, *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius* (Stuttgart, 1996); cf. Carleton Paget, "Jewish Proselytism," 73–4 and nn. 44–50; and Gruen, *Diaspora*, 15–53.

<sup>41</sup> W. D. Davies, "Paul: From the Jewish Point of View," *CHJ* 111 678–730, at 683, 691; J. Gager, *The Reinvention of Paul* (New York, 2000), passim.

<sup>42</sup> Carleton Paget, "Jewish Proselytism," 102.

<sup>43</sup> The nations included in Israel's redemption, Isa. 2.2–4; feasting together at the Temple, 25.6; coming with Israel to Jerusalem, Zech. 8.23; conveying Israel back to Zion, *Ps. Sol.* 7.31–41; burying their idols, 1 *Enoch* 91.14; Gentiles universally acknowledge Israel's God, Sirach 36.2–17, while burying their idols, Tobit 14.6. *Pianissimo*, Philo, *Vita Mos.* 2.44; *fortissimo*, Paul passim (eschewing idol worship but not converting to Judaism in light of the coming end of days/return of Christ). BT *Yev.* 24b holds that in the messianic age, Israel will not receive converts, thereby attesting to the Rabbis' assumption that Gentiles (the only possible candidates for conversion) will be present; BT *Av. Zar.* 3b.

some *mitzvot*). These traditions – as one would expect – are not univocal, and single documents can express many, sometimes opposing, views.<sup>44</sup>

Those texts, finally, which evince a positive orientation toward “eschatological Gentiles” speak only of Gentile inclusion, not conversion. The “righteous Gentile” of rabbinic discussion abandons his idols in this life; the proselyte, a former Gentile, “counts” eschatologically as a Jew.<sup>45</sup> By contrast, however, the Gentiles of these apocalyptic scenarios cling to their idols literally right to the End, repudiating them only once the Lord of Israel has revealed Himself in glory. Even at that point, these Gentiles do not convert to Judaism; instead, they turn from their own (false) gods and acknowledge, as Gentiles, Israel’s God.<sup>46</sup> Far from serving as a likely inspiration for Gentile missions, then, this inclusive tradition may speak rather about what Jews thought it would take to persuade most Gentiles to abandon their traditional worship: nothing less than a definitive and final self-revelation of God.<sup>47</sup> Taking this view in conjunction with the virtually universal Jewish opinion that the Law was the defining privilege of Israel (so too Paul, Rom. 9.4), a theological impetus for mounting missions to Gentiles becomes difficult to reconstruct.

This theoretical consideration – that ancient Jews had little ideological or theological reason to feel that they should endeavor to convince Gentiles to become Jews – leads to a second, practical one: the balance within the religious ecosystem of the ancient city. Jews won exemptions from civic and imperial cults through persistence and negotiation. Majority culture tolerated their exclusivism out of general respect for ancestral traditions. To have pursued actively a policy of alienating Gentile neighbors from their family gods and native civic and imperial cults would only have put the minority Jewish community at risk. Pagan communities and civic authorities were for the most part willing to adjust to and respect Jewish religious difference, even to the point – remarkably – of tolerating former pagans who, as converts to Judaism, sought the same rights and exemptions as “native” Jews. However, as the early Gentile churches discovered, when Christians began conspicuously to insist on exercising Jewish religious prerogatives without themselves becoming Jews, this tolerance expired.

This point moves to the final question on the social sources of Christian anti-Judaism. What role, if any, did Jews play in the (pagan) persecutions

<sup>44</sup> E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia, 1985), 212–21.

<sup>45</sup> Rabbinic righteous Gentiles: Tos. *Sanh.* 13.2; Noahide prescriptions, Tos. *Av. Zar.* 8.4–7; BT *Sanh.* 56b; D. Novak. *The Image of the Non-Jew in Judaism* (Toronto, 1983). See also ch. 25 in the present volume.

<sup>46</sup> E.g. Tobit 14.5–6; *Sib. Or.* 3.715–24; Justin, *Dial.* 122–3; cf. BT *Av. Zar.* 3b.

<sup>47</sup> Precisely Paul’s point: that Gentiles-in-Christ now abandon idols and *porneia* is a sign that the End (identified with Christ’s return) is at hand.

of (Gentile) Christians?<sup>48</sup> How did this role, perceived or actual, contribute to Christian anti-Judaism?

Historians conventionally divide the Empire's anti-Christian persecutions into two phases: the first, approximately from the late first to the mid-third century; the second, from Decius in 249 to Diocletian in 303. In the later period, emperors mandated uniform participation in acts of public cult. Jews (and, thus, Jewish Christians) were explicitly exempted;<sup>49</sup> Gentile Christians who refused were targeted for harassment, imprisonment, and possibly death. The persecutions of the first phase, however, were random and sporadic. They arose at a local rather than an imperial initiative, and their actual legal grounds remain obscure.<sup>50</sup>

Popular rumors of the Christians' debauchery and cannibalism, and their self-exemption from imperial cult, doubtless contributed to the churches' local visibility. Visible, too, was their non-participation in the civic cults of those gods who were theirs by birth and blood. Such behavior threatened to rupture the *pax deorum*, the pact or peace between heaven and the human community. Deprived of cult, the gods grew angry; and when gods were angry, humans suffered. Therefore, "when the Tiber overflows or the Nile doesn't," when plague or earthquake struck, Christians might find themselves sitting targets for local anxieties.<sup>51</sup> Once before the magistrate (frequently the Roman governor on his assize rounds), Christians were ordered to sacrifice. Refusal could mean death.<sup>52</sup> The pagan context of these persecutions dominates the accounts. Nevertheless, some historians claim that the Jews, "either in the background or in the foreground," also played an important role, spreading malicious rumors, stirring up trouble, participating actively and enthusiastically in local outbreaks of anti-Christian violence.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>48</sup> The floggings that Paul both initiated (Gal 1.13) and endured (2 Cor. 11.24) are not relevant to this discussion, since the principals in both instances were Diaspora Jews.

<sup>49</sup> J. B. Rives, "The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire," *JRS* 89 (1999), 135–54; Jewish exemption, *PT Av. Zar.* 5.4 (44d); Eusebius, *HE* 6.12.1. A. M. Rabello, "On the Relations between Diocletian and the Jews," *JJS* 35 (1984), 147–67.

<sup>50</sup> H. Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford, 1972), 57–62; the now classic exchange of G. E. M. de Ste. Croix and A. N. Sherwin-White, "Why were the Early Christians Persecuted?" *Past and Present* 26 (1963) and 27 (1964).

<sup>51</sup> Tertullian, *Apology* 40.2; on Christian withdrawal from cult and the anxieties it occasioned, see S. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984), 123–6.

<sup>52</sup> See, e.g., the martyrdoms of *Polycarp* 9; *Perpetua* 6; *Scillitan Martyrs* (where the proconsul complains of their forsaking the *mos Romanorum*) (Musurillo, *Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, 11, 113–5, 87–9); also the procedure sketched in Pliny, *Ep.* 10.

<sup>53</sup> A. Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (New York 1904), 64–7; W. H. C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (New York, 1967), e.g. 178 (malice), 194 (troublemaking), 215 (active part in persecutions). Taylor notes that Frend

Evidence cited in support of this claim includes some statements found in patristic writings and some episodes given in *acta martyrum*. In his *Dialogue*, Justin accused the Jews of murderous harassment of Christians, extending to the crucifixion itself: "Your hand was lifted high to do evil, for even when you had killed the Christ you did not repent, but you also hate and murder us" (133.6). Likewise, Tertullian characterized synagogues as *fontes persecutorum* (*Scorpiace* 10), and Origen suggested that Jews stood at the source of popular anti-Christian calumnies about ritual murder, cannibalism, and promiscuity (*Contra Cels.* 6.27, though cf. 6.40). Jews also figure prominently in the martyr stories of Polycarp and of Pionius. "The entire mob of pagans and Jews from Smyrna" roar, enraged, demanding Polycarp's death in the arena (*Poly.* 12); later, when "the mob" collects wood for his pyre, "the Jews (as is their custom) zealously helped them" (13). Later, the Jews together with their pagan neighbors frustrate the Christian community's efforts to retrieve Polycarp's body (17–18). A century later, again in Smyrna, Pionius and his companions are watched on their way to the tribunal by a great crowd of Greeks, women, and also Jews ("on holiday because it was a great Sabbath," *Pionius* 2–3), who importune Christians in the crowd to enter their synagogues (13).<sup>54</sup>

This is a slim dossier; indeed, its very slimness prompts some historians to trust the accounts, since the theme of Jewish hostility to martyrs is otherwise so exiguous in Christian literature.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, the indictments themselves seem rhetorical and retrospective. These sources present contemporary Jews as standing in the long line of persecutors of the righteous extending to the first generation of the Church, to Jesus himself, and before him to the Prophets. The Jewish presence described in these documents, in other words, can be read as a narrative restatement of the

"so takes the hostility and malice of the Jews for granted, that they occasionally overshadow the pagan officials in his descriptions of the persecutions," *Anti-Judaism*, 84. More recently R. Lane Fox, *Pagan and Christian* (New York, 1986), 487; and G. Bowersock, *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge, 1995), 56, continue this historiographical tradition. Cf. F. Millar's review of Frensdorff, in *JRS* 56 (1966), 231–6; and Taylor, *Anti-Judaism*, 78–114.

<sup>54</sup> J. Parkes argues that the Smyrnan Jews attempted to offer these Christians refuge, *Conflict of Church and Synagogue* (Cleveland, 1961), 144–5; if so, this refuge would cohere with Eusebius' report of Jewish sympathy toward persecuted Christians, *Martyrs of Palestine* 8.1. Others see evidence of hostile intent, e.g., Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, who paints a lurid picture of Jews and pagans together "gloating at the Christians from their city's colonnades," 487; for a full discussion, 479–87.

<sup>55</sup> L. Robert, *Le Martyre de Pionios*, ed. G. W. Bowersock and C. P. Jones (Washington DC, 1994), argues that Jews did indeed actively participate in these anti-Christian persecutions.

“trail of crimes” motif in orthodox anti-Jewish hermeneutic,<sup>56</sup> wherein allegations of such persecutions serve to reaffirm orthodox Christian identity and the orthodox understanding of contested biblical texts. The rhetoric of these texts, “the literary and theological nature and function of such accusations,” demands investigation. “Thus the initial question must not be about the Jews – ‘Did they persecute Christians?’ – but about the Christians – ‘Why did they perceive Jews as persecutors?’”<sup>57</sup>

Does this literary framing mean that real Jews were most likely not involved in these persecutions? No historical evidence can prove a negative, but consideration of other factors can help assess relative plausibility or implausibility. First, these charges of Jewish anti-Christian aggression arise specifically within orthodox Christian documents, which are the showcases of the erudite *adversus Iudaeos* tradition. It must be recalled, however, that more than the orthodox perished in these outbreaks of violence. “Heresies” – rival Gentile Christian churches with quite different orientations toward the Septuagint and with identities independent of Jewish constructions of “Israel” – also produced martyrs.<sup>58</sup> It is difficult to frame a Jewish resentment sufficiently broad to account for both anti-orthodox and anti-Marcionite aggression. Second, as attested by the cry awkwardly attributed to the Smyranean Jews in *Polycarp*,<sup>59</sup> such anti-Christian actions focused

<sup>56</sup> Thus, for example, Tertullian’s famous remark on the synagogues continues, “before which the apostles endured the scourge,” a clear reference to episodes described or predicted in various New Testament texts. Parkes comments, “The statement of Jewish hostility in general terms is based on theological exegesis [of Old and New Testament texts] and not on historical memory,” *Church and Synagogue* 148; general discussion and analysis of this literature, 121–50; M. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism*, 91–114, cf. Paget, “Anti-Judaism,” 215–16; J. Lieu, “Accusations of Jewish Persecution in Early Christian Sources, with Particular Reference to Justin Martyr and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*,” in Stanton and Stroumsa (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance*, 279–95. And see also ch. 11 in the present volume. On the literary nature of these (re-worked) martyr stories more generally, see J. W. van Henten and F. Avemarie, *Martyrdom and Noble Death: Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity* (London, 2002), especially 3–4, 94–6 (Polycarp).

<sup>57</sup> Lieu, “Accusations,” 280; idem, *Image and Reality*. E. L. Gibson proposes an internal target for this rhetoric, i.e., synagogue-going Christians, “Jewish Antagonism or Christian Polemic: The Case of the *Martyrdom of Pionius*,” *J ECS* 9 (2001), 339–58.

<sup>58</sup> Pionius was burned next to a member of Marcion’s church, 21.5; “Anonymous” in Book 5 of Eusebius’ history, derogating Montanist martyrs, mentions that “it is a fact that some of the other heresies have immense numbers of martyrs . . . [such as] those called Marcionites, from the heresy of Marcion,” *HE* 5.16.20–1. See R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire, AD 100–400* (New Haven, 1984), 29–30 and n. 13.

<sup>59</sup> “The whole crowd of Gentiles and Jews dwelling in Smyrna cried out in uncontrollable anger and with a great shout, ‘This is the teacher of Asia, the father of the Christians, the destroyer of our gods, the one who teaches many neither to sacrifice nor to worship!’” *Pionius* 12.2.

precisely on the issue of public cult. Were Jews on these volatile occasions to have made themselves so conspicuous, they would have risked emphasizing, on precisely the same issue, their own degree of religious difference from majority culture.

Finally, to either side of these persecutions chronologically, one consistently finds complaints of excessive intimacy between Gentile Christians and their Jewish neighbors threading through orthodox writings of many genres – sermons, letters, commentaries, conciliar canons. These sources speak regularly of Christians’ frequenting synagogues, keeping Sabbath or feast days with Jewish friends, soliciting Jewish blessings, betrothing their children to Jews, or indeed, marrying Jews themselves.<sup>60</sup> This is not to say that relations were always sunny; and Jewish anti-Christian polemic dates from this period, too.<sup>61</sup> But polemic is not persecution. If Jews had actually played – or even been commonly thought to have played – a vigorous role in the persecution of Gentile Christians, then this abundant and continuous evidence of intimate social interaction becomes extremely difficult to account for.

When focusing on ancient Jewish–Christian relations, the lived social context of these relations too often falls outside the locus of consideration. These two minority communities lived within cities that were both structured and celebrated by the majority religious culture. An abiding aspect of that culture was its deep respect for the *mos maiorum*, inherited religious tradition, the cornerstone of both law and piety.<sup>62</sup> This deep respect alone accounts for the extraordinary privileges and exemptions granted uniquely to Jewish communities in virtue of the ethnicity and antiquity of their own ancestral way of life. In addition, these exemptions in turn allowed Hellenistic Jews, without compromising those things fundamental to

<sup>60</sup> Christians going to synagogue, e.g., Origen, *In Lev. Hom.* 5.8; *Sel. in Exod.* 12.46; notoriously, Chrysostom’s sermons against Judaizers. Christians keeping the Sabbath; Augustine, *Ep.* 54.2.3; going to a Jew for a cure, *De Civ. Dei* 22.8.21. Church councils continuously legislate against Christian interest in Judaism and interactions with Jews, e.g., Elvira (303 CE) condemns intermarriage (canon 16), soliciting Jewish blessings for fields (canon 49), accepting Jewish hospitality (canon 50), and sexual relations (canon 78). Legislation collected in A. Linder, *The Jews in the Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1997).

<sup>61</sup> W. Horbury, *Controversy*; on the *birkat ha-minim*, besides Horbury, see S. Wilson, *Related Strangers* (Minneapolis, 1995), 183–93; Carleton Paget, “Anti-Judaism,” 217 n. 98 221; J. Z. Pastis, “Jewish Arguments against Christianity in the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*,” in B. G. Wright (ed.), *A Multifarious Heritage: Essays in Honor of Robert Kraft* (Atlanta, 1999), 184 n. 4; for the earlier period, see C. Selzer, *Jewish Responses to Early Christians: History and Polemics, 30–150* (Minneapolis, 1994). See also ch. 11 in the present volume.

<sup>62</sup> T. D. Barnes, “Legislation against the Christians,” *JRS* 58 (1968), 32–50.

their own religious identity, to attain their remarkable degree of social and cultural integration in the ancient city.

The value that majority culture attached to inherited custom, furthermore, unites both phases of the anti-Christian persecutions, when the traditionally pious, whether at the civic or later the imperial level, feared heaven's hostile response to any diminution of customary piety. In addition, it accounts, in the second century in particular, for the temporal coincidence of law banning conversions to Judaism (or indeed the circumcision of any non-Jew) together with outbreaks of aggression against Gentile Christians; only those born into Judaism could be permitted the Jews' religious prerogative of exemption from public cult.<sup>63</sup> The self-identity of the New or True Israel notwithstanding, then, Israel *secundum carnem* was the sole community whose right of religious difference Roman law and custom acknowledged. And this remained the case even after 312, when Constantine began Christianity's conversion to a form of imperial Roman religion.

#### IV PAX ROMANA CHRISTIANA: THE CONVERSION OF CHRISTIANITY

His momentous decision to patronize one branch of the church enabled Constantine to avail himself of the benefits of two movements, – one pagan, one Christian; each one ancient – whose universalist tendencies had intensified particularly in the half-century preceding his reign. To the pagan side lay the (new) emphasis on cult acts and the worship of the emperor that had sprung into focus with the Decian persecution of 249.<sup>64</sup> To the Christian side lay the social realization of orthodoxy's rhetoric of universalism, especially in the consolidation of episcopal authority and power during the period of growth that had marked the fifty-odd years between Decius and Diocletian. Isolating blood sacrifices as the sign *par excellence* of traditional polytheism (as Decius before him, for different reasons, had done), Constantine repudiated those practices while retaining and even emphasizing adoration of the emperor's image. Imperial cult thus continued to serve as a powerful force for Empire-wide religious and political

<sup>63</sup> Linder, *Roman Legislation*, 99–102, on the laws against circumcision from Hadrian to Antoninus Pius (late 120s to c. 155). Antoninus' rescript seems to have a wider application than only to the non-Jewish slaves of Jewish masters: "Circumcidere Iudaeis filios suos tantum rescripto divi Pii permittitur: in non eiusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis poena irrogatur," *Dig.* 48.8.11.

<sup>64</sup> Rives, "The Decree of Decius;" G. W. Bowersock, "Polytheism and Monotheism in Arabia and the Three Palestines," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 51 (1997), 1–10.



coherence.<sup>65</sup> Extending his considerable support to the orthodox Church, Constantine thereby acquired a far-flung cadre of talented, educated men, the bishops, whose network of urban churches was well ensconced throughout both halves of the Empire. From this point onward, ecclesiastical and imperial politics grew increasingly intertwined.<sup>66</sup>

The groups who most immediately felt the negative effects of these changes were, first of all, other Christians, whom Constantine ordered to disband, outlawing their assemblies, exiling their leaders, and impounding their holy books.<sup>67</sup> Traditional polytheist practice suffered, too. In banning blood offerings, Constantine drove a wedge between public, civic religious celebration and the sacrifices that had been one of its prime expressions since time immemorial.<sup>68</sup> Neither set of directives accomplished its aim; well after this period, heretical communities still gathered and pagans made their traditional offerings. Nor is it clear that Constantine himself and the Christian emperors after him truly expected these directives to be enforced; much of this genre of legislation is closer to moral exhortation (and, perhaps, to political posturing) than to legal prescription.<sup>69</sup> However, the increasing Christianization of Roman law established a tone and ultimately facilitated the erosion of religious pluralism, an unhappy hallmark of the later Empire.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>65</sup> J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford, 1979) 232–52, on the politico-theological continuities between Aurelian, Diocletian, and Constantine. The emperor cult should have been as problematic for Christians after 312 as before (although sacrifice had been removed, the imperial images remained), but it was not: see R. MacMullen, *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries* (New Haven, 1997), 34–5; Bowersock, “Polytheism and Monotheism,” 7, who notes that because of the imperial cult, the rabbis classified imperial statues as idols, *M. Av. Zar.* 3.1; *PT Av. Zar.* 3.1 (42b).

<sup>66</sup> H. A. Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops* (Baltimore, 2000); T. D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, 1981); D. Hunt, “The Successors of Constantine,” *CAH* XIII 1–43, at 7ff.; MacMullen, *Christianity and Paganism*, 29–30.

<sup>67</sup> Eusebius, *HE* 10.5.16, 6.4, 7.2; *Vita Const.* 3.64–6; *CTb* 16.5.1, from the year 326: “haereticos atque schismaticos non solum ab his privilegiis alienos esse volumus, sed etiam diversis muneribus constringi et subici.” Barnes, *Constantine*, 224, points out that this law “was clearly not enforced, since Valentinian, Marcionite, and Montanist conventicles long continued to exist.”

<sup>68</sup> The first general condemnation of pagan cult (“superstitio . . . sacrificiorum insania”) appears in 341, *CTb* 16.10.2, whereby Constans refers to an earlier law of his father’s. S. Bradbury, “Constantine and the Problem of Anti-pagan Legislation in the Fourth Century,” *Classical Philology* 89 (1994), 120–39. Drake sees Constantine’s all-bark-no-bite pronouncements against various pagan and Christian groups as part of a larger policy promoting a non-specific monotheism to unify the Empire, *Constantine*, 194–272.

<sup>69</sup> Bradbury, “Constantine,” 134–5.

<sup>70</sup> C. Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (Princeton, 1952); laws relating specifically to Jews, Linder, *Imperial Legislation*; M. Saltzman, “The

The concern of Constantine and his successors that worship be “correct,” no matter the particular contribution of a Christian sectarian mentality, was also a continuation of the ancient Roman solicitude for the *pax deorum*. Heaven (whether traditionally polytheist or, now, Christian) superintended the commonweal.<sup>71</sup> Impiety – increasingly defined as deviance from Catholic orthodoxy – accordingly put the state at risk. With hostile legal rhetoric in the early decades of the fourth century, with imperially sponsored campaigns against temples, cult statues, and religious minorities by the century’s end,<sup>72</sup> emperors increasingly sought to impose some sort of universal standard of religious behavior outside the Church and doctrinal harmony within it. The challenge was to lessen effectively the gap between the ideology of orthodoxy and the reality of a religiously diverse society.

In Roman law before 312, Jews had had a special status.<sup>73</sup> Now, in the decades after Constantine, they, like other non-Catholics, might be classed as pariah outsiders. Imperial legal rhetoric routinely grouped them together with pagans and with deviant Christians (“heretics”),<sup>74</sup> characterizing them and their religious culture as a *feralis* and *nefaria secta* (*CTb* 16.8.1; 8.2; 8.8; 8.9), *sacriligis coetus* (8.7; cf. *CJ* 1.7.2), and *contagia polluerens* (7.3). Preventive laws against the circumcision of non-Jews – focused now especially on the issue of Jewish masters owning Christian slaves – were frequently and shrilly reiterated, and conversion from Christianity to Judaism particularly denounced (for example, *CTb* 16.8.1; 8.7).<sup>75</sup> Echoing

Evidence for the Conversion of the Roman Empire to Christianity in Book 16 of the *Theodosian Code*,” *Historia* 42/3 (1993), 362–78; D. Hunt, “Christianising the Roman Empire: The Evidence of the Code,” in J. Harris and I. Wood (eds.), *The Theodosian Code* (London, 1993), 143–58.

<sup>71</sup> Liebeschuetz, *Continuity and Change*, on the *pax deorum*, 292; on Constantine’s conversion and its sequelae, 277–308.

<sup>72</sup> MacMullen, *Christianity and Paganism*, 51–3, with copious primary references in n. 63.

<sup>73</sup> The basic study, old but still valuable, is J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l’empire romain*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1914); W. Pakter, “Early Western Church Law and the Jews,” in H. Attridge and G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* (Leiden, 1992), 714–35. See also ch. 5 in the present volume.

<sup>74</sup> L. Cracco Ruggini, “Pagani, ebrei e cristiani: Odio sociologico e odio teologico nel mondo antico,” in *Gli ebrei nell’alto medioevo*, 1 (Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo 26, 30 marze–5 aprile 1978; Spoleto, 1980), 15–117; idem, “Intolerance: Equal and Less Equal in the Roman World,” *Classical Philology* 82 (1987), 187–205.

<sup>75</sup> A statute dating from 409 condemns such conversions as well as “God-fearing” (voluntary judaizing), and vilifies Judaism as a “perversitatem . . . alienam Romano imperio,” *CTb* 16.8.19. In 423, Theodosius II specified confiscation of property and perpetual exile as the penalty for a Jew facilitating the circumcision (hence, conversion) of a Gentile Christian (*nostrae fidei hominem*), 16.9.5.

canon law, the state also condemned judaizing (in the language of the statute, Christians “polluting themselves with Jewish contagions,” 16.7.3, here combined with execrations against pagans and Manichees) and intermarriage (3.7.2). By 418, the *imperium* limited the offices within public service that Jews could fill, and denied them a place in the military (16.8.24); in 425, together with pagans, Jews were in principle excluded from imperial administration entirely, as well as from law (the concern, again, was that, because of this contact, Christians might convert, *Cons. Sirm.* 6). Construction of new synagogues was forbidden;<sup>76</sup> those in “desert places” were ordered destroyed, if that destruction could be accomplished without disturbing public order (*CTb* 16.8.22; 8.25; 8.27).

Yet orthodoxy’s anti-Judaism provided only one small tributary to those Roman legal traditions regarding Jewish rights and practices that had coursed, by Constantine’s day, for more than three centuries. Occasionally (which is to say, exceptionally), emperors enacted legislation that impinged directly on Jewish practice: *Codex Theodosianus* 16.8.18 on Purim celebrations (in 408); *Codex Justinianus* 1.9.7 on consanguinity rules (393); and *Novella* 146 on protocols for synagogue worship (553).<sup>77</sup> Harsh rhetoric aside, though, Christian emperors through the fifth century by and large continued and arguably even extended the policies of their pagan predecessors, granting to Jewish communities a significant degree of autonomy, both religious and social. Laws pressuring Jews into curial service must be seen in context; the city councils throughout this period became increasingly desperate, and the annulment of traditional cult in the function of government had removed the reason for the Jews’ original exemption. (Strikingly, Jewish “clergy,” like their Christian counterparts, were excused.<sup>78</sup>) By mandate, synagogues were protected from destruction, from appropriation by the military (troops were not to be quartered therein), and from unlawful seizure (in such cases, Jewish communities were to be fairly compensated for their property), all on the well-established principle – and in increasing contrast to non-Catholic Christians and to traditional cult – that “Iudaeorum secta nulla lege prohibita” (*CTb* 16.8.9).<sup>79</sup>

<sup>76</sup> G. Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land. Palestine in the Fourth Century* (Edinburgh, 2000), 121–60, on the null effect of this law in Palestine in the fourth century in light of the archaeological evidence.

<sup>77</sup> Linder, *Imperial Legislation*, 236–8, 191–3, 402–11.

<sup>78</sup> On Jews and curial duties, *CTb* 16.8.3–4 (exempting Jewish “clergy”); 12.1.99 (mitigating this exemption); 16.8.13 (confirming their rights, in exceptionally respectful language); 12.1.158 (a specifically western interpretation of these exemptions); 12.1.165.

<sup>79</sup> The language of this statute of 393, coming within a few years of the destruction of the synagogue at Callinicum, is quite strong. It continues: “We are therefore gravely

Christian emperors in general affirmed the prerogatives of the Jewish Patriarch.<sup>80</sup> Imperial mandate asserted his unique authority with respect to excommunication (16.8.8; reaffirmed in 8.15) and forbade public insult to him (8.11; no such law protecting bishops appears in the books).<sup>81</sup> With the Empire *de facto* divided, Honorius tried to prohibit the Patriarch's collection of donations from western synagogue communities (8.14, in 399); within five years, he rescinded his own order and granted the Jews "the right of conveyance [of these monies] according to the privileges established by the ancient emperors" (8.17). Jewish courts exercised authority not only in cases concerning religious issues but also (with the preceding consent of both parties) in civil cases, and their judgments were to be enforced by the imperial government.<sup>82</sup> Finally – and in striking contrast to what would later be the case in medieval Europe – Jews who had converted to Christianity for reasons of convenience (or "out of various necessities") rather than conviction were allowed to return *ad legem propriam* (16.8.23, issued in 416).

Thus, when compared with the ultimate consequences of Constantine's conversion for imperial and ecclesiastical politics, therefore, for Church doctrine, for non-Catholic Christians, and for the public practices of

disturbed by the interdiction imposed in some places on their [the Jews'] assemblies. Your Sublime Magnitude [Addeus, the supreme military commander in the East] shall, upon reception of the order, repress with due severity the excess of those who presume to commit illegal acts (*inlicita*) under the name of the Christian religion and attempt to destroy and despoil synagogues." Other statutes protective of Jews and synagogues include 16.8.12 (issued in 397); 8.20 (412; this statute both protects synagogues and affirms Jewish exemptions from legal business on Sabbaths and holy days by appeal to long-standing legal precedent); 8.21 (420; protecting both Jewish persons and property, whether private or communal); 8.25 (423; specifically forbidding the quartering of troops in synagogues, and ordering compensation for those seized); 8.26 (423; coupling protective measures with a warning against Jews' circumcising "a man of our faith").

<sup>80</sup> M. Jacobs, *Die Institution des jüdischen Patriarchen. Eine quellen- und traditionskritische Studie zur Geschichte der Juden in der Spätantike* (Tübingen, 1995); P. Brown, *Authority and the Sacred* (Cambridge, 1995), 47–8; L. I. Levine, "The Status of the Patriarch in the Third and Fourth Centuries: Sources and Methodology," *JJS* 47 (1996), 1–32.

<sup>81</sup> The demotion of Gamaliel VI (a *vir clarissimus* and "illustrious honorary praetorian prefect") and the restriction of his powers (16.8.22, in 415) is exceptional and evidently enacted because of the Patriarch's overstepping himself; see Linder, *Roman Legislation*, 267–72; Stemberger, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land*, 230–68; O. Irshai, "Confronting a Christian Empire: Jewish Culture in the World of Byzantium," in D. Biale (ed.), *Cultures of the Jews: A New History* (New York, 2002), 189–92. This institution had run its course by 429; the language of the *Theodosian Code* (*post excessum patriarcharum*, 16.8.29) suggests that the family line had died out, not that the Empire had eliminated the office.

<sup>82</sup> *CTh* 2.1.10, dated February 3, 398. This same prerogative was extended to bishops five months later (*CJ* 1.4.7). See Linder, *Imperial Legislation*, 204–11.

traditional polytheism, the changes that the Christianization of the government worked on the Empire's official legal posture toward Jews and Judaism seem relatively mild. What did change markedly in the course of the fourth century as a result of Constantine's decision, however, was the role of the bishop in urban politics. In the coming centuries, the power of the bishops only increased and their role in local administration only grew; so, too, did their involvement in political strife and urban violence. These later developments, in turn, affected Jewish communities significantly.<sup>83</sup>

Bishops had long stood at the heart of their communities, directing the internal flow of charity, instructing their congregations through exposition of Scripture, shaping local opinion, and administering community resources. In frequent and regular contact with Church members (who were, in effect, their urban power-base), their tenure in office was in principle permanent. (By comparison, their secular counterparts for the most part served from year to year.) As a group, they were distributed throughout the Empire and linked across vast spaces by their common canon, calendar, and theological commitments. For Constantine, they represented an enormous and previously untapped pool of disciplined administrative talent. By lavishing imperial largesse and new judiciary powers on these men, he in effect created a new Empire-wide system of welfare and justice that served as an alternative to the clogged and corrupt mechanisms of the state.<sup>84</sup> This new role, and the imperial authority that strengthened it, vastly enhanced the bishops' already considerable local power.

Unexpectedly, however, in 361, the new Emperor, Constantine's nephew Julian, reversed this huge and improvised imperial-ecclesiastical system. Renouncing the orthodox Christianity in which he had been raised, Julian humiliated the bishops by revoking imperial patronage. Furthermore, he publicly and energetically embraced polytheism and proclaimed universal religious toleration (thus further destabilizing the orthodox by allowing exiled bishops and heretics to return). Finally, he announced that he intended to oversee the rebuilding of the Jews' Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>83</sup> J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *The Decline of the Roman City* (Oxford, 2001), 145–68; G. Fowden, "Bishops and Temples in the Eastern Roman Empire AD 320–435," *JTS* 29 (1978), 53–78.

<sup>84</sup> H. A. Drake, *Constantine*, especially 11, 27–34 (religious coercion and episcopal power); 325–52 (*Sirmondian Constitutions* empowering bishops with judiciary functions).

<sup>85</sup> On restoring temples and sacrifices as well as rescinding earlier privileges granted to Christians, Ammianus Marcellinus, *Historia* 22.5.2; Libanius, *Orationes* 18.126; allowing previously exiled Christians to return, Julian, *Ep.*; Amm. Marc. 22.5.3–5. Hunt, *CAH XIII* 60–73. On Julian's assessment of Christianity, *Against the Galileans*; on his plans to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem, Loeb *Ep.* 51 to the Jews, 398. For the impact of his plan on later Christian–Jewish relations, see Wilken, *Chrysostom*, 128–60. Later Christian

This last gesture took deliberate aim at two of the Church's most powerful "empirical" arguments against Jews and Judaism, namely, that Rome's defeat of Judaea in AD 70 and 135 proved incontrovertibly that God had repudiated Israel because of their rejection of his Son; and that the "fleshly" (that is, Jewish) observance of the Law was in any case impossible, since the biblically mandated sacrifices could be performed only at the Temple in Jerusalem.

Julian died while on a campaign in 363 before much could come of his efforts. His successor Jovian, a Christian scrambling to consolidate his own position, promptly restored orthodox bishops to their privileged position. Their experience under Julian had evidently radicalized them because, from this point on, they embraced imperial patronage and exercised their powers of coercion seemingly without ambivalence. By century's end, the bishops emerge as the impresarios of urban violence. Assisted by paramilitary bands of roving monks and urban "hospital workers" (the *parabalani*), they could enforce their own views on religious unity while the enormous spiritual prestige of the monks legitimated their resort to force. Pagan cult statues and temples, heretical assemblies, Jewish buildings and communities all might serve as targets for Christian mobs, the local bishop inciting and inspiring their actions.<sup>86</sup>

Paradoxically, however, the one island of relative safety for religious outsiders remained the synagogue. Jews, like everyone else, could be the

historians dwelt on Julian's attempted defiance of Jesus' prophecy of the Temple's desuetude in Matt. 24.2: "There shall not be left here [on the Temple Mount] one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down": Rufinus, *HE* 10.40; Philostorgius, *HE* 7.9; Socrates, *HE* 3.20; Sozomen, *HE* 5.22; Theodoret of Cyrus, *HE* 3.5.

<sup>86</sup> *Callinicum*, 386 or 388: a synagogue was burned down (a Valentinian chapel, likewise destroyed by the mob, does not merit mention as a criminal act), Ambrose, *Ep.* 40, who mentions there an earlier synagogue-burning in Rome. *Alexandria*, 415: during the episcopate of Cyril, Alexandrian Jews (as well as pagans and heretics), were targeted by Christian mobs and expelled from the city, and their synagogues were seized and consecrated as churches, Socrates, *HE* 7.13–15. *Edessa: Chron. Edess.* 51 = *TU* 1X (1892), 106. *Magona* (Minorca), 418: the synagogue was destroyed and the Jewish population were given the choice of conversion or exile, *Severus of Minorca, Letter on the Conversion of the Jews*, ed. S. Bradbury (Oxford, 1996). *Antioch*: synagogues were destroyed during the reign of Theodosius II, Evagrius, *HE* 1.13. See E. D. Hunt, "St. Stephen in Minorca: An Episode in Jewish-Christian Relations in the Early 5th Century AD" *JTS* 33 (1982) 106–23, at 116–17; Bradbury, *Severus*, 53–7; P. Brown, "Christianization and Religious Conflict," *CAH* XIII 632–64, who comments that "these incidents . . . do not in themselves amount to evidence for a generalized, and inevitable, trend toward the victimization of Jews in the post-Constantinian empire," 643. F. Winkelmann, "Der *laos* und die kirchlichen Kontroversen im frühen Byzanz," in idem, *Volk und Herrschaft im frühen Byzanz* (Berlin, 1991), 133–53. On the important issue of the role of bishops in religious coercion, Bradbury, "Constantine and Anti-pagan Legislation," 137–8; Fowden, "Bishops and Temples," 67–77.

occasional object of mob violence. However, Roman legal tradition in general prevailed, and Judaism – unlike paganism or heresy – even when marginalized, was nonetheless never outlawed. Jewish communities not only remained protected by legislation framed at the highest levels of government; they also continued to attract sympathetic attention and social support at a popular level.<sup>87</sup> Indeed, the hostility of ecclesiastical writers, their repeated efforts to delegitimize and disallow Christian involvement (both clerical and lay) in synagogue activities, and their insistence that Judaism itself represented the ultimate antitype of the true faith, obliquely witness to a positive attitude toward Jews and Judaism on the part of many in their own congregations.

The intense and articulate anti-Judaism that had characterized orthodox Christian sensibility and rhetoric since the internal hermeneutical wars of the second century thereby found full expression in the commentaries, treatises, Church histories, and especially the sermons of fourth-century churchmen, the ideologues of imperial orthodoxy. This literature betrays not only the “push” of clerical disapproval but also the continuing “pull” of the synagogue’s attraction, and Chrysostom’s sermons of 387, delivered in Antioch, are a premier example.<sup>88</sup> During approximately the same period, Church councils repeatedly published canons the chief aim of which was to establish and enforce a separation of Christians, ecclesiastics and lay people, from Jews. These prohibitions reveal the situation on the ground: some Gentile Christians kept the Jewish Sabbath as a day of rest and worked on Sundays (Laodicea, canon 29); they received festival gifts from Jews and heretics (canon 37) and accepted *matzah* and participated in Jewish “impieties” (canon 38). They shared in Jewish fasts and feasts (*Apostolic Canons*, canon 69); tended lamps in synagogues on feast days (canon 70); joined with Jews and heretics in prayer (canon 63), and gave their children to Jews in marriage (Chalcedon, canon 14).<sup>89</sup> In addition, the Jewish

<sup>87</sup> The donor inscription from Aphrodisias, if dated to the mid-fourth to late fifth century, would be further evidence of this. A. Chaniotis, “The Jews of Aphrodisias: New Evidence and Old Problems,” *SCI* 21 (2002), 209–42.

<sup>88</sup> These sermons catalogue the Jewish practices of John’s Gentile Christian congregation, who attend synagogue on the Sabbath and the high holy days (1.5; 8.8), go to hear the “trumpets” (i.e. Rosh Ha-Shanah; 1.5), fast on Yom Kippur (1.2), and join in “pitching tents” (that is, erecting *sukkot*, 7.1). Wilken notes that John, Theodoret of Cyrus, and the *Apostolic Constitutions* likewise criticize Gentile Christians for frequenting *mikvaot*, Chrysostom, 75; J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom* (London, 1995), 63–6. A recent MS of the previously missing section of *Contra Iud.* 4 has just been discovered on the island of Lesbos: see W. Pradels et al., *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 6 (2002), 1–124.

<sup>89</sup> Linder, *Legal Sources*; Parkes, *Church and Synagogue*, 174–7.



calendar – especially the date of Pesach relative to Easter – continued to influence Christian communal celebration, Constantine’s pointed efforts at Nicaea notwithstanding.<sup>90</sup>

Whence this sympathetic Gentile Christian involvement, despite frequent and fervid condemnations by the leadership? The answer lies in part with the strong and prevailing social patterns of religious interaction that had shaped communal life in the Mediterranean city for nearly a millennium. Celebrations (of all sorts) were open and public, and Jewish celebrations in particular had long numbered among them. Indeed, so strong was this tradition of openness that the Christian mass, despite regrets occasionally expressed by churchmen, was also frequented by outsiders – pagans, heretics, and Jews.<sup>91</sup> The theologically inspired effort to establish and enforce a separation between these habitually mixing populations was a *novum*. On the evidence, it succeeded only rarely, if ever.

Another part of the answer lies, however, with the type of Christianity that triumphed in the fourth century and beyond. Unlike many of its various rivals, the Church backed by Constantine had laid claim to the Septuagint: Scriptures enjoining and praising fidelity to Jewish law were, as the Old Testament, part of the Church’s own canon, thus read aloud regularly whenever the community gathered for worship. Furthermore, the services in the synagogue (not least the public readings in the vernacular from the Pentateuch and the Prophets, and reciting psalms) could not be alien to Christian visitors. As a matter of theological principle, this Church identified its high God, through the pre-incarnate Christ, with the God of Israel. In the four canonical Gospels – read regularly in Christian community service – Jesus of Nazareth was portrayed as an observant Jew (Matt. 5.17–19), worshiping in the synagogue, observing the great Jewish pilgrimage festivals, reciting the *Shema* (Mk. 12.29), wearing *tzitziot* (the *krespeda* of Mk. 6.56), giving instruction on fasting, prayer, and on offerings at the Temple (Matt. 5.23–4), and the appropriate dimensions of tefillin (Matt. 23.5). The supersessionist rhetoric of the erudite *adversus Iudaeos* tradition notwithstanding, then, many Gentile Christians evidently perceived Jewish practice as continuous from the Old Testament through

<sup>90</sup> See especially Wilken’s comments on this “dispute about religious and communal identity” in the year 387, when Nisan 14 fell on Easter Sunday, *Cbrysostom*, 76–9. For Constantine’s fulminations against Quartodecimans, *Vita Const.* 3.18–19; see too notes in A. Cameron and S. G. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (Oxford, 1999), 269–72.

<sup>91</sup> Proclus of Constantinople (mid-fifth century) complains about Jews attending his sermons, and then criticizing their content to Christians in the congregation, *Homily 2*; J. H. Barkhuizen, “Proclus of Constantinople,” in M. B. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden, 1998), 94.

the New Testament to their contemporary Jewish neighbors. Indeed, some Christian judaizers justified their voluntary observance of Jewish law by pointing precisely to the example of Christ, whose practices they wanted to imitate.<sup>92</sup>

Finally, although both traditional polytheism and “deviant” Christianity were roundly condemned in the New Testament itself, Judaism as such was not. The orthodox could only condemn the Jewish practice of Judaism, complaining that Jews observed in a “fleshly” way a Law meant to be understood and kept “spiritually,” that is, according to (orthodox, Gentile) Christian interpretation. In addition, by holding Jews, not Romans, as particularly responsible for the death of Jesus Christ, they focused, fueled, and justified a continuing anti-Jewish hostility.<sup>93</sup> Nonetheless, Judaism was never and could never be in the same relation to the Church that paganism and heresy were, if only for the reason that Judaism, according to orthodoxy’s own self-understanding, was incontrovertibly the source of (true) Christianity. As Augustine observed, although the Church was the bride of Christ, the synagogue was his mother (*Contra Faustum* 12.8). The Church’s rise to power did little to resolve the tradition’s abiding and intrinsic ambivalence. Thus, from the late fourth century onward, searing hostility and episcopally orchestrated violence – against pagans and contesting Christian churches as well as against Jews – could unpredictably disrupt the comfortable social and religious intimacy that often characterized relations between these various urban communities.

#### V JEWS AS *TESTES VERITATIS*: PLACE, TEXT, TIME

Orthodoxy’s awareness of and insistence on a historical connection between Judaism and Christianity had expressed itself both theologically and socially in various ways from the second to fifth centuries. Contemporary synagogue Judaism served as an object of derogation as well as a site of religious coceleration throughout this period. Equally rich subjects of controversy were the Land of Israel, and specifically Jerusalem; the

<sup>92</sup> Christians justify their judaizing by arguing that they should be imitators of Christ, Origen, *Matt. Comm. Sermon*. 79; similarly Epiphanius, *Haer.* 28.5.1; on keeping Pesach because Jesus did, John Chrysostom, *Jud.* 3.4; references with discussion in Wilken, *Chrysostom*, 92–4.

<sup>93</sup> Jews sometimes returned this hostility: in 414, Jews rioted in Alexandria, killing Christians, Socrates, *HE* 7.13; a century later, the Himyarite kingdom persecuted Christians, on which see J. Beaucamp, F. Briquel-Chatonnet, and C.J. Robin, “La Persecution des Chrétiens de Nagrân et la chronologie himyarite,” *Aram* 11–12 (1999–2000), 15–83.

acknowledged substratum of Hebrew behind the text of the Septuagint and, in certain instances, passages of the New Testament; and the religious significance of the historical priority of Judaism to Christianity. All three areas presented churchmen with additional opportunities to construct their particular definitions of Christian identity with immediate reference to Jews and Judaism.

#### A PLACE

The Galilee, Judaea, and Jerusalem were familiar imaginary landscapes for early Christians because they served as the setting for the New Testament's narratives about Jesus, the first disciples, and Paul. The spiritual significance of these places intensified, however, during the second-century wars of interpretation, when proto-orthodox Church Fathers – Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian – ranged themselves against their Valentinian and Marcionite opponents. Against their Docetic Christian opposition, orthodox writers insisted that Christ truly had a fleshly body both before and after his resurrection. Accordingly, they argued, believers too would be raised in their fleshly bodies at the End (against the individual and purely spiritual redemption imagined by their opponents). This final redemption would manifest itself on earth, specifically in a renewed Jerusalem, where the saints would reign with Christ for a thousand years.<sup>94</sup>

This millenarian understanding of redemption used many of the same sources that its Jewish counterpart did, namely the classical prophets of the Septuagint, and various pseudepigrapha. Accordingly, the struggle between Gentile Christians over the correct understanding of salvation in Christ articulated, as well, a struggle between Christians and Jews over the correct millenarian understanding of these Jewish texts, and by extension, over who held title to the eschatological real estate of the New Jerusalem.<sup>95</sup> As these traditions developed, they gave scope to anti-Jewish fantasies as the imagined character of Antichrist assumed specifically Jewish features: he would come from the tribe of Dan; he would gather in the dispersed of

<sup>94</sup> C. C. Hill, *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of the Future Hope in Early Christianity* (Oxford, 1992).

<sup>95</sup> Tertullian refers to Jewish Apocalyptic interpretations of the Prophets, *Adv. Marc.* 3.24. Justin informs Trypho that the gathering in Jerusalem of Christian saints raised in the flesh accords with “the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others” (*Dial.* 80), and he adds that Jews who do not repent (presumably, by joining Justin’s Church) “shall not inherit anything on [God’s] holy mountain” (*Dial.* 24). R. Wilken, “Early Christian Chiliasm, Jewish Messianism, and the Idea of the Holy Land,” *HTR* 79 (1986), 298–307.

Israel; he would restore the Temple and the kingdom; the Jews would worship him as a god.<sup>96</sup>

By the turn of the third century, these apocalyptic traditions were framed by elaborate chronographical calculations attempting to determine the expected time of the End by knowing the age of the world.<sup>97</sup> Here, too, the debate between like-minded Christians and Jews reveals knowledge of the opposing interpretation and thereby evinces communication between these communities. Meanwhile, the shared temperament and the exegetical compatibility of these two contesting camps gave more allegorically minded interpreters, such as Origen, the opportunity to condemn both. Christian millenarianism, he urged, was “literal,” “fleshly” and thus essentially “Jewish.” Understood *kata pneuma*, “Jerusalem” was not a place name but a spiritual state. “Israel is a race of souls, Jerusalem a city in heaven” (*De Princ.* 4.3.8).<sup>98</sup>

Constantine’s patronage of Christianity put the earthly Jerusalem back on the map. Emperors had always endorsed large projects of public building, and in this sense Constantine was little different from his pagan predecessors. However, to the earlier imperial repertoire of temples, theaters, baths, and circuses, the new Emperor added grand basilicas and churches built over martyrs’ shrines.<sup>99</sup> In Jerusalem, in particular, he established a new Christian urban topography by constructing churches at sites named in the Gospels that were associated with Jesus’ suffering (Golgotha), death and resurrection (Holy Sepulchre), and ascension into heaven (Mount of Olives). When Eusebius wrote about this cycle of construction in the *Vita Constantini*, he described the city as rebuilt and resplendent, with a new “temple,” that is, the church of the Anastasis (resurrection) at its heart (3.33). The architecture of the new, beautiful city made a theological point, for the Christian Jerusalem stood counterpoised to the devastated old Jewish city, represented by the blasted plain of the empty Temple mount.

Politically and theologically, Eusebius drew new meaning from ancient prophecies of restoration. Since Augustus, imperial ideology had regarded the emperor as heaven’s particular representative on earth; when things went well, the emperor’s intentions conformed to the will of heaven and the Empire prospered. After 312, this ideology remained intact, although the

<sup>96</sup> W. Bossuet, *Der Antichristus in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testament und der alten Kirche* (Göttingen, 1895); E. Lohmeyer, “Antichristus,” *RAC* 1 450–7.

<sup>97</sup> O. Irshai, “Dating the Eschaton: Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Calculations in Late Antiquity,” in A. I. Baumgarten (ed.), *Apocalyptic Time*, (Leiden, 2000), 113–53.

<sup>98</sup> For a full survey, see N. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews* (Cambridge, 1976).

<sup>99</sup> Recent full discussion: R. L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven, 1992).

identity of “heaven” had changed, and on earth, heaven was also represented by the Church. In light of biblical prophecy and in view of the new cycle of building projects centered specifically on the Holy Land, Eusebius rendered this old imperial ideology in a new, Christian key. Constantine had restored Jerusalem; Constantine had (re)built the “temple.” Therefore, Constantine was God’s anointed; in unifying the Empire, he had realized Isaiah’s promise of the messianic peace: “He shall have peace from sea to sea” (*Laus Const.*).<sup>100</sup>

The Christian building project embraced much of Palestine, marking sites of significance established by the Old Testament as well as by the New. These sites in turn provided a growing stream of pilgrims with important destinations; and in some places of shared significance – the caves of the Patriarchs or the Oak at Mamre – festivals were celebrated by crowds of Christians, Jews, and pagans.<sup>101</sup> Eventually, these foci of piety gave rise to story cycles about the miraculous divinations through which such sites or relics had been identified. Often these stories featured a Jew who, combining local knowledge with biblical authority, established the authenticity of the sacred object or place. In this manner, “Judah Cyriacus” helped Helena, Constantine’s mother, to find the relics of the true cross; Gamaliel, “a knowing Jew,” revealed the burial spot of Stephen’s bones; the garments Jesus wore the day he was crucified were retrieved by the Jew Dorotheus; and a fifth-century Galilean Jewish virgin helped to locate the robe worn by the Virgin Mary.<sup>102</sup> In such stories, the “Jew” functions as an authenticator of Christian tradition. This character embodies orthodoxy’s commitment to the complementary ideas of Christianity as the fulfillment of the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament (indeed, often these “Jews,” their mission complete, convert to the Church), and to the idea that the true Israel rests upon the foundation of the *veritas hebraica*.

#### B TEXT

These ideas about Jewish witness and Jewish loci recapitulated a linguistic and textual fact, namely, the priority of the Hebrew language in both phases, Old Testament and New, of Christian written tradition. The

<sup>100</sup> P. W. L. Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places: Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1990).

<sup>101</sup> Eusebius, *Vita Const.* 3.53; Sozomen, *HE* 2.4; A. Kofsky, “Mamre: A Case of Regional Cult?” in A. Kofsky and G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1998), 19–29.

<sup>102</sup> O. Limor, “Christian Sacred Space and the Jew,” in J. Cohen (ed.), *From Witness to Witchcraft: Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought* (Weisbaden, 1997), 55–77.

centrality of the Bible to the contemporary dialogue and controversy with Jews cannot be overestimated.<sup>103</sup> Early Christianity's awareness that it dealt in translations can already be seen in the stories that evolved during the course of the second century around the Gospel of Matthew, traditionally held to be the oldest of the canonical four. Ascribed to the apostle Matthew, the Gospel was thought to be an eyewitness account, composed originally in "the Hebrew tongue" and, accordingly, preached to Jewish Christians (so Papias, *apud* Eusebius, HE 3.24.5; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, 30.6.8). The words in Aramaic or Hebrew that pepper the Greek text of the Gospels also pointed to this prior linguistic layer; and Christian scholars consulted Jews in order to secure the meanings of these words.

Gentile Christians were also aware of differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Jewish Scriptures. Justin discussed at length the reading of Isaiah 7.14, LXX, *parthenos* or "virgin," complaining to Trypho that Jewish teachers maintain that the Hebrew *'almah* would be better translated by *neanis*, "young girl" (*Dial.* 43; 66–7).<sup>104</sup> At other points, he accused Jews of having suppressed Christological references in the Greek biblical text by editing them out (72–3; Trypho responded that this "seems incredible"). The Christians' dependence on and interpolations into the Septuagint text, as well as their interpretations of it, eventually prompted Jews to make other translations. Beginning in the 230s, Origen attempted to establish a sort of critical Greek edition by bringing four of these Jewish versions – Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the Septuagint – in parallel columns, together with the Hebrew, and a transliteration of Hebrew into Greek characters (thus securing the vocalization). Although he deferred to the Septuagint's authority, Origen suggested amended readings in light of the Hebrew; and one sees the same deference to the Hebrew text and same readiness to consult with Jewish scholars on linguistic and interpretive points in Eusebius and Jerome.<sup>105</sup>

It was Augustine, Jerome's contemporary, who synthesized all these issues – the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Old Testament; the variety of other Jewish Greek translations; the compounding problem of multiple anonymous Latin translations; the relationship of

<sup>103</sup> W. Horbury, "Jews and Christians on the Bible: Demarcation and Convergence (325–451)," in J. van Oort and U. Wichert (eds.), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon* (Kampen, 1992), 72–103.

<sup>104</sup> A. Kamesar, "The Virgin of Isaiah 7.14: The Philological Argument from the Second to the Fifth Century," *JTS* 41 (1990), 52–75.

<sup>105</sup> J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975), 159–60; A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of The Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford, 1993); H. I. Newman, *Jerome and the Jews* (PhD dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1997) (Hebrew).

Jewish prophecy to Christian fulfillment – in a theological vision that positively resolved earlier, seemingly unnerving problems. As a Latin reader, Augustine had always necessarily depended on biblical translations for the New Testament as well as the Old. His move in 383 from Carthage to Rome and eventually to Milan brought him into contact with previously unfamiliar regional Latin renderings of biblical texts, and he later commented on the vast number and variable quality of western translations.<sup>106</sup>

Augustine's richly complex appreciation of language itself as a sign and an effect of Adam's fall, however, radically relativized the value of any linguistic record of God's word. Divine being, Augustine maintained, transcended time and thereby temporal sequence; human consciousness, as a consequence of Adam, was "divided up in times." The linear nature of language, he held, was the linguistic and cognitive reflection of humanity's entrapment in time, on account of which human knowledge of God can only be mitigated and imperfect.<sup>107</sup> In this sense, then, even the original Hebrew was a sort of "translation" from the divine realm into the human, thus the historical, since language itself – any language, in Augustine's view – attests to the primal dislocation of consciousness suffered by the entire species after Eden.

God's Spirit, Augustine held, is nonetheless the "author" of Scripture in both its Hebrew and its Greek recensions. For this reason, the Septuagint takes precedence over any other Greek rendering, divinely authorized through the miracle of the seventy-two elders' inspired translation. In places where its Greek differs undeniably from the earlier Hebrew, then, Augustine concluded, this difference is also due to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and *vice versa*: anything in the Hebrew not in the Greek "is something which the Spirit of God decided not to say through the translators but through the prophets." In this light, there are no mistranslations, only a plenitude of meanings, divinely intended for different audiences, whether the Jews (primarily at the level of the Hebrew) or the Gentiles (for whose benefit, maintained Augustine, the Greek translation was made). In this sense, then, Ptolemy's translators themselves, the legendary Jewish sages sent from Jerusalem, had served as prophets to the church (*De Civ. Dei* 18.42–3).

<sup>106</sup> *De Doctrina Christiana* 2.11.16, 34–6.

<sup>107</sup> Hence, the epistemologically integrative function of memory, *Confessions* 10 passim; human consciousness as distended in time, 11.29.39; the language of Scripture as a bridge connecting a timeless Deity and time-bound (thus, word-bound) humanity, 13.29.44. On this aspect of Augustine's theology, see also T. Martin, "Modus inveniendi Paulum," in D. Patte and E. TeSelle (eds.), *Engaging Augustine on Romans* (Harrisburg, 2002), 63–90, especially 69–70.



## C TIME

The broad lines of orthodoxy's critique of Judaism had remained fairly constant from the mid-second century onward. In the Church's eyes, the newness of the revelation in Christ, its apparent temporal inferiority to Judaism, understood aright, actually revealed Christianity's religious superiority. Such an apology appealed to the prominent biblical theme of fraternal rivalry wherein the elder brother ceded to the younger – Cain to Abel, Ishmael to Isaac, Esau to Jacob, and, by Christian reckoning, the elder nation (the Jews) to the younger (the Gentiles). Orthodox readings of Scripture also distinguished between “good” Jews – “Hebrews,” in Eusebius' designation, that is, “Christians” before Christ (Abraham and the other Patriarchs, for example) – and “bad Jews,” that is, those Jews who lived according to the Law.<sup>108</sup>

Furthermore, in their effort to justify retaining the Septuagint while not observing the practices it mandated, the orthodox generated a more global condemnation, holding that Jews and their religion (although not their book) were themselves intrinsically otiose. Understood “spiritually” (as God had always intended, but as the Jews were incapable of doing), the Law had always been an encoded allegory of Christ and his Church. In this view, the Jews' continuing attachment to “literal” observance – most especially their insistence on fleshly circumcision – broadcast both their essential misapprehension of the Law's own nature and their own enduring spiritual obduracy. Finally, the heroes of biblical history who had correctly apprehended the essential Christian content of the (only seemingly) Jewish message had been an alienated minority among their own people. The repudiation of Jewish practice pronounced by the Jews' own prophets (so stated the argument) had been unambiguously repeated and enacted by Christ and by his disciples after him. The Prophets, Christ, his disciples, and indeed (most especially through the destruction of the Temple and the exile imposed by Rome) God himself had all denounced the Jewish understanding of the Law.

By the late fourth century, however, and especially in the West, two new developments created a theological and social context wherein the *adversus Iudaeos* tradition seemed to cause more problems than it solved. First, from outside the Church, an exotic and extreme form of Pauline Christianity, Manichaeism, presented an articulate challenge to orthodoxy's biblical theology. A late avatar of the sorts of Christianities established by Marcion

<sup>108</sup> Eusebius, *HE* 1.4.4–14; A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism* (Leiden, 2000), 98–103; J. Ulrich, *Eusebius von Caesaria und die Juden: Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesaria* (Berlin, 1999), 57–131.

and Valentinus, western Manichaeism repudiated the Old Testament entirely, its creator God, and its people, while holding that Paul's letters, purged of their judaizing interpolations, provided the guidelines for Christian faith. The problem for the Church was that the Manichees' critique of the Old Testament and their reading of Paul recapitulated too closely, in tone and even in substance, orthodoxy's own traditional anti-Judaism. Second, from within the Church, an impending storm gathering around Origen's theological legacy complicated orthodoxy's extensive reliance on philosophical allegory. Historically, allegory had been the hermeneutic of choice for reading Christian meaning into Jewish texts, and the rhetoric of traditional anti-Judaism condemned Jewish understanding as excessively fleshly – *kata sarka* or *secundum carnem* – precisely in contrast to the “spiritual,” allegorizing understanding of the Church. As Origen's work grew increasingly suspect in the course of the fourth century, however, so too did his style of interpretation. The question then was, in the absent philosophical allegory, how could the Old Testament be read as a work of Christian revelation?

In these circumstances, Augustine (354–430) made his singular contribution to Christian teaching on Jews and Judaism.<sup>109</sup> His reconceptualization of the relationship of Judaism to Christianity began as a side effect of his attempt against the Manichees to understand the letters of Paul. However, it quickly grew into a major support of his historical approach to understanding the double canon of Catholic Scripture, and thus of his life-long theological effort to understand how a changeless, radically transcendent God works in time. His novel response to the anti-materialist, dualist, Pauline heresy of his generation gives the measure of his intellectual self-confidence in the face of the challenge of both heresy and Judaism. Unlike the orthodox writers of the second century, whose most thoroughgoing arguments *adversus Iudaeos* appeared most prominently in their anti-heretical writings, Augustine built his novel apology for Catholicism against the Manichees precisely by mounting a defense of Jews and Judaism. In so doing, he challenged the polemic against the Jews that had characterized the anti-Judaism not only of his opponents but also of his own tradition.

<sup>109</sup> This discussion synthesizes constructive arguments with full references in P. Fredriksen, “*Excaecati Occulta Iustitia Dei*: Augustine on Jews and Judaism,” *J ECS* 3 (1995), 299–324; idem, “*Secundum Carnem*: History and Israel in the Theology of St. Augustine,” in W. E. Klingshirm and M. Vessey (eds.), *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R. A. Markus* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 26–41; idem, “Allegory and Reading God's Book: Paul and Augustine on the Destiny of Israel,” in J. Whitman (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory* (Leiden, 2000), 125–49; and idem, “Augustine and Israel: *interpretatio ad litteram*, Jews, and Judaism in Augustine's Theology of History,” *Studia Patristica* 38 (2001), 119–35.

Augustine's arguments appear fully assembled for the first time in his massive refutation of Latin Manichaeism, the thirty-three books of the *Contra Faustum* (written c. 399). Against the view (common to both Catholics and Manichees) that emphasized a sharp contrast between Law and gospel, Augustine insisted that the Law was continuous from Moses to Jesus: Law and gospel together, he urged, were dual aspects of a unitary divine initiative of redemption (*Contra Faust.* 12.3–4). Much more radically, he argued further that those who praised the Law but condemned the “fleshly” Jewish interpretation of it were fundamentally mistaken in their reading of Scripture and in their understanding of Catholic truth. God's commands to Israel had been neither ambiguous nor ironic: lists of permissible foods had in fact related to eating, keeping the Sabbath really had meant not doing certain kinds of work, circumcising the flesh really did mean circumcising the flesh, and so on. “The Jews,” he urged, “were right to practice all these things” – blood sacrifices, purifications, food disciplines, Sabbath, and holidays (12.9). Despite the plenitude of meanings available in Scripture – and Augustine could effortlessly conjure Christological references from virtually any Old Testament text – God, he maintained, was no allegorist when He gave Israel His Law. In the time before Christ, the Law also prescribed behavior.

This prescribed behavior was nowhere more true, Augustine insisted, than with that most reviled observance, fleshly circumcision. What the apostle Paul himself had designated “the seal of the righteousness of faith” (Rom. 4.11), marked in the male organ of generation the *regeneration* of the flesh accomplished by Christ's being born in the body and being raised in the body (*Contra Faust.* 6.3). Had Jews understood God's command to circumcise *secundum spiritum* without performing it *secundum carnem* (as the framers of the classical *adversus Iudaeos* tradition would have wished), they would have prefigured only imperfectly the central Christological *mysterium* of incarnation and resurrection. Instead, however, by following the precepts of the Law *ad litteram*, by observing the Law *secundum carnem*, the entire Jewish people “was like a great prophet” foretelling Christ not only in word but also in deed (22.24). Circumcision, and indeed all the myriad Jewish observances were *sacramenta*: [*signa*] *cum ad res divinas pertinent*.<sup>110</sup> Thus the Jewish observance of Jewish law, Augustine concluded, had been entirely appropriate and in accordance with God's will. Enacting the Law in the flesh had been precisely the point.

This new interpretation of Israel's past and of Jewish religious practice was thereby addressed directly to the two theological challenges of his day. Against the Manichees, Augustine provided a radical defense of the intrinsic

<sup>110</sup> *Ep.* 138.7.

unity of the Law and the gospel, hence of the Catholic double canon. Against the growing Latin suspicion of Alexandrian-style allegory, Augustine advanced a reading of the Old Testament *ad litteram*, by which he meant *secundum historicam proprietatem*, “historically.”<sup>111</sup> Whereas the earlier *adversus Iudaeos* tradition, relying on allegory, had condemned Jewish practice as an unintelligent antitype of Christianity, Augustine, interpreting *ad litteram*, commended Jewish practice as the divinely mandated, historical, embodied expression of Catholic truth. Whereas allegorical typology had emphasized contrast, Augustinian historical typology emphasized continuity.

Augustine’s reassessment of the Jewish past, however, and specifically his endorsement of the Jews’ commitment to observing the Law *secundum carnem*, entailed yet another radical revision of the *adversus Iudaeos* tradition. He applied his positive assessment of Jewish observance to two other crucially important historical moments, namely, that of Jesus and his apostles and that of the present-day Church. Against the traditional view that Jesus and his apostles (especially Paul) had condemned the Law, Augustine argued exactly the opposite. Jesus, he maintained, had himself been a Law-observant Jew, the son of Law-observant parents; and his apostles, the founding generation of the Church, had themselves, as Christians, kept their people’s customs.<sup>112</sup> They did so, Augustine said, in part because they understood that the ordinances of the Law pointed forward to the redemption in Christ. However, a pastoral as well as a theological reason had also motivated them: it was crucially important for their Gentile audiences to see them keep the Law. These Gentiles had been instructed that they had to abandon their old gods and that they were not to assume Jewish observances. Torah observance, the entire Jewish people’s *actio prophetica*, however, was not at all the same as idolatry; and the reasons for not worshipping idols had nothing in common with the reasons for not obeying Jewish law. Therefore, within the new movement, Augustine concluded, traditional Jewish observance of Torah was to be relinquished only gradually, “lest by compulsory abandonment it should seem to be condemned rather than completed (*terminata*)” (*Contra Faust.* 19.17).

So much for biblical Jews and for the Jews of the apostolic generation. What of contemporary Jews and current Jewish practice? What was their relation and relevance to the present-day Church? Here again Augustine proposed an original and positive view of Jews and Judaism.<sup>113</sup> And he did

<sup>111</sup> *Retractationes* 1.18. <sup>112</sup> Correspondence with Jerome, *Epp.* 40, 71, 75, 82.

<sup>113</sup> Augustine’s enthusiasm for things Jewish was strictly theologically determined; he was not a philo-Semite, and many of his anti-Jewish and anti-judaizing remarks are dismally traditional: see Blumenkranz, *Judenpredigt*, 62–8; Efrogmson, “Whose Jews? Augustine’s *Tractatus* on John,” *Multiform Heritage*, 197–211.

so, paradoxically, by focusing on two episodes – one biblical and one historical – around which earlier tradition had built powerful condemnations: the story of Cain and the fact of post-Second Temple exile.

The figure of Cain for earlier Christian interpreters had encoded negative attributes associated with Jews: unacceptable sacrifice, malice, jealousy; and fratricide.<sup>114</sup> Conflating the effects of the First Revolt and the Bar Kochba rebellion, these men held that the Roman destruction of the Temple and the Jews' exile from Judaea pronounced God's repudiation of the people and their cult for having rejected His Son.<sup>115</sup> In the *Contra Faustum*, Augustine, too, understood Cain as a figure for the Jewish people, and he also drew parallels between Cain's murder of Abel and the Jews' murder of Christ. As God confronted Cain because Abel's blood cried to him from the ground (Gen. 4.10), "so the voice of God in the Holy Scriptures accuses the Jews" through the voice of his Church, which was established through Christ's blood (12.9). Like Cain, the Jews continue "tilling the earth," that is, they understand the Law in a carnal or earthly way (12.11). Like Cain, they groan and tremble, wandering, established in every kingdom while they mourn the loss of their own, which has been taken from them; like Cain, they live in fear, "in terrified subjection to the immensely superior number of Christians" (12:12).

Here, however, the Jews' allegiance to the Law, Augustine urged, served precisely as their safeguard. As God had put his mark on Cain in order to protect him, so too, in the present, toward the same end, God marks the Jews. The Jewish traditions for keeping the Law *secundum carnem* are the "mark of Cain" by which God Himself signals to the rest of humanity His continuing protection of the Jewish religion and people. As a result, anyone who "kills" Cain, that is, any emperor or monarch who tries to force Jews to stop living as Jews, in effect strives against God, the true author of their practices. Such a ruler would risk drawing down upon himself God's seven-fold curse against those who would injure Cain (Gen. 4.15; *Contra Faust.* 12.12–13). And God will preserve the Jews as a people "to the end of the seven days of time" precisely so that, in their stateless condition, they will "be a proof to believing Christians of the subjection merited by those who, in the pride of their kingdom, put the Lord to death" (12.12).

Furthermore, Augustine argued, precisely because of the integrity of their religious identity and their dogged loyalty to the traditional observances of the Law, Israel *secundum carnem* served an abiding revelatory

<sup>114</sup> L. A. Unterseher, *The Mark of Cain and the Jews: Augustine's Theology of Jews and Judaism* (PhD thesis, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, 2000), ch. 3.

<sup>115</sup> E.g. Justin, *Dial.* 17, within the larger context of a condemnation of fleshly circumcision.

purpose within Christian society. "It is a most notable fact that all the nations subjugated by Rome adopted the ceremonies of Roman worship; whereas the Jewish nation under pagan or Christian monarchs has never lost the sign of their Law by which they are distinguished from all other nations and peoples" (*Contra Faust.* 12.13). But what the Jews (like the Manichees) do not realize (although orthodox Christians do) is that the Law's fundamental message is Christological. God has so arranged things that the Law proclaims Christ behaviorally, in the present, exactly through the fleshly practices to which the Jews so loyally cling, as well as textually, in the ancient books which they uncomprehendingly read.

The scattered Jewish community, therefore, living in exile in every corner of the Empire, served the Church like a desk (*scriniaria*), bearing their ancient Scriptures ultimately for Christian benefit (12.23). How so? Here Augustine refers to the two cardinal Roman indicators of legitimate religion: antiquity and ethnicity. Precisely through the antiquity of their nation and of their sacred texts, Jews authenticate Christian beliefs, since "from the Jewish manuscripts we prove that these things [the prophecies of Christ] were not written by us to suit the event, but were long ago published and preserved as prophecies in the Jewish nation" (13.10). That the Jews rejected Christian interpretations of these prophecies only strengthened the Church's claim:

It is a great confirmation of our faith that such important testimony is borne by enemies. The believing Gentiles cannot suppose these testimonies to Christ to be recent forgeries; for they find them in books held sacred for so many ages by those who crucified Christ, still venerated by those who blaspheme him . . . The unbelief of the Jews has been made of signal benefit to us, so that those who do not receive these truths in their heart . . . nonetheless carry in their hands, for our benefit, the writings in which these truths are contained. And the unbelief of the Jews increases rather than lessens the authority of these books, for their blindness is itself foretold. They testify to the truth by their not understanding it. (*Contra Faust.* 16.21)

Thus far Augustine's presentation of the Jews as a special kind of textual community seems a variation on earlier teachings about the positive value of the Hebrew Scriptures as witness to Christian revelation. Whereas earlier writers had claimed the Jewish Bible by condemning Jewish practice, however, Augustine mounts his argument by focusing on the Jewishness of Scripture and on the particularity of Jewish practice as positive historical realities. The Jews' fleshly observance of the Law had prophesied Christ; his death, through their agency, founded the Church; they share with the typological figure of Cain the negative aspects (both are fratricides) and the positive (both are explicitly protected by God). Their refusal to credit Christian interpretations of Scripture supported rather than undermined

Christian claims. Their continuing exile taken together with their continuing practice was more than simply a punishment. Through divine providence, against the Church's enemies, the Jews as Jews witnessed to Christian truth. Unique among the religious minorities of the Christian Empire, the Jews were to be left alone.

This theme of the Jews as a protected witness people defines Augustine's discussion in *The City of God*, where he links it to the proof-text of Psalm 59.12, "Slay them not, lest your people forget; scatter them with your might" (*De Civ. Dei* 18.46).<sup>116</sup> "Slaying" for Augustine does not mean "killing"; it means "impeding or preventing traditional Jewish practice," most extremely by forced conversion ("not putting an end to their existence as Jews").<sup>117</sup> Neither does his reference to Jewish "subjection" intend anything more dire than what had occurred long ago, that is, the loss of Jewish national sovereignty.<sup>118</sup> Both aspects of Jewish destiny, their loyalty to their Law and their wandering in exile, are linked strategies in God's providential plan; the broadest possible dispersion of observant Jews was necessary in order to amplify the broadest possible dissemination of the gospel.<sup>119</sup>

In his own period, Augustine's "witness doctrine" articulated a theological justification for an already long-standing principle of Roman law. His views on the positive value of ancient Jewish observance created a new, more historically oriented way for Christians to understand their Bible. His insistence on the essential continuity of law and gospel, Old Testament and New, furthermore, powerfully responded to the Manichaean challenge. In short, Augustine's teaching fundamentally addressed questions of theology and identity internal to his own religious community. But the fact remains that Augustine, alone of all the Church's apologists, mounted a defense of Catholic Christianity that also served, in its way, as a defense of Jews and Judaism.

Augustine had little reason to think that his ideas on this topic would some day in their turn be understood "literally." He lived in a society governed by Roman law, wherein Jews were full citizens. One of his recently

<sup>116</sup> Augustine reiterates this theme, together with the citation from Psalms, in *Enarr. in Ps.* 58; *Ep.* 149; *Tractatus adv. Iudaeos*.

<sup>117</sup> *De Civ. Dei* 18.26; so too *Contra Faust.* 12.13.

<sup>118</sup> "Subject to the immensely superior number of Christians," *Contra Faust.* 12.12; "bend down their backs always," *Enarr. in Ps.* 69.22; *De Civ. Dei* 18.46.

<sup>119</sup> Augustine continues: "Thus it was not enough for the psalmist to say, 'Do not slay them, lest at some time they forget your law,' without adding, 'Scatter them.' For if they had lived with that testimony of the Scriptures only in their own land, and not everywhere, the obvious result would be that the Church, which is everywhere, would not have them available among all the nations as witnesses to the prophecies which were given beforehand concerning Christ," *De Civ. Dei* 18.46.



discovered new letters reveals that a North African Jew, Licinius, requested that Augustine intervene on his behalf in a property dispute between him and the bishop Victor, one of Augustine's own colleagues. Augustine, extremely familiar with Roman law, took Licinius' side in the affair.<sup>120</sup> The letter testifies not only to Augustine's sense of justice and knowledge of law but also to Licinius' unself-conscious expectation of justice, and to Victor's acknowledgment that, were Licinius to pursue the matter in court, Victor would lose. All the principals in the case knew themselves to be members of the same society, ruled by the same law.

All this would eventually change as late Latin society altered in the wake of the western Empire's demise. Nevertheless, because of Augustine's tremendous authority, his "witness doctrine" became part of the erudite tradition through which patristic learning entered into and shaped western Christian thought.<sup>121</sup> In the changed social context of medieval Christendom, his invocation of Psalm 59, taken literally, would ultimately safeguard Jewish lives even as it justified policies of oppression; Jews were permitted to "survive but not thrive." However, those days fell well after the lifetime of Augustine,<sup>122</sup> in a culture in many ways discontinuous with his own.

## VI EPILOGUE: CHRISTIAN ANTI-JUDAISM AND THE END OF MEDITERRANEAN ANTIQUITY

Successive waves of Vandals, Goths, and Franks rent the cultural and political fabric of the western Empire from the early fifth century onward. Two centuries later, the double blow of invasions, first Sasanian (611–14 CE) and then Muslim Arab (634 CE), forever altered east Rome. As the Empire fragmented, so does the evidence, foreclosing the possibility of a comprehensive account of Christian anti-Judaism in the fifth through seventh centuries. Nevertheless, enough data remain to permit some closing remarks on the constant master themes of the older, pan-Mediterranean tradition as well as on some of its new and regionally distinctive variations.

In the West – Italy, Visigothic Spain, and Gaul – the accelerated decline of central imperial power and of traditional civic politics tended to concentrate local authority further in the person of the bishop. Ecclesiastical

<sup>120</sup> *Ep.* 8\* (*CSEL* 88, 41–42); H. Castritius, "Seid weder den Juden noch den Heiden noch der Gemeinde Gottes ein Ärgernis' (1 Kor. 10,32): Zur sozialen und rechtlichen Stellung der Juden im spätrömischen Nordafrika," in R. Erb and M. Schmidt (eds.), *Antisemitismus und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1987), 47–67.

<sup>121</sup> J. Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, 1999).

<sup>122</sup> Contra M. Simon, who sees the shift toward Jewish victimization occurring already under Theodosius, *Verus Israel*, 227.

office, often monopolized by senatorial families, looked back to and identified itself with *Romanitas*: to be orthodox and Catholic was to be Roman, especially in the sea of Arian newcomers. The newcomers, meanwhile, attempting also to draw on the ancient Empire's prestige, enacted their *Romanitas* by reaffirming Roman law. Each cultural posture brought with it social as well as legal consequences for western Jews. As power condensed, local patronage networks thickened and became more exclusive with the amplification of a celestial layer: saints' relics embodied a city's heavenly *patronus*; the bishop served as the impresario of his cult; the town's calendar and thus its communal rhythms were increasingly determined by the liturgical cycles of the Church. This regional erosion of a "secular," that is, a religiously pluralistic, concept of citizenship meant in practical terms an erosion as well of the place of Jewish Romans in their cities.<sup>123</sup>

Caesarius, Bishop of Arles (469–542), presents an instructively inconsistent figure.<sup>124</sup> An active preacher, Caesarius attempted to limit Jewish influence on Christian behavior by curtailing social interactions between the two groups. Accordingly, he urged fasting on the Sabbath during Lent, thus demoting Saturday to the status of a regular weekday and enhancing the separate status of Sunday. He also forbade Christians to attend *Judaeorum convivium* (whether religious or more purely social) and to invite Jews to theirs. Presiding over the Council of Agde in 506, Caesarius oversaw the ratification of this and other divisive directives.<sup>125</sup> Nevertheless, the Bishop also publicly admitted his high regard for the Jews' piety and his admiration for their abstinence from work on the

<sup>123</sup> For saints' cults, episcopal power, and nostalgic evocation of *Romanitas*, see P. Brown, *The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago, 1981); for political and urban decline and the end of old, religiously pluralistic citizenship, see J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Decline and Fall of the Roman City* (Oxford, 2001), especially 247. On bishoprics and senatorial families, see Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Frank.*; R. A. Markus, *Gregory the Great* (Cambridge, 1997), 76–80; V. Colorni, "Gli ebrei nei territori italiani a nord di Roma dal 568 agli inizi del secolo XIII," *Settimane* 26 (1980), 241–312. Hymning the forced conversion of the Jews of Clermont in 576, the poet Venantius Fortunatus opined that *una urbs* should be united *una fide*, *Carmina* 5.17–20.

<sup>124</sup> W. E. Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge, 1994).

<sup>125</sup> Agde, canon 40, against mixed socializing. On an earlier, similar ruling, see B. Blumenkranz, "*Judaeorum convivium*: à propos du concile de Vannes (465), c. 12," in *Etudes d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel le Bras*, II (Paris, 1965), 1055–8. Jews who converted were also a source of anxiety: Agde, canon 34, ruled that Jewish candidates for baptism be subject to a longer period of instruction because they were "prone to return to their vomit," i.e., their traditional practices: *Concilia Galliae* A.314—A.506, ed. C. Munier, *CCSL* CXLVIII 207–8; cf. Gregory, *Hist. Frank.* 6.17. Forced conversions, as in Clermont 576, occasioned no such scruple; see above.

Sabbath.<sup>126</sup> His city – a Roman administrative center since 395 and a thriving metropolitan see since 440 – itself also presents evidence of growing social dissonance between its Jewish and Christian inhabitants. Nevertheless, Jews participated actively in the defense of Arles against the Burgundian siege of 507/8 CE, and they attended the public procession at Caesarius' funeral. Although the latter story might well be a hagiographic commonplace, it nonetheless reflects a social world wherein Jews – distinctive, different, singled out – still remained integrated within the lingering urban framework.

Some Gothic regimes, seeking to establish themselves, reaffirmed Roman law and custom, thereby in consequence likewise reaffirming established Jewish legal rights. Early Visigothic lawcodes reasserted the Jews' status as "Roman" citizens; and the Ostrogoth King Theodoric (455–526) extended to Italian Jews unequivocal protection and freedom of practice according to their laws, a policy he communicated to the Jews of Genoa and Milan. Arsonists who torched a Roman synagogue he found and condemned.<sup>127</sup> Elsewhere things could be otherwise. In 576, between Easter and Pentecost, the town of Clermont in the Auvergne was wracked by a series of violent clashes between Jews and Christians, evidently a result of enflamed local church politics and of the "frequent" efforts of Bishop Avitus to convert Clermont's Jews. Finally, a Christian mob destroyed the synagogue, and Avitus baptized most of the Jewish community (some 500 people, according to contemporary sources). Those who refused were expelled from the town, evidently without legal redress.<sup>128</sup>

The contrasting behaviors of two important and near-contemporary figures of the western Church, Gregory the Great (c. 540–604, Pope from 590) and Isidore of Seville (c. 560–636, bishop from 600) effectively illustrate the range of possible policies and actions regarding Jews. Both men were aristocrats, well connected socially and ecclesiastically; both, for

<sup>126</sup> On the Sabbath, Caesarius, *Serm.* 13.3 and 73.4.

<sup>127</sup> For status of the Jews in Visigothic law, see *The Breviary of Alaric* 2.1.10 (compiled in 506); discussed in E. A. Thompson, *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford, 1969), 52–6. Theodoric's epistles to these Jewish communities are reported in Cassiodorus, *Variae*, 4.33.1–2.5.37, *MGH AA* XII (Berlin, 1894), 128–9; 163–4; the synagogue in Trastevere, 4.43, 133–4. On Theodoric's attitude toward the Jews, see J. Moorehead, *Theodoric in Italy* (Oxford, 1992), 97–100; and P. Amory, *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy*, 489–554 (Cambridge, 1997), 59–60. The relevant legislation is assembled in A. Linder, *Legal Sources*.

<sup>128</sup> B. Brennan, "The Conversion of the Jews of Clermont in AD 576," *JTS* 36 (1985), 320–37, who also considers a similar occurrence in Orleans (before 585). Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Frank.* 5.11–12 (Clermont), 8.1 (Orleans); Venantius Fortunatus, *Opera Poetica* 5.5, *MGH AA* IV/1 (Berlin, 1881); J. W. George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul* (Oxford, 1992), 127–9.

their day, were well educated and erudite; both drew on Augustine in particular as well as on Latin tradition more generally for their fundamental theological orientations. In their homiletic and exegetical writings, both fully exhibited the by now standard Catholic expressions of contempt for Jewish obduracy and religious blindness. Nevertheless, the social expression of their religious convictions differed notably. Gregory, although extending greater effort than did Augustine to actively attract Jews to the Church, nonetheless acknowledged their legitimacy as a community and upheld Roman legal tradition. Jewish ownership of Christian slaves he actively and everywhere combated (with mixed results),<sup>129</sup> and coerced conversions as well as Christian seizures of Jewish property he condemned strenuously.<sup>130</sup> Neither he nor the Jews whose grievances he sought to redress seemed to regard them(selves) as anything less than Roman citizens.

Isidore's political and religious environment differed significantly from Gregory's. In 587, the Visigoth King Reccared embraced Catholicism, converting Arian clergy in the course of the Council of Toledo two years later. Subsequent efforts to integrate *regnum* and *ecclesia* invariably involved Iberian Jews, a particular target of Reccared's pious successor, Sisebut.<sup>131</sup> The means of choice was law. Beginning in 589, both kings and bishops approved a seemingly endless stream of oppressive anti-Jewish legislation, affirming and extending earlier penalties and introducing new ones. A royal mandate of 613 gave Jews the choice of conversion or exile.<sup>132</sup> Intermarriage between Jews and Christians, interdicted centuries earlier (*CTb* 3.7.2, in 388), incurred an added and onerous entanglement: children born of such unions should necessarily be Christian.<sup>133</sup> In 633, the Fourth Council of Toledo, over which Isidore presided, consented in principle to forced conversions (canon 57) and specified penalties against Catholic Jews who maintained

<sup>129</sup> R. A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge, 1997), 78–9.

<sup>130</sup> Ordering bishops to compensate Jews for seizures of synagogues: Terracina, in 591 (*Ep.* 1.34; 2.6); Palermo, in 598 (*Ep.* 9.38); Brennan, "Clermont," 336–7; Markus, *Gregory*, 76–80.

<sup>131</sup> On Reccared's conversion, see P. Heather, *The Goths* (Oxford, 1996), 280–4; on Visigoth Spain, P. Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, 2002), 127–35; Thompson, *Goths*, 92–109.

<sup>132</sup> Isidore, *Historia Gothorum* 60, MGH AA XI 291.

<sup>133</sup> Third Council of Toledo, canon 14. The *Theodosian Code* had likewise banned mixed marriages between Romans and others (3.14.1, in 373, specifies Goths), probably to equal effect. Toledo's *novum* was thus not repeating the ban itself, but legislating the religious identity of the offspring. For conflicting assessments on the motivations and social effects of post-Arian Visigothic law, B. Blumenkranz, *Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidental 430–1096* (Paris, 1960); B. Bachrach, "A Reassessment of Visigothic Jewish Policy, 589–711," *American Historical Review* 78 (1973); B. S. Alpert, "Un Nouvel examen de la politique anti-juive wisigothique," *REJ* 135 (1976), 3–29.

contact with their unconverted kinsmen (canons 59–62).<sup>134</sup> Children of converted Jews whose parents relapsed were to be taken from their homes and raised by Christians (canon 60).

Isidore both enacted and influenced these repressive initiatives. He countenanced the government's edict enjoining forced conversions, voicing concern but (unlike Gregory) nowhere suggesting that the perpetrators of such acts be penalized in any way. Less intellectually sophisticated than Augustine, much more Eusebian in his political theology, and living in a more brutal age, Isidore's convictions led him to propound an integrative vision of ecclesiastical expansion and universal redemption, one in which the conversion of the Jews figured as a historical stage anticipating the return of Christ. In such a context, Augustine's meaning in invoking Psalm 59.12 ("Slay them not") – originally an injunction against interfering with Jewish religious practice – seemed instead to determine the extreme limit of permissible coercion.<sup>135</sup>

In the East, the Roman *risorgimento* under Justinian (487–565, emperor from 527) also strengthened the identification of Church and state. As in Catholic Spain, Byzantine Jews were the object of increasingly hostile or intrusive legislation. Outstanding in this regard is Justinian's *Novella* 146, enacted in 553, whereby the Emperor proposed to regulate biblical readings for synagogues. At stake was the language of biblical instruction: which Greek translation could Jewish communities use? Justinian endorsed the Septuagint while permitting Aquila as well. However, he explicitly forbade instruction in "*deuterosis*," by which he (perhaps) intended specifically rabbinic tradition. Through such encroachments on Jewish custom and liturgy, the Emperor hoped to encourage Jews to grasp the "true" meaning of the text, that is, its Christological sense.<sup>136</sup>

Strong continuities between east Rome and the earlier culture of the old Empire remained. Central power, such as it was, continued to be exercised by the emperor; urban culture, together with its traditions of lay education

<sup>134</sup> P. D. King, *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1972), 130–44; A. M. Rabello, "The Legal Condition of the Jews under the Visigothic Kings," *Israel Law Review* 11 (1976), 216–87, 391–414, 563–90.

<sup>135</sup> W. Drews, *Juden und Judentum bei Isidor von Sevilla: Studien zum Traktat De Fide catholica contra Iudaeos* (Berlin, 2001). Cohen, *Living Letters*, 73–122, compares Augustine, Gregory, and Isidore.

<sup>136</sup> M. Avi-Yona, *The Jews of Palestine: A Political History from the Bar Kokhba War to the Arab Conquest* (Oxford, 1976), 249–51; cf. L. Rutgers, "Justinian's Novella 146," in R. Kalmin and S. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Culture and Society under the Christian Roman Empire* (Leiden, 2002), 381–403; on the general deterioration of Jews in civil law, consult A. M. Rabello, "Civil Jewish Jurisdiction in the Days of the Emperor Justinian (527–565): *Codex Justinianus* 1.9.8," *Israel Law Review* 33 (1999), 51–66, repr. in idem, *The Jews of the Roman Empire: Legal Problems from Herod to Justinian* (Aldershot, 2000); and Linder, *Imperial Legislation*, 402–11.

and literacy, lavish municipal entertainments, and governance by a civilian curia or *boule*, however attenuated, endured. Jews remained integrated in the social and political life of their cities of residence (indeed, they were still legally obligated to serve in the curias).<sup>137</sup> Byzantine Christian intellectuals, like their western counterparts, channeled anti-Jewish sentiments, exegesis, and theological opinions into homilies, commentaries, and legislation both imperial and canonical. But they also developed new literary expressions of this ideology: hymns and liturgical poems, fictive disputations, *altercations*, and various historical fictions.<sup>138</sup> In particular, the wave of so-called “public disputations” placed in legendary settings imagined capitulations of Jews to the new Christian imperial order inaugurated by Constantine. One such legend presented a debate between Pope Sylvester and twelve rabbis (accompanied by scriptural allusions, discussions of Jesus’ descent, and miraculous revelations), culminating in the conversion of 3,000 Roman Jews; similar themes characterized another fiction set in Jerusalem, the “Invention of the True Cross.” While each of these stories may have originated in the late fourth century, their earliest redactions date from the fifth and sixth, and they circulated mainly in the East.<sup>139</sup>

In both halves of the Empire during these centuries, then, one sees the repetition of centuries-long anti-Jewish polemical traditions as well as opportunistic innovations. In the West, repressive canonical and secular lawcodes expressed this theological legacy in a new key. There, bishops who were heir to earlier traditions of erudite anti-Judaism found themselves, in the decentralizing wake of the invasions, in an unprecedented position of authority and power. Culturally *déclassés* barbarian kings, whether Arian (as the Vandals and Goths) or pagan (as the Franks), to the degree that they availed themselves of the bishops and of the Roman Church, to that degree

<sup>137</sup> *Novella* 45, in 537. Such service was onerous, and heretics, too, were likewise obliged. The East’s generally higher levels of lay literacy meant that rulers need not depend on clerics for administration, to the degree that was becoming true in the West: hence, despite disabilities, members of religious minorities could still serve in government.

<sup>138</sup> On the work of the sixth-century Constantinopolitan poet Romanos, see SC 99, 110, 114, 128; and R. J. Schronk, *From the Byzantine Pulpit: Romanos the Melodist* (Gainesville, 1995). More generally, see S. Krauss and W. Horbury, *Jewish-Christian Controversy*, 148–9; A. Külzer, *Disputationes Graecae contra Judaeos: Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen anti-Jüdischen Dialogliteratur und ihrem Judenbild* (Stuttgart, 1999); and P. Andrist, *Le Dialogue d’Athanasie et Zacharée: étude des sources et du contexte littéraire* (doctoral thesis, Geneva, 2001), especially 431–49. On Greek disputations, see also A. Cameron, “Disputations, Polemical literature and Formation of Opinion in the Early Byzantine Period,” *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 42 (1991), 91–108; while on the similar (and slighter) Latin traditions, Williams, *Adversus Judaeos*.

<sup>139</sup> On the *Acta Silvestri*, see Krauss and Horbury, *Controversy*, 44–6; Andrist, *Dialogue*, 98–99.

could they avail themselves of the lingering prestige of “Rome.” Ironically, then, it was the collapse of western Roman power that facilitated the practical rebirth of the Constantinian-Eusebian political theology that identified Church, Empire, and divine will. While the barbarian king championed his miniature Christian *imperium*, the bishops upon whose administrative skills he depended influenced royal politics and policy to a degree unimaginable in Constantine’s day.<sup>140</sup> Christian anti-Judaism, expressed in the changed context of the now shrunken, ideally religiously homogeneous city and kingdom, had greater scope for social expression than ever before.<sup>141</sup>

In the East, confused accounts in various late chroniclers also allude to seventh-century imperial efforts to baptize Jews forcibly.<sup>142</sup> For the most part, however, Byzantine theological anti-Judaism seems to have given rise less to new laws than to new sorts of literature. The trauma of twice losing Christian Jerusalem – once to the Persians and again to the Arabs – further stimulated such production. Christian authors strove to distinguish their fate from that of the Jews, whose own loss of Temple and homeland centuries previously, much emphasized in Christian writings from the second century onward as clear indications of God’s anger and rejection, looked, on the face of it, uncomfortably close to current Christian experience.<sup>143</sup>

The “Jew” as a theological and hermeneutical idea – carnal, hard-hearted, philosophically dim, and violently anti-Christian – had assumed its familiar shape in the disputes of early second-century, formerly pagan intellectuals. The concept helped them to articulate their convictions as readers of the Septuagint against the other biblical communities. In no Gentile theological system do Jews and Judaism seem to figure positively; but for orthodox theology in particular, hostile characterizations of Jews became a defining characteristic. The men developing the literary patrimony and group

<sup>140</sup> Gregory of Tours specifically recasts the thuggish Clovis, converted to the Roman Church from Frankish paganism in (probably) 508, as a “new Constantine,” *Hist. Frank.* 2.31.

<sup>141</sup> Catholic Visigoth kings occasionally outflanked their own bishops in this regard, enacting anti-Jewish legislation so extreme that they included, as well, penalties for clergy unwilling to enforce it: E. A. Thompson, *Goths*, 185–9 (Chintila), 204–9 (Recceswinth), 231–9 (Erwig); see also legislation in Linder, *Legal Sources*, 257–332.

<sup>142</sup> Parkes, *Conflict*, 257–69, usefully sets these in the context of domestic doctrinal turmoil and impinging Persian power.

<sup>143</sup> D. Olster argues that these sixth- and seventh-century anti-Jewish dialogues actually encode a cultural apology *vis-à-vis* Islam, *Roman Defeat, Christian Response and the Literary Construction of the Jew* (Philadelphia, 1994); cf. Averil Cameron, “Byzantines and Jews: Some Recent Work on Early Byzantium,” *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 20 (1996), 249–74; V. Deroche, “Polémique anti-judaïque et l’émergence de l’Islam (7e–8e siècles),” *Revue des études byzantines* 57 (1999), 141–61.



identity of this new community lived in a culture wherein Jews had been part of the fabric of Mediterranean urban life for centuries; wherein, from 212 CE, they were Roman citizens; and wherein they and their Gentile neighbors (whether pagan or Christian) mixed and mingled in the baths, gymnasia, schools, senates, and synagogues of their cities. This easy social intimacy, and the religious symbiosis it expressed and facilitated, both contrasted with and provoked the charged rhetoric of the ideologues.<sup>144</sup>

Constantine's patronage eventually empowered orthodox bishops, but had little effect on these long-lived social patterns. Religious and social mixing between different types of Jews and Christians, between Christians of different sorts, and between Christians, Jews, and pagans all continued. Indeed, the vitality of this habitual contact accounts in part for the increasing shrillness of anti-Jewish invective. As orthodox identity, enabled especially under Theodosius II, becomes enacted in Mediterranean cities, the volume and the vituperation of the *adversus Iudaeos* tradition increased. Together with the laws preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus* and the canons in various conciliar corpora, this literature at once relates the optative prescriptions of the governing elites and provides glimpses of the social reality that they condemn or attempt to regulate.<sup>145</sup> Church and state collaborated in the Christianization of late Roman culture; however, no immediate correspondence between law, theology, and society can be presumed. Indeed, the constant reiteration of civil and ecclesiastical legislation suggests the opposite: legal prescription cannot yield social description.<sup>146</sup>

Mediterranean society in the fifth through seventh centuries became increasingly brutalized as ancient traditions of urban civility waned. In this new climate of violence, the Church's tremendous moral prestige legitimated the coercion of all religious outsiders. By this point, in learned Christian imagination, "the Jew" represented the religious outsider *par excellence*. In time, within this changed context, the rhetoric of the ancient *adversus Iudaeos* tradition would create a new social reality.

<sup>144</sup> This phenomenon of social interaction disguised or embedded in a more formal literature ideologically committed to separation is investigated narratologically by G. Hasan-Rokem, who focuses on folkloric Galilean stories available in gospels and the Talmud, *Tales of the Neighborhood: Jewish Narrative Dialogues in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2003).

<sup>145</sup> Summarized in Parkes, *Conflict*, 379–86.

<sup>146</sup> See also S. Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society* (Princeton, 2001), 195–9, noting a sixth-century inscription from Calabria attesting to a Jewish *patronus civitatis*; *JWE* 1 114; M. Williams, "The Jews of Early Byzantine Venusia: The Family of Faustinus I, the Father," *JJS* 50 (1999), 47–8.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Ancient Christian sources

- Ambrose, *Epistulae et Acta*, ed. M. Zelzer, CSEL LXXXII/3 (Vienna, 1982). ET: M. M. Beyenka, FC XXVI (Washington, DC, 1954).
- Augustine, *Confessiones*, ed. J. J. O'Donnell, I (Oxford, 1992). ET: H. Chadwick (Oxford, 1991).
- contra Faustum Manicheum*, ed. J. Zycha, PL LXII 173–206. ET: R. Stothert, NPNF IV 155–345.
- De civitate Dei*, ed. E. Hoffman, CSEL XI: 1–2 (Vienna, 1899). ET: H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth, 1972).
- De doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford, 1995).
- Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. E. Dekkers and J. Fraipont, CCSL XXXVIII–XL (Turnholt, 1956); ET: J. H. Parker (Oxford 1953–7).
- Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL XXXIV/2 (Vienna, 1898). ET: W. Parsons, FC XII (Washington, DC, 1951).
- Epistulae novae*, ed. J. Divjak, CSEL LXXXVIII (Vienna, 1981). ET: R. Eno, FC 81 (Washington, DC, 1989).
- Retractationes*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCSL LVII (Turnholt, 1984). ET: M. I. Bogan, FC LX (1968).
- Tractatus adversus Iudaeos*, PL XLII 51–64. ET: M. Ligouri, FC XXVII (Washington, DC, 1955).
- Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL CIII–CIV (Turnholt, 1953). ET: M. M. Mueller, FC 31, 47, 66 (Washington, DC, 1956–73).
- Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA XII (Berlin, 1894). ET: S. J. B. Barnish (Liverpool, 1992).
- Chronicon Edessenum*, text and German trans.: L. Hallier, TU 91, (1892).
- Commodian, *Les Instructions de Commodien*, text and French trans.: J. Durel (Paris, 1912).
- Epiphanius, *Panarion*, ed. K. Holl, GCS XXV, XXXI (Leipzig, 1915–31). ET: F. Williams (Leiden, 1987).
- Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, eds. E. Schwartz, Th. Mommsen and F. Winkelmann, GCS NF 91–2. (Berlin, 1999). ET: H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton (London, 1927–8).
- Martyrii Palaestini*, GCS NF 92 (Berlin, 1999), 907–52. ET: H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton (London, 1927–8).
- Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Winkelmann, GCS 1/1 (Berlin, 1975; rev. ed. 1992). ET: A. Cameron and S. G. Hall (Oxford, 1999).
- Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentière (London, 1898). ET: M. Whitby (Liverpool, 2000).
- Gregory the Great, *Epistulae*, ed. D. Norberg, CCSL CXL–CXLa (Turnholt, 1982). Italian translation: V. Recchia (Rome, 1996).
- Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ed. B. R. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH SRM 1 (Hanover, 1950). ET: L. Thorpe (Baltimore, 1974).
- Isidore of Seville, *Historia Gothorum*, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA XI (Berlin, 1894).
- Jerome, *Epistulae*, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL LIV (Vienna, 1910–1918). ET: C. C. Mierow and T. C. Lawler, ACW 33 (Westminster, MD, 1963).
- John Chrysostom, *Adversus Iudaeos*, PG XLVIII 843–942. ET: P. Harkins, ACW 31 (Westminster, MD, 1963).

- Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, ed. M. Marcovich, Patristische Texte und Studien, LXXVII (Berlin, 1997). ET: T. B. Falls, FC (Washington, DC, 2003).
- Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha and Fragments*, ed. and trans. S. G. Hall (Oxford, 1979).
- Origen, *Commentary on Matthew*, ed. E. Klostermann, E. Benz, and L. Früchtel, GCS xxxviii, xl (Leipzig, 1933–55). ET: J. Patrick, ANF 1v 409–512.
- Contra Celsum*, ed. M. Marcovich, VCSup 54 (Leiden, 2001). ET: H. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1953).
- De principiis*, ed. P. Koetschau, GCS xxii (Leipzig, 1913). ET: G. W. Butterworth (New York, 1966).
- In Exodum*, ed. W. A. Baehrens, GCS xxiv (Origines, vi) (Leipzig, 1920). ET: R. Heine, FC LXXI (Washington, DC, 1982).
- In Leviticum*, ed. W. A. Baehrens, GCS xxiv (Origenes, vi) (Leipzig, 1920). ET: G. W. Barkley, FC LXXXIII (Washington, DC, 1990).
- Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidez, GCS 21 (Berlin, 1913). ET: E. Walford (London, 1855).
- Proclus of Constantinople, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of Virginity in Late Antiquity: Homilies 1–5*, ed. and trans. N. Constans, VCSup 66 (Leiden, 2003).
- Romanus Melodus, *Hymns*, text and French trans.: J. Grosdidier-des-Matons, SC xcix, cx, cxiv, cxxviii, cclxxxiii (Paris, 1964–81).
- Rufinus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. E. Schwartz and Th. Mommsen, GCS NF 6.2 (Berlin, 1999). ET: P. R. Amidon (New York, 1997).
- Severus of Minorca, *Letter on the Conversion of the Jews*, ed. and trans. S. Bradbury (Oxford, 1996).
- Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G. C. Hansen, GCS NF 1 (Berlin 1995). ET: A. C. Zenos, NPNF 11 (Grand Rapids, 1979).
- Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. G. C. Hanson, GCS NF 4 (Berlin, 1995). ET: C. Hartranft, NPNF 11 (Grand Rapids, 1979).
- Tertullian, *Adversus Iudaeos*, ed. A. Kroymann, CCSL 1 (Turnholt, 1954). ET: S. Thelwall, ANF 111 151–73.
- Against Marcion*, text and trans. A. E. Evans, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1972).
- Apologeticum*, ed. E. Dekkers, CCSL 1 (Turnholt, 1954). ET: T. R. Glover, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1931).
- De Ieiunio*, ed. A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa, CCSL 11 (Turnholt, 1954). ET: S. Thelwall, ANF 1v 102–14.
- Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina*, Opera Poetica, ed. F. Leo, MGH AA 1v 1–2 (Berlin, 1881–5). ET: J. W. George (Liverpool, 1995).

#### Non-Christian Greek and Latin sources

- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum Libri*, ed. W. Seyfarth (Leipzig, 1978). ET: J. C. Rolfe, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1935–9).
- Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaearum*, books 12–14. ET: R. Marcus, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1943).
- Julian, *Works*, text with trans., W. C. Wright, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1913–23).
- Juvenal, *vide Stern, GLAJJ*.
- Libanius, *Opera*, 2 vols., ed. R. Foerster (Leipzig, 1903–27). ET: A. F. Norman, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1969–77).
- Philo, *Flaccus*, text and trans. F. H. Colson, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1941).

- De vita Moysis*, text and trans. F. H. Colson, LCL (Cambridge, MA, 1935).  
 Pliny the Younger, *Epistularum*, ed. J. Cowan (Hildesheim, 1983). ET: B. Radice, LCL LIX (Cambridge, MA, 1969).  
*Psalms of Solomon*, ed. and trans. H. E. Ryle and M. R. James (Cambridge, 1891).  
 Sallustius, *On the Gods and the World*, ed. and trans. A. D. Nock (Hildesheim, 1966).  
 Tacitus, *vide* Stern, *GLAJJ*.

### Collections of primary texts

- Charlesworth, J. H., *Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (New York, 1983).  
 Frey, J. -B., *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1936, 1952).  
 Linder, A., *The Jews in the Legal Sources of the Early Middle Ages* (Detroit, 1997).  
*The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit, 1987).  
 Musurillo, H., *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford, 1972).  
*Le Martyre de Pionios*, eds. L. Robert with G. W. Bowersock and C. P. Jones (Washington, DC, 1994).  
 Noy, D., *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe*, 1: *Italy (excluding the city of Rome)*, Spain and Gaul; 11: *The City of Rome* (Cambridge, 1993, 1995).  
 Pharr, C., *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmionian Constitutions* (Princeton, 1952).  
 Stern, M., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem, 1974–84).

### Studies

- Alexander, Philip S., "Jewish Elements in Gnosticism and Magic c. 70–c. 270," *CHJ* 111 (1999), 1052–78.  
 Alpert, B. S., "Un Nouvel examen de la politique anti-juive visigothique," *REJ* 135 (1976), 3–29.  
 Amory, P., *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554* (Cambridge, 1997).  
 Andrist, P., *Les Dialogues d'Athanase et Zacharée: étude des sources et du contexte littéraire* (doctoral thesis, Geneva, 2001).  
 Applebaum, S., "The Legal Status of the Jewish Communities in the Diaspora," in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Philadelphia, 1974), 420–63.  
 Athanassiadi, P., and M. Frede (ed.), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 1999).  
 Avi-Yonah, M., *The Jews of Palestine: A Political History from the Bar Kokhba War to the Arab Conquest* (Oxford, 1976).  
 Bachrach, B. C., "A Reassessment of Visigothic Jewish Policy, 589–711," *AHR* 78 (1973), 11–34.  
 Barclay, J., *Jews in the Western Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE to 117 CE)* (Berkeley, 1996).  
 Barkhuizen, J. H., "Proclus of Constantinople," in M. B. Cunningham and P. Allen (eds.), *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden, 1998), 179–200.  
 Barnes, T. D., *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA, 1981).  
 "Legislation against the Christians," *JRS* 58 (1968), 32–50.  
 Beaucamp, J., Briquel-Chatonnet, F., and Robin, C. J., "La Persécution des Chrétiens de Nagrân et la chronologie himyarite," *Aram* 11–12 (1999–2000), 15–83.  
 Blumenkranz, B., *Die Judenpredigt Augustins* (1946; Paris, 1973).

- "*Judaeorum convivia*: à propos du concile de Vannes (465), c. 12," *Etudes d'histoire du droit canonique dédiées à Gabriel le Bras*, 11 (Paris, 1965), 1055–8.
- Juifs et Chrétiens dans le monde occidentale*, 430–1096 (Paris, 1960).
- Botermann, H., *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius* (Stuttgart, 1996).
- Bousset, W., *Der Antichristus in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testament und der altern Kirche* (Göttingen, 1895).
- Bowersock, G. W., *Martyrdom and Rome* (Cambridge, 1995).
- "Polytheism and Monotheism in Arabia and the Three Palestines," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 51 (1997), 1–10.
- Bradbury, S., "Constantine and the Problem of Anti-pagan Legislation in the Fourth Century," *CPh* 89 (1994), 120–39.
- Brakke, D., "Jewish Flesh and Christian Spirit in Athanasius of Alexandria," *J ECS* 9 (2001), 453–81.
- Brennan, B., "The Conversion of the Jews of Clermont in AD 576," *JTS* 36 (1985), 320–37.
- Brown, P., *Authority and the Sacred* (Cambridge, 1995).
- "Christianization and Religious Conflict," in *CAH* x111 (Cambridge, 1998), 632–64.
- The Cult of the Saints* (Chicago, 1981).
- Cameron, A., "Byzantines and Jews: Some Recent Work on Early Byzantium," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 20 (1996), 249–74.
- "Disputations, Polemical Literature and Formation of Opinion in the Early Byzantine Period," *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 42 (1991), 91–108.
- Carleton Paget, J., "Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity," *ZAC* 1 (1997), 195–225.
- "Jewish Christianity," in *CHJ* 111 (Cambridge, 1999), 731–775.
- "Jewish Proselytism at the Time of Christian Origins: Chimera or Reality?" *JSNT* 62 (1996), 65–103.
- Castritius, H., "Seid weder den Juden noch den Heiden noch der Gemeinde Gottes ein Ärgenis (1 Kor 10,32): Zur sozialen und rechtlichen Stellung der Juden im spätrömischen Nordafrika," in R. Erb and M. Schmidt (eds.), *Antisemitismus und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1987), 47–67.
- Chaniotis, A., "The Jews of Aphrodisias: New Evidence and Old Problems," *SCI* 21 (2002), 209–42.
- Cohen, J., *Living Letters of the Law: Ideas of the Jew in Medieval Christianity* (Berkeley, 1999).
- Cohen, S. J. D., *The Beginnings of Jewishness* (Berkeley, 1999).
- Colorni, V., "Gli ebrei nei territori italiani a nord di Roma dal 568 agli inizi del secolo XIII," *Settimane* 26 (1980), 241–312.
- Crago-Ruggini, L., "Intolerance: Equal and Less Equal in the Roman World," *CPh* 82 (1987), 187–205.
- "Pagani, ebrei e cristiani: Odio sociologico e odio teologico nel mondo antico," *Gli ebrei nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1980), 15–117.
- DeRoche, V., "Polémique anti-judaïque et l'émergence de l'Islam (7e–8e siècles)," *Revue des Etudes Byzantines* 57 (1999), 141–61.
- Drake, H. A., *Constantine and the Bishops* (Baltimore, 2000).
- Drews, W., *Juden und Judentum bei Isidore von Sevilla: Studien zum traktat De fide catholica contra Iudaeos* (Berlin, 2001).
- Efroymsen, D. P., "The Patristic Connection," in A. T. Davis (ed.), *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity* (New York, 1979), 98–117.

- "Whose Jews? Augustine's *Tractatus* on John," in B. G. Wright (ed.), *A Multiform Heritage*, (Atlanta, 1999), 197–211.
- Feldman, L., *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1993).
- Fowden, G., "Bishops and Temples in the Eastern Roman Empire, AD 320–435," *JTS* 29 (1978), 53–78.
- Fredriksen, P., "Allegory and reading God's Book: Paul and Augustine on the Destiny of Israel," in J. Whitman (ed.), *Interpretation and Allegory* (Leiden, 2000), 125–49.
- "Augustine and Israel: *interpretatio ad litteram*, Jews, and Judaism in Augustine's Theology of History," *SP* 38 (2001), 119–35.
- "*Excaecati occulta iustitia dei*: Augustine on Jews and Judaism," *J ECS* 3 (1995), 299–324.
- "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2," *JTS* 42 (1991), 532–64.
- "*Secundum carnem*: History and Israel in the Theology of St. Augustine," in C. Klingshirn and M. Vessey (eds.), *The Limits of Ancient Christianity* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 26–41.
- "What 'Parting of the Ways'? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City," in A. H. Becker and A. Y. Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Tübingen, 2002), 1–28.
- Gager, J., *The Origins of Antisemitism* (New York, 1983).
- Geary, P., *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, 2002).
- Gibson, E. L., "Jewish Antagonism or Christian Polemic: The Case of the *Martyrdom of Pionius*," *J ECS* 9 (2001), 339–58.
- Goodman, M., *Mission and Conversion* (Oxford, 1994).
- Gruen, E., *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA, 2002).
- Heritage and Hellenism* (Berkeley, 1998).
- Hasan-Rokem, G., *Tales of the Neighborhood: Jewish Narrative Dialogues in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2003).
- Henten, J. W. van, and Avemarie, F., *Martyrdom and Noble Death* (London, 2002).
- Hill, C. C., *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of the Future Hope in Early Christianity* (Oxford, 1992).
- Horbury, W., *Jews and Christians in Contact and Controversy* (Edinburgh, 1998).
- "Jews and Christians on the Bible: Demarcation and convergence (325–451)," in J. van Oort and U. Wichert (eds.), *Christliche Exegese zwischen Nicaea und Chalcedon* (Kampen, 1996), 72–103.
- Hunt, E. D., "Christianizing the Roman Empire: The Evidence of the *Code*," in J. Harris and I. Wood (eds.), *The Theodosian Code* (London, 1993), 143–58.
- "St. Stephen in Minorca: An Episode in Jewish–Christian Relations in the Early Fifth Century AD," *JTS* 33 (1982), 106–23.
- "The Successors of Constantine," in *CAH* XIII (Cambridge, 1998), 1–43.
- Irshai, O., "Confronting a Christian Empire: Jewish Culture in the World of Byzantium," in D. Biale (ed.), *The Cultures of the Jews* (New York, 2002), 181–221.
- "Dating the Eschaton: Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Calculations in Late Antiquity," in A. I. Baumgarten (ed.), *Apocalyptic Time* (Leiden, 2000), 113–53.
- Jacobs, M., *Die Institution des jüdischen Patriarchen: eine quellen- und traditionskritische Studie zur Geschichte der Juden in der Spätantike* (Tübingen, 1995).
- Juster, J., *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, 1–11 (Paris, 1914).
- Kamesar, A., *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesis* (Oxford, 1993).
- "The Virgin of Isaiah 7:14: The Philological Argument from the Second to the Fifth Century," *JTS* 41 (1990), 52–75.

- King, P. D., *Law and Society in the Visigothic Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1972).
- Klingshirn, W. E., *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Kofsky, A., *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism* (Leiden, 2000).
- “Mamre: A Case of Regional Cult?” in A. Kofsky and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Sharing the Sacred: Religious Contacts and Conflicts in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem, 1998), 19–30.
- Krauss, S., and Horbury, W., *Jewish-Christian Controversy from the Earliest Times to 1789*, 1 (Tübingen, 1995).
- Külzer, A., *Disputationes Graecae contra Iudaeos: Untersuchungen zur byzantinischen anti-Jüdischen Dialogliteratur und ihren Judenbild* (Stuttgart, 1999).
- Lane Fox, R., *Pagans and Christians* (London, 1986).
- Levine, L. I., *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, 2000).
- “The Status of the Patriarch in the Third and Fourth Centuries: Sources and Methodology,” *JJS* 47 (1996), 1–32.
- Lieberman, S., “The Martyrs of Caesarea,” *Annuaire de l’institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves* 7 (1939–44), 395–446.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G., *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford, 1979).
- The Decline and Fall of the Roman City* (Oxford, 2001).
- Lieu, J., “Accusations of Jewish Persecution in early Christian Sources, with Particular Reference to Justin Martyr and the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*,” in G. N. Stanton and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge, 1998), 279–95.
- Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh, 1996).
- “The Race of the God-fearers,” *JTS* 46 (1995), 483–501.
- Limor, O., “Christian Sacred Space and the Jew,” in J. Cohen (ed.), *From Witness to Witchcraft. Jews and Judaism in Medieval Christian Thought* (Wiesbaden, 1997), 55–77.
- Lohmeyer, E., “Antichristus,” *RAC* 1 (Stuttgart, 1950), 450–7.
- McKnight, S., *A Light among the Gentiles* (Minneapolis, 1991).
- MacMullen, R., *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries* (New Haven, 1997).
- Christianizing the Roman Empire, AD 100–400* (New Haven, 1984).
- Markus, R. A., *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Martin, T., “Modus inveniendi Paulum,” in D. Patte and E. TeSelle (eds.), *Engaging Augustine on Romans* (Harrisburg, 2002), 63–90.
- Millar, F., “Empire and City, Augustus to Julian: Obligations, Excuses, and Status,” *JRS* 73 (1993), 76–91.
- “The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity, AD 312–438,” in J. Lieu, J. North, and T. Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London, 1992), 97–123.
- Mitchell, S., “The Cult of *Theos Hypsistos* between Pagans, Jews, and Christians,” in P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede (eds.), *Pagan Monotheism* (Oxford, 1999), 81–148.
- Moorehead, J., *Theodoric in Italy* (Oxford, 1992).
- Newman, H., *Jerome and the Jews* (PhD dissertation, Jerusalem, 1997) (Hebrew).
- “Jerome’s Judaizers,” *JECs* 9 (2001), 421–52.
- Olster, D., *Roman Defeat, Christian Response, and the Literary Construction of the Jew* (Philadelphia, 1994).
- Pakter, W., “Early Western Church Law and the Jews,” in H. Attridge and G. Hata (eds.), *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* (Leiden, 1992), 714–35.



- Parkes, J., *Church and Synagogue* (Philadelphia, 1961).
- Pradels, W., Brandle, R., and Heimgartner, M., "The Sequence and Dating of the Series of John Chrysostom's Eight Discourses *Adversus Iudaeos*," *ZAC* 6 (2002), 91–116.
- Price, S., *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984).
- Pucci Ben Zeev, M., *Jewish Rights in the Roman World* (Tübingen, 1998).
- Rabello, A. M., "Civil Jewish Jurisdiction in the Days of the Emperor Justinian (527–565): *Codex Justinianus* 1.9.8," *ILR* 33 (1999), 51–66.
- "The Legal Condition of the Jews under the Visigothic Kings," *ILR* 11 (1976), 216–87, 391–414, 563–90.
- "On the Relations between Diocletian and the Jews," *JJS* 35 (1984), 147–67.
- Reynolds, J., and Tannenbaum, R., *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias* (Cambridge, 1987).
- Rives, J. B., "The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire," *JRS* 89 (1999), 135–54.
- Rutgers, L., *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism* (Leuven, 1998).
- "Justinian's Novella 146," in R. Kalmin and S. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Culture and Society under the Christian Roman Empire* (Leiden, 2002), 381–403.
- Salzman, M., "The Evidence for the Conversion of the Roman Empire to Christianity in Book 16 of the *Theodosian Code*," *Historia* 42 (1993), 362–78.
- Schäfer, P., *Judeophobia* (Cambridge, MA, 1997).
- Schreckenberg, H., *Die christlichen adversus-Judaeos Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.–11. Jb.)* (Frankfurt, 1982).
- Schürer, E., Vermes, G., et al., *HJPAJC* 111.
- Schwartz, S., *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 BCE–640 CE* (Princeton, 2001).
- Simon, M., *Vetus Israel* (London, 1986).
- Stanton, G., "Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*: Group Boundaries, 'Proselytes,' and 'Godfearers,'" in G. M. Stanton and G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge, 1998), 263–78.
- Stemberger, G., "Hieronymus und die Juden seiner Zeit," in D. A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter. Festschrift für H. Schreckenberg* (Göttingen, 1993), 347–64.
- Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century* (Edinburgh, 2000).
- Stern, M., "The Expulsions of the Jews from Rome in Antiquity," *Zion* 44 (1979), 1–27 (Hebrew).
- Taylor, M., *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity* (Leiden, 1995).
- Thompson, E. A., *The Goths in Spain* (Oxford, 1969).
- Ulrich, J., *Eusebius von Caesaria und die Juden: Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius* (Tübingen, 1999).
- Visotzki, B. L., "Prolegomenon to the Study of Jewish Christianity in the Rabbinic Literature," *AJS Review* 14 (1989) 47–70.
- Walker, P. W. L., *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford, 1990).
- Wander, B., *Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten* (Tübingen, 1998).
- Wilken, R. L., *John Chrysostom and the Jews* (Berkeley, 1983).
- The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven, 1992).
- Winkelmann, F., "Der *Laos* und die kirchlichen Kontroverse im frühen Byzanz," in idem (ed.), *Folk und Herrschaft im frühen Byzanz* (Berlin, 1991), 133–53.
- Young, F., *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Yuval, I., *Two Nations in Your Womb* (Tel-Aviv, 2000) (Hebrew).