

Modern Theology 11:2 April 1995  
ISSN 0266-7177

## TORAH-OBSERVANCE AND CHRISTIANITY: THE PERSPECTIVE OF ROMAN ANTIQUITY

---

PAULA FREDRIKSEN

In his open letter to a Jewish friend who converted to Christianity, Michael Wyschogrod argues that from a religious perspective, *whether Jewish or Christian*, this convert's Jewish identity perdures: "Anyone born of a Jewish mother or anyone *properly* converted to Judaism<sup>1</sup> is, according to rabbinic law, a Jew. You were born of a Jewish mother, therefore you are a Jew. In the eyes of God, as you say, there is nothing anyone can do about that." As a religious Christian, continues Wyschogrod, his friend must likewise construe this Jewish identity religiously; that is, not as a mere ethnic designation, but as a divinely conferred responsibility: "the only operative test ... for whether someone is a Jew" is whether he keeps the *mitzvot*. Seguing nicely from logical argument to scriptural, Wyschogrod then invokes Acts 15, the so-called Apostolic Conference: Paul and the Jerusalem apostles concurred that Gentiles in Christ were not obligated to keep Torah; but Jews—that is, Jews in Christ—by implication were. *Quod erat demonstrandum*: "Are you not, from a Christian point of view, obligated to lead a Torah-observant life because, as you say, you are a Jew?"

Wyschogrod may have a future as a Christian halakhist. Proceeding much as the rabbis, and indeed Paul too, he scissors scriptural passages out from their literary context to put them at the service of arguments never anticipated by their original authors. This prooftexting technique, called "situational exegesis," accounts for the clarity of his—and, indeed, most—halakhic argument. I would like to consider this same issue—that is, Torah-observance—from the perspective of actual social practice, both ancient and (much more briefly) modern; and I would like to take a closer look at the primary sources. My conclusions, such as they are, will lack the emphatic

---

Dr Paula Fredriksen  
Department of Religion, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, USA

© Basil Blackwell Ltd 1995. Published by Blackwell Publishers, 108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, UK and 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA

196 Paula Fredriksen

clarity of Wyschogrod's. No surprise: history is a messy enterprise. Let's begin.

I. *Who was a Jew?*

Jesus and Paul were born into one of the periods of the richest religious variety *within* Judaism. Indeed, some modern scholars have begun to speak of "ancient Judaisms"—an exaggerated response, perhaps, to an important and accurate perception. Varieties of late Second Temple Judaism might be divided, crudely, according to linguistic and geographic considerations into the two broad (and not necessarily mutually exclusive) categories of Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism; and within each of these larger groups, we know of many others. Josephus, for example, in his *Antiquities of the Jews*, introduces first-century Palestinian Judaism to his Gentile audience with the rubric of four "philosophies": Sadducees, Pharisees, Essenes, and "the school of Judah the Galilean"—that is, insurrectionists. Further distinctions within these groups could probably be drawn, and most Jews belonged to none of them.<sup>2</sup>

Philo of Alexandria, another first-century witness, besides speaking of the Essenes (in terms not entirely identical to Josephus'), wrote enthusiastically of the mysterious Therapeutae, a philosophical, celibate community of both men and women in Egypt.<sup>3</sup> Philo's enthusiasm reveals his esteem of philosophy as the key to unlocking the higher, spiritual mysteries of the Bible, a text he considers to be itself the acme of philosophy, written by "the philosopher, Moses."<sup>4</sup> But too much spiritualizing can be a bad thing; and Philo speaks elsewhere, with frigid disapproval, of a group (are they a genre or an actual community?) who so esteem the higher, spiritual meaning of the Law that they might be led to neglect the humbler, literal performances attendant to it, ceasing to observe *kashrut* and even male circumcision.<sup>5</sup> Yet both he and they obviously consider themselves to be Jews. Indeed, from their own perspective, these allegorists, enlightened and spiritually evolved, are better Jews, in fact, than those who interpret the commandments *kata sarka*.

The movement around Jesus, both in his lifetime and later, during the first generation, is further evidence for the religious variety within Judaism—and, concomitantly, for the absence of any single, universally recognized authority when it came to questions of interpreting the Law.<sup>6</sup> The gospels frequently depict Jesus arguing with contemporaries over the correct understanding of Torah. He has one opinion, his opponents another; but all stand within the framework of the idea of Israel and the importance and sanctity of the Law. And in the earliest evidence we have from the Jesus movement, namely, the letters of Paul, written roughly mid-century, much of Paul's energy goes into refuting the interpretation of Torah floated by other Jewish *apostoloi*.<sup>7</sup> In both phases of the Jesus movement, then—its rural,

*Torah-observance and Christianity* 197

Galilean phase in Jesus' lifetime; its urban, diaspora phase thereafter—just as in Judea and the Galilee generally, and as in Alexandria and elsewhere, it was business as usual: Jews concurred on the importance of the Law with as much energy and commitment as they disagreed on the proper way to observe it.

After the Temple's destruction in 70, and with the rise of rabbinic Judaism, direct evidence for this energetic variety falls off, and our prime documentary sources for the second through sixth centuries are the (two!) Talmuds. The rabbis routinely argued with and among each other—the Mishnah and Gemara are themselves monuments to agreeing to disagree—but they fix the parameters of acceptable argument, and see Jews outside those parameters as deviants, *minim*. At what point are most Jews rabbinic Jews—after the second century? By the fourth? The sixth? *Ever*? We cannot know, and while the rabbis assert that they represent authentic Judaism—preserving the tradition from Moses through the judges and prophets, through “the men of the great assembly” and thence to themselves—we have no more reason to accept their claim than we do Justin's, or Irenaeus', or Terullian's, that only their group(s) preserved the truth of Christian orthodoxy.

## II. *Who was a Gentile?*

In principle, anyone who was not a Jew was a Gentile. But a Gentile could choose to change his or her status. He or she would then become an ex-Gentile and hence a Jew of a special sort, that is, a convert (Heb. *ger*; Gk. *proselutos*).<sup>9</sup>

Jews, furthermore, drew distinctions between Gentiles and Gentiles. At an abstract level, rabbis discussed the behavior of the *ger toshav*, the foreign (i.e., non-Jewish) resident of *the Land*, that is, territorial Israel: the term seems to have described an ideal type, not an actual population.<sup>10</sup> Rabbis also discussed the qualifications of the *ben Noach*, a non-Jew who conformed to a certain standard of ethical and religious behavior, most prominently, the repudiation of idols (and, hence, the sexual sins associated with idolatry).<sup>11</sup> This category, too, seems to have been more ideal than real, since Gentiles who (a) did not convert to Judaism but also (b) did not worship traditional deities would have occupied a legal and social no-man's land.

Less abstractly, Jewish synagogue communities in Roman antiquity were familiar with a Gentile population that voluntarily associated with Jews and assumed, to a greater or lesser degree, some observance of Jewish religious customs—sources most frequently mention Sabbath, food laws, and holidays. Greek texts name these people *phoboumenoi* or *sebomenoi*; Greek inscriptions, *theosebeis*; in Latin, they are *metuentes*; in Hebrew, *yirei shamay'im*, “fearers of heaven.” This population was known as “God-fearers.”<sup>12</sup>

198 Paula Fredriksen

Godfearers ranged in degree of affiliation from interest and civic benignity to active involvement in Jewish urban communities. Other, less sympathetic Gentiles, whether pagan satirists or Christian polemicists, comment with some irritation on these people, who "live between both ways," rushing between synagogues and traditional shrines, "*medius Iudaeus*."<sup>13</sup> The next thing you know, grumbles Juvenal, a Godfearer's sons go whole hog, circumcising themselves and fearing the Law.<sup>14</sup> Once circumcised, the person's religious affiliation was clear: he was a Jew. Up to that point, however, no matter how fervent that person's respect and whole-hearted his religious observance, he would remain, nevertheless, a Gentile.<sup>15</sup>

Who, then, was a Jew? And who was a Gentile? When considered from a genealogical—or, to use Wyschogrod's term, ethnic—perspective, the answer in antiquity seems reasonably clear: a Jew was the child of a Jew, or, a Jew was a Jew by blood. No "operative test" obtained: both Philo and the allegorizing non-observant Jews whom he criticized considered the allegorizers Jewish. An ex-Gentile was also a Jew, though a Jew of a special sort; nonetheless, then as now, the issue would probably turn on whether he or she had been "properly converted." But the force of the adverb would depend on what Jew one asked: what was proper according to a Pharisee (if we could know) would doubtless vary from what was proper to a Sadducee, or to an allegorizer. The question of the status of converts among contemporary Orthodox (and which group among the Orthodox?), Conservative (whether toward the right or the left, an issue which involves the status of women as witnesses and members of the *bet din*), and Reform groups attests to the same social reality: in the absence of a universally recognized authority, many answers prevail.

The question becomes even more interesting, the answers various, when considered from an eschatological perspective. As the rabbis put it, Who has a place in the World to Come? Do righteous Gentiles? No such thing, said R. Eliezer; Yes, of course, said R. Joshua.<sup>16</sup> Confusingly enough, even *unrighteous* Gentiles would seem to have a place in the world to come: worshipping their idols right up to the last moment, these Gentiles, upon seeing the Lord of the Universe reveal himself in glory, will "bury their abominations and bend knee," in the words of the *Alenu*. Then—but only then—will they go, with redeemed Israel, to worship God on "his holy mountain," that is, at the Temple. Will all Israel be there too? Yes, says prophetic tradition: even the tribes lost to Assyria. Yes, says Paul: for God has condemned all to unrighteousness so that he may have mercy upon all; all Israel will be saved (Rom. 11:29–32, 26). Yes, say the rabbis of mishnah Sanhedrin: All Israel has a place in the World to Come—except, that is, those Jews who disagree with the rabbis.<sup>17</sup>

The questions, Who is a Jew? and, Who is a Gentile? have to do with issues of group identity: Who belongs and who does not? The answer depends on who is asked, and around what other issue(s) the question is motivated. The

*Torah-observance and Christianity* 199

genealogical answer is the least ambiguous, but also the least religious: as Wyschogrod notes, even a voluntary apostate remains, by the genealogical criterion, a Jew. *As soon as religious criteria come in to play, however, the answers are as various as the answerers.* Who is a Jew? becomes another way of asking, Who does as I do? The qualifying population, accordingly, shrinks—even to the point where Gentiles are included with redeemed Israel, while Jews of a persuasion other than that of the person putting the question get left out. Hence the Paul of Romans 11 wrote Romans 9 (“For not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel...” v. 6); hence those who recite the *Alenu* and read Isaiah 2:2–4 also hold by *mSanh.* 10.1.

Thus Wyschogrod’s statements—“To be a Jew means to labor under the yoke of the commandments”; “The only operative test ... for whether someone is a Jew is whether he sins when he eats leavened bread on Passover” and keeps the other mitzvot—need to be nuanced. “To labor” and “to keep” according to whose interpretation? And if he answers something like, “According to the standards of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis,” then this gives us information not about some other Jew’s identity (whether his converted friend’s or anyone else’s), but about Wyschogrod. And, as Jesus might have said to the Pharisees, or the Pharisees to the Therapeutae, or the Sadducees to the Essenes: One person’s *halakhah* is another person’s *meshuggas*.

### III. *Christian Halakhah*

Wyschogrod builds his case in part by citing Christian writings: from the New Testament, Paul’s letter to the Romans, on the continuing religious significance of Israel (11:29); Galatians, on not circumcising (5:2); and Acts, which he takes as reliable for “Paul himself” (21:20–26 the Temple; 15, the Apostolic Conference); from tradition, Thomas, *ST* 103, R4, on the supersession of Jewish rites by Christian. This evidence, no less than the Jewish sources reviewed above, marks out an historical and social quagmire. Let’s begin again.

Acts, first of all, cannot be taken *prima facie* as evidence about Paul. Luke, the author, shows little or no acquaintance with Paul’s authentic correspondence, some fifty years earlier than the composition of Acts; and where both allude to common occurrences—Paul’s call to be an apostle; the conference in Jerusalem: his stay in Corinth—their narratives and/or chronologies are incompatible. Luke’s Paul, c. 100, and Paul’s Paul, c. 50, are two different people.<sup>18</sup>

Did the historical Paul sacrifice at the Temple, in order to allay Jewish fears about his Judaism? We cannot know. I think he very well could have, but cannot *know* that he did it for the reasons Acts adduces.<sup>19</sup> And the conference in Jerusalem as reported in Acts 15 differs markedly from Paul’s

## 200 Paula Fredriksen

review of a similar conference in Galatians 2: in one, Peter is the Apostle to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7); in the other, Peter is to go to Israel, Paul to the Gentiles (Gal. 2:2,7,9 and frequently elsewhere).

Paul's attitude toward Torah is, in fact, anguished and inconsistent. Depending on where, to whom, and against whom he speaks, his posture and tone vary. In Galatians, he is extremely negative, at times coming close to condemning the Law outright; in Romans, where he has more wiggle room, he waffles, see-sawing between almost-condemnation and outright praise. His ambivalence diminishes toward the theological crescendo of the letter, in 9–11 (esp. 9:4, where Torah appears in the list of Israel's divinely-granted privileges; 10:4, the Law has Christ as its *telos*; cf. 15:8–9). And elsewhere he has good things to say.

But Torah-observance did not blind Paul. His call as *apostolos* gave him the room to live as he saw fit, to the end of advancing his *euangelion*:

To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the Law I became as one under the Law—though not being myself under the Law—that I might win those under the Law. To those outside the Law I became as one outside the Law—not being without Law toward God but under the Law of Christ—that I might win those outside the Law. To the weak I became weak, that I might win the weak. I have become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some.

1 Cor. 9:20–22

We cannot be certain exactly what this means. Wyschogrod is surely right in noting that Paul spoke only to Gentiles, not to Jews, when he urged his listeners not to be circumcised (for Jews, one assumes, the point would have been moot; Gal. 5:2). But on the basis of his furious *esprit de l'escalier* in Gal. 2:11ff., reviewing his face-off with Peter in Antioch, we may at least conclude that Paul ate and drank what would have fallen off most first-century Jewish lists of legit comestibles. He did so freely and in good conscience; he felt righteous indignation when other Jews-in-Christ—or at least those in leadership positions who dealt with mixed communities, like Peter and Barnabas—declined to follow his example (2:11–13). Paul's endorsement of Torah observance for Jews, then, was more ambiguous and much less consistent than Wyschogrod's characterization, drawn from Acts 15 and 21, allows.

Wyschogrod further cites a 13th-century Catholic authority, Thomas Aquinas, who, he claims, on the basis of Gal. 5:2, concluded that Jewish Christians were no longer required to keep the mitzvot—indeed, would sin if they did—because “the ceremonies of the Old Law signified Christ as to be born and to suffer, but ours [i.e., church sacraments] signify him as having been born and having suffered” (ST 103, R4). But Thomas' argument derives from an original teaching of a more fundamental authority: the fifth-century bishop Augustine of Hippo.<sup>20</sup>

*Torah-observance and Christianity* 201

It was Augustine who first promulgated the teaching that the Jews *qua* Jews served a vital function for the Church. By preserving the Scriptures that foretold Christ despite, indeed by virtue of, their hostility to Christianity, the Jews functioned as a witness to Christian truth. Thus, alone of all the non-Catholic communities in the post-Theodosian Western Empire—pagans, Donatists, Pelagians, Manichees—the Jews, argued Augustine, were not to be coerced:

By the evidence of their own Scriptures they bear witness for us that we have not fabricated the prophecies about Christ. It follows that when the Jews do not believe in our Scriptures, their own Scriptures are fulfilled in them, while they read them with blind eyes.... It is in order to give this testimony which, in spite of themselves, they supply for our benefit by their possession and preservation of those books, that they themselves are dispersed among all nations, wherever the Catholic Church spreads.... Hence the prophecy in the Book of Psalms: "Slay them not, lest your people forget; scatter them by your might."

*de civitate Dei* 18.46; cf. Ps 59:10f.

Earlier church fathers, such as Justin Martyr and Tertullian, had defended the Old Testament against the dualist Christians of their generation (Marcion and Valentinus) by denigrating both the Law (it had been given because of Jewish hardness of heart) and those Jews who had kept it (unenlightened, indeed carnal, these Jews had understood the Law, and so fulfilled it, *secundum carnem*, on a merely literal level).<sup>22</sup> Augustine, against the Manichees, argued otherwise. The Law itself, he urged, had been intended and received as a good thing; otherwise, how could Paul have praised Israel for having it?<sup>23</sup> And the Jews had been right to keep the Law "literally": the fault lay not with their observance, but with their failure to acknowledge when the things the Law pointed forward to had been realized in Christ.<sup>24</sup> "The same Law that was given by Moses became grace and truth in Jesus Christ" (c. *Faust.* 22.6).

Further, Augustine argued, *even once Christ had come, the apostolic generation had been right to continue to keep the Law*. Some, like Timothy, even chose to receive circumcision—nothing wrong with that (19.17). For this Jewish-Christian generation, keeping the Law was freedom, because they knew it had been fulfilled in the Lord's coming. Forcing Gentiles to keep Torah would have been confusing and counter-productive, and Paul rightly reprimanded Peter on precisely this point (Gal. 2:11ff.). But this unique Jewish-Christian generation, the font of the Church, was right not to suddenly cease the *actio prophetica* (as Augustine strikingly characterized Torah-observance), lest "by compulsory abandonment it [the Law] should seem to be condemned rather than closed" (19.17).

So Augustine could endorse Wyschogrod's summary emphatic statement on the apostolic conference of Acts 15: "*Jewish believers in Jesus remained*

202 Paula Fredriksen

*obligated to circumcision and to the Mosaic Law.*" True, Augustine would agree; but "obligated" pedagogically and pastorally, to avoid any confusion about the Law's status. And this prerogative was unique to their generation.

#### IV. Conclusion

I promised a messy picture; I think I have delivered. Considered from the vantage point both of Jewish history and of Christian authority, Wyschogrod's argument can certainly be challenged.

But I like his proposal, I suppose because I so dislike what I detect in the self-declarations of Jews who convert to Christianity. Jews who convert to Buddhism or some other non-Western religion rarely make a point of asserting their Jewish identity: to their new faith, it hardly matters. But nineteen centuries of polemical and theological bad blood stand between Christianity and its parent religion; and when a Jewish convert to Christianity declares his continuing Jewishness, one need not strain to hear the old supersessionist theme.

Different Christian communities have different emphases. Among those Jewish-Christians (especially in Israel) trumpeted weekly by fundamentalist Protestant ministers on some of my favorite cable stations, it's hard not to whiff the sweat of apocalyptic fervor. Identify the Nation to the North (Russia? Syria?); blend in a little Ezekiel and a pinch of the *New York Times*; do some gematria with 666; read Romans 11:12f. in a particular way, and there you have it: a converted Jew is another piece of an empirical proof, one more step along the road leading to the Rapture, Armageddon, the Second Coming, and so on. Better this than the saccharine supersessionism of the Jews-for-Jesus (sponsored, in part, by the Assemblies of God); still, with both types, these converts seem to be using their Jewish identity as a way to front the particular theological message of their new church.

Catholics are another issue. Something sits poorly with an innocent avowal of Jewish identity when the institution, and the European culture that it for so many centuries embodied, has so much Jewish blood on its hands—and especially, during the Inquisition, over exactly the issue of judaizing. Here I like Wyschogrod's proposal precisely because, in this instance, it would make that avowal so much more complicated—and in the case of a cardinal, *encore plus*. For Wyschogrod's final point stands: Torah-observant Jews within the Church, tolerated and even endorsed by the Church, would go far toward clarifying the new Catholic attitude toward the Hebrew bible, and its own Jewish roots.

It would be asking a lot, for the sake of principle, to have Cardinal Lustiger, for example, give up his *coquilles Saint Jacques* and *boudin à l'ail*. But, to bring this discussion back to the point on which I opened it: if Lustiger chose his rabbi carefully enough, he would not have to.



## Torah-observance and Christianity 203

## NOTES

- 1 My emphasis, for a point I shall develop further on.
- 2 For the varieties of Judaism in the late Second Temple period, see Emil Schürer, *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, rev. and ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and others, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973–87), hereafter *HJP*; more recently, E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, 63 BCE – 66 CE (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992). The indispensable primary source is Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* (hereafter *AJ*) and *The Jewish War* (hereafter *BJ*), available in facing Greek/English in the Loeb series, 10 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–65). I refer here to his remarks in *AJ* 18.1, 1–6.
- 3 One the Essenes, *That Every Good Man is Free*; on the Therapeutae, *On the Contemplative Life*.
- 4 *On the Creation of the World*, 1.
- 5 *On the Migration of Abraham*, 89–93.
- 6 See however Sanders' discussion of non-sectarian "common Judaism"—that of the priests and the ordinary people—in *Judaism: Practice and Belief*, pp. 1–43, 45–313; on the general authority of the priests outside the Temple, esp. pp. 170–89.
- 7 Interestingly—and, from the Jewish point of view, typically—what Paul and his Jewish colleagues argue about are not "Christian" issues (e.g., definitions of Jesus as Christ, or theological definitions of Christ), but *Jewish* ones: Are Gentiles-in-Christ more like God-fearers (hence, pagans) or more like proselytes (hence, Jews by choice), and therefore obligated to keep the *mitzvot*? For disputes on the food laws, Gal. 2:11ff.; Rom. 14:13–23; 1 Cor. 8; on circumcision—that is, halackhically resolving the identity issue by conversion to Judaism—esp. Gal. (and Paul's warning, 5:3 "I testify to everyone who receives circumcision that he is bound to keep the whole Law"); on Jewishness as the measure of authority to evangelize, 2 Cor. 11:21–12:13, where Paul adduces genealogy, persecutions, ecstatic experiences and personal revelations; Phil. 3:2–6, genealogy, education, "party"-affiliation, and piety ("as to righteousness under the Law I was blameless," v. 6).
- 8 *The Sayings of the Fathers (Pirkei Avot)* 1:1.
- 9 Evidence for a procedure for female conversion is elusive: Shaye Cohen has noted that, outside of rabbinic sources, the usual means seems to have been marriage to a Jewish male, "The origins of the matrilineal principle in rabbinic law," *AJSR* 10 (1985), pp. 19–53, esp. pp. 25–29. Circumcision, for male converts, seems universally remarked upon in Jewish, pagan, and eventually Christian sources. For a review of this issue, and the way it affects our understanding of the first generation of the Jesus movement, see P. Fredriksen, "Judaism, the circumcision of Gentiles, and apocalyptic hope," *JTS*, 42 (1991), pp. 532–64, esp. pp. 535–40 and nn. 11–12.  
Josephus reports that some people thought of Herod as a "half-Jew" (*AJ* 14.403), a theologically incoherent idea but a useful insult, presumably because referring to Herod's Idumean ancestry (the region, biblical Edom, had been converted to Judaism only recently, under the Hasmoneans). Herod thought of himself, however, as fully Jewish; he kept Jewish Law and splendidly refurbished the Temple.
- 10 b. Arakin 29a.; for discussion, Schürer-Vermes, *HJP* 3:171–72.
- 11 *Sanh.* 56–60; see Fredriksen, *art. cit.*, 535 and n. 8.
- 12 For discussion, *HJP* 3:150–76, esp. 165ff.; also the lengthy note to Juvenal in Menachem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Academy, 1974–84) 2: 103–107; Fredriksen, "Judaism ...", 540–43; on God-fearers as the presumed recipients of Paul's letters, *idem*, "From Jesus to Christ: The Contribution of the Apostle Paul," *Jews and Christians Speak of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994) 77–90.
- 13 Commodian, *Instructiones* 37.1.
- 14 *Satires* 14.96–101.
- 15 Fredriksen, "Judaism ...", 536 nn. 11–12. This is the point of the much-misinterpreted story of Izates and the royal house of Adiabene, related in *AJ* 20. Izates' first "contact," Ananias, encourages his piety but urges him *not* to receive circumcision, so that Izates can continue to rule as a Gentile (20.38–41); subsequently, Eleazar tells him that, if he would be a Jew, he must convert, i.e., be circumcised (20.42–47).

## 204 Paula Fredriksen

- 16 T. Sanh. 13.2; see E. P. Sanders' comments on this debate, with respect to early Christianity, in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) pp. 206–12; and in *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), pp. 212–21, esp. p. 215.
- 17 "All Israel has a share in the World to Come. And these shall have no share: he who says [as the Sadducees did] that there is no resurrection of the dead, and he who says that the Law is not from Heaven, and an apikoros [atheist]," mSanh 10.1. For a detailed overview of the issue of inclusion and exclusion in Tannaitic literature, Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, pp. 147–82. On the gracious inclusion of unrighteous Gentiles as an articulate stream within Jewish tradition, Fredriksen, "Judaism ...", pp. 544–48.
- 18 Any commentary on Acts and/or Galatians will point this out. For a critical comparison, esp. on the issue of Paul's call/conversion, P. Fredriksen, "Paul and Augustine: Conversion Narratives, Orthodox Traditions, and the Retrospective Self," *JTS* 37 (1986), pp. 3–34, esp. pp. 6–20.
- 19 For a different reconstruction of motive, my closing remarks in "Judaism ...", pp. 563f.
- 20 The fundamental study of Augustine's teaching on Jews remains Bernhard Blumenkranz, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins* (Paris: Etudes augustiniennes 1973, orig. ed. Basel 1946); also, by the same author, "Augustin et les juifs. Augustin et le judaïsme," *Recherches augustiniennes* 1 (1958), pp. 225–41. For a reconsideration of Augustine's teaching on Judaism, seen from the perspective of his battles against the Manichees, see my essay "Divine Justice and Human Freedom: Augustine on Jews and Judaism, 392–398," *Juden und Judentum in der Sicht der christlichen Denker im Mittelalter*, ed. Jeremy Cohen (Wolfenbuettel, forthcoming 1995).
- 21 This argument, without the psalm as prooftext, appears in *C. Faustum*, e.g., 12.23; 13.10; 16.21. Augustine explicitly forbids religious coercion against Jews in 12.13.
- 22 On hardness of heart, Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho* 18, 21, 22, 27, and frequently; on confusing the literal with the spiritual meaning, 12, 18, and frequently. Not realizing that the God who acted in the Old Testament was not the High God, the Father, but "another God," the pre-incarnate Son, the Jews failed to grasp the entire meaning of their scriptures (56–62; 126–27)—"rather, not yours, but ours" (29). Tertullian reproduces much of Justin's argument in Book III of his *adversus Marcionem*.
- 23 *C. Faust.* 12.3.–4; Rom. 9:4.
- 24 *C. Faust.* 12.9, the position alluded to in the quotation above from the *Summa*.