Revelations of Lesser Gods:
The Heresy of Christian Anti-Judaism and the Logic of a Demiurge for Nostalgic Israel

By

Glen Jody Fairen

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

RELIGIOUS STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

© GLEN JODY FAIREN, 2015

Abstract

In the rush to (correctly) reclassify early "Christianity" as "Jewish," scholars have made a few dubious assumptions. On one hand, while vigorously defending the "Jewishness" of some "Christianities" such as those found in the New Testament, scholars are just as quick to assume others "Christianities," such as Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John*, were not, nor ever could have been "Jewish," despite similarities to figures like Paul or texts such as *John* or *Matthew*. Indeed, considering the rhetorical vitriol surrounding the scholarly claims of what was "Jewish" and the lack of evidence that either Marcion or the *Apocryphon of John* held to any animosity towards "Judaisms" it appears that the relative "pro-" and "anti-Jewishness" of a given discourse is a cipher for more modern issues and concerns.

Therefore, by first looking at how Marcion was represented in antiquity, and later reconstructed by scholars such as von Harnack, it will be argued that this early Christian "heretic" was not "anti-Jewish," (however this is problematically defined) but, because of the vague similarities between his understanding of Jesus and the "Aryan Christ," Marcion has easily been marginalized by modern scholars as the "heretical" forerunner of the Christian antisemitism.

Next, by examining how the *Apocryphon of John* supposedly misappropriates "Judaisms" and as such can not be properly "Jewish," (as opposed to Paul or *John*) it will be argued that this is not as a reflection of the ideological options available to ancient Jews, but is simply a convenient method of rebranding what used to be "heretical," as that which is now "anti-Jewish."

And finally—after taking into account that ancient "Judaisms" were hardly stable, self-evident or monothetic—it will be shown that, when both Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John*

are divorced from the “pro-” or “anti-Jewish” rhetoric of scholars, and then (re)considered in parity with other contemporary “Jews” and “pro-Jewish Christians,” that they were not “antisemitic heretics,” but were simply two possible ways in which the authority of “Nostalgic Israel” was preserved in antiquity for those who identified in someway with its mythic narrative and claims.

Dedication.

This thesis is dedicated to the memories of my mother Noreen Tweedle (1939-2014) and my father Tim Miller (1946-2014).

Acknowledgments.

With a project this size, and one that has gone on for so long, it is almost impossible to thank everyone who in some way helped me with its completion.

First and foremost I would like to thank my Supervisor Dr. Willi Braun who never doubted and who has helped me in more ways than he could possibly know. Thank you.

I would also like to thank Dr. Andrew Gow. While not able to serve on the committee, has nonetheless been such a support for me during my time as a student and lecturer at the University of Alberta.

I would also like to thank Janey Kennedy and Barb Heagle in O.I.S. As always, above and beyond what their jobs require and without their support and guidance I would have never made it this far.

To my committee members I wish to give my thanks: Dr William Arnal (for the 3rd time!!), Dr. James Crossley and Dr Lorne Zelych. Their insights helped make this work the best it could be.

I would also like to give a shout out to my friends and colleagues at the University of Alberta. Dr. Clayton Bench, Pat Hart and Mark Wheller. I can't wait to hang out together at a conference and wave our doctorates at folks and pretend we know what we are talking about. And while not part of the department at the University of Alberta, I would like to thank my dear friends Larry Gasper and Jenn Babbs. I'm sure both would have fun at the doctoral waving and pointing out that we are indeed pretending.

I would like to thank Melinda Noyes, not just for her help in editing, but for being there when I needed her. Much love.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the University of Alberta for their generous financial support during my doctoral program.

INTRODUCTION: The More Things Change 1

SECTION ONE: Marcion-Ancient Representations, Modern Inventions

Chapter 1: The Making of a Heretic. 14

1.1.1: Introduction 14

1.1.2: Whose "Historic" Marcion? Arnal, Lieu and Lincoln 17

1.1.3: The Sources: Marcion's Life and Thoughts 26

1.1.4: Representing Marcion's Christianity 40

1.1.5: The Myth of Marcion in Antiquity 49

Chapter 2: Marcion(s) in Modernity 52

1.2.1: Introduction 52

1.2.2: Harnack 53

1.2.3: Harnack's Myth of Marcion 58

1.2.4: Harnack's Marcion and anti-Judaism 62

1.2.5: The Other Marcion(s) of the Early 20th Century: Bauer, Knox and Blackman 68

1.2.6: Marcion(s) of the Present 74

1.2.7: Jesus the Jew, Marcion the Antisemite 81

1.2.8: Constructing a Pedigree 87

1.2.9: Hitler Made Me Do It! The academic *doxa* of Marcion's anti-Judaism 102

Chapter 3 Apples and Dragons: Q, Marcion and the (De) Contextualization

of Divine Wisdom 108

1.3.1: Introduction 108

1.3.2: Q as Method 111

1.3.3: Where to Begin? The Problems in a (Re)construction of the *Euangelion* 116

1.3.4: Q and the *Euangelion* Jesus and Wisdom's (De) Contextualization 128

SECTION TWO: John's Not So Secret Revelation

Chapter 1: Christian....but Not Jewish Enough 140

2.1.1:Introduction 140

2.1.2: Jewish...but NOT THAT Jewish: Exceptions in the "Ways That Never Parted." 145

2.1.3: The Jewish Matthew 152

2.1.4: The Jewish John 159

2.1.5: The Jewish Apocalypse of John 163

2.1.6: The Jewish Paul(s) 168

2.1.7: The Jewish Q 177

2.1.8: The Exceptions that Make the Rule 183

Chapter 2:The Weirdo at the Table: the Apocryphon of John and constructing "Christianity." 191

2.2.1: Introduction 191

2.2.2: Qualities of Anti-Jewishness:Construction of Sophia and Divine Wisdom 200

2.2.3: Qualities of Anti-Jewishness: Genesis 1-3 204

2.2.4: Origins of Anti-Jewishness: Spiting the Divine and an Ignorant Creator 212

2.2.5: If Not Jewish Enough...Then What? 217

Chapter 3. A Demiurgical Bastard and the Oxymoron of Jewish Gnosticism 230

2.3.1: Introduction 230

2.3.2: The Apocalypse of Adam and Jewish Gnosticism 238

SECTION THREE: Cipher Judaism(s) and a Game of Nostalgic Israel

Introduction: The Problem as it Stands 244

Chapter 1: Look at all the Judaisms! 256

3.1.1: Introduction 256

3.1.2: Problemitizing Judaism(s) 260

3.1.3: Monotheism? 272

Chapter 2: Steve Mason, the *ethnoi* of the Judaens and the Case of the Vanishing Jews 280

3.2.1: Introduction: Steve Mason 280

3.2.2: Not Saying You Hate Judaism, But... 291

Chapter 3: A Game of Nostalgic Israel and the Rectification of the Demiurge 313

3.3.1: A Matter of Perspective 313

3.3.2: A "Pro-Jewish" Marcion? 314

3.3.3: A Jewish Apocryphon of John? 317

3.3.4: Redescribing 322

3.3.5: Donald Who? 328

3.3.6: Lets Play Nostalgic Israel 334

3.3.7: Its All Just a Game 346

3.3.8: Marcion, the *Apocryphon of John* and Salvaging Nostalgic Israel 347

CONCLUSION: Naming, Classifying and Taxonomy 355

BIBLIOGRAPHY 365

Introduction

The More Things Change...

One of the central issues within scholarship on emergent Christianities over the last few decades has been a re-evaluation of Christianity's relationship to Judaism. For, while in the past scholars insisted on a definitive and early break between what eventually became "Christian" from what was understood to be "Jewish"[1] by the end of the first century C.E., over the last few decades there has been a critical rectification of this "Parting of the Ways" model to one more accurately described as the "Ways that Never Parted" (Becker & Reed 2007). It is now standard for scholars to claim that many of the so-called earliest "Christian" innovations of what has been traditionally constructed as "Judaism" were not a breaking away or the invention of a new religion, but should more properly be understood as "Jewish" and / or in continuity with, and examples of, the variety of Judaisms of the period (Sanders 1983, 1985; Gager 2000; Becker & Reed 2007).[2]

---

[1] Please note that the terms "Judaism", "Judaisms", "Jewish", "Jew" etc., when used throughout this project, are not intended to imply a monothetic tradition or "religion" in antiquity. Indeed, considering the whole point of this project is to challenge the assumption of the existence of such a creature, and its use by scholars of early "Christianity" (another problematic classification) the use of the term(s) will parallel those of the scholars who insist on the existence of that "particular beast, Judaism in the Greco-Roman Age". (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 5. See also Arnal 2005, 58; Crossley 2008, 173-193 and Sanders (1993) for a list of the stereotypes used for the invention of Judaism.)

[2] For instance, while past scholarship saw Paul's juxtaposition between Gospel and Law or the *Gospel of John*'s deification of Jesus as creative / demiurgical logos as a definitive "Christian" break with "Judaism," in more recent scholarship they have been (correctly) reconfigured as simply examples of the multiplicity of options available to Jews in the ancient Greco-Roman world. See below for more details on both Paul and the *Gospel of John.*

And rightly so. For not only does this model offer a critical rectification of the largely theological debates on what were the "Jewish" sources that influenced "Christianity" (with the implied subtext of purity and pedigree) it also provides a much more accurate picture of the porous and constructed boundaries of what eventual coalesced into the variety of Christianities and Judaisms of the ancient world (Boyarin 2004).

This scholarly insistence on the Jewishness of earliest Christianities, however, has not been wholly divorced from theological and / or problematic subtexts. While much effort has gone into insisting that many Christian expressions (such as those found in the New Testament) are "Jewish," there has been a comparable level of insistence[3] that other (particularly non-canonical) Christianities must in turn represent a definitive break from, or be antithetical to, the same Judaisms of the period. This is particularity clear with recent scholarly reconstructions of those "Christianities" that use as part of their interests a Demiurgical or Archonic figure. While these groups were previously constructed in scholarship as *a priori* "heretical," they are now understood to be *a priori* un-

[3] I stress *insistence* over *effort* because, when it comes to these "other" Christianities, most scholarly reconstructions either a) ignore the intellectual significance of texts like *the Apocryphon of John* and thinkers like Marcion or b) cast them as less than or insignificant in relation to their canonical counterparts. Indeed, if any effort is made to place these groups within the context of what is anachronistically called "Christianity" of the 2nd century C.E., the discussion generally devolves into how these groups deviate from proper "Jewish" or "Christian" understandings (see n. 4 and King 2006, 241; Smith II 2004; Logan 1996, xviii; Williams 1996). Intentionally or not this prioritizes the theological choices of a small group in the 4th century C.E. as representing the historical reality of the 2nd century C.E.

Jewish, anti-Jewish or even anti-Semitic depending on the hyperbole required. This insistence is so much a part of the "goes without saying" in scholarly discourse, that this stance is rarely challenged, instead being rationalized as either Gentile propaganda aimed at the Jews or, if conceived by Jews themselves, then the product of those who must have split from some imagined "normative" Judaism.[4]

The critical question, however, is why? Why are these discourses perceived as fundamentally and self-evidently un-Jewish? Beyond a few vague generalities that claim these formulations "strike at the core of Jewish piety" (King 2006, 241; see also Jonas 1967; Pearson 1990; Williams 1999; C. Smith II 2004), scholars have not given concrete or objective rationales for why this self-evidently *must* constitute an anti-Jewish stance.

And herein lies the problem. While these assumptions are at times an attempt to keep a few theological eggs in their traditional baskets, what is more problematic is that because of the "goes without saying" nature of what these Christianities *must* represent, scholarship on these objects has been seriously

---

[4] As a prime example, Birger Pearson states "[w]e have seen, in [demiurgical texts] how biblical and other Jewish texts and traditions have been radically reinterpreted in the service of a high gnosis which denigrates the Creator and his world and overthrows the centrality of the Law. The "building blocks" of this new gnosis, as expressed in literature, are Jewish; yet the interpretation can be seen to be "anti-Jewish" in the extreme, if by "Judaism" we mean devotion to the Creator, his Law and his people. . .[Therefore, the authors of demiurgical texts] in reinterpreting their Jewish religious traditions. . .burst the bonds of Judaism and created a new religion. We are thus presented with the anomaly of Jews who finally intended to be 'no longer Jews.'" (Pearson 1986, 34-35)

limited by the assumptions employed. In other words, because of the scholarly imperative to place "authentic" (i.e., canonical) Christianities within the spectrum of recognizable Judaisms, those that used Demiurgical or Archonic figures in their cosmologies can only be considered in historical reconstructions if they are first safely quarantined as representing the "heresy" of Christian Anti-Judaism. So while scholars have largely abandoned the classification of "orthodox" / "heresy" that used to frame the discussion of what was to be classed as "Gnostic" texts, there has been simply a rebranding of the same tired old binary, but with the new and improved classification of "pro-" / "anti-Jewish."

For instance, according to Justin Martyr, Marcion of Sinope "teach[es] men to deny that God [of the Hebrew Bible] is the maker of all things in heaven and earth, and that the Christ predicted by the prophets is His Son, and preaches another god besides the Creator of all, and likewise another son" (1 Apol. 58).[5] According to Justin, it seemed that Marcion disagreed with other Christians by claiming that Jesus could not have acted as the fulfillment of "Jewish" messianic claims and as such should have no connection with the mythic pedigree of

[5] While the convention is that "abbreviations for the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament, New Testament, Apocrypha, and Septuagint titles *do not* require a period and *are not* italicized" (Alexander, Kutsko, Ernest & Decker-Lucke 1999, 73 emphasis original), this is not the case with many non-canonical counterparts; either in title (i.e., compare [Gospel of]John with *Gospel of Thomas*) or abbreviation (John with *Gos. Thom.*). This—intentionally or not—parses off some texts in antiquity over and above other equally significant texts based on what appears to be modern theological preference. Therefore, since one of the arguments of the following is that *theological* preference should have no bearing on *historical* reconstructions, this project will italicize the titles of *all* ancient texts and while the conventional abbreviations will be employed none will be rendered in italics.

"Nostalgic Israel."[6] Even though Marcion appears to have understood this "history" as an accurate and literal account of the Creator who would fulfill his "apocalyptic" promise and send a "military" messiah to his chosen people, for him it was simply not appropriate for Christian legitimating claims because Jesus and his revelation was a *new thing,* one unprecedented in history as it represented a new "alien" god who was unknown to the Demiurgical creator, his people, and his revelation. It is because of this rejection of the "Christian" legitimizing claims via the Hebrew scriptural tradition, that Tertullian essentially accused Marcion of being a "Judaizer;" one who "borrow[ed] poison from the Jew—the asp, as the adage runs, from the viper" (Marc. 3.8:1).

Nonetheless, within the scholarly climate of the "Way that Never Parted," because of the distinction that Marcion drew between the Creator (and his revelation / scripture) and the previously unknown father of Jesus, he has served as the arch-example of the scholarly conceptual paradigm that links Demiurgical speculation and an anti-Jewish stance. The problem, however, is that this paradigm is more a function of modern scholarly anxieties than a reflection of the data of ancient history. By following the work of William Arnal, who has shown

---

[6] In an attempt to avoid the "pro-" or "anti-Jewish" implications that the term "Judaism" carries with it in regards to Demiurgical and Archonic innovations and in recognition of claiming any kind of "Judaism" in antiquity—normative or otherwise—this project will instead look at how each group constructs, affiliates itself within (or against) and reinterprets the huge variety of mythic, historical and ideological *bricolage* that represents a "Nostalgic Israel" (as opposed to a Nostalgic Rome, Egypt or Greece. See Section 3.1).

that the debate about the "Jewishness" of Jesus encodes a rectification of older scholarly models which granted a "pseudo-scientific legitimacy" to the anti-Semitic rhetoric of the last century and as such appears to be an attempt at salvaging "true" Christianity from the perverse history of European anti-Semitism (Arnal 2005, 1-20; see also Crossley 2008), the case will be made that similar anxieties are dictating the assumptions that Marcion's Christianity with its supposed purging of Jewish elements within texts (such as Paul and *Luke*) and Demiurgical speculation, was anti-Jewish. To put it simply, it seems that as Jesus and the first Christians become more and more "Jewish," Marcion is being forced to serve the opposite rhetorical function, becoming not just "anti-Jewish" but a "proto-Nazi."

With these kinds of ideological tones in mind, it should come as no surprise that we find a similar phenomenon with other Demiurgical cosmologies and the "goes without saying" assumption of their anti-Jewishness. For instance, *the Apocryphon of John* has been marginalized in scholarly reconstructions not because of its lack of intellectual significance, but on the (uncontested and as yet unproven) assumption that it is anti-Jewish. But unlike Marcion, *the Apocryphon of John*'s supposed anti-Jewishness is not based on its rejection or "purging" of "Jewish" influence, but because of its overly allegorical (mis)appropriation of what scholars imagine was some species of "normative" Judaism.

Through a revelation given by the resurrected Jesus, *the Apocryphon of John* reinterprets and expands on the creation account of *Genesis* (1-3) to include a hidden, invisible realm populated by a plethora of divine and semi-divine agents, including a disobedient Divine Wisdom. But what has been most problematic for scholars is that *the Apocryphon of John* also constructs the God of the Hebrew Bible not as the supreme deity of the Cosmos but as an ignorant, corrupted demiurge who "is impious in his Madness...For he said, 'I am God and no other god exists except me,' since he is ignorant of the place from which his strength had come" (ApocJohn 12: 11-13). It is this kind of demotion of YHWH that scholars have interpreted as "[ridiculing] the most cherished beliefs of the Jews [and as presenting] evidence of some kind of real [anti-Jewish] animosity" (King 2006, 241; Logan 1996, xviii; Jonas 1965, 287).

Of course, this kind of assumption—unconvincingly argued yet rarely contested in scholarship—carries serious problems. For instance if, as the "Ways that Never Parted" model has shown, there was no single way to be Jewish in antiquity, and if one takes into account the special pleading that scholars employ to stress the "Jewishness" of other texts which not only reconfigure "Jewish" sources but at times cast "Jews" as narrative antagonists as nonetheless in

continuity with Judaism or minimally anti-/un-Jewish[7] (Brown 1979; Marshall 2001; Gager 2000) then the conclusion must be drawn that not only are the scholarly comparisons that accuse *the Apocryphon of John* with anti-Jewish animosity based on dubious definitions of what constituted Jewishness in antiquity, but also that these definitions are rooted in identifiable ideologies of modern scholarship rather than in the data of history.

In other words, much as Marcion's rejection of supposed "Jewish" tropes as inappropriate for Christian claims constructs a very static demarcation of "Judaism," so too does the scholarly insistence on the anti-Jewish character of *the Apocryphon of John* imply a very similar type of normative Judaism that is being vilified. Indeed, it seems that between these two very different renderings of "anti-Jewish" Christianities, scholars can and have constructed (or reaffirmed) an imagined species of "normative" Judaism. And while claiming a "normative" Judaism in antiquity is problematic enough, what is even more at issue is that this construct is not a reflection of the ideological options available to and / or promoted by Jews in antiquity, but rather a static scholarly shorthand used in parsing off some Christianities from their demiurgical counterparts.

---

[7] For example, the *Gospel of John*'s depictions of *hoi Ioudaioi* cast them as enemies of Jesus and his followers, ranging from simply being ignorant of the "true" meaning of the Law (5:45-47) to the children of the devil (8:44). Yet in scholarship *the Gospel of John* is nonetheless a "Jewish" text.

To put it bluntly, given our evidence for the multiplicity of *Judaisms* in antiquity, the *Judaism* that these sources were apparently "for" or "against" is simply a Christian-centric maneuver that, like older supersessionalist models, "has served a double (or a duplicitous) function. . .[providing] apologetic scholars with insulation for early Christianity. . . [and also being] presented by the very same scholars as an object to be transcended by early Christianity" (J.Z. Smith 1990, 83).[8] It is perhaps the greatest irony that, despite scholars' good intentions in reclaiming the "Jewishness" of Christianity as a corrective to the racist and supersessionalist models of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they have re-inscribed the same kind of rhetoric of the past by constructing a static, "normative" Judaism that is not a reflection of the variety of ways one could have identified with being Jewish in antiquity, but rather a way of quarantining demiurgical Christianities from their non-demiurgical counterparts.

The question, then, is why? Why would some scholars, who have been explicit in their stated agendas to refute the old supersessionalist scholarship of the past (J. Sanders 1993; Fredrickson & Reinhartz 2002; Becker & Reed 2007; etc.) essentially be (re)constructing models of what was "Jewish" that are remarkably similar to the one they are trying to refute? What is the investment in

---

[8] This sentiment has been nuanced further by Crossley who makes the convincing case that while key markers for Christianity are to be seen as coming from a Jewish context, they nonetheless must be "Jewish...but Not *That* Jewish" (Crossley 2008, 173).

insisting on an implicitly "static Judaism"—one that sits between the "literalness" of Marcion and the overly "allegorical" nature of *the Apocryphon of John*—when this not only ignores the available data (Mason 2007; Lightstone 2006 [1984]; Boyarin 2004), but also is awkwardly used, on one hand, to prove the "Jewishness" of some "Christianities" (as found in the New Testament) and, on the other hand, used as a cipher to claim that very similar and analogous Christianities (such as those in the Nag Hammadi) are anti-Jewish?[9] Indeed, when one considers the lack of rationalization as to why texts like *the Apocryphon of John* are non- or anti-Jewish when texts like *the Gospel of John* are in continuity with "Judaism" and how Marcion has been cast as the progenitor and prototype of Christian anti-Judaism (up to awkwardly-drawn affiliations with the Nazis) one has to ask what is at stake for scholars who make these kinds of claims?

The answer, it appears, is not some latent ideological hold-over from old supersessionalistic and anti-Semitic models, or simply about the agenda behind the "Ways that Never Parted;" in regard to Demiurgical speculations like Marcion and *the Apocryphon of John*, this insistence on a "normative" and essentially static form of Judaism is intimately tied with constructions of what is (properly) Christian. Indeed, it seems that this imagined "normative" Judaism and its

---

[9] Along with Arnal, 2005 see Crossley 2008, 173-193)

relationship to some types of Christianity is not simply a method of rectifying the racism of the past, but is also entwined with that *other* rhetorical boogeyman of Christian origins scholarship namely so-called "Gnosticism" and its antithetical relationship to Judaism. As Birger Pearson clearly illustrates:

> Given the massive Jewish influence discoverable in Gnostic texts, how does one interpret the Gnostics' attitude vis-à-vis their roots? It is obviously not enough to speak of "Jewish Gnosticism" for once the Gnostic hermeneutical shift has occurred one can no longer recognize the resultant point of view as "Jewish". One finds, instead, an essentially non-Jewish, indeed anti-Jewish, attitude, and one must interpret this attitude on its own terms as a radically new hermeneutical program, giving birth to a radically new religious movement. . . .The Gnostic attitude to Judaism, in short, is one of alienation and revolt, and though the Gnostic hermeneutic can be characterized in general as a revolutionary attitude vis-à-vis established traditions, the attitude exemplified in Gnostic texts, taken together with the massive utilization of Jewish traditions, can in my view only be interpreted historically as expressive of a movement of Jews away from their own traditions as part of a process of religious self-redefinition. The Gnostics, at least in the earliest stages of the history of the Gnostic movement, were people who can aptly be designated as "no longer Jews" (Pearson 1990, 125,130. See also Williams 1996, 218).

The tension between what is "Gnostic" and what is "Jewish" is clear, particularly when one considers that, despite the active scholarly deconstruction of the category "Gnosticism" (Williams 1996; King 2003; Fairen 2008), Demiurgical and Archonic cosmologies are still the essential "sick sign" of the "Gnostic heresy" (Williams 1996, 4) and as such *must* be diametrically opposed to Judaism. As Karen L. King writes, "If the origin of Gnosticism is to be found in

Judaism, what kind of Judaism could this have been? How could Jews have produced a religion in which the creator God of Genesis was portrayed as a weak, arrogant, malicious and inferior deity?" (King 2003, 181) The answer to this question, given the way the argument has been framed and the assumptions of what must be "Jewish", "Christian" and "Gnostic," must *a priori* be no Judaism at all. The problem is that the "goes without saying" that underlies this assumption *needs* to be spoken about. At its very core this assumption is utterly flawed and indebted to the tired old theological boundaries that are needed to construct "Gnosticism" (and its bastard Demiurgical children) as heretical and outside the bounds of what is essentially the "orthodoxy" of the "Jewish-friendly" New Testament. In other words, even though the discursive boundary of Gnosticism constructed by scholars, for all intents and purposes, has been torn down along the scholarly frontier, it seems that (at least in the case of Demiurgical and Archonic cosmologies) a new discursive fence is simply being erected in its place. While the names of the principals have changed from "orthodox" and "heresy" to "pro-" and "anti-Jewish," what they demarcate and why, has not changed.

Sadly it seems, the more things change, the more they remain the same. However, in an attempt to offer a corrective to these issues, this project sets out to:

- Deconstruct how scholars have used both Marcion and *the Apocryphon of John* as negative exemplars of these kinds of "heretical" Christianities—constructing them as everything from Gnosticism's last gasp (Williams 1996), as anti-Jewish rhetoric (King 2006) or as pathological theology (Moll 2010)—and as such attempt to bring to light some of the (implied and explicit) scholarly agendas and methodological problems that have dominated and limited scholarship.
- Offer a critical rectification of how these cosmologies have been reconstructed by avoiding interpreting these discourses as heretical deviations or anti-Jewish polemic and instead construct them as examples of various groups attempting to salvage the "mythic" authority of Nostalgic Israel for their self-construction in light of the Greco-Roman political and religious context of the 2nd century.
- Propose a fresh taxonomy in which to examine Demiurgical and Archonic discourses that avoids the rhetorically pregnant and anachronistic terms "orthodoxy", "heresy" and "Gnosticism" but also the equally (if less obviously) problematic "Christianity" and "Judaism" which have dominated and limited the discourse thus far.

SECTION ONE

Marcion: Ancient Representations, Modern Invention

Chapter 1

The Making of a Heretic

1.1.1: Introduction

According to Richard Dawkins:

> The God of the Old Testament is arguably the most unpleasant character in all fiction: jealous and proud of it; a petty, unjust, unforgiving control-freak; a vindictive, bloodthirsty ethnic cleanser; a misogynistic, homophobic, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, filicidal, pestilential, megalomaniacal, sadomasochistic, capriciously malevolent bully (Dawkins 31, 2006).

Richard Dawkins has been accused of many things.[10] But he has not in any serious manner been accused of being anti-Jewish. And—by virtue of his

---

[10] While one can be sympathetic to his conclusions—especially those in *The God Delusion*—Dawkins' critique and analysis of "religion" is at best superficial and pedantic. Dawkins seems utterly ignorant of the scholarly debate around what constitutes "religion" in the first place, basing his claims simply on some literalistic strains of Christianity, Judaism and Islam. For Dawkins, "religion" amounts to nothing more than "belief in a old man in the sky" (Dawkins 2006, 58)—hence why he can recycle the hoary old 19th century argument that "Buddhism" is not a religion but a "philosophy" (Dawkins 2006, 59; Masuzawa 2005, 121-71). Indeed, for Dawkins "religion" is such an easily identifiable and bounded object that he insists that if it could be removed from Northern Ireland, then the conflict there would cease (See also Lincoln 2005, 15). Nonetheless, lack of scholarly savvy has not of course diminished Dawkins' self-righteous diatribes (for instance see http://www.huffingtonpost.com/scott-stephens/can-a-religious-believer-be-a-serious-journalist-richard-dawkins-and-the-unbearable-smugness-of-tweeting_b_3141971.html). And while he has been accused of Islamaphobia (http://www.theguardian.com/science/2013/aug/08/richard-dawkins-twitter-row-muslims-cambridge) the same racists vitriol has not been leveled against "Jews" nor can it be assumed to have been leveled by virtue of this statement alone (as opposed to how Marcion has been represented). The closest Dawkins has come to being accused of being "anti-Jewish" was in a 2007 article in *The Guardian* where he states: "When you think about how fantastically successful the Jewish lobby has been, though, in fact, they are less numerous I am told - religious Jews anyway - than atheists and [yet they] more or less monopolize American foreign policy as far as many people can see. So if atheists could achieve a small fraction of that influence, the world would be a better place." http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2007/oct/01/internationaleducationnews.religion

statement above—nor should he be. Taken at its most basic level, Dawkins is simply making an evaluation of the character traits of the Creator deity, YHWH, as he is portrayed in the Hebrew Bible. One-sided and biased yes. But inaccurate? No. Indeed, it would be fundamentally foolish to assume Dawkins held antagonism towards the "Jews" based on his summary statement alone. So at first blush it is perhaps surprising then, that the second century Christian, Marcion of Pontus, who we are told made very similar claims about YHWH, has—unlike Dawkins—been constantly assumed by large swaths of modern scholarship not only to be essentially anti-Jewish and / or anti-Judaic, but at times tangentially linked with or posed as a precursor of the antisemitism of the Nazis (Bergen 1996, 143; Heschel 2008, 26).[11] As Stephen Wilson states that "Marcion's anti-Judaism

[11] Anti-Jewish , anti-Judaism and antisemitic should not be understood as terms that are interchangeable. In the case of Marcion they are not only deployed to refer to different "hatreds" but seem to be used as an indication of degree, depending on the hyperbole needed by the scholar. Also, please note that instead of the conventional "anti-Semite" and its associated terms, I follow the lead of James G. Crossley who in turn follows Richard Evans who does not hyphenate the term. According to Evans the term anti-Semite "is itself an antisemitic formulation; there was, and is, no such thing as 'Semitism,' except in the mind of antisemites" (Evans 2000, 334, n. 7).

is considered to be so obvious and so extreme that it scarcely warrants analysis"[12] (Wilson 1986, 45).

But the fundamental question that needs to be asked is why is this the case? And why has this not warranted analysis? Considering that none of our ancient literature makes the claim that Marcion was anti-Jewish or antagonistic towards Judaism, why is it that when we encounter Marcion in modern scholarly literature, there is a general and *a priori* assumption that this was in fact the case? What is it about Marcion that makes him anti-Jewish, when a figure like Dawkins is not?

Or perhaps a better way of asking this would be, what is it about Marcion's version of Christianity as it is represented by his ancient opponents, that seems to provoke modern scholars to make such a claim?

1.1.2 Whose "Historic" Marcion? Arnal, Lieu and Lincoln

Despite being one of the power chords of Christian Origins scholarship, the

---

[12] Two examples that span the spectrum of the "obviousness" of this assumption regarding Marcion and Judaism. First and most bluntly, Bart Ehrman makes the unqualified and unfounded claim that "[Marcion] hated the Jews and everything Jewish" (Ehrman 2003, 111). What is surprising here is not so much that Ehrman makes such a claim, but that it remains essentially unchallenged, particularly by far more nuanced scholars than Ehrman. For instance, Karen King has claimed that Marcion was engaged in anti-Jewish polemics (2003, 188) and Judith Lieu who, while not accusing Marcion of anti-Jewish intentions, nonetheless awkwardly claims that Marcion was "not unintentionally anti-Jewish" (1996, 267). But what is perhaps most telling regarding the "obviousness" of the assumption of Marcion's stance towards Judaism is the work of Joseph P. Tyson. While on one hand Tyson resists the knee-jerk assumption that Marcion was antagonistic towards the Jews, he nonetheless hedges his bets by arguing that, while Marcion *might* have been anti-Jewish, he was no more or less so than his "orthodox" opponents (Tyson 2006, 207-208). One notable exception to this trend is Sebastian Moll who correctly points out that "we lack any evidence that Marcion had any negative feelings about the Jews in general." (Moll 2010, 60)

claim that Marcion was antagonistic towards "Jews" is highly problematic for a number of reasons. But for our purposes, there are two issues that trump the others. First, despite dubious claims to the contrary,[13] there are simply no first-hand texts available that were produced by Marcion himself, let alone any that spell out what he supposedly believed or thought about any group or idea including "the Jews" or "Judaism." Therefore, making the claim that he "hated the Jews and everything Jewish" (Ehrman 2003, 111) is at best short-sighted and sloppy.

Second, all of our evidence for what Marcion said, did or thought is unfortunately mediated through second hand (and generally late) heresoligical accounts. And these accounts are hardly interested in a detailed and unbiased account of Marcion. For example, Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* begins by depicting Marcion's home of Pontus as a place where:

> [O]nly the fiercest nations inhabit it, if indeed it can be called habitation, when life is passed in wagons . . . their life has no germ

---

[13] Sebastian Moll has claimed that there is evidence of a letter written by Marcion himself and preserved by Tertullian (Adv. Marc. I.16). Apparently addressed to his "companions in misery and hatred" this "Letter" supposedly details Marcion's conversion experience from orthodoxy to his own "heresy" and his obsession with *Unde Malum* (Moll 2010, 115-118). However, Moll's insistence on the authorship of this Letter seems less about any compelling or collaborating evidence from antiquity but his own agenda in casting Marcion as within "a situation in which the terms 'heresy' and 'orthodoxy' apply" (Moll 2010, 2 n.6). For Moll's model to succeed, Marcion must have at one point been a member of the supposed "Orthodox" Church in Rome, then subsequently ejected from it (Moll 2010, 46). It should be noted that the closest to any scholarly consensus regarding anything actually written by Marcion is found in *An Exposition of the Gospel* by the fourth-century Syrian writer, Ephrem. "O Wonder Beyond Wonders / Rapture, Power, and Amazement is it / That one can say nothing at all / [About the Gospel] / Nor even conceive of it / Nor even compare it to anything" (Tyson 2006, 144 n. 43)

> of civilisation; they indulge their libidinous desires without restraint, and for the most part naked . . . The dead bodies of their parents they cut up with their sheep, and devour at their feasts . . . Their women are not by their sex softened to modesty. They uncover the breast, from which they suspend their battle-axes, and prefer warfare to marriage. In their climate, too, there is the same rude nature. The day-time is never clear, the sun never cheerful; the sky is uniformly cloudy; the whole year is wintry; the only wind that blows is the angry North. Waters melt only by fires; their rivers flow not by reason of the ice; their mountains are covered with heaps of snow. All things are torpid, all stiff with cold... Nothing, however, in Pontus is so barbarous and sad as the fact that Marcion was born there more uncouth than a Scythian, more unsettled than a Wagon-dweller, more uncivilized than a Massagete, with more effrontery than an Amazon, darker than fog, colder than winter, more brittle than ice, more treacherous than the Danube, more precipitous than Caucasus. (Marc. I.1,1).[14]

Beyond assuming that ancient Pontus was in fact as hostile and "uncivilised" as Tertullian claims, this truly incredible bit of name-calling serves as a prime example of how our "primary" sources have no interest in discussing "Marcion the theologian," "Marcion the Christian," or even "Marcion the human," but only

---

[14] Euxinus, natura negatur, nomine illuditur. Ceterum hospitalem Pontum nec de situ aestimes; ita ab humanioribus fretis nostris quasi quodam barbariae suae pudore secessit. Gentes ferocissimae inhabitant; si tamen habitatur in plaustro. Sedes incerta, vita cruda, libido promiscua et plurimum nuda, etiam cum abscondunt, suspensis de iugo pharetris indicibus, ne temere qui intercedat. Ita nec armis suis erubescunt. Parentum cadavera cum pecudibus caesa convivio convorant. Qui non ita decesserint ut escatiles fuerint, maledicta mors est. Nec feminae sexu mitigantur secundum pudorem; ubera excludunt, pensum securibus faciunt, malunt militare quam nubere. Duritia de caelo quoque. Dies nunquam patens, sol nunquam libens, unus aër nebula, totus annus hibernum, omne quod flaverit aquilo est. Liquores ignibus redeunt, amnes glacie negantur,montes pruina exaggerantur. Omnia torpent, omnia rigent; nihil illic nisi feritas calet, illa scilicet quae fabulas scenis dedit de sacrificiis Taurorum et amoribus Colchorum et crucibus Caucasorum.

in establishing his mythic status: Marcion as the "Arch-heretic" or "the first born of Satan" [15] (Mart. Pol. 22:2; Ign. Phld 7:3). However,

> limited as we are by the lack of unbiased sources dealing with Marcion, we must focus on the ways in which his theology and practice were perceived by his opponents. Having said this, it is yet significant that we are able to form an impression of Marcion's theology [from the heresiological accounts] that is remarkably coherent. (Tyson 2006, 31)[16]

Therefore, considering the rather standard and consistent rending of Marcion by his primary detractors, some scholars have assumed that beyond the rhetorical

---

[15] While Marcion seems to have taken the brunt of ancient Christian name calling, this was a standard heresiological practice. "The polemicists use a wide variety of additional strategies drawn from their cultural milieu and modified to suit their own purposes. These included *ad hominem* attacks, accusing their opponents of such moral and malignities as arrogance, pride, jealousy and impiety, and sexual immorality—that is the usual abuses of the educated polemic. Another strategy was simply nominalist: they called their opponents "heretics" while reserving for the themselves the name of true believer (true disciple, true Christian, and so on). The term heresy does not necessarily need to be present for us to recognize this tactic; the polemicists could characterize heretics as such simply claiming that their beliefs and practices were deficient. In this way the polemicists' discourse produced heresy as the deficient and defective other in contrast to true Christianity. These characterizations took on a variety of forms, such as distinguishing the righteous from he unrighteous; the enlightened from the blind; the pure from the defiled; dry canals from channels that pass on true teaching, and so on. According to the discourse, true Christians are said to rely on God the creator; heretics, to reject God as creator and therefore to be godless. True Christians know they are saved through the grace of God by faith in Jesus Christ (*pistis*); the Saviour (*gnosis*). True Christians rely on Scriptures as guides to faith and appropriate moral behaviour; heretics pervert them for devious purposes and are incapable of truly moral behaviour. True Christians are humble before God; heretics are arrogant. And so on. Whether heresy was represented as the absence of some positive element like piety or faith, or the presence of some theological error or moral deficiency, the point was the same: heretics lacked the truth and hence fell into error, immorality and division." (King 2003, 30)

[16] For a more detailed account of the similarities and differences regarding Marcion's theology and biography as represented by the heresiological sources, see below.

flourishes these constructions of Marcion are essentially reliable.[17]

Of course, this may be more about wish fulfillment than recognition of the accuracy of the various accounts. One has only to superficially think about the agenda of the heresiologists'[18] and hyperbole employed to make their cases, to realize that taking these accounts at any kind of "face value" will be riddled with

---

[17] While the case of Marcion has forced scholars to give the heresiological accounts more leeway than other "heresies" in which we have primary evidence (Moll 2010, 11-24) there nonetheless seems to be a need or desire to give the heresologists the benefit of the doubt in some streams of more traditional or conservative scholarship. For example, according to Alistair Logan "we should be more prepared to accept the evidence of the heresiologists, particularly Irenaeus and Epiphanius, about the existence of Gnostic communities (1) where they appear to have first-hand information either from texts or personal knowledge . . . and (2) *where they have no personal axe to grind and are primarily concerned to describe rather than refute* (more true of Irenaeus)" (Logan 2006, 29, emphasis mine). This claim, however, must be understood as naïve at best, especially when one considers that in the preface to *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus openly bares his axe and whetstone: "Insomuch as certain men have *set the truth aside, and bring in lying words* and vain genealogies, 'which, as the apostle says minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith', and by means of their craftily constructed plausibilities draw away the minds of the inexperienced and take them captive, [I have felt constrained, my dear friend, to compose the following treatise in order to expose and counteract their machinations.] These men *falsify the oracles of God, and prove themselves evil interpreters of the good word of revelation*." (Haer Pref. 1, emphasis mine) Irenaeus' discourse is not a non-biased or objective project, despite Logan's desires to the contrary, but "amounts to a string of caricatures that not only tend to be vague and somewhat indefinable themselves but are in the first place of questionable validity as characterization of the constructed category of sources usually called 'Gnostic'" (Williams 1999, 4; see also Murphy, 2000, 398; Fairen 2008, 69-92)

[18] For example, according to Sebastian Moll the fact that Marcion went "to Rome at some point in his life is one of the few elements of his biography which can be considered certain, as it is attested by virtually all the Church Fathers" (Moll 2010, 7; see also 43-46). What is interesting is that the one "Church Father" that does not make this claim is Justin Martyr, the one who actually lived in Rome and is understood to be a contemporary of Marcion. One would think that if this is to be "considered certain" then Justin would have mentioned it. Of course for Moll, the "fact" that Marcion must have gone to Rome is tied to his insistence that he was "ejected" from the "Church". It is a linch pin to his whole argument that he was the first "arch Heretic". "Marcion deserves, in a double sense, the title *arch-heretic*...because he is the first Christian ever to be actually outside the Church for doctrinal reasons...[and] his biography [is] of a man who is familiar with orthodox doctrine and then deliberately chooses to deviate from it [becoming] a stereotype for future heresiologists." (Moll 2010, 46). While Moll's work is littered with issues, circular reasoning and methodological naiveté (such as the "theory" of Individual-Reflective Faith" and that Marcion abandoned "Orthodoxy" [27-28]) it seems, for Moll, in critiquing Harnack's assumption that Marcion was a proto-Lutheran and protestant forerunner, he has not so-subtly smuggled in his own agenda of resurrecting a Marcion who can act as the Catholic boogyman. *Gloria in Excelsis Deo* indeed (Moll 2010, Preface).

problems. As been noted in regard to Harnack's "historical" reconstruction of Marcion (May 1987/88, 129-151)—but equally applicable to others—scholarly assertions of "historical" accuracy can be a convenient way to smuggle in agendas with a veneer of historical accuracy. Given the evidence, this seems especially true regarding any of the "historical" figures of ancient Christianity, not the least of all Marcion.

So what are we to do? Perhaps we should take the lessons learned from scholarly attempts to find other "historical" figures of early Christianity, particularly Jesus. For example, according to William Arnal the so-called historical Jesus

> keeps transforming into a theological entity in front of our very eyes [because] the main sources on which we base our reconstructions present him in a theological entity in the first place. Whether Jesus himself existed as a historical figure or not, the gospels that tell of him are unquestionably mythic texts.[19]. . .In seeking the real, historical person behind these narratives, we are using these texts as sources for a figure that they themselves show no interest in at all. Just as the myths and legends about Herakles are simply not about a historical person, so also the gospels are not about the historical Jesus (Arnal 2005, 75-76).

---

[19] "*The Gospel of Mark*, for example, is a narrative that includes a cast of characters comprising, intra alia, God, a son of God, angels, the devil, demons, holy spirits, evil spirits, and what seem to be the ghosts of Moses and Elijah. It is a story that features miraculous healing and exorcism, as well as walking on water, feeding thousands of people with a handful of loaves and fishes (twice!), face-to-face conversations between people who lived centuries apart, spooky prognostications, trees withering at Jesus' command, a sun darkening in the middle of the day, and a temple curtain miraculously tearing itself in half." (Arnal 2005, 75-76)

This is why reconstructions of a "historical" Jesus have been so problematic from the first "Quest" (Schweitzer, 1954) in the 19th century until it was eventually deemed a "failure" in the 21st (Mack 2001, 25-40). Not only do our sources represent contradictory and multiple Jesuses[20] but as Arnal notes, they simply have no interest in a historical person.[21] Therefore, so-called "historic" constructions have been more about scholarly and theological preferences than about finding the real figure behind the texts.[22] The need for a so-called Historical Jesus seems more about the modern desire for "historic" origin than any attempt to clarify antiquity (Arnal 2005, 39-70).

These same issues need to be considered with regard to the constructions / representations of Marcion that come to us via the sources we have, even if they were produced for the opposite intent. Unlike the New Testament's portrayal of Jesus that cast him as the defining or central feature of the various Christianities

---

[20] Not only do our surviving mythic sources for Jesus cast him in decidedly biased fashion, there is also a multiplicity of "Christs" in both canonical and non-canonical sources, that not only contradict each other (for example, compare *John* 12:27 with *Mark* 14:32-35) but can not be seen as having any kind of objective historical providence: the salvific Christ (Rom. 6:1-14), the wisdom teacher of *Thomas* (Thom. 1), the "gnostic" revealer of both the *Gospel* (9:35-40) and *the Apocryphon, of John* (1:1-2:25), the cosmic ruler of *Revelation* (1:5) the Messianic Son of Man in *Mark* (2:10) the "Rabbi" of *Matthew* (5:17-20) and the noble philosopher of *Luke* who conducts symposia (5:17) and dies—like Socrates—a noble death (22:66-23:43).

[21] Indeed the earliest sources we have for the figure of Jesus are from the Pauline letters which detail encounters with the post-resurrected Christ; hardly the hallmark of historical accuracy.

[22] "The Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the kinds of God, who founded the kingdom of heaven upon earth, and died to give his works its final consecration, never existed. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism and clothed by modern theology in a historical garb." (Schweitzer 1954, 396)

in which he is embedded, the heresiological accounts were interested in vilifying and casting figures like Marcion outside the bounds of proper Christianity.[23]

So where does that leave us in regards to Marcion and what if anything can be said about him? And more to the question at hand, how can this help us address his supposed anti-Judaism? Perhaps the way between the horns of this dilemma is to not ask if Marcion "hated the Jews" or not, but to look at how he is represented in these sources, and how "Judaism" and "the Jews" [24] were constructed within this overall conceptual horizon. To help account for this, a page will be taken from Judith M. Lieu[25] and her notion of "image and reality." According to Lieu, when looking at the how Christians constructed Jews in the writings of the second century, what is required is a

> [r]ecognition both of the stereotyping and of evidence of real contact, even in the same author, [which] means we must speak about 'image and reality' in some form of interaction. When this literature speaks of Jews and Judaism there is a contemporary reality, one of which, in differing degrees, its authors are aware. Yet their own needs, the logic of their own argument, and the tradition they draw upon...help create and mould the terms in

---

[23] "They reasoned that the heretics were not *in reality* Christians; they just falsely *called* themselves by the name of Christians, despite the fact that their beliefs and practices were contrary to the precepts of Christ." (King 2003, 24) Interestingly enough, while we have multiple Jesuses in the multiple representation, we have a very singular Marcion in the multiple sources we have for him.

[24] The issue of how to define "Judaism" and / or how one defines "the Jews" will be addressed in Section 3, Chapter 1.

[25] It should be noted that a similar incorporation of "image and reality" can be found in Judith Lieu's book "Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century" (2015). This title, however had not been released before the submission of this dissertation.

> which they speak—to create an 'image'. Neither can we see these two components in simply opposition...while they draw on and maintain such earlier traditions, they also create new ones through the 'image' they project, which in turn becomes part of the 'reality' for the next generation. Although the image they create can assume an independent existence, helping constitute the symbolic universe of later generations, it's starts life within the particular piece of literature. We, then, have to begin by superseding historical judgement and by tracing how the Jew(s) or Judaism function within the overall strategy of each document concerned. (Lieu 1996, 12-13)

It is this kind of symbolic universe we need to consider in relation to Marcion and the sources we have of him, to get a better understanding of how he was represented in antiquity.

For example, while there might be a "reality" of Marcion found within the heresiological texts, it is a reality that has been finessed into the heresiological "image" of which Marcion needs to be the "negative other" for the heresiological project at hand.

Taking the rhetorical nature of heresiological project regarding Marcion seriously and as fundamental to how he is rendered helps us not only account for the consistency of the representations available to us without assuming historical accuracy, but also avoids the problems of attempting to winnow the historic wheat

from the rhetorical chaff to get to the real person.[26] Instead this lets us recognize that for all of our sources, the "image" and "reality" are hopelessly entwined and mutually reinforce each other to create a new reality "through the image they project" (Lieu 1996, 12)[27] into what Bruce Lincoln calls the authoritative "myth" of what Marcion represents for the construction in question.[28] In other words, much as the Jews have a specific purpose in the "Christian" texts in which they appear and may be based in part on their "reality," it is the "image" that is most central (Lieu 1996, 11-13) and what we have access to. This is what we need to

---

[26] For example, assuming that Marcion was influenced by demons is clearly a rhetorical move on the part of the heresiologists to quarantine Marcion from "proper" Christianity. But could not elements of his "mythic" biography that are less supernaturally inspired be equally mythic? For example, Marcion's journey to Rome. While this is certainly more plausible than demonic influence, could it not be equally rhetorical? As noted, this "fact," while assumed by scholars to be accurate (Moll 2010, 7; see also 43-46) carries with it an equally rhetorically pregnant function as demonic possession. It casts Marcion as deviant; at one time a member of the "Orthodox" Church in Rome where he could be excommunicated as a "heretic" and "the first born of Satan" (Mart. Pol. 22:2; Ign. Phld 7:3). We should be cautious in assuming a narrative element whose "proof" of accuracy is simply its plausibility to modern sensibilities without considering its rhetorical implication.

[27] "[W]e do not have the means to to examine the 'image and reality' of Judaism in [Marcion's] thought. We can only deal with the polemicists' 'image' of Marcion's portrayal of and relationship with Judaism, and reach back through that to try to catch some glimpse of his own account" (Lieu 1996, 262).

[28] According the Lincoln, "In my view we would do better to classify narratives not by their content but by the claims that are made by their narrators and the way in which those claims are received by their audience(s). Thus, some narratives make no truth-claims at all, but rather present themselves and are accepted as fictions pure and simple: These I propose to call Fable. Others, in differing styles and degrees, purport to offer accurate accounts of past events. But of the stories that make such truth claims, only some have sufficient persuasive power to gain general acceptance, and others—those that, in the opinion of their primary audience, lack creditability—I shall classify as Legend [and] those that do have credibility, History....Beyond this, there is a further category, and that a crucial one: Myth—by which I designate that small class of stories that possess both credibility and and authority." (Lincoln 1989, 24) In other words, it is not the "truth" or "historical reality" of Marcion that is important but the combination of the "Image and Reality" (Lieu 1996; see also Haynes 1995) that creates the creditable and authoritative "myth" (Lincoln 1989) of Marcion that is required by the heresiologists that is in turn presented to modern scholars.

consider and take seriously in regards to Marcion.[29] We are not looking at what the historical Marcion though about the Jews or anything else for that matter. That insight is lost to us. What we are looking for is how the "mythic" Marcion was represented by the sources we have available and what that may say about the construction of Judaism.

1.1.3 The Sources: Marcion's Life and Thoughts

According to Adolf von Harnack, "Für eine Biography Marcion's fehlen die Unterlagen. Ob aus dem, was uns von seinem Wirken erhalten ist, Schlüsse auf seine Entwicklung gezogen werden können, muß die Untersuchung zeigen." (Harnack 1924, 1)

With Harnack in mind, there are of course numerous sources for Marcion from antiquity that have been mined by scholars. Some, like Epiphanius of

---

[29] "This means that we need to start over with the quest for Christian Origins. And the place to start is the observation that the New Testament texts are not only inadequate for a Jesus quest, they are data for an entirely different phenomenon. They are not the mistaken and embellished memories of the historical person, but the myths of origin imagined by early Christians seriously engaged in their social experiments. They are the data for early Christian mythmaking." (Mack 2001, 40; see also Arnal 2005, 75-76) So in much the same way and for the similar reasons that Burton Mack has made the case that the quest for the Historical Jesus has failed (2003, 25-40) we will disagree with Harnack and others who have attempted to reconstruct a biography for the "historical" Marcion. Not only does the mythic nature of the sources negate this, this project is simply not interested in finding the "real" Marcion. The "real" Marcion had no impact on history. It is the "Mythic" Marcion of the heresiological (and modern scholarly) imagination that has impacted the history of early Christianity. This "Historic" Marcion hoopla is more about what the constructor wants him to be, such as the proto-Luther of Harnack, the Anti-catholic theologian of Moll (2010, 132) or even the Jew-Hater of Erhman. In other words, it is more about what the biographer wants from Marcion; what rhetorical function he serves and what kinds of conceptual tasks he is required to do than his actual "historical" footprint.

Salamis, are generations after the assumed dates for Marcion.[30] And of course all are second hand.[31] But three sources in particular—Justin Martyr's (110-165 CE) *Apologia I*, Irenaeus' (120-202 CE) *Adversus Haereses* and Tertullian's (160-225 CE) *Adversus Marcionem*—have been the most commonly used by modern scholars in their constructions. And while each is of course invested in creating their own "image" of Marcion as a function of the heresiological "myth," all have two interesting features they share. First—despite the discrepancies in length, time from which they were produced, and the details they provide—because they are based on constructing Marcion as a paradigm of the "heretic" or the "proximate other" (Smith 2004, 245-46) who is outside the bounds or "proper" Christianity,[32] their renderings are remarkably similar. And of course this is unsurprising. But what *is* surprising and which is most salient for the topic at hand is that at no point do these three[33] sources claim or imply that Marcion was antagonistic towards the Jews or towards Judaism.

---

[30] The spectrum of dates proposed for Marcion have ranged between 117 CE to 150 CE (Tyson 2006, 24-48).

[31] *pace* Moll (2010, 115-118).

[32] For example, in relation to the "heresy" of the Gnostics, Karen King writes "Gnosticism has been constructed largely as the heretical other in relation to diverse and fluctuating understandings of orthodox Christianity. This means that modern historical constructions of Gnosticism reflect many of the characteristics and strategies used by early Christian polemics like Irenaeus and Tertullian to construct heresy . . . Indeed, it is largely apologetic concerns to defend normative Christianity that make Gnosticism intelligible as a category at all." (King 2003, 2–3)

[33] Or any ancient source for that matter.

For example, our earliest source that names Marcion is the brief—and perhaps contemporary[34]—account found in Justin Martyr's *Apologia I*. According to Justin Martyr, within a list[35] of "some men who have said that they are themselves gods and yet were not persecuted by you[36] but are deemed worthy of honours" (1 Apol.26.1) there is

> Marcion, of Pontus who is even till this day alive, and teaching his disciples to believe in some other god greater than the Creator. And he, with the assistance of the devils, has caused many of every nation to speak blasphemies and to deny that [the] God [of the Hebrew Bible] is the maker of this universe and to assert that some other being, greater than He, has done greater works. All who follow the opinions of these men, are, as we before said, called Christians; just as also those who do not agree with the philosophers in their doctrines, yet have in common with them the name of philosophers given to them. And whether they perpetrate those fabulous and shameful deeds — the upsetting of the lamp, and promiscuous intercourse, and eating human flesh— we do not know; but we do know that they are neither persecuted nor put to death by you, at least on account of their opinions. But I have a

---

[34] See Grant 1993 and Green 2010 for a description of the "Christian" climate of Rome in the first few centuries C.E.

[35] This appears not to be a genealogy of heretics (as per Irenaeus) but a list of Christians who are "heretical" according to Justin Martyr yet are not persecuted by the Roman authority

[36] The "you" of Justin Martyr's *Apologia I* is "[t]o the Emperor Titis Aelius Adrianus Antionius Pius Augusts Caesar and to his son Verissimus the Philosopher, and to Lucius the Philosopher, the natural son of Cæsar, and the adopted son of Pius, a lover of learning, and to the sacred Senate, with the whole People of the Romans, I, Justin, the son of Priscus and grandson of Bacchius, natives of Flavia Neapolis in Palestine, present this address and petition in behalf of those of all nations who are unjustly hated and wantonly abused, myself being one of them." (1 Apol.1*)*

> treatise against all the heresies that have existed already composed, which, if you wish to read it, I will give you. (1 Apol. 26)[37]

Now beyond the cannibalistic innuendo and potential for sexual shenanigans, the main thrust of the above is that, even though Marcion causes "blasphemies and to deny that God is the maker of this universe and to assert that some other being, greater than He, has done greater works" he is nonetheless understood to be a Christian; just one that Justin fundamentally disagrees with. As stated by Justin, as with different philosophical schools such as the Cynics and Platonists, while disagreeing with each other, there is an understanding (at least from an "outsider") that they are nonetheless still all philosophers. But beyond the standard heresiological cliches that are designed to cast Marcion outside the realm of proper Christianity, what Justin Martyr actually claims about Marcion's life is limited to three points.

1) Marcion was from Pontus.

2) He was alive during the time of Justin's writing.

---

[37] Μαρκίωνα δέ τινα Ποντικόν, ὅς καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἐστι διδάσκων τοὺς πειθομένους, ἄλλου τινὰ νομίζειν μείζονα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ θεόν· ὅς κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων συλλήψεωζ πολλοὺς πέπεικε βλασφημίαζ λέυειν καὶ ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦδε τοῦ παητὸς θεόν, ἄλλον δέ τινα, ὡς ὄντα μείζονα, τὰ μείζονα παρὰ τοῦτον ὁρμώμενοι, ὡς ἔφημεν, Χπιστοανοὶ καλοῦνται, ὅν τρόπον καί οἱ οὐ κοινωνοῦντες τῶν αὐτῶν δογάτων ἐν τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τὸ ἐπικατηγορούμενον ὄνομα τῆς φιλοσοφίας κοινὸν ἔχουσιν. εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ δύσφημα ἐκεῖνα μυθολογούμενα ἔργα πράττουσι, λθχνίας νὲν ἀνατροπὴν καὶ τὰς ἀνέδην μίξεις καὶ ἀνθρωπείων σαρκῶν βοράς, οὐ γινώσκομεν· ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι μὴ διώκονται μηδὲ φονεύονται ὑφ ὑμῶν, κἂν διὰ τὰ δόγματα, ἐπιστάμεθα. ἔστι δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶν γεγενηένων αἱρέσεων σοντεταγμένον, ᾧεἰ βούλεσθε ἐντυχεῖν, δώσομεν.

3) Marcion and his followers—despite all the issues noted by Justin and his emic perspective—are understood to be "Christians."

Of course, for Justin Martyr the biographical details of Marcion are not of primary concern. His representation of Marcion is interested in creating the "myth" of Marcion's heresy. This is later reiterated when Justin claims that

> as we said before, the devils put forward Marcion of Pontus, who is even now teaching men to deny that God is the maker of all things in heaven and on earth, and that the Christ predicted by the prophets is His Son, and preaches another god besides the Creator of all, and likewise another son.[38] And this man many have believed, as if he alone knew the truth, and laugh at us, though they have no proof of what they say, but are carried away irrationally as lambs by a wolf, and become the prey of atheistical doctrines, and of devils. For they who are called devils attempt nothing else than to seduce men from God who made them, and from Christ His first-begotten; and those who are unable to raise themselves above the earth they have riveted, and do now rivet, to things earthly, and to the works of their own hands; but those who devote themselves to the contemplation of divine things, they secretly throw back; and if they have not a wise sober-mindedness, and a pure and passionless life, they drive them into godlessness. (1 Apol. 58)

Here we get to the heart of matter: the theological points claimed by Marcion that are at odds with Justin Martyr's (and later heresiologists') renderings.

1) There two gods: the Creator God and one greater than the Creator.

2) This second god has done greater things than the Creator.

---

[38] Καὶ Μαρκίωνα δὲ τὸν ἀπὸ Πόντου, ὡς προέφημεν, προεβάλλοντο οὸ φαῦλοι δαίμονες, ὃς ἀρνεῖσθαι μὲν τὸν ποιητὴν τῶν οὐπανίων καὶ γνίνων ἁπάντων θεὸν καὶ τὸν προκηρυχθέντα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν Χπιστὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ νῦν διδάσκει, ἄλλου δέ τινα καταγγέλλει παρὰ τὸν δημιουργὸν τὸν πάντων θεὸν κα`ὁμοίως ἕτερον υἱοώ·

3) The Christ predicted by the prophets of Ancient Israel has not come—presumably this Christ is not identified as Jesus—and that there is another Son / Messiah.

And while there does seem to be some confusion on Justin Martyr's part regarding Marcion's cosmology it is important to note that at no point is the claim made or even implied that Marcion is "anti-Jewish" or that he has any antagonism towards Judaism either explicitly or in what can be inferred from Justin Martyr's representation.

The next major source for Marcion that has been commonly used by scholars comes a few decades after Justin Martyr, and is *Adversus Haereses*[39] by Irenaeus of Lyons. While a much longer text overall than that of Justin Martyr and one in which the explicit purpose is to "refute all heresies," Irenaeus' representation of Marcion is oddly similar to that of Justin Martyr adding clarification and details but not deviating from the general template for how Marcion is represented.

For instance, according to Irenaeus, Marcion did not get his system from devils as per Justin Martyr, but inherited it from

[39] It should be noted that *Adversus Haereses*, while written in Greek, is predominately preserved in Latin (with occasional Greek fragments). Therefore, both will be included when available.

> Credo [who] was one who took his system from the followers of Simon [Magus of Samaria]...Marcion of Pontus succeeded him, and developed [Credo's] doctrine. (Haer. 1.27.1)[40]

In a well established heresiological formula, Irenaeus places Marcion within the line of heresy that goes back to the first mythic Christian heretic, Simon Magus (King 2003, 23). And while this might be a little more credible pedigree than the demons,[41] like Justin Martyr this attempt at establishing a link with the first heretic is clearly a way of quarantining Marcion *a priori*.

As noted, Irenaeus, like Justin Martyr, also has Marcion originating from Pontus, but adds that he had relocated to Rome (Haer. I.27.1; III, 4,3) where he had his famous confrontation with Polycarp (Haer. III.3.3). However, it is Irenaeus' representation of Marcion's theology that is the bulk of his discussion and the bulk of his worry. Like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus has to grapple with the idea that Marcion was recognized as a Christian but one that

> advanced the most daring blasphemy against Him who is proclaimed as God by the law and the prophets declaring Him to be

---

[40] Et Credon autem quidam ab his qui sunt erga Simonem, occasionem accipiens, cum uenisset Romam sub Hygino, qui nonum locum episcopatus per successionem ab apostolis habuit, docuit eum qui a lege et prophetis annuntiatus sit Deus non esse Patrem Domini nostri Christ Iesu.

<Καὶ> Κέρδων δέ τις ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Σίμωνα τὰς ἀφορμὰς λαξὼν καὶ ἐπιδημήσας ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ὑγίνου ἔνατον κλῆρον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχοντος, ἐδίδαξεν τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν κεκηρυγμένον Θεὸν μὴ εἶναι Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·

[41] Irenaeus goes on to claim "Although they do not confess the name of their master, in order all the more to seduce others, yet they do teach his doctrines. They set forth, indeed, the name of Christ Jesus as a sort of lure, but in various ways they introduce the impieties of Simon; and thus they destroy multitudes, wickedly disseminating their own doctrines by the use of a good name, and, through means of its sweetness and beauty, extending to their hearers the bitter and malignant poison of the serpent, the great author of apostasy?" (Haer. I.27.4)

> the author of evils, to take delight in war, to be infirm of purpose, and even to be contrary to Himself. But Jesus being derived from that father who is above the God that made the world, and coming into Judaea in the times of Pontius Pilate the governor, who was the procurator of Tiberius Caesar, was manifested in the form of a man to those who were in Judaea, abolishing the prophets and the law, and all the works of that God who made the world, whom also he calls Cosmocrator. (Haer. I. 27.2)[42]

According to Irenaeus, it seems that this abolishing of the works of the Cosmocrator had far reaching consequences that impacted not only current believers but also figures in the mythic past of ancient Israel.

> Salvation will be the attainment only of those souls which had learned his doctrine; while the body, as having been taken from the earth, is incapable of sharing in salvation. In addition to his blasphemy against God Himself, he advanced this also, truly speaking as with the mouth of the devil, and saying all things in direct opposition to the truth, that Cain, and those like him, and the Sodomites, and the Egyptians, and others like them, and, in truth, all the nations who walked in all sorts of abomination, were saved by the Lord, on His descending into Hades, and on their running unto Him, and that they welcomed Him into their kingdom. But the serpent which was in Marcion declared that Abel, and Enoch, and Noah, and those other righteous men who sprang from the patriarch Abraham, with all the prophets, and those who were pleasing to God, did not partake in salvation. For since these men, he says, knew that their God was constantly tempting them, so now they suspected that He was tempting them, and did not run to

---

[42] Succedens autem ei Marcion Ponticus, adampliauit doctrinam, impudorate blasphemans eum qui a lege et prophetis adnuntiatus est Deus, malorum factorem et bellorum concupiscentem, et inconstantem quoque sententia et contrarium sibi ipsum dicens. Iesum autem ab eo Patre, qui est super mundi fabricatorem Deum, uenientem in Iudaeam temporibus Pontii Pilati praesidis, qui fuit procurator Tiberii Caesaris, in hominis forma manifestatum his qui in Iudaea erant, dissoluentem prophetas et legem et omina opera eius Die qui mundum fecit, quem Cosmocratorem dicit.

> Jesus, or believe His announcement: and for this reason he declared that their souls remained in Hades.[43] (Haer. 1.27.3)

This was not simply a version of the "Christian" fulfilment of "Jewish" prophecy as is the standard supersessionalist claim. Compared to writers like Irenaeus and Justin Martyr, Marcion represents an inversion. The supposed mythic forerunners of Christianity— "those other righteous men who sprang from the patriarch Abraham"—appropriated by the heresiologists were in fact, according to Marcion's representation, deluded by the Creator and tricked into following a corrupted god. It is only the nominal villains of these narratives—the "heretics" such as Cain, the Sodomites and the Egyptians—who were not blinded by the "truth."

While offering more detailed and clearer account of Marcion's ditheism than that of Justin Martyr, providing a kind of rationalisation of Marcion's stance[44] and spelling out the consequences of it, the basic gist of Marcion's

---

[43] Salutem autem solum animarum esse futuram earum quae eius doctrinam didicissent, corpus autem, uidelicet quoniam a terra sit sumptum, impossibile esse participare salutem. Super blasphemiam autem quae est in Deum adjecit et hoc, uere diaboli os accipiens, et omnia contraria dicens ueritati : Cain enim et eos qui sunt similes ei et Sodomitas et Aegyptios et similes eis et omnes omnino gentes quae in omni permixtione malignitatis ambulaverunt saluatas esse a Domino, cum descendissent ad inferos et adcucurrissent ei, et in suum adsumpsisse regnum; Abel autem et Enoch et Noe et reliquis iustos et eos qui sunt erga Abraham patriarchas, cum omnibus prophetis et his qui placuerunt Deo, non participasse salutem, qui Marcione fuit serpens praeconaucit. Quonian enim sciebant, inquit, Deum suum semper tenptantem eos, et tunc temptare eum suspicati, non adcucurrerunt Iesu neque crediderunt annuntiationi eius : et propterea remansisse animas ipsorum apud inferos dixit.

[44] According to Irenaeus Marcion "declar[ed God] to be the author of evil, to take delight in war, to be infirm of purpose, and even to be contrary to Himself." (Haer. I.27.2) As such when Jesus descended to Hades, many of the "righteous" did not follow him

cosmology is nonetheless represented much the same as in Justin Martyr's account. There are two gods; the Creator of the world, and a highest god. The Creator is identified as the God of the Hebrew Bible, the author of evil. The Highest God is distinct from the Creator, and is a god of love who had remained unknown until the sudden appearance of Jesus (Haer. III.12,12; III, 25, 3). According to Irenaeus, Marcion understood that these two deities and their revelations are completely unrelated. And for Irenaeus, this separation of Christianity from the mythic history of Israel is of course, highly problematic.

This is for Irenaeus[45] most clearly and problematically illustrated with Marcion's editorial work of the Pauline letters and the *Gospel of Luke*.

> Besides [Marcion's blasphemy], he mutilates the Gospel which is according to Luke, removing all that is written respecting the generation of the Lord, and setting aside a great deal of the teaching of the Lord, in which the Lord is recorded as most dearly confessing that the Maker of this universe is His Father. He likewise persuaded his disciples that he himself was more worthy of credit than are those apostles who have handed down the Gospel to us, furnishing them not with the Gospel, but merely a fragment of it. In like manner, too, he dismembered the Epistles of Paul, removing all that is said by the apostle regarding that God who made the world, to the effect that He is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and also those passages from the prophetical writings which

[45] And something that has been taken up by large swaths of modern scholarship. (See Section 1, Chapter 2)

> the apostle quotes, in order to teach us that they announced beforehand the coming of the Lord. (Haer. I.27.2)[46]

While this editorial work has been taken by modern scholars as an indication of Marcion's "anti-Judaism," this does not seem to be a concern or issue of Irenaeus. As was the case with Justin Martyr, it should be stressed that within Irenaeus' representation, there is no claim that Marcion was anti-Jewish or antagonistic to Judaism. Any concern Irenaeus had about Marcion's supposed separating "Christianity" from "Judaism" is not based on any anti-Jewish intent. Like Justin Martyr that was not an issue. The issue is the lack of genealogical link with the mythic history of Ancient Israel and the insistence on the novelty of Christianity on the part of Marcion, an issue that had been picked up by the critics of Christianity (Origen, *C Celsum* II, 1,4; V 25,33; see Somos, 2012) And while this kind of construct might have a specific resonance in modernity (see Chapter 2) the question needs to be asked: does this modern resonance have any bearing on the supposed "anti-Jewishness" of ancient thinkers like Marcion? Can these claims even be made about his representations?

---

[46] Er super haec, id quod est secundum Lucam Euangelium circumcidens et omnia quae sunt de generatione Domini conscripta auferens et de doctrina sermonum Domini multa auferens, in quibus manifestissime Conditorem huius uniuersitatis suum Patrem confitens Dominus conscriptus est, semetipusum ueraciorem esse quam sunt hi qui Euangelium tradiderunt apostoli, suasit discipulis suis, non Euangelium, sed particulam Euangelii tradens eis. Similiter autem et apostoli Pauli epistolas abscidit, auferens quaecunque manifeste dicta sunt ab Apostolo de eo Deo qui mundum fecit, quoniam hic Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi, et quaecunque ex propheticis memorans Apostolus docuit praenuntiantibus aduentum Domini.

The last of the major ancient representations of Marcion used by scholars is that of Tertullian. While some of Tertullian's more general works (such as *De praescriptione haereticorum*) have been mined for information on Marcion, it is his five volume *Adversus Marcionem* that has been used as *the* primary source for any scholar looking at Marcion (Wilson 1986, 45; Osborn 1997; Moll 2010, 11; 18-20). But even considering the detail and the length of Tertullian's work,[47] very little of substance is added to Marcion's biography from what is found in Justin Martyr or Irenaeus.

For example, like our previous sources, Tertullian understands that Marcion is from Pontus, and like Irenaeus he agrees that he came to Rome (Marc. I.1.2). However, according to Tertullian, Marcion also was a ship owner who donated a large sum of money to the Roman "Church" but after a theological debate, the money was returned and Marcion was excommunicated (De praescr 30.2).

Of course, very little within Marcion's life story as presented by Tertullian gives evidence that he was in anyway antagonistic towards the Jews. But again, like both Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Tertullian is not interested in a detailed analysis or recording of Marcion's biography beyond what could be used to prove his "heresy" (Lukas 2006). Like the other heresologists, his primary concern is

---

[47] *Adversus Marcionem* is longer than the collected New Testament.

constructing Marcion's theological position as being in heretical error. And while the sheer bulk of Tertullian's writing regarding Marcion far exceeds Irenaeus or Justin Martyr, we nonetheless have a surprisingly similar picture of Marcion's theology.

For example, like Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, Tertullian places Marcion in a line of *successio haereticorum*, going back to Credo (Marc. I.2.1). Tertullian also points out that Marcion, "while morbidly brooding over the question of the origin of evil" (Marc. I.2.1) constructed a ditheistic cosmology with the imperfect Creator God who is worshipped by the Jews (Marc. IV.33.4) and who is revealed through the "Scriptures" and Laws (Marc. II.12,1, II.18.1; III.1.6). In Tertullian's representation of Marcion, the highest God was unknown until the sudden revelation of the Docetic Jesus.[48]

Considering the above, it is unsurprising that Tertullian's Marcion claims Jesus is not the messiah as foretold by the Hebrew Prophets nor the one who will fulfill the Creator's prophecies. In this representation, Marcion's Jesus is a completely different entity, distinct from the Creator, his revelations and his Messiah who will at some future date fulfill the Hebrew prophecies. Jesus—like the god he represents—is utterly novel and unanticipated.

---

[48] "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, Jesus descended [out of heaven] into Capernaum, a city in Galilee, and was teaching [in the synagogue] on the Sabbath days." (Euan 3:1a / Marc. 4:7)

Finally, like Irenaeus, Tertullian claims editorial work on the part of Marcion. Indeed volumes 4-5 of *Adversus Marcionem* give an almost line by line critique of Marcion's gospel (assumed to be *Luke*) and his edition of Paul's letters.[49]

However, his editorial work is not represented by Tertullian as "anti-Jewish." On the contrary. While Marcion's editorial work seems to be in the service of denying any link between "Christianity / Jesus" and "Israel," Tertullian makes it clear that this is not about any "anti-Jewish" purging, but in the interest of maintaining a very "Jewish" reading as both Marcion and "the Jews" are (according to Tertullian) unwilling to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures as anticipating Christ (Marc III.6.2; III.7,1). Tertullian represents Marcion as taking the Hebrew texts at face value, a literal and accurate rendering of history. And as such, from Tertullian's perspective, this makes Marcion a "Judaizer" in all but name; one who "borrow[ed] poison from the Jew—the asp, as the adage runs,

---

[49] It is interesting to note that Tertullian seems to assume that Marcion's editorial work is intentionally incomplete, and is in effect trying to "trick" people that he in fact did not edit *Luke*. "Now Marcion was unwilling to expunge from his Gospel some statements which even made against him—I suspect, on purpose, to have it in his power from the passages which he did not suppress, when he could have done so, either to deny that he had expunged anything, or else to justify his suppressions, if he made any. But he spares only such passages as he can subvert quite as well by explaining them away as by expunging them from the text." (Marc. IV.43.7) However, as noted by Tyson (2006) and will be explored below is the possibility that this is a result not of Marcionites trickery but of a later Lukan addition to Marcion's Gospel. See Schmid 1995.

from the viper." (Marc. 3.8:1).[50] This is a far cry from the anti-Jewish sentiment claimed in modernity.

1.1.4: Representing Marcion's Christianity

As noted before, but is worth repeating.

> [L]limited as we are by the lack of unbiased sources dealing with Marcion, we must focus on the ways in which his theology and practise were perceived by his opponents. Having said this, it is yet significant that we are able to form an impression of Marcion's theology [from the heresiological accounts] that is remarkably coherent. (Tyson 2006, 31)

Whether this is a product of Marcion's "reality" or the "image" that has been invented regarding him, the "myth" of Marcion's version of Christianity is, according to the heresiological sources, remarkably coherent and fits into three broad but interlinked categories.

a) Marcion and Scripture

According to Joseph Tyson,

> Marcion apparently read Galatians 1-2 as fundamental to an understanding of Paul. He must have discovered here several keys that opened the doors to an understanding of the importance of other letters and their bearing on the history of earliest Christianity. (Tyson 2006, 37)

This claim had been made by Adolf von Harnack who maintained that

---

[50] Desinat nunc haereticus a Iudaeo, aspis quod aiunt a vipera, mutuari venenum, evomat iam hinc proprii ingenii virus, phantasma vindicans Christium.

> The point of departure for Marcion's criticism of the [Jewish] tradition can not be mistaken. It was provided in the Pauline contrast of law and gospel, on the one side malicious, petty, and cruel punitive correctness and on the other merciful love. (Harnack 1924, 21)[51]

Considering this juxtaposition, it really is no surprise that Marcion maintained that the Christian "Gospel" had no dependence on the Hebrew Scripture (Hoffmann 1984, 227-36). While this lack of connection to the pedigree of the salvation epic of ancient Israel was one of the main heresiological criticisms of Marcion's message (Haer 3.13:1), the lack of any mythical dependence on the Hebrew Scripture did solve the need for an interpretative framework or allegorical method to allow these "Jewish" texts to be appropriated for "Christian" purposes.[52]

While this lack of canonical status of the Hebrew Scriptures has lead to the conclusion that Marcion's understanding of Christianity was fundamentally anti-Jewish, it must be stressed that although representations of Marcion deploy the Hebrew Scriptures as ultimately irrelevant to Christianity in terms of its value

---

[51]It should be noted that Sebastian Moll has recently challenged the claim that Paul was the central interpretive filter for Marcion (2010, 70; 83-89).

[52] For example, see *Marc*. 3, 12:1-14:1 for the variety of ways in which Tertullian attempts to rationalise his version of Jesus with the "Military Christ" of the prophets, Justin Martyr's interpretation of the "Old Testament" as anticipating Christ (1 Apol 31:7-8 and Dial 29:2), the use of John the Baptist as a prophetic link with Jesus (Matt. 3:11; John 1:27; Luke 3:16) and the *Apocryphon of John*'s reinterpretation of *Genesis* (see Section 2, Chapter 2) to name just a few examples.

as a method for authenticating Christian claims, they nonetheless represent Marcion understanding them as an accurate rendering of history.

> In this sense it is a trustworthy Scripture, accurately describing the Creator-God, giving a truthful account of history. . .But Marcion was pointed in his criticism of this God. A Creator-God was no more acceptable to Marcion as to the Gnostics, although he was not interested in describing the creative activity in those terms. For him, neither the creation stories of Genesis nor the Torah as a whole was to be challenged on the grounds of their accuracy but rather in terms of the god portrayed in them (Tyson 2006, 33).

This has been echoed by Sebastian Moll.

> Marcion is a Biblicist. This designation is by no means to be understood as a commendation of his theology. That Marcion misunderstood the biblical messages goes without saying[53] but this is no argument against his biblicism...Marcion's literal understanding of the Old Testament or, put negatively, his strict rejection of its allegorical interpretation, has occupied scholars for a long time..." (Moll 2010, 78).

While there are certainly serious issues with Moll's reconstruction—such as uncritically and anachronistically assuming the bounded nature of the "Old" and "New" Testaments in the Second Century—he nonetheless makes the important insight that "*Marcion did not understand the Old Testament in light of the New, he interpreted the New Testament in light of the Old"* (Moll 2010, 106; emphasis

---

[53] Beyond being blinded by traditionalist and obvious theological bias, one must question how scholars could make the claim that Marcion "misunderstood" the message of the "Bible"—as if such a text existed in the Second century CE—any more so than a writer such as Justin Martyr (with the *Dialogue with Trypho*), Paul (*Galatians* vs. *Romans*) or any other "New Testament" author who required a very specific allegorical reading of the Hebrew Scriptures to authenticate and "prove" their claims correctly or incorrectly read a text.

original). While this is of course a common "Christian" understanding, because of Marcion's supposed anti-Judaism, it is easy to assume that his "purge" of all things "Jewish" meant the Hebrew Bible had no place at all in Marcion's conceptual horizon. Moll's insight however nicely points out that even though there seems to have been no "Old Testament" for Marcion's "New," the Hebrew Scriptural tradition would have still been part of Marcion's understanding of "history."

Nonetheless, because other Christians like Tertullian and Irenaeus used the Hebrew Scripture as part of their method of authentication, Marcion's "literalist" position posed a serious challenge to those who insisted on an underlying unity between the budding Christian scriptural canon and the Hebrew mythic and literary traditions (Tyson 2006, 48; Knox 1942, 1-18). If these Christians were to appropriate the Hebrew Scriptures as their own, then an allegorical interpretative framework was required: one that could not only be used to deploy the texts and salvation epic of ancient Israel as anticipating Jesus, but also as ultimately being fulfilled by Christianity.

> In short, given the church's apologetic interest (and out of apology that hierarchy emerges) in documenting its antiquity—a needed riposte to pagan attacks on the church as "nova, prava et immodica superstitio," the Old Testament was strategically more useful than it was theologically inconvenient. (Hoffmann 1987, 189. See also King 2003, 46; Mack 1988, 253-54)

For example, throughout his *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin Martyr clearly demarcates the difference between a "proper" allegorical reading of the Hebrew Scriptures as indicative of Christianity and a "literalistic" reading as indicative of the "error" of the Jews.

> For He has been gracious towards the Gentiles also; and our sacrifices He esteems more grateful than yours. What need, then, have I of circumcision, who have been witnessed to by God? What need have I of that other baptism, who have been baptised with the Holy Ghost? I think that while I mention this, I would persuade even those who are possessed of scanty intelligence. For these words have neither been prepared by me, nor embellished by the art of man; but David sung them, Isaiah preached them, Zechariah proclaimed them, and Moses wrote them. Are you acquainted with them, Trypho? They are contained in your Scriptures, or rather not yours, but ours. For we believe them; but you, though you read them, do not catch the spirit that is in them. (Dial. 29)[54]

According to Joseph Tyson;

> Justin is an early example of the emerging Christian tradition of denigrating literal interpretation of [Old Testament] texts. He identifies such interpretations as Jewish, and his method of interpretation does not produce an understanding of the underlying unity of the [Old and New Testaments]. He and other opponents of Marcion were thus compelled to find different ways to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures (Tyson 2005, 206).

Ironically, if one considers the modern charges of anti-Judaism that have been levelled, because Marcion is understood to have literally interpreted the Hebrew Scriptures and as such saw them as having no bearing on Christianity, authors like

---

[54] See also Dial. 9, 38, 67; Marc. 3, 5:2-3 and Haer 4, 34:1.

Tertullian not only cast Marcion as essentially a "Judaizer" (Marc. 1. 20:1; 2. 21:2; 3.5:4) but also, since the only "proper" interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures was of (Christian) allegory, literal interpretations became fundamentally linked with both Marcion *and* Judaism[55] (Tyson 2006, 33).

b) Marcion and the Messiahship of Jesus

While the traditional Christian interpretation of the difference between the Law and Gospel nonetheless maintained that the figure of Jesus was the Messiah predicted in the Hebrew Bible, it appears that Marcion concluded that Jesus had not been prefigured or predicted by the prophets, was not the fulfilment of Jewish messianic expectations, and as such had no connection of any kind to a Jewish heritage or genealogy.[56] So unlike other Christians, our representations of Marcion claim that he saw serious inconsistencies between the messianic prophesies of the Hebrew Scripture and the figure of Jesus. In Marcion's represenations, Jesus was distinct from the Creator's Christ who was still to come (Marc. 3.23:6), a Messiah who would re-gather the Jews from dispersion, re-establish Israel (Marc 4.6:3) and "with the recovery of their country; and after this

---

[55] See Marc. II. 21.2; III. 5. 4; III.12.1.

[56] "The most certain observation we can make about the Gospel of Marcion is that it lacks an account of Jesus' birth and infancy...There is no prediction of the birth of Jesus or John, nothing of his parents, nothing of the circumstances of the births, no circumcision or presentation in the temple, no infancy narratives, and nothing of the twelve-year-old Jesus in the temple. Lacking is...the narrative of Jesus' baptism by John, the temptation of Jesus, and the genealogies are all missing." (Tyson 2006, 43-44)

life's course is over, [facilitate the Jews'] repose in Hades in Abraham's bosom" (Marc 3.24:1). Marcion's second ["Jewish"] Christology is represented as historical. "The Christ of the Jews will be known as Emmanuel" (Marc 3.12:1; Isa 7:14)[57]; he will be a warrior (Marc 3.13:1), "born of a young woman" (Marc 3.13:5); he will take up the strength of Damascus and the spoils of Samara against the king of Assyrians (Isa 8:4; Marc 3.13:1). The Jewish Messiah by his very nature will be shown to be "the son and the spirit and the substance of the Creator" (Marc 3.6:8), but it is not prophesied in Scripture that he will suffer and die on a cross (Hoffmann 1984, 228).

It is these inconstancies that allowed Marcion's hypothetical "Gospel" to apparenlty dispense with elaborate genealogies—such as in *Luke*—that linked Jesus with a "Jewish" background.

> No genealogy connects him with Jewish ancestors or with parents of any kind. There is no anticipation [as per predicted in the Hebrew Scriptures] of his appearance; he is not subject to being baptised, and he undergoes no temptations. These omissions, if it is right to regard them as such, are consonant with what we know of Marcion's theology, which would separate Jesus as much as possible from the Creator God and his chosen people and would demonstrate the newness of his revelation . . . The lack of a birth and infancy account

---

[57] "And challenge us first, as is your [Marcion's] wont, to consider Isaiah's description of Christ, while you contend that in no point does it suit. For, to begin with, you say that Isaiah's Christ will have to be called Emmanuel; then, that He takes the riches of Damascus and the spoils of Samaria against the king of Assyria. But yet He who is come was neither born under such a name, nor ever engaged in any warlike enterprise." (Marc. 3.12:1. See also Haer. 3, 9:1-3; 4.34.1-4).

> stresses the uniqueness of Jesus, who appears in the world without human connections or local habitation (Tyson 2006, 44).[58]

According to the heresiological sources, because Marcion saw Jesus as "new," he felt that the Hebrew Scripture predicted a messiah distinct from Jesus—"the Creator's Christ who was still to come"[59] (Hoffmann 1984, 226) —who at a future time would orchestrate a restoration of the Jewish people to their homeland and establish a terrestrial kingdom of Israel (Hoffmann, 1984, 226-228).[60] It is this denial of Jesus as the Messiah of Jewish expectation that in antiquity lead the heresiologists to claim that Marcion was "advocating the cause of the Jews" (Haer. 4.34:4. Marc 2, 21:2; 3, 5:4: 3, 12:1)[61] but in modern times has prompted anxiety in modern scholarship that Marcion was "anti-Jewish." (See Section 2)

c) Marcion and YHWH

---

[58] It is precisely this lack of any precedent that, according to Harnack, prompted Marcion to prioritise Jesus and his new revelation. "Christ is all in all and hence also the founder and perfected of faith. Before him were only false prophets, and after him there is no need of any further revelation but only a restorative reformation" (Harnack 1924, 67).

[59] "So you cannot get out of this notion of yours a basis for your difference between the two Christs, as if the Jewish Christ were ordained by the Creator for the restoration of the people alone from its dispersion, whilst yours was appointed by the supremely good God for the liberation of the whole human race" (Marc. 3. 21:1).

[60] See also Marc. 3, 6:3; 3, 7:1; 3, 8:1-2: 3, 12:1.

[61] Hence, within the discursive parameters of the heresiologists, belief in Jesus as the fulfilment of Hebrew Scripture became the difference, par excellence between "Judaism" and "Christianity."

What seems to have been the ultimate result of Marcion's insistence of Jesus being utterly distinct and separate from "Jewish" pedigree was—at least to his opponents—most strikingly articulated via his ditheistic cosmology that differentiated between YHWH, who created the world and the Law, and the supreme and unknown Alien God (Hoffmann 1984, 206-09; May 1997).

> Our ancient sources agree that Marcion made a total separation between the religion that Jesus and Paul espoused and that of the Hebrew Scriptures. The God of Jesus was totally unknown before Jesus appeared. The God who ruled prior to 29 CE knew nothing of Jesus or of the second God. . .and Marcion was willing to date [this revelation] with precision—in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, emperor of Rome (Tyson 2006, 32).

Marcion is represented as not so much being interested in "distancing" his version of Christianity from that which was "Jewish" or "Judaisms" *per se*, but was rather interested in the inconsistencies he saw with the other Christians trying to rationalise Jesus' "God of Love" with the Jewish "God of Justice" (Löhr 2002 and 1996; Mühlenberg 1979). It seems that Marcion's ditheistic cosmology—or at least the hermeneutical problems solved by it and its attendant claims—encapsulated for the heresiologists the "heretical" quality of Marcion. And it is this notion of theological heresy that was taken up by modern (19th and early 20th centuries) scholars and influenced their reconstructions of Marcion.

1.1.5: The Myth of Marcion in Antiquity

If one looks at the various representations of Marcion as provided by the three heresiological accounts above, an interesting pattern appears. While the later accounts of Irenaeus and Tertullian seem to add more detail to their representations of Marcion, the farther they are chronologically from his dates, there nonetheless is a general agreement with Marcion's possible contemporary Justin Martyr in their basic claims. In other words, while there are differences in details and the amount of information given,[62] there are few contradictions between our sources. Instead we have a coherent picture with all three sources representing Marcion to a greater or lesser extent in a similar fashion.

But it is worth repeating, that in all three of our major sources, there is nothing in these representations of Marcion that strikes one as anti-Jewish or antagonistic to the Jews in any way. Of course the heresiologists are not worried if Marcion was anti-Jewish. His relationship to Judaism—however each defined the term—is not a concern; unless of course like in Tertullian, where Marcion is represented as being too much like "the Jews" in which that would be a critique. So looking for specific references of anti-Judaism within these sources is not likely to get results.

---

[62] For instance, while Tertullian insists that Marcion went to Rome, this is not a claim made by Justin Martyr.

But that being said, it seems that within the heresiological project—especially Tertullian but also in Justin Martyr—Marcion and the "Jews"[63] hold similar conceptual places and are conceptualized in similar ways, for similar purposes (Lieu 1996, 261-70). Both groups occupy the same conceptual horizon as "proximate others" to the heresiologists. As noted by Smith

> [W]hile difference or "otherness" may be perceived as being either LIKE-US or NOT-LIKE-US, it becomes most problematic when it is TOO-MUCH-LIKE-US or claims to BE-US. It is here that the real urgency of theories of the "other" emerge, called forth not so much by a requirement to place difference, but rather by an effort to situate ourselves. (J.Z. Smith 2004, 245)

For the heresiologists, Marcion and the Jews represent competing interpretations of the "history" that the heresiologists wish to claim. Sitting conceptually between Marcion (who saw Jesus as significant but having nothing to do with the centrally important Hebrew Scriptures) and the "Jews" (who saw no significance with Jesus but the Hebrew Scriptures as central)[64] were the "orthodox" who—in the interest of linking a significant Jesus with a significant interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures—required a specific allegorical reading.

---

[63] Of course, Boyarin's "Jews" are just as constructed a cipher as the "Jews" of the "Ways that Never Parted" or of the "Jews" in such sources as the *Gospel of John. A*s noted by Arnal "Real people—even Jews!—have different views and behave in multiple ways." (Arnal 2005, 31)

[64] Indeed one can picture multiple points of agreement between Marcion and "the Jews." Of course the Hebrew Bible does not predict Jesus: for Marcion, Jesus was a "new thing" who does not appear in any previous discourse—let alone the Hebrew Scriptures—and for the "Jews" he is entirely irrelevant. Indeed both agree that the Jewish messiah was not Jesus; the Messiah predicated in the Hebrew Scriptures was still to come. And of course YHWH was not the father of Jesus: that goes without saying. See Section 3, Chapter 3 for more on the "agreement" between the representations of both Marcion and "the Jews" or "Judaism."

So unlike Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian who denied the accuracy of the "Jewish" or non-Christian interpretation of the history of the ancient Hebrews, this was not the stance of Marcion.

But in light of this, one has to wonder at the persistence in the scholarly depiction of Marcion as antagonistic to or at odds with Judaism. For example, as explained Wilson "it is as if the Marcionites said to the Jew: 'Keep your God, your Scriptures, your Messiah, and your law: we consider them inferior, superseded in every way by the Gospel'" (Wilson 1986, 58). While Wilson is certainly not claiming that Marcion is anti-Jewish, the assumed tone of the "Marcionites" is still at best one of dismissiveness. The question is why? If this is not something gleaned from the evidence and representations of Marcion in Antiquity, is it something about modernity that is provoking such a response?

Chapter 2

Marcion(s) in Modernity

1.2.1 Introduction

Moving from the heresiologists to the early 20th century, we of course see a decided shift in how Marcion is represented. No longer the two-dimensional villain of Tertullian's or Irenaeus' nightmares, Marcion becomes a more rounded and (at times) sympathetic character whose "heresy" is more than just demon-inspired corruption. Of course, this sympathy leads itself to its own set of issues and biases that are equally as problematic as the representations of antiquity, even if Marcion's evaluation is radically different.

But despite these differences, there are two important similarities between the heresiological accounts and those of scholars in the early part of the 20th century. In both groups of representations, Marcion is understood to be the "heretical other" to what is understood as "orthodox" Christianity. So even though Marcion may have been more positively represented in the 20th century—as an innovator (Harnack 1924; Knox 1942) or as part of the majority of "Christianity" (Bauer 1971 [1934])—he nonetheless is still a heretic; deviating from "normative" or what eventually would become Roman Catholic doctrine. And while he is a

heretic, a defining feature of his heresy in the representations of the early part of the 20th century is *not* anti-Judaism. If that figures into it at all, it is something that is either secondary or at times, praiseworthy. The fact that he deviated from the Second Century orthodox position (however that is understood and evaluated) is what constitutes the *sine qua non* of his heresy.

1.2.2 Harnack

According to Gerhard May

> Every scholarly endeavour with Marcion invariably has to build on Adolf von Harnack's classic monograph. From [the 20th] century there is hardly a second book on an early Christian theologian that has has such a penetrating and lasting success. (May 1987/88, 129)

While this statement was made over two decades ago, thus far in the 21st century it still holds true. Adolph von Harnack's *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (1924) is THE power-chord of Marcion scholarship, still cited and used, still debated and critiqued, and all for good reason.

> The result of some fifty years of labour, in which he put more of himself into than any other of this voluminous works, it is a brilliant example of the collation, synthesis, and sympathetic portrayal which leaves his successors

> with the feeling that there is little to do but pick over the bones. (Wilson 1986, 46)

But in the course of picking over these bones,[65] many of the inherent problems with Harnack's portrayal have become more and more obvious.

> [W]ith the passing of more time, it has become increasingly clear to what extent [Harnack's] interpretation of Marcion's purposes and work bears the stamp of his own thinking. Is the biblical theologian—who rejects all philosophy and metaphysics, who restores the Gospel of pure kindness and the love of God by using a critical philological method that rejects all allegory, who founds his reformation of the depraved churches on a "symbolic book," the *Antithesis*, who's piety can be expressed in verse by Paul Gerhardt—really the Marcion of the ancient sources, or is he not rather a modern ideal picture, a projection into history? Harnack's book is not only a historical study; it represents also a document of the theology of its author. *This fact, of course, does not suggest that Harnack's interpretation of Marcion is simply to be dismissed as unhistorical or anachronistic. One should not be too quick to criticise.* (May 1987/88, 129-30 emphasis added)

Dismissed it certainly has not been. The sheer presence of Harnack's text in almost every subsequent secondary source on Marcion almost a century later is ample proof of that.[66] Criticism on the other hand, has been both

---

[65] This "picking" began soon after *Marcion* was first published. For instance Hans von Söden was very critical of Harnack's comparison with Luther (ZKG 40 1923, 204) as was Walter Bauer on if Marcion was as dependent on Paul as Harnack claimed (GGA 185 1923, 7).

[66] Every secondary source on Marcion used in this project extensively cites Harnack. Even Sebastian Moll's *Marcion the Arch-Heretic* (2010) is *still*, almost a century later, attempting to "debunk" the work of Harnack.

quick and at times somewhat defensive (Moll 1-4, 2010; Wilson 1986, 46; Hoffman xv, 1984; May 1987/88, 129-30). While scholars have (rightly) mined the intellectual labour of Harnack—his synthesis of sources, his reconstruction of Marcion's texts, and the general shape of Marcion's thought and theology—there nonetheless seems to be a need to first point out the none-too-subtle theological and personal biases of Harnack before proceeding with the text; this essentially means dismissing large swaths of Harnack as unhistorical and anachronistic.[67] Of course this is hardly surprising nor generally would it even be worth mentioning since it is blindingly obvious that any writings—theological, scholarly or otherwise—carry the biases of their various authors.

But what is striking is that despite the oft-cited and seemingly endemic problems with Harnack, "most researchers of the present see Marcion as Harnack presented him." (May 1987/88, 129)[68] This surely must strike one as strange. If the text is as problematic as scholars seem to claim, why not simply jettison it from the scholarly canon? Why is it that almost a century later Harnack is still the scholarly "classic track" where

---

[67] The most recent example is Sebastian Moll's *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (2010), who writes "In view of all these insufficient attempts to replace Harnack's portrait, it can be stated correctly: 'ein neues Markenbild, das an Geschlossenheit und Überzeugungskraft denjenigen Harnacks vergleichbar wäre, besitzen wir freilich noch nicht'. Even at the risk of sounding too bold I hereby declare: with this thesis I take up the challenge to fill the gap." (Moll 2010, 9-10).

[68] Or are actively trying to create a representation that is in reaction to Harnack.

other works like Wilson's *Marcion: A Study of a Second Century Heretic* (1932), Knox's *Marcion and the New Testament* (1942) or Blackman's *Marcion and his Influence* (1948) are—to stretch the metaphor—one-hit wonders?[69] While there may be a myriad of reasons why some texts remain central to the scholarly canon and others do not, a plausible reason for Harnack's longevity seems to be more than simply academic precision.

> [*Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*] owes its glory not only to the lifelong research Harnack put into it and the almost complete collection of sources consulted, but also to Harnack's talent as a writer. The book casts a spell on the reader which is hard to escape from. The author manages to to paint a portrait of Marcion so lifelike that we almost have the impression we knew him in person. In front of our eyes a man steps out of the fog of history and enters the scene of our modern world: we admire his genius and straightforwardness, but we also feel sympathy for this tragic hero, whose ideas were not accepted by the Church, merely because he was so much ahead of his time. (Moll 2010, 1)

If one wades through the hyperbole above regarding Harnack's "magical" qualities as a writer and the "glory" of the text, Moll *does* eventually point out some of the reasons that *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* has been kept within the scholarly canon. It is not simply the collation or synthesis of the "facts" by Harnack that has made it so enduring. Indeed,

---

[69] For instance, Knox's understanding of Marcion and his relation to *Luke* has hardly the impact of Harnack's work.

since Harnack is essentially recounting and collating what can be found in the heresiological sources, his "facts" are easily accessible on their own. One does not need Harnack to write about Marcion (though he does make it easier). Scholars—despite the qualifying statements to the contrary—are not using Harnack by simply winnowing the historical wheat from the theologically problematic chaff. This would not make him so "glorious" or his spell of entrapment so hard to escape. So the question is why? Why is it that we are still using Harnack over and above a text like Knox's *Marcion and the New Testament*? As implied by Moll, this persistence is not simply due to Harnack's synthesis but the overall representation—both so problematic yet so convincing—that seems to have given him such staying power. It is both this overall "myth" that Harnack created and how scholars have grappled with that legacy that seem to be why it is so enduring. In other words, it may be that Harnack's *Marcion* is so persistent *because* it is so problematic.

As noted, the "historical" Marcion—like the "historical" Jesus—is a figure that is lost to us. Our primary sources are simply the "myth(s)" of how he was represented in antiquity by the heresiologists. And while this may have included the "facts" of Marcion or his movement, it also combined the "image" that was required by the heresiologists to create the

"myth" of Marcion the heretic, the destroyer of the Gospel and the "first born of Satan" (Mart. Pol. 22:2; Ign. Phld 7:3). And this kind of construction is equally true for Harnack. So in much the same way as with Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian, the "myth" of Marcion created by Adolf von Harnack is the combination of an "image" and a "reality" with his "reality" being that of the heresiological sources filtered thought the theological climate of the 19th century which in turn was combined with the "image" needed by Harnack to produce his "myth" of Marcion that has endured up until the present. Even more so than our primary sources, Harnack's "myth" has impacted our understanding of Marcion in the modern period: both generally and—specifically for our purposes—his supposed anti-Judaism.[70]

1.2.3 Harnack's Myth of Marcion

Considering that he was using the heresiological "facts" as his primary sources, it should come as no surprise that the general shape of Marcion is similar for both Harnack and writers like Tertullian.[71] What it is that makes Harnack's Marcion so different from the heresiologists are

---

[70] See Section 1 Chapter 3 for a possible representation of Marcion without relying on an assumed "anti-Jewish" starting point.

[71] Harnack used Tertullian as his primary source for Marcion's Gospel, his editions of Paul and the *Antithesis*.

the more speculative and evaluative features, such as the character of Marcion and his import for early Christianity.

Basing his conclusions regarding Marcion's theology on the sources of the heresiologists, Harnack famously claimed that "[t]he starting point of criticism for Marcion of the tradition can not be mistaken. It was in the Pauline contrast of law and gospel, on one side petty and cruel justice, and on the other side love, mercifully given." (Harnack 1924, 30)[72]

For Harnack, this contrast underwrites the entirety of Marcion's theological system from the division of "old" and "new" texts and revelations, to his ditheistic cosmology that, on one hand consisted of the creator god of the Jews who acted as a "just despot" and, on the other, an all loving and totally alien God who made himself known for the first time via the revelation of Jesus (Harnack 1924, 65-81).

> Hence, it is demanded by the redemption of the Saviour-God, who is God in truth and who had not appeared in any revelation of any kind before he appeared in Christ. He therefore may be understood only as utterly Alien. But it also follows from there that the inimical realm from which the redemption through Christ frees humanity is nothing less than the world itself, along with it's Creator. Now since Marcion remained true to the Judaeo-Christian tradition of

[72] Der Ausgangspunkt der Kritik M.s an der Überlieferung kann nicht verfehlt werden: er war in dem paulinischen Gegensatz von Gesetz und Evangelium, übelwollender, kleinlicher und grausamer Strafgerechtigkeit einerseits und barmherziger Liebe andrerseits gegeben.

> claiming that the Creator of the World was the God of the Jews and saw the Old Testament not as a book of lies but the truthful account of history—a remarkable limitation of his religious anti-Judaism!—for [Marcion] the god of the Jews, with his book the Old Testament, had to become the real enemy. (Harnack 1924, 32-33)[73]

And while the heresiologist's certainly lack the positive enthusiasm of Harnack's construction of Marcion's thought as shown above, the general shape of both is nonetheless similar.

But what are seen as the most problematic features of Harnack's myth are when he moves from these "facts" to the more evaluative and speculative features of Marcion. And for good reason. Harnack not only saw Marcion as a hero—apparently he was "in love" with him (Moll 2010, 1)—but also the protagonist of a heroic narrative: a reformer and restorer of nascent Christianity who, as a loyal follower of Paul (Harnack 1924, 35) tried to save the simple "Gospel" of Jesus from the false apostles and those who would Judaize it (Harnack 1924, 223). For Harnack, Marcion was not only a proto-Protestant and a forerunner of Luther himself

---

[73] Daß der Erlöser Gott, der in Wahrheit Gott ist, in keiner Offenbarung irgendwelcher Art vor seiner Erscheinung in Christus an die Menschen herangetreten ist, ist daher durch die Natur seiner Erlösung gefordert: nur als der absolut Fremde darf er verstanden werden. Daraus ergibt sich aber auch, daß das Feindselige, wovon die Erlösung durch Christus befreit, nichts Geringeres sein kann als die Welt selbst mitsamt ihrem Schöpfer. Da nun M. darin der jüdisch-christlichen Überlieferung treu blieb, daß er den Weltschöpfer und den Judengott identifizierte und in dem AT kein Lügenbuch, sondern die—wahrhaftige Darstellung der wirklichen Geschichte sah eine merkwürdige Einschrankung seines religiosen Antijudaismus! —, so mußte ihm der Judengott samt seiner Urkunde, dem AT, zum eigentlichen Feinde werden.

(Harnack 1924, 215-16)[74] but also seemed to represent a theological stance similar to Harnack and the climate of 19th-century German Protestantism. And while Harnack has been (not unfairly) accused of representing Marcion in anachronistic fashion, at least it seems from Harnack's perspective this was not the case.[75] He was not trying to understand an ancient thinker via the lens of modernity. Because for Harnack, not only was Marcion's "Christianity" a unique movement,[76] but Marcion was also a man ahead of his time, essentially a 19th-century thinker who just happened to live in the second century.

> The rejection of the Old Testament in the second century was a mistake which the Church rightly avoided; to maintain it in the sixteenth was a fate which the Reformation was not able to escape; but still to preserve it in Protestantism as canonical since the nineteenth century is the result of religious and ecclesiastical crippling...it was Luther who once again gave a central position to the Pauline-Marcionite recognition of the distinction between Law and Gospel. . .[Luther's] thesis which was set above other faith-perspectives, stated in

---

[74] . . . so ist wirklich der Glaubensbegriff Luthers derjenige, der dem Marcionitischen am nachsten steht, wie schon Neander" (Harnack 1924, 225).

[75] "Man muß, um M. vollkommen zu verstehen, den Versuch machen, die zeitgeschichtlichen Gerüste abzubrechen. Man kann das, ohne ihn auch nur in einem Zuge zu modernisieren." (Harnack 1924, 226)

[76] "[S]onst ist sie vollkommen; unjüdisch und ebenso unhellenisch"(Harnack 1924, 22).

> negative terms "the law is unable to show us the true God." (Harnack 1924, 218)[77]

As noted, since both Harnack and the heresiologists are essentially using the same evidence or "facts" for Marcion, their representations of him are similar. It is, however, their respective evaluations of him that are of course radically different. For the heresiologists, Marcion is an "other" against which they can create a "orthodox" Christianity. For Harnack, Marcion is also the "other" but the "other" who is the "proto-Protestant" corrective to the deviation of the "proto-Catholic" Church that dominated Christianity until the time of Luther.

1.2.4 Harnack's Marcion and anti-Judaism

As with Harnack's and the heresiologists' general interpretations of Marcion, their respective representations of his relationship to Judaism also carries similarities and differences. But instead of it being a matter of interpretation of the character and impact of Marcion, the similarity lies in how

---

[77] Das NT half ihr seit dem Ausgang des 2. Jahrhunderts dabei und beseitigte wenigstens einen Teil der drückenden Schwierigkeiten und der Sophismen, mit denen man sich die Augen verblendete; nun durfte man Stufen unterscheiden und das AT auf die niedere stellen; freilich blieb diese Unterscheidung immer bedroht.— Inspiration und nur eine durch sie gesetzte lex veritatis geben. Durch Luther wurde die Paulinisch-Marcionitische Erkenntis des Unterschieds von Gesetz und Evangelium wieder in den Mittelpunkt gestellt; sie wurde der Hebel der Reformation als geistlicher Bewegung. Seine allen anderen Glaubensbetrachtungen übergeordnete These lautete im Negativen: ,,Lex non potest nobis monstrare verum deum"

each understood his relationship to that which was "Jewish" and how this acted as a cipher for other issues, particularly those of identity.

For instance, neither Harnack nor the heresiologists are interested in Marcion's understanding or evaluation of Judaism *per se.* Indeed, even though the parameters of what was "Jewish" or "Judaism(s)" were radically different in each period,[78] there nonetheless was a shared understanding that the "Jews" had been superseded and replaced by what was understood to be "Christian" (despite both being conceptualised in radically different terms from the 2nd to the 19th century). And while the supersessionism of the heresiologists incorporates some elements of the anti-heretical debates in which much of what was thought to be "Jewish" became equated with what was heretical (King 2003, 4 & 175-90), in Harnack's representation this encoded elements of the Protestant anti-Catholic polemic (Smith 1994, 1-24; 34-35; 57-58). Harnack had understood that Protestantism had refined Christianity of its later, second-century accretions to leave it in its "purist" form (Harnack 1924, 215-223; Wilson 1986, 47; King 2003, 55-70). And for Harnack it appears that these accretions where many of the "tell-tales of Judaism"—particularity the Law and the "Old Testament"—that stifled the enthusiasm of Christianity (Harnack 1888, 227-28). However, this appropriation was not to be criticised due to being solely "Jewish" *per se*.

---

[78] This will be explored in Section 3, Chapter 1 in greater detail.

> [Harnack] identifies Judaism with particularism, in contrast to Christian universalism. Moreover, he identifies the apocalyptic elements of Christianity as a mythological contamination from degenerate "Late Judaism," and he insisted that apocalyptic myth had no part in Jesus' original Gospel." (King 2003, 69; Harnack 1924, 197-198).[79]

One can easily see why Marcion would be so appealing to Harnack. With his own rejection of the need of the Hebrew Bible for the "Gospel," Marcion accomplishes a few conceptual tasks for Harnack. On one hand, Marcion avoids the issues of the early "proto-Catholics" who tried to take the particulars of the Hebrew Scriptures and make them universally applicable, and on the other, avoids the strategies of the so-called "gnostics" who resort to an overt allegorical critique of the Hebrew Bible (King 2003, 64).[80] In essence, Harnack can construct Marcion as a proto-Protestant (Harnack 1924, 225), with his solution of taking the "Old Testament" literally yet refusing to incorporate it into the Christian canon, easily dovetailing into Harnack's own issues with Protestantism's persistent preservation of Hebrew Scriptures in his own time (Harnack

---

[79] Unter diesen aber, den von den pseudoapostoli und Judaici evangelizatores Bekehrten und Betörten, versteht er die ganze grosse Christenheit; sie ihres Irrtums zu überfuhren und durch Reformation zum wahren Christentum zurückzubringen, ist sein einziges Streben gewesen...Im Grunde in einem Element, aus dem sich, wie aus einer schlechten Wurzel, ein ganzer Baum des Irrtums entwickelt hatsie haben den neuen Wein in die alten Schlauche gegossen und das Evangelium in das AT transponiert. (Harnack 1924, 197-98)

[80] According to Harnack, the so-called Gnostics took the Hebrew texts as "lies or as fraud" while the "orthodox" or what was to become the Catholic used allegory. Marcion, who takes the text as literal, is understood to side with the Jews. (Harnack 1924, 22 n.5)

1924, 218). It seems that Marcion is acting as an alternative ancient pedigree for Harnack's theology, one that is not heretically "Gnostic" nor problematically "catholic" but recaptures the purity of the Gospel "enthusiasm" (Harnack 1924, 217).

So what does this say about Harnack's Marcion and the modern claim that he was anti-Jewish? While Harnack does claim that Marcion founded an anti-Jewish religion (Harnack 1924, 33), Harnack's Marcion hardly seems to have "hated Jews and everything Jewish" as is claimed in more recent scholarship (Ehrman 2003, 111; King 2003, 188; Tyson 2005, 196).

Indeed, it is interesting to note that Harnack postulated that Marcion, because of his "literalistic" reading of the Old Testament and his familiarly with the text, was originally "Jewish" (Harnack 1924, 22. See also Marc. III.6.2). This of course is not to say that Harnack conceptualised Marcion as being explicitly "for" Judaism. Indeed, Harnack's Marcion "resented" Judaism (Harnack 1924, 22). But instead of casting Marcion as the antisemite of Ehrman's musing—and of course without negating or downplaying Harnack's own personal anti-Jewish sentiments or sympathies for racist individuals such as Houston Stewart Chamberlain (Kinzig 2004)—Harnack seems to have been trying to draw

stronger narrative links between Marcion and Paul. While all of our ancient representations of Marcion claim that he saw himself as a follower of Paul (*pace* Moll[81]) with the Pauline corpus combined with the Marcionite Gospel the entirety of his canon, Harnack's assertion that Marcion was "Jewish" or affiliated with Judaism not only conceptually explains Marcion's literalism but also draws connections between him and Paul. In other words, and despite the fact that Harnack claimed that Paul would "have turned away in horror from this blasphemous teacher [Marcion]" (Harnack 1924, 198), like Paul, Marcion was of Jewish origin, who became dissatisfied with his ancestral traditions. Both encountered the "Gospel" and both fought against the Judaizers of the Christian message (Gal. 2 and Harnack 1924, 198). However, due to Marcion's "extreme" Paulism and his "Jewish" literalistic reading of the Hebrew Bible, not only did this lead him to reject the "Old Testament" as a tool for Christian authority and "purge" any references to it from both the "Gospel" and Paul, but this also nessesitated the cosmological

[81] According to Moll "Marcion's system was so radically different from the one of Paul that it seems unlikely to assume any substantial influence of the Apostle on the arch-Heretic. If, however, Marcion had to virtually force his own ideas upon Paul, it leaves us with the question why he included the Apostle in his own canon...[The answer is that] Marcion wanted to claim the Apostle's reputation for his own movement. In other words: *Marcion did not make Paul an authority, he made use of his authority* (Moll 2010, 85-86 emphasis original). This claim, typical of Moll's work, is riddled with methodological misuse. His implication that Marcion "misused" Paul not only implies a normative Pauline theology (which even a superficial comparison of *Galatians* and *Romans* will show to be problematic) but implies a disingenuousness on the part of Marcion. That is a theological evaluation, not historical or scholarly conclusion.

reconfiguration that included a demiurgical figure who would become identified as the Creator god of the Hebrew Bible. As noted by Franz Overbeck in *Christentum und Kultur* (1919, 2l 8f)—and repeated by Harnack—Marcion was the only one who understood Paul, and he understood him poorly.

Of course, this interpretation of Marcion should not be taken as an indication that Harnack himself was sympathetic to Judaism or was not anti-Jewish. His derogatory stance regarding Judaism—while not on the same level as Grundmann or Chamberlain—is well documented and hardly defensible (see below). But this theological stance, while informing his representation of Marcion was not focused on being anti-Jewish *per se*, but more on retroactively (and anachronistically) being anti-Catholic.

So returning to the question proposed earlier, why has this myth of Marcion as presented by Harnack remained a standard of scholarship? Despite the oft cited problems and obvious biases in its construction, why do scholars keep coming back to it?

While this will be addressed in more detail below, what one needs to keep in mind is that modern scholars are not just using the "myth" of the heresiologists as part of their own "reality" but also using Harnack's

myth of Marcion, a myth that as it becomes part of the modern reality is in turn filtered through modern concerns and agendas. And while Gerhard May noted that "most researchers of the present see Marcion as Harnack presented him" (May 1987/88, 129), a more accurate claim would be that most researchers understand Marcion through the lens of how they see and understand Harnack and his legacy.[82]

1.2.5 The Other Marcion(s) of the Early 20th Century: Bauer, Knox and Blackman

As noted, while Harnack's work was and is the premier modern scholarly representation of Marcion and has all but set the standard for subsequent reconstructions (May 1987/88, 129), his was not the only voice. While most other scholars did not cover Marcion exclusively or as thoroughly as Harnack, these other representations have nonetheless been influential to some degree.[83] But regarding the primary question of representations of Marcion and his apparent anti-Judaism, none of these "other" Marcions make the claim that he was anti-Jewish. And while many of the tropes that have been interpreted by modern scholars as being

---

[82] See Aland 1973, 2002; King 2003; Lieu 1996; Hoffman 1984; Moll 2010; Tyson 2006; Räisänen, 2002; May 1987/88.

[83] For example, John Knox's work is being reexamined in light of the work of Joseph Tyson's *Marcion and Luke-Acts; A Defining Struggle* (2006).

anti-Jewish are present in these representations, it is important to note that this claim is—if present at all—not central or significant to the authors themselves.

For example, Walter Bauer, in his landmark work *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (first published in 1934) did not deploy Marcion in terms of his supposed anti-Jewish or antisemitic stance, but followed the heresiological evaluation that Marcion was simply a heretic, one who was utterly Pauline in orientation.

While containing similar biographical evaluations as Harnack, Bauer places Marcion's time of activity earlier, before the writing of the Pastorals (Bauer 1971 [1934], 223). Indeed, Bauer's Marcion was not only closer to the time of Paul, but understood him to be indebted to Paul. According to Bauer:

> I would regard [Marcion] as the first systematic collector of the Pauline heritage.[84] He who ruthlessly rejected the Old Testament and everything of primitive Christianity stemming from Palestine, was plainly bent on giving his teachings as broad a Pauline foundation as possible... (Bauer 1971 [1934], 221-22).

It is this desire for a broad Pauline foundation that influenced Marcion's distinctive theological claims.

---

[84] According to Bauer, Marcion was responsible for the preservation of both *Philemon* and *Galatians* (Bauer 1971 [1934], 221).

> Possibly he had already become acquainted with [Paul's letter to the Galatians] in his native land. In any event, it is certain that it was from Galatians and not say, from Romans with its concise explanations that Christ was the end of the law (10:4), that Marcion got the idea about how he could break the back of the Old Testament so highly treasured by so many Christians and drive the Jewish apostles from the field (Bauer 1971 [1934], 221-22).

Therefore, it seems that Bauer's Marcion did not "break the back of the Old Testament" or "drive the Jewish apostles from the field" because of any overt anti-Jewish or antisemitic stance, but as a result of a heightened Paulism. So even though Bauer understood Marcion as misusing Paul (Bauer 1971 [1934], 182) by compromising his letters (Bauer 1971 [1934], 215), this is for Bauer primarily an issue of Roman orthodoxy (Bauer 1971 [1934], 128-129) and not necessarily of anti-Jewish sentiment.

This lack of criticism of Marcion for his supposed anti-Jewishness is also a feature of John Knox's *Marcion in the New Testament* (1942). Much like Bauer, Knox understood Marcion's issues with the Jewish Scriptures as not deriving from any kind of anti-Jewish stances, but more of a Pauline critique of the Christian appropriation of it.

> Besides taking a Docetic view of the Gospel history, he denied the identity of the Father of Jesus with the God of the Jews. This God, the Creator of the world, Marcion regarded as an inferior deity. He therefore repudiated the Jewish Scriptures, which were also the Scriptures of the early Church and substituted for them what may properly be called

> the first New Testament.[85] This Marcionite "New Testament" was in two parts, "Gospel" and "Apostle," corresponding perhaps to the Law and the Prophets of the Hebrew canon, and thus set the pattern of the later ecclesiastical New Testament. The "Gospel" was in considerable part identical with [Luke][86] and the "Apostle" with the ten letters of Paul. (Knox 1942, 2-3)

And while Knox claimed that Marcion "undoubtedly misunderstood Paul at certain vital points, there can be no question that he came nearer to understanding him than did, say, the author of I Timothy, and that he stood much closer to Paul[87] than to Credo" (Knox 1942, 13), Knox's representation of Marcion's theology as "not merely to supplement or 'fulfil' Judaism but entirely to displace it" (Knox 1943, 7) had, as with Bauer's model, more to do with Marcion's Paulism than any sort of anti-Jewish sentiment.

> Underneath the Marcionite antithesis between the God of justice and the God of love lay the Pauline antithesis between the law and the gospel, the flesh and the sprit. The one was the result—erroneous, if you will—of reflection on the other:

---

[85] "It is not infrequently said that Marcion's canon was the first 'closed' canon of distinctly Christian writings." (Knox 1942, 19)

[86] "Marcion's Gospel, although it contained nothing which was not to be found in our *Gospel of Luke*, was less than three-fourths long" (Knox 1942, 3). This relationship will be taken up below.

[87] "There is undoubtedly historical continuity between Paul's conflicts with the Judaizers, which continued probably up to the very end of his life, and Marcion's struggle with the Roman Church (although I hope that no one will understand me to mean either that Paul would have agreed with Marcion or that the Roman Church believed Christians must be circumcised!)" (Knox 1943, 15; see Lieu 2010 for how Paul is contested in the Second Century.)

> [nonetheless] Marcion was not primarily a Gnostic but a Paulist (Knox 1943, 14).[88]

The last early modern representation of note[89] of Marcion is E.C. Blackman's *Marcion and His Influence* (1948). While Blackman is explicit in his stated goals of refuting both Harnack and Knox[90] in which he wishes to offer a corrective to Harnack's overstatement of Marcion's importance (Blackman 1948, 38-40), this corrective never goes into Marcion "anti-Jewishness" as a central feature. Indeed, for Blackman, Marcion may have been "anti-Jewish" (1948, x) and held that the Jewish texts were revelations of an inferior god (Blackman 1948, 22-29) but this, as with Harnack, was simply not a means of criticism. Marcion's crime for Blackman was that he was the "arch-heretic" (1948, iiix) who deviated from Christianity since his ditheism was a rejection of, and a threat to,

---

[88] While Knox deployed Marcion as an opponent of "orthodoxy" it was less in terms of his supposed "heresy" and more as an innovator: one who not only formed the first canon but also provided a catalyst for the "Catholics" to do the same. Indeed, it is Marcion's innovation, according to Knox, that provided the impetus behind the composition of *Luke-Acts*. "The relation between Marcion's Gospel and canonical Luke is not accurately described either by the simple statement that Marcion abridged Luke or by the simple statement that Luke enlarged Marcion. The position would rather be that a primitive gospel, containing approximately the Markan and Matthew elements which our Luke contains and some of its peculiar materials, was somewhat shortened by Marcion or some predecessors and later enlarged by the writer of our Gospel, who was also the maker of Luke-Acts" (Knox 1942, 110).

[89] One intentional omission is Robert Smith Wilson's *Marcion: A Study of a Second Century Heretic* (1932) as this is basically a english "translation" of Harnack (Moll 2010, 5).

[90] "One feels that Harnack became short-sighted through his long and detailed attention to Marcion, and in consequence his vision...was out of focus" (Blackman 1948, 12).

both the Church's monotheism (1948, 65-70) and its claim to ancient pedigree (1948, 119-120).[91]

However, considering his intention to refute Knox and Harnack, Blackman's criticism of Marcion and his heresy appears more a modern retrojection or a screen in which anxieties contemporary to Blackman were being played out,[92] a situation that seems to be relevant in more modern scholarship.[93]

What is interesting is that in all of the above examples, Marcion's "heresy" (either his deviation from—as per Bauer and Blackman—or his innovation of—as per Harnack and Knox—"Catholic / Orthodox" Christianity) did not appear to be based on his "anti-Judaism." According to modern scholarship, Marcion's primary identifying feature was NOT that he was "anti-Jewish" but he deviated from "proper" or "catholic"

---

[91] Nonetheless, even though Marcion is inconsistent (Blackman 1948, 117), "[he] seems to have understood and shared the Pauline view, that paradoxical view that though the law essentially belongs to the old order it can be described positively as holy, just, good, spiritual" (Blackman 1948, 114).

[92] "The question of the validity of the Old Testament as Christian Scripture would appear to be still not settled; there are still Christians who cannot accept is authority, but prefer to class it in the category of books 'good and useful to read'. Here is our point of contact with Marcion." (Blackman 1948, 113) Blackman goes on to state "[Marcion degraded the Old Testament] for good reason, viz., because he did not find in it testimony to a redeeming God. This guiding principle of his may be commended, even while his general attitude to the Old Testament is rejected" (Blackman 1948, 124; see also Enslin 1945).

[93] See below.

theological practice, particularly a misreading of Paul. Any anti-Judaism —if at all present—is at best a secondary concern.

1.2.6: Marcion(s) of the Present

In more recent scholarship, particularly in the last 40-50 years, there has been a shift in how Marcion has been represented, in particular the defining features of his supposed "heresy." And at first blush, this is surprising. For, while shifts in scholarly reconstructions can be prompted due to methodological refinement or the discovery of new sources or data,[94] this has not been the case in regard to Marcion. No new sources have been discovered;[95] and scholarly models have done little to advance beyond the representations of Harnack and others contemporary with him. And while the use of the term "heresy" has been jettisoned in academic reconstructions as being nothing more than outside the shifting perspectives of those who create "orthodoxy" and as such carries no explanatory value (King 2003; Fairen 2008; *pace* Moll 2010),[96] modern representations nonetheless still maintain Marcion's position as the "other." But,

---

[94] For instance, note the shift in how "Gnosticism" has changed in scholarly reconstructions from a "heretical Church" that could only be exhumed largely from heresological sources to, with the help of the Nag Hammadi Library, "a structural possibility" (J.Z. Smith 1993, 151 n12) analogous to many ancient discourses, such as apocalypticism (Fairen 2008)

[95] Of course, when it comes to Christian Origins, new sources—such as the Nag Hammadi Library—have done little to change how scholars configure their models of analysis or narration (Fairen 2008, 1-4; King 2003).

[96] However, see Moll 2010, 1-4.

where in the past—for good or ill—his "othering" was by virtue of his "theological" heresy, this has now been replaced by to his supposed anti-Jewish stance.[97] As noted before, but worth repeating, according to Bart Ehrman

> [Marcion] took what most people in the empire found most attractive about Christianity—love, mercy, grace, wonder, opposition to this harsh material world and salvation from it—and pushed it to an extreme, while taking Christianity's less attractive sided—law, guilt, judgement, eternal punishment, and above all association and close ties with Jews and Judaism—and getting rid of them...this may have opened the doors to heightened hostilities *since Marcion seems to have hated the Jews and everything Jewish*; or possibly even more likely, it may have led simply to benign neglect as Jews and their religion would have been considered to be of no relevance...for Christians. *The entire history of anti-Semitism might have been avoided, ironically, by an anti-Jewish religion.* (Ehrman 2003, 111 emphasis added)

While Ehrman at least attempts to rationalise the draw of Marcionism for the general public of the Roman Empire, his representation nonetheless assumes that Marcion must by default have had some form of animus for Judaism. And while this is a significant claim— especially considering the speculation that "[t]he entire history of anti-Semitism might have been avoided, ironically, by an anti-Jewish religion"—there is no rationalisation why Marcion must have hated Jews and Judaism in any of the evidence provided.

---

[97] However, "[t]here is no compelling evidence to support the judgement that Marcion's theology is anti-Jewish in design, and the familiar view that his 'rejection' of the OT made him the arch-Semite of the ancient church is uninformed" (Hoffman 1984, 231).

Some scholars, however, have tried to take this assumed position and have tried to nuance what the parameters of Marcion's supposed anti-Judaism looked like. "Marcion's anti-Judaism, like that of the Nag Hammadi documents but unlike that of the Gospel of John, focuses almost exclusively on the god and the scriptures of Judaism and says little of the Jews as such." (Gager 1983, 172)

This splitting of Marcion's anti-Judaism along "religious" lines is also understood as part of Marcion's intra-Christian polemic.

> Yet a great deal of what Marcion said about Judaism seems to have been the result of his antithetical turn of mind and his own peculiar form of Christian self-definition, and there is little to suggest that he was deliberately anti-Jewish. Quite the opposite, in fact, for in a number of places Tertullian reports that Marcion often allied himself with the Jewish against received Christian option [Marc 3.6; 3.7; 3.8;3.24] (Wilson 1995, 215; see also Lieu 1996, 264; Gager 1972).

But while the image of Marcion as anti-Jewish is somewhat mitigated through how he is represented as deploying this stance in intra-Christian polemics, this does not of course let him off the hook.

> It is important, first, to state the obvious: Marcion's teaching in general contains a profound denigration of Judaism and the symbols precious to its life and faith. Whether it is in his view of their god, their scriptures, their law, or in his account of Jesus, Paul, or the Jewish Christian conspiracy, in each case Judaism appears as an inferior religion. In Marcion's system of dualistic oppositions, the things that characterise Judaism always forms the darker side of the contrast. (Wilson 1995, 214-15)

A very similar sentiment has been echoed by Judith Lieu.

> So far it might be right to say that what Marcion was in practice most vehemently opposed to was 'judaizing' (as defined by himself) rather than the Jews themselves. Yet when it comes to his 'image' of Judaism, despite his affinities with Jewish arguments and his willingness to allow them to keep their eschatological hopes, he gives Judaism no continuing validity even apart from Christianity...He allows them none of the virtues of their faith which are stressed in their own, or even in Christian, apologetic, and, although he does not join in the Christian competition for the possession and the true interpretation of their scriptures, this does not make his assessment of them any more positive. Neither was his theology of the Creator God *unintentionally* anti-Jewish" (Lieu 1996, 267)

In other words, it seems that despite the unintentional anti-Jewishness of Marcion, Lieu insists that his "distinction between this supreme Father and the Creator God 'of the Jews' demanded a violent attack against Jewish faith, history and practice" (Lieu 1996, 262).

Of course, in a project such as this, space does not allow a full quoting of all the instances of modern representations of Marcion's anti-Jewish stance or antithetical stance towards "Judaism." But what is perhaps telling regarding this general assumption, are the few instances that attempt to lessen his supposed anti-Judaism by mitigating it by virtue of its comparison with Marcion's "orthodox" opponents. "So can Marcion really be regarded as an enemy of the Jews? No, the

tables should rather be turned on his 'orthodox' opponents: *they* seem a little more anti-Jewish" (Räisänen 1997, 74).[98]

Even during the rare occasions when Marcion's supposed anti-Judaism is not a central feature of his reconstruction, there nonetheless seems to be a need to address and subsequently "correct" the assumption of Marcion's anti-Jewishness.

> Conventional interpretations of Marcion's theology have paid but scant attention to the pro-Jewish element in his thought, emphasising instead his presumed 'rejection' of the [Old Testament] and his denigration of the Creator (Hoffmann 1984, 229).

While Hoffmann is clear that Marcion was not interested in Judaism *per se,* or in refuting it (Hoffmann 1984, 229-34), he nonetheless seems to be overcorrecting the anti-Jewish assumptions regarding Marcion by not only claiming that Marcion was "pro-Jewish" but—as with Harnack—was actually Jewish (Hoffmann 1984, 29).[99]

But while these kinds of qualifications seem all but sheepishly defensive, some of course have gone the other way, not only representing Marcion as anti-Jewish, but linking him—directly or indirectly—to the greatest antisemitic event

---

[98] See also Efroymson who similarly claims "Jesus was 'retrieved' from Marcion for traditional Christianity...by means of the anti-Judaic myth'" (Efroymson 1979, 102; 104; Tyson 2006, 207-208).

[99] Moll denies that Marcion could have been "Jewish" based upon the "theory" of Individual-Reflective Faith which requires that, since Marcion abandoned "Orthodoxy" (27-28) he would not have had two conversion experiences. Again, Moll seems utterly unaware of the malleable nature of what could have constituted Judaism or Christianity in antiquity, let alone the idea of orthodoxy and heresy.

of last century, the Holocaust. As an exemplar, Susannah Heschel in her 2008 book, *The Aryan Jesus* which states that

> The Institute [for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on the Church Life of the German *Volk*]'s foundation was not only Nazi politics. That Jesus was not a Jew was the ultimate western fantasy . . . It was also the secret hope of a strain of Christian theology since the days of the 2nd century Christian theologian Marcion. (Heschel 2008, 26; see also Bergen 1996, 143)

This link is made explicitly by Alan Davis.

> The emergence of racism as an anti-Semitic ideology during the nineteenth century was one of the sources for the Holocaust in the twentieth...the remote traces of this theme can be found in Marcion's attempt to wrench the new church from its Jewish womb. (Davis 1975, 569)

As noted above (but not limited to), the representation of Marcion as anti-Jewish is not only clearly articulated, but also runs the gamut of variation on how extreme it was and how far it could have reached forward into history. In summary, in more modern scholarship Marcion is represented:

1) as engaged in anti-Jewish polemic, as part of his intra-Christian polemic
2) as no more anti-Jewish than other Christians
3) as anti-Jewish by virtue of his theology by denigrating the tropes of Judaism or by his demiurgical speculation
4) as hating Jews and everything Jewish, with links drawn to the Holocaust

There are a few key concerns that must be stated regarding the above.

While Marcion's representations as "anti-Jewish" are based on a tenuous

idea of what is actually "Jewish" or "Judaism" in antiquity[100]—but not so tenuous that we are unable to glean that Marcion was apparently "against it"—it must be stated that we have no evidence of what Marcion *actually* did or thought. All we have are the various representations of him; representations of him that are all clearly biased by the agendas of the various representers and are built upon the images and realities of the representations that went before. Of course we are simply not dealing with neutral "evidence" that has been passed on from antiquity to modernity. What we have is an accretion of representation of Marcion—from Justin Martyr to Sebastian Moll—that have taken the "image" of what went before and filtered it through the "reality" of the current author (from the 2nd to the 19th centuries, to the post-Holocaust 21st) to create a representation of Marcion that serves the current "mythic" needs (Lincoln 1989, 24; Lieu 1996, 12).

So then the question that begs to be asked is why? Why was Marcion understood as offhandedly anti-Jewish in only a few sources in the early part of the 20th, and why has that assertion become more and more central to his historical constructions, particularly over the last 50 years? As noted, outside of one possible passing and ambiguous reference

---

[100] This will be addressed in Section 2, Chapter 1 and 2 regarding *the Apocryphon of John.*

in Tertullian (Marc. 5.5:1) it must be stressed that this assumption that Marcion was anti-Jewish, anti-Judaic or antisemitic, is simply *not* based on any "evidence" from the representations of antiquity, nor central to his representations in the early part of the 20th century. So why the shift?

For a possible answer, we have to look outside of the evidence from antiquity and examine the agendas and concerns of recent Christian origins scholarship—particularly of the last 50 years—where the (re) evaluation of Marcion has taken place. For, while Marcion himself has not been a central concern in Christian origins scholarship, what *has been* —particularly over the last 50 years—is a reevaluation of the relationship of Judaism and Christianity.[101] One can not help but see a connection.

To help with this, the methodological insights of William Arnal's deconstruction of the "Jewish" Jesus is particularly relevant.

1.2.7 Jesus the Jew, Marcion the Antisemite

When looking at the agendas of scholars who reconstruct the so-called "historical" Jesus, it is according to William Arnal because:

---

[101] What is interesting within this scholarly debate, however, is not the relative "pro-" or "anti-Jewishness" of Marcion, and how this in turn effects his reconstruction. What seems to be central is the scholarly desire to construct and contrast Marcion's theology against an assumed set of practices that constitute the "normative" boundaries of Judaism.

> Jesus means so much, so differently, to so many people...it is almost impossible to say anything about him without engaging people's most deeply cherished feelings—about right and wrong, about who 'we' are, about the meaning of our behaviors and principles. . . . A statement about Jesus, it would seem, is always a statement about something else, controversial, rich with implications. (Arnal 2005, 10)

Throughout *The Symbolic Jesus* (2005) Arnal illustrates that the insistence of some scholars on a "Jewish" Jesus—and the venomous reaction against supposedly non-Jewish or Cynic Jesuses—is a screen on which modern "issues of identity and self-definition: scholarly, political, religious and cultural" (Arnal 2005, 6) are being cast and renegotiated.

Considering that one of the main issues faced in the last 50 years of New Testament scholarship has been the reconfiguration of the relationship between, and the boundaries of, Christianity and Judaism in antiquity (Becker & Reed 2007) it should come as no surprise that these issues have affected historical constructions. In particular, scholars have had to come to grips with the role that previous New Testament scholarship and theology have played in paving the way, or providing academic and intellectual legitimacy to, western expressions of antisemitism such as the tragedy of the Holocaust. According to Burton Mack

> This sorry plot lies at the very foundations of the long, ugly history of Christian attitudes and actions towards Jews and Judaism. The destruction of their city was only a sign . . . .No thinking person can justify this long history, nor doubt that the gospel has justified it in the eyes of Christians. Boring and distasteful, the documents

> pile up from the time of the early church, through the *Adversus Judaeos* literature, to the crusades, reactions to the plagues, Catholic doctrine, Luther's pronouncements, German tracts of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, common clichés in New Testament scholarship, and the anomaly of anti-Semitic attitudes that emerge throughout the third world wherever the gospel is read today. The Nazi enactment of the final solution [sixty odd] years ago may have been tainted by pagan desires. But the rationale was Christian. The holocaust was also a gospel event (Mack 1988, 375).

This kind of realisation that the history of New Testament studies—from the active antisemitic reconstructions of scholars such as Walter Grundmann and Houston Stewart Chamberlin pre-Holocaust to the re-inscription of old, theologically loaded supersessionist models of Rudolph Bultmann, post-Holocaust—had been either actively engaged with or complicit in the intellectual environment that contributed to and justified the Holocaust is an issue that still weighs heavy. It is this realisation, according to Arnal, which has prompted the increase over the last 50 years of Jewish-Jesus scholarship: scholarship—such as that developed by Birger Pearson, Paula Fredrickson, Sean Freyne, N.T, Wright, John G. Gager and John P. Meier—that is offering a corrective by representing how the "historical" Jesus, Paul and the earliest Christians did not represent a radically "new" religion compared to its singular and stagnant parent, Judaism. And rightly so. Many of these models have convincingly shown that the earliest "Christians" were no Christians at all, but could be subsumed easily under the

variety of Judaisms and ideological options available to Jews in the ancient world.[102]

The problem, however, is that these "normative" Judaisms that scholars construct for their "Christianities," while presumably intended to be a corrective of the anti-Judaic and antisemitic scholarship of the nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries, are nonetheless remarkably congenial to a Christian-centric ideology which needs to create a specific kind of Judaism: one that is not about historical description, but rather one used for Christian pedigree. For example, the Jewish-Jesus models represent a disturbing trend in Christian Origins scholarship that requires a deployment of first-century Judaism in such as way as to insure a pure pedigree for Jesus (and nascent Christianity) that is, on one hand, isolated from the Hellenistic influences, and on the other hand, caricatured enough for Christian supersessionist claims (J.Z. Smith 1990, 83).[103]

While the worry from a historical perspective is that a very narrow and essentially cliché version of Judaism is being put forward—by Christian Origins

---

[102] See Braun who notes an ideological position gains authority by retrojecting its point of origins to the "first times" (Braun 2010, 56). One can not think of a more "authentic" starting position for "Christianity" than "Judaism."

[103] See Section 2 Chapter 1.

scholars, no less!—as the only valid context for the "Jewish" Jesus,[104] the greater concern is the implied agenda that seems to have been smuggled in with these historical models: an agenda that, while on one level one can be sympathetic to, nonetheless has more to do with modern sensibilities than accurate historical research.

Again, to quote Arnal at length:

> The figure of Jesus has often been a device for recasting Christianity, sometimes polemical, in such a way that whatever present features are deemed to be unattractive are eliminated as late accretions, and the "true essence" of Christianity recaptured and revived by appeal to Jesus himself. In short, much Jesus scholarship has just been gospel writing done anew. Is Christianity too dogmatic? It did not used to be; that was a later accretion at the hands of early Catholicism. Is it too supernaturally oriented? Well, Jesus would have no truck with that nonsense. And so, too, was it complicit in centuries upon centuries of inhumanity to Jews, culminating in the final solution? Only through the sheerest perversity of those Christians, who failed to understand that their religion was created by, and revolved around, the very kind of figure they are abusing. Jesus the Jew, then, stands as the clearest possible indication that Christianity is not anti-Jewish, properly, and so is not implicit in the Holocaust. Christian justifications for and participation in the Nazi movement were perversions—not

---

[104] As Arnal has pointed out, "Jesus himself is being made to conform to a stereotype of Judaism that is anti-Semitic in its inception. But this, I suspect, is no irony: it is precisely the point. The very centre of (anti-Jewish and at times, anti-Semitic) European culture has been the figure of Jesus. The historically dominate religion(s) of Europe have revolved around Jesus. . . .How better, then, to repudiate the anti-Semitism that springs from xenophobia than by making this centre of European culture himself one of the recognisable 'outsiders'? . . . A Jesus who does . . . perform a massive act of inversion and subversion of a sordid European history: a final Christian assimilation and appropriation of the 'other'; or the final victory of the other by claiming its central place in the culture that repudiated it . . . the Jewish Jesus of modern scholarship accomplished, or at least implies, the repositioning of the quintessential outsider as, in fact, in the end, the very centre and pinnacle of the dominant culture" (Arnal 2005, 49).

> expressions of what Christianity genuinely and essentially is. Thus Christian anti-Judaism of both the past and the present is condemned; thus the responsibility of contemporary Christians for the Holocaust is lessened; and thus, especially, are the doors opened to Jewish-Christian interfaith dialogue now that this messy business of anti-Judaism has been dispensed with (Arnal 2005, 50).

Considering the above, it seems probable that a similar retrojection is going on with the scholarly deployment of Marcion, for these same kinds of reasons, but this time with the opposite rhetorical purpose. As "proper" pro-Jewish Christianity needs to find its footing in a "Judaified" Jesus, we still need a rationalisation for the antisemitic Christianities and cultural contexts that eventually lead to the Nazis and the Holocaust (Arnal 2005, 8-19). In essence as "perverted" as these antisemitic expressions may have been—for they could of course have no bearing on "real" Christianity— they must have come from somewhere. And in stretching Arnal's analogy of scholars' "Gospel writing anew," it seems that they have also become the new heresiologists. For much as Irenaeus claims that heresy needs to derive from one easily quarantinable source (Haer 1.1:23) so too it seems that for some Christian origins scholars, Christian antisemitism too must have its pedigree. And what better tether can there be than

the Arch-Heretic, Marcion of Sinope, a thinker of whom we know nothing outside of his construction as the paradigmatic "other"?[105]

1.2.8 Constructing a Pedigree

a) Marcion and "anti-Jewishness:" Adolph von Harnack

---

[105] "The Eastern European Jew is the very image of anti-Semitic stereotype; he or she is 'the eternal Jew' of Hitlerian propaganda. The figure who resists assimilation, is segregated, obeys distinctive ancestral laws, speaks in an incomprehensible and 'foreign' language written in an incomprehensible and 'mystical' alphabet, eats differently, dresses differently—such a figure can stand in easily as a target for any xenophobia whatsoever...Thus a particularly segregated subculture, that of central and Eastern European Ashkenazi Jews, comes to symbolize Judaism in general...The fact that the very distinguishability of Eastern European Jewry is what seems most to share with the Jewish Jesus of recent scholarship—language, law, clothing, distinctive practice, lack of assimilation, segregation—suggests to me that Jesus himself is being forced to conform to a stereotype of Judaism that was anti-Semitic in its inception. But this, I suspect, is no irony: it is precisely the point. The very centre of (anti-Jewish and, at times, anti-Semitic) European culture has been the figure of Jesus...How better, then to repudiate the anti-Semitism that springs from xenophobia than by making the centre of European culture himself one of the recognizable 'outsiders'? ...[This Jesus] performs a massive act of inversion and subversion of a sordid European history: a final Christian assimilation and appropriation of the 'other'; or a final victory of the 'other' by claiming a central place in the culture that repudiated it. In either case...the Jewish Jesus of modern scholarship accomplished, or at least implies, the repositioning of the quintessential outsider as, in fact, in the end, the very centre and pinnacle of the dominate culture....The agenda here has two facets. It offers a way to respond to the Holocaust, and, simultaneously , a rejoinder to contemporary anti-Semitism. In terms of the former, the travesty of the Holocaust is underscored by insisting on its irony. No, the "eternal Jew", as it happens, was not a threat to European civilization (and its North American spin-offs), but its basis...The figure of Jesus has often been a device for recasting Christianity, sometimes polemically, in such a way that whatever present features are deemed to be unattractive are eliminated as late accretions, and the 'true essence' of Christianity recaptured and revived by appeal to Jesus himself. In short, much of Jesus scholarship has just been gospel writing done anew. Is Christianity too dogmatic? It didn't used to be; that was a later accretion at the hands of 'early catholicism.' Is it too supernaturally oriented? Well, Jesus would have no truck with that nonsense. And so, too, was it complicit in centuries upon centuries of inhumanity to Jews, culminating in the 'final solution'? Only through the sheerest perversity of those Christians who failed to understand that their religion was created by, and revolved around, the very kind of figure they were abusing. Jesus the Jew then, stands as the clearest possible indication that Christianity is not anti-Jewish, properly, and so is not implied in the Holocaust. Christian justification for, and participation in the Nazi movement were perversions—not expressions of what Christianity genuinely and essentially is. Thus Christian anti-Judaism of both the past and present is condemned; thus responsibility of contemporary Christians for the Holocaust is lessened; and thus, especially, are the doors opened to Jewish-Christian interfaith dialogue now that this messy business of anti-Judaism has been dispensed with" (Arnal 2005, 49-50).

As noted previously by Gerald May, "[e]very scholarly endeavour with Marcion invariably has to build on Adolph von Harnack's classic monograph" (May 1987/88, 129; see also Balas 1980). While many scholars have (with good reason) accused Harnack of making Marcion in his own image (May 1987/88, 129-130) it appears that few have taken into consideration Harnack's own rendering of Judaism and its relationship to both ancient and modern Christianity as something that may also be imposed unto Marcion: something that, considering the assumption of Marcion's anti-Judaism, is rarely acknowledged. While much of Harnack's other biases have been modified or challenged (May 1987/88, 129-148; Moll 2011) his off-hand claim of Marcion's "resentment towards Judaism" (Harnack 1924, 15) coupled with his own Christian-centric and anti-Jewish tendencies have not been seriously engaged, particularity in how they might have affected his rendering of Marcion. This has serious implications.

While Harnack did not construct Marcion as fundamentally anti-Jewish nor was anti-Judaism a key feature of his representation, Harnack did create a Marcion that was, much like the Jesuses criticised by Albert

Schweitzer,[106] a product that was embedded in his own context and agenda. As stated before but worth repeating, Harnack claimed that "[t]he starting point of criticism for Marcion of the tradition can not be mistaken. It was in the Pauline contrast of law and gospel, on one side petty and cruel justice, and on the other side love, mercifully given" (Harnack 1924, 30).

And while Harnack's Marcion rejected the "law," Harnack's description of "Jewish" tradition—one that was "malicious, petty, cruel punitive correctness," that needs to be juxtaposed against the "merciful love" of the Christian gospel—is not a neutral evaluation but encodes much of the supersessionism of Christian theological and apologetic scholarship that needs to construct a stagnant Judaism to which the greatness of Christianity could be contrasted.[107]

For instance, in regards to Judaism, Harnack claimed that

> Israel, no doubt, had a sacred treasure which was of greater value than all the treasure of the Greeks—the living God; but in what miserable vessels was this treasure preserved, and how much

---

[106] Schweitzer, in a critique of the scholars who tried to construct Jesus as this kind of ethical forerunner of 19th century values, stressed that: "[t]he Jesus of Nazareth who came forward publicly as the Messiah, who preached the ethic of the kingdom of God, who founded the kingdom of heaven upon earth, and died to give his work its final consecration, never existed. He is a figure designed by rationalism, endowed with life by liberalism, and clothed by modern theology in a historical garb." (Schweitzer 1954, 396)

[107] While much later, this idea is clearly articulated by Bultmann who claimed that "[a]s interpretation of the will, the demand, of God, Jesus' message is a great *protest against Jewish religion*—i.e. against a form of piety which regards the will of God as expressed in the written Law and in the Tradition which interprets it, a piety which endeavours to win God's favour by the toil of minutely fulfilling the Law's stipulations (Bultmann 1955, 1:11 emphasis original).

> inferior was all else possessed by this nation in comparison with the riches, the power, the delicacy and the freedom of the Greek spirit and its intellectual possessions. A movement like that of Christianity, which discovered to the Jew the soul whose dignity was not dependent on its descent from Abraham . . . could not continue it in the framework of Judaism however expanded [by Hellenistic influence] but must soon recognize in the world which the Greek Spirit had discovered and prepared, the field which belonged to it. (Harnack 1961, Vol.1, 47)[108]

As Harnack retrojected his own 19th-century Lutheranism into antiquity, it should come as no surprise that his version of Marcion would reflect his own religious convictions. "Luther's concept of faith actually is the one that stands nearest to the Marcionite concept." (Harnack 1924, 139)

With this in mind it is clear that, for Harnack, Marcion's theological rendering was not just historically interesting, but represented a Christianity that was relevant for Harnack's present age. Again, as noted before but worth repeating;

> The rejection of the OT in the second century was a mistake which the great Church rightly avoided; to maintain it in the sixteenth century was a fate from which the Reformation was not yet able to escape; but to preserve it in Protestantism as a canonical document since the nineteenth century is the consequence of a religious and ecclesiastical crippling (Harnack 1924, 134).

---

[108] "The Gospels did not come into the world as a statutory religion, and therefore none of the forms in which it assumed intellectual and social expression—not even the earliest—can be regarded as possessing a classical or permanent character . . . As Christianity [via the Gospels] rises above all antithesis of Here and the Beyond, life and death, work and shunning of the world, reason and ecstasy, Hebraism and Hellenism, it can also exist under the most diverse conditions; just as it was originally amid the wreck of the Jewish religions that it developed its power" (Harnack 1957, 191)

But of course, Harnack was not alone in his constructions. Even though his need to reclaim Marcion was not a common scholarly agendum, Harnack was still a product of a scholarly environment that not only was steeped in Christian anti-Judaism (Arnal 2005, 8-12), but also produced the explicit antisemitic scholarship that served as part of the intellectual environment that ultimately led in part to the production of the Nazis (Arnal 2005, 11). It is this environment, and the modern scholarly need to distance itself from it (Arnal 2005, 8-20) that seems to be contributing to the *doxa* that assumes Marcion as antisemitic.

b) *Marcion and antisemitism: Houston Stewart Chamberlain*

One of the most (in)famous scholars of the antisemitic, Christian-centric context of the late 19th and early 20th centuries was Harnack's friend,[109] Houston Stewart Chamberlain. While born in Southsea, Hampshire, England (September 9, 1855) to a military family and raised in France, Chamberlain nonetheless

[109] It is interesting to note that "Harnack, a friend of Chamberlain's, flatly told him that he was 'possessed by an anti-Jewish demon.' However this did not prevent Harnack from admiring Chamberlain's work in general. In a letter to Chamberlain, Harnack disquietingly assures him: 'Still enough—the Jew shall not have the last word. Rather, may he disappear completely and may there remain between us only the conviction of a broad and deep unity and agreement.' Harnack's call for Judaism's 'complete disappearance,' although not a call for genocide, nonetheless demonstrates how the conceptual boundaries of Christian anti-Semitism became alarmingly ill defined in this period" (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 40)

identified with all things German,[110] particularly Wagner.[111] For example, in a letter dated to May 23rd, 1876, Chamberlain stated

> I cannot tell you how much my reverence, my passionate love for Germany and my faith in her, increase. The more I learn of other nations, the more I mix with people of all classes—educated and uneducated—from all the countries of Europe, the more I love Germany and the Germans. My belief that the whole future of Europe—i.e. the civilization of the world—rests in the hands of Germany. (A. Chamberlain 1923, 28-30)[112]

---

[110] In a letter to his Aunt Harriet, Chamberlain stated that "My three greatest wishes in life are: first, to be allowed to remain in Europe and not to emigrate to the colonies, second, to stay far away from England, and third, to settle in Germany" (Chamberlain 1919, 59).

[111] Chamberlain wrote many books praising Wagner, such as *Das Drama Richard Wagner* (1892) and *Richard Wagner* (1896) and eventually married Wagner's step-daughter, Eva von Bülow-Wagner (Field 1981, 287).

[112] Ich kann Dir gar nicht sagen, wie meine Verehrung, meine leidenschaftliche Liebe, sowie mein Glaube an Deutschland zunimmt. Je mehr ich andere Nationen kennen lerne, je mehr ich mit Leuten — gebildeten und ungebildeten — aller Klassen aus allen Völkern Europas verkehre, desto mehr liebe ich Deutschland und die Deutschen. Mein Glaube, daß die ganze Zukunft Europas — d. h. der Zivilisation der Welt — Deutschland in den Händen liegt, ist zur Sicherheit geworden. Das Leben des Deutschen ist ein ganz anderes als das von anderen Menschen; in ihm hat das Selbstbewußtsein, das Gefühl seiner Würde, den Höhepunkt erreicht; er ist zugleich der Dichter und praktische Organisator, der Denker und Tuer, der Mann des Friedens par excellence und der beste Soldat, der Zweifler und der einzige, der imstande ist, wirklich zu glauben. Aber wie immer, je größer die Gaben, desto größer die Aufgabe. Deutschlands Aufgabe ist eine kolossal schwierige, und wenn es sie erfüllen soll, so muß die ganze Nation sie begreifen und alle zusammen wie ein Mann nach ihrer Erfüllung streben. Nicht bloß hat sie an sich selbst so viel zu tun, so viel zu entwickeln, sondern während dies fortgeht, muß sie sich allein gegen die Feindseligkeit und Verkennung ganz Europas aufrecht erhalten. Wenn man nicht selbst sich mitten im Strome befindet, sondern von ferne aus den Lauf der Dinge beobachten kann, so muß man sich oft fragen: Wird Deutschland seine Aufgabe erfüllen können? Wird es sie erfüllen? Und wenn man auch von ganzem Herzen unbefangen das Land liebt und keine Wolken darüber hängen sehen möchte, so ist man gezwungen, sich selbst zuzugestehen: nein! Wenn die gründlich verrotteten moralischen Verhältnisse sich nicht bessern (und stehen bleiben tun sie nicht, wenn sie nicht besser werden, werden sie schlimmer), wenn die ganze Nation nicht einsieht, daß Reinheit die größte Kraft eines Volkes ist, daß, wenn die Zukunft Europas von Deutschland abhängt, Deutschland nur dann eine Zukunft haben kann, wenn man den jetzigen Zustand von Grund auf angreift und gegen die ganze übrige Welt die Moralität als Hauptwaffe erhebt, wenn Deutschland das nicht einsieht, dann muß es auch bald fallen — fallen, ohne seine Aufgabe vollendet zu haben, eine Beute der Barbaren ... (ach Gott! was für ein Deutsch schreibe ich! Sei mir nicht böse, denn ich bin ja kein Deutscher).

Considering his positive portrayal of Germanic culture, it is unsurprising that Chamberlain's writings were also well received within Germany itself. For example, Chamberlain's *Foundations of The Nineteenth Century*, while clearly

> a Christian-racialist tract widely regarded as one of the most important antecedents of Nazi ideology...[Its] highly charged attacks on Catholicism[113] and scientific materialism also ensured a warm reception among liberal Protestants...[who] found their own views echoed in Chamberlain's call for a nationalist *Kulturreligion*" (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 39)

For Chamberlain, this *Kulturreligion,* while understood as the future of Germany, nonetheless found its antecedence with the birth of Jesus. According to Chamberlain, Jesus's birth was not just the most important event in world history but was also the advent of a new "God-Man" of the Indo-Europeans (Field 1981, 182-183). It is this "uniqueness" of Jesus that allowed Chamberlain could make the claim that

> [w]hoever makes the assertion that Christ was a Jew is either ignorant or insincere; ignorant when he confuses religion and race, insincere when he knows the history of Galilee and partly conceals, partly distorts the very entangled facts in favour of his religious prejudices or, it may be, to curry favour with the Jews. The probability that Christ was no Jew, that *He had not a drop of genuinely Jewish blood in his veins, is so great that it is equivalent*

---

[113] "Chamberlin's bitterest attacks were reserved for Roman Catholicism, which the [*Foundations*] had depicted as a tyrannical power bent on universal domination. Rome, Chamberlain argued, had institutionalized Semitic elements within Christianity and spread them throughout Europe." (Field 1981, 307).

> *to certainty*. . .[Jesus] *is not perfecting the Jewish religion but its negation* (Chamberlain, 1913, 1:218-19, 227, emphasis mine).[114]

Basing this assertion on the "evidence" of foreign or Aryan influence in Galilee, Chamberlain could then construct Jesus as the "Teutonic" juxtaposition of "Semitic" faith[115] (Field 1981, 303). In other words, while Jesus may not have been a full-blown "Aryan," for Chamberlain he was certainly no Jew and as such "European culture, even in its Christian-influenced elements, was safe from contamination from Jewish-thought processes" (Arnal 2005, 9).[116]

c) Marcion and Nazi Paganism: Alfred Rosenberg.

While considered one of the "enemies" of Christianity within the Nazi Party,[117] Alfred Rosenberg nonetheless considered Jesus an important element

---

[114] Die Wahrscheinlichkeit, dass Christus kein Jude war, dass er keinen Tropfen echt jüdischen Blutes in den Adern hatte, ist so gross, dass sie einer Gewissheit fast gleichkommt...Diese Erscheinung ist nicht die Vollendung der jüdischen Religion, sondern ihre Verneinung.

[115] While Chamberlain certainly laid the litany of Europe's historic woes at the feet of "Jews," unlike "some anti-semites Chamberlain did not reject the Old Testament altogether but argued that recent advances by Protestant scholars made it possible to sift out the Indo-Aryan and Canaanite myths before they were engulfed or petrified by Semitic concepts" (Field 1981, 190). This kind of "editing"on the part of Chamberlain was also employed in his reading of the Pauline letters (Chamberlain 1921, 178-179). According the Field, given "their general views it is hardly surprising that Chamberlain and the Kaiser were fascinated with by the figure of Marcion who tried to eradicate all traces of the Old Testament from Christianity and demanded a 'de-Judized' Gospel" (Field 1981, 497 n.62).

[116] It should be noted that, while Marcion hardly figured into Chamberlain's work, he is nonetheless placed into a long line of "anti-Jewish" Christians due to his "rejection" of the Old Testament (Chamberlain 1913, 2: 677-678).

[117] In many of the revisionist histories of the Nazi movement, there is "the belief that, however much Christian clergy welcomed the [Nazi] movement or however much Nazi ideology may have borrowed from Christian traditions, Nazism itself could not be described as a Christian movement" (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 3; see also Gailus 2007; Bergen 2007; Stowers 2007)

within his construction of "Nazi Paganism." Based upon the work of Houston Stewart Chamberlain (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 95 n. 49) Rosenberg's *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts*—while rejecting "standard Christian" tropes such as original sin, the Trinity, the Virgin Mary and resurrection (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 94-95—nonetheless understood Jesus as a key figure for Germanic self-understanding.

> Now Jesus appears to us as the self-confident Lord in the best and highest sense of the word. It is his life which holds meaning for the Germanic People, not his agonising death, which is the image of him among the Alpine and Mediterranean peoples. The mighty preacher and wrathful one in the temple, the man who swept along his followers, is the idea which today shines forth from the Gospels, not the sacrificial lamb of the Jewish prophets [that was] crucified. (Rosenberg 1934, 604)[118]

While this "dejudification" of Jesus was meant as a means of emphasising his "Aryanism," it also appeared to be a means by which Rosenberg could critique existing versions of Christianity. For example, by equating "race" with "religion," Rosenberg discounted "the catholic priesthood [that] was...a racial defiled mixture of 'Etrusco-Syro-Near Easterners and Jews' who had infiltrated and infected ancient Rome" (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 97). It is because of this

---

[118] Jesus erscheint uns heute als selbstbewußter Herr im besten und höchsten Sinne des Wortes. Sein Leben ist es, das für germanische Menschen Bedeutung besitzt, nicht sein qualvolles Sterben, dem er den Erfolg bei den alpinen und Mittelmeervölken verdankte. Der gewaltige Prediger und der Zürnende im Tempel, der Mann, der mitriß, und dem ,,sie alle'' folgten, nicht sas Opferlamm der jüdischen Prophetie, nicht der Gekeruzigte ist heute das bildende Ideal, das uns aus den Evangelien hervoleuchtet.

defilement that Catholicism represented a "Jewish-clerical Christianity" which enforced a separation between God and humanity; the antithesis of the new revelation of Jesus (Rosenberg 1934, 161; Steigmann-Gall 2003, 97).

And while Rosenberg levelled criticism against Lutherism as a tradition that had itself lost its way and become calcified, his attacks against it did not carry the same racially charged vitriol. For instance, Rosenberg praised Martin Luther's fight against Rome's clerical authority and its "Tibetan-Etruscan Asian" influences (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 97). But while Rosenberg considered Luther a forerunner of German Nationalism and racial purity, (Rosenberg 1934, 129) his adherence to the "Jewish" Old Testament nonetheless remained an issue.[119] For Rosenberg, the Hebrew Bible, "as a religious book . . . must be abolished for all time. With it will end the failed attempt of the last fifteen hundred years to spiritually make us [Germans] Jews" (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 98; Rosenberg 1934, 603). Rosenberg even goes so far as to call for a removal of all Jewish "distortions" of the New Testament, calling for creation of a "fifth Gospel," one that would supposedly be more in line with the notions of an "Aryan" construction of Christianity. It seems that for Rosenberg, far from being only concerned with German paganism or the "political" religion of the Nazis

---

[119] "Although this [according to Rosenberg] was compensated for by his later tract, 'On the Jews and their Lies' and his declaration that Christianity would have nothing to do with Moses, the Old Testament nonetheless remained part of Luther's canon." (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 97)

(Stowers, 2007; Hexham 2007), he was also was interested in the place of Jesus within his religious horizon.

d) Marcion and Nazism's Christianity: Walter Grundmann

While the "Aryan Jesuses" of Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Alfred Rosenberg can be dismissed as fringe constructions that lack academic acumen, and Harnack can be quarantined (perhaps apologetically) as simply a reflection of intellectual environment of the time, the same can not be said for one of the "pillars" of New Testament scholarship, Walter Grundmann,[120] an academic who

---

[120] The modern scholarly evaluation of Chamberlain and Rosenberg appears almost gleeful in noting the lack of academic quality of both writers, as if pointing out how shoddy the scholarship was somehow adds weight to the foolishness of the ideas presented. For example, Chamberlain's *Foundations* has been dismissed as the product of the "scavenger" that is typical of racist literature, "pedantically piling up facts to demonstrate its contention and annexing ideas from all dominate trends of contemporary scholarship." (Field 1981, 199) While "annexing ideas and trends" *sounds* problematic, it is also *could* be interpreted as a needed first step in immersing one's self in the scholarship on a particular topic to get a "lay of the academic land." In his evaluation of Rosenberg, Steigmann-Gall points out that *even* Hitler (!) appeared to find Rosenberg's ideas to be the product of a "narrow-minded Baltic German who thinks in horribly complicated terms...a relapse into medieval notions!" (Steigmann-Gall 2003, 92). While Hitler perhaps should not be cast as the arbiter of "good scholarship", the tone of this claim is that if *even Hitler* didn't like the work of Rosenberg, it must be shoddy indeed. However, the same dismissive tone is generally not leveled at Grundmann's *scholarship* (his character is a different matter). For example, at the beginning of his chapter devoted to Grundmann, Gerdmar points out that "Walter Grundmann (1906–1976) has lately received much interest, with *a number of articles and books being devoted to him*. The reason is hardly that Grundmann is *a particularly interesting exegete—the part of his work that is not ideologically tainted is quite ordinary*—but he has become the main example of nazified theology" (Gerdmar 2009, 532-534 emphasis added). Two points are worth noting. First, claiming that Grundmann's scholarship is "hardly interesting" and "quite ordinary"—while, perhaps meant to cast Grundmann as unremarkable—nonetheless places him not as an academic outlier (for good or ill) but within the heart of the scholarly "guild" of his time. This position of Grundmann as a fully immersed within New Testament scholarship (as opposed to the fringe where Chamberlain and Rosenberg can be positioned) is indicated by the "number of articles and books" Gerdmar refers to; a list that amounts to a two page foot note (that takes up the entirety of page 533!). It seems that perhaps this producer of "quite ordinary" scholarship nonetheless weighs heavy on the minds of modern academics. For later scholarly analysis of the work of Harnack see Fairen 2008; Section 1, Chapter 1.

not only was influential before and during the Nazi era, but remained so after the conclusion of World War II (Heschel 2008, 286).

Evidence for Grundmann's commitment to Nazism can be illustrated via his early membership within the party.[121] "Academics were sought after, first for the SS and then for the SD, and Grundmann was probably *gefundenes Fressen* to these groups. He was thus an early and dedicated National Socialist" (Gerdmar 2009, 535; Johnson 1986) whose scholarship was intended to be "pathbreaking for a National Socialist perspective in the realm of theology." (Heschel 1994, 592)

For instance, in *Totale Kirche im totalen Staat* (1934) Grundmann sets about discussing the relationship between the Nazi State and the German Protestant Church. Because religion is a concern of the *Volk*, Grundmann maintained that a national religion and a national Church, based on blood and racial hygiene, would be inevitable (Grundmann 1934, 25). It is unsurprising therefore that Grundmann's Jesus reflects this agenda.

> Speaking of the gospel in the existing situation, it is probably imperative for Grundmann to disconnect Jesus from his biological descent and make him relevant to the Germans under National Socialist rule. Jesus Christ is thus not conditioned by being Jewish

---

[121] "On 1 December 1930, *Universitätsassistent* Walter Grundmann became a member of the NSDAP in Tübingen. This early joining of the party placed him among those not suspected of opportunism, as they joined the party after the National Socialists came to power in early 1933. The pioneers of 1930–1932 enjoyed a high status and often obtained leadership positions in e.g. the SS. From 1 April 1934, Grundmann was a supporting member (*Förderndes Mitglied*, FM) of the SS (membership no. 1032691). Such members vowed to give a monthly contribution to the organisation and were allowed to carry the FM badge, although they were not involved in any concrete activities." (Gerdmar 2009, 534)

> or Aryan—he comes from beyond (*jenseits*) and is a miraculous new creation. Needing to find a formula for Christ's being that 'rescues' him from being Jewish, this is Grundmann's solution. Hence Grundmann also turns against a liberal theological picture of Jesus, making him a mere moral preacher or hero of virtues, since he as a human would belong to a specific race...He is foreign to race and kind inasmuch as he is foreign to humanity—here Grundmann in fact constructs an 'Apollinarian' Christology, to avoid anchoring Jesus in race and Volk. Faith in Jesus is therefore not destruction of race, but perfection of it. (Gerdmar 2009, 545)

This ambiguity of Jesus' genealogy however, shifted in Grundmann's most "famous" work *Jesus der Galiläer und das Judentum* (1940)[122] which attempted to address two issues: what was Jesus' stance towards Judaism, and was Jesus himself a Jew?

Throughout the text, Grundmann juxtaposes Jesus with the Jews and the Judaism of his day. For instance, according to Grundmann, Jesus was not from Judea but from "Gentile" Galilee and hence was not a "Jew" (Grundmann 1940, 6); while Jesus may have been raised in the synagogue, his teachings were not

[122] "In 1933, Grundmann had dismissed questions of the racial descent of Jesus as blasphemous or irrelevant, making Jesus ahistorical instead of either Jewish or Aryan; by 1940, however, he has changed his mind completely" (Gerdmar 2009, 566)

typical of Judaism (Grundmann 1940, 8);[123] unlike the Pharisees, Jesus related to the "people of the land" who did not observe the Torah according to Pharisaic interpretation (Grundmann 1940, 9-11, 41),[124] and while the Torah was the centre of Jewish life, it was not a central concern for Jesus. For Grundmann, that which was "specifically Jewish and what is limited by the Old Testament, the focus on Israel, the limitation of salvation to the last generation and the earthly aspect of salvation, as well as the legalism of living and acting, has not been adopted by Jesus."[125]

> Central to his world was defining Jesus not simply as a non-Jew, but as the anti-Jew, and making the sharp opposition between the religiosity of Jesus and that of Judaism...Galilee was not simply

---

[123] But taking the position that Galilee was not just geographically distinct from Judah but culturally, religiously, and racially as well, Grundmann could claim that Galilee had been populated by the Aryans who had been forcibly converted to Judaism by the Hasmoneans, and therefore were not "Jewish." "Moreover, the grandfather of Jesus is different in Luke's and Matthew's lists because they wanted to conceal the correct name, Grundmann argues. It was not a Jewish, but 'a non-Semitic, a Greek name' [Grundmann 1940, 197]. For the identity of Jesus' father, Grundmann turns to the Panthera legend, as well as to a note in Epiphanius that Joseph's father Jacob had the byname Panthera. According to Grundmann, Jacob Panthera was thus a Galilean, who with many others was subject to the forceful Judaisation of Galilee that took place in the time of Jesus' great-grandfather. The grandfather took a second name, also giving Old Testament names to his children, and so Joseph, too, had a non-Jewish Galilean pedigree. '*Jesus is the son of Galilean parents*,' Grundmann concludes [1940, 199 emphasis original] Jewish tradition then made Jesus a son of Panthera, not Joseph, and later he was turned into a soldier. The Jewish-Christian church, however, used these genealogies to counter such assaults and to vindicate Jesus as the Son of David" (Gerdmar 2009, 570). Unsurprising, with this non-Jewish lineage in mind, Grundmann's Jesus would not the expected messiah of the Old Testament but represented a new kind of eschatology (Heschel 2008, 152; Grundmann 1938).

[124] According to Grundmann, the "people of the land" placed trust in God without recourse to Torah and "had come to a positive valuation of suffering in this world and looked for reward and redemption in the coming world. They based their piety on this hope which had formed under the tyranny spread by the [Torah-friendly] Pharisees" (Grundmann 1940, 78).

[125] ...des Alten Testaments, die Konzentrierung auf Israel, die Beschränkung des Heils auf die letzte Generation und der irdische Charakter des Heils, sowie die Gesetzlicheit des Lebens und Handelns, von Jesus nicht übernommen worden ist.

> Gentile, but represented a non-Jewish religiosity that stood in polemical opposition to the Jews of Judea. (Heschel 2008, 154. See also Gerdmar 2009, 566)

And of course while Grundmann's work has proven to be embarrassing for later New Testament scholars, his position as a founding figure of the *Institut zur Erforschung des jüdischen Einflüsses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben,* the Christian wing of the Nazi party and the theological fount of the German Positive Churches, has irrevocably (and correctly) linked him with antisemitism and Nazism. While space does not allow a full analysis of the *Institut* and Grundmann's role within it,[126] an exemplar of it agenda and methodology is explicit in the statement issued at its founding on May 6, 1939:

> The foundation of this institute is based on the conviction that Jewish influence on all areas of German life, including therefore that of religion and of the church, must be brought to light and eliminated. Christianity has nothing in common with Judaism. From *the Gospel of Christ on* it has developed *in opposition to Judaism* and has always been attacked by the latter. . . . Christianity has the task of promoting a true renewal of genuine religious life in our nation. Since alien Jewish influences have gained [a foothold] within Christianity itself over the course of its historical development, *the dejudaisation of the Church and of Christianity has become the inescapable and decisive task for contemporary church life; it is the presupposition for the future of Christianity.* With this aim in mind the task of the institute is to make an exact and detailed investigation into the manner and degree of Jewish influence on church life thorough scholarly research. Leading scholars and churchmen will work together side by side in their

---

[126] Specifically see Heschel 1994; 2009, 67-200. For an exhaustive bibliography of scholarly analysis of the *Institut* see Gerdmar 2009, 531 n. 1

> determination to carry out this task. On the basis of the results of this scholarly research it will then be possible to rid the church life of the German people of those elements which derive from Jewish influence and to clear the way for a faith springing from the unadulterated Gospel of Christ to place itself at the disposal of the German people for the creation of its religious community.[127]

1.2.9: Hitler Made Me Do It! The Academic Doxa *of Marcion's Anti-Judaism*

It should be noted that these kinds of racist, anti-Judaic models of ancient and Christian history not only dovetailed with the antisemitic ideology of Nazism, but also granted a veneer of academic legitimacy to it.

> Nazi anti-Semitism itself did not arise in a vacuum, but represented a continuation of racial anti-Semitism popularised and given pseudo-scientific legitimacy in the nineteenth century by writers such as Chamberlain. . .[and] ultimately finds its parentage in Christian anti-Judaism, which extends from the New Testament period right up to modernity, and which set the tone for the exclusion of European Jews from the 'blood and soil' romanticising (and intellectualising) of national identity in the nineteenth century (Arnal 2005, 9).

However, considering the overt effort to rehabilitate Christianity from its complacency and / or contribution to the Holocaust, there has been an equal need to quarantine the Holocaust's perpetrators—the Nazis and those who were sympathetic to their cause—as not products of the Christian-centric culture of

---

[127] Translated in Matheson 1981, 81-82; emphasis in original.

Europe that produced them, but *perversions* of it; Europe's cultural heretics. And what better way to do that than to cast them into some kind of continuity with not "proper" European culture or religion—with the Jewish Jesus and Jewish New Testament at its centre, properly interpreted—but history's "Arch-heretic" Marcion (Lüdemann 1996, 148; Moll 2010)? So, much like the heresiologists' insistence on tracing a lineage of heresy through some kind of figure of deviance —such as Simon Magus (Acts 8:9-24) or Credo (Haer. 1.27.1)— it appears that scholars have been doing the same kind of thing with the most deviant Christian and European heresy, Nazism.

It should be stated that no representation of Marcion from antiquity appears to contain the kind of supersessionism of Grundmann's *Institut*, nor ever advocated the "eradication" of the Jews as per the Nazis, but instead seems to have emphasised the novelty of the revelation of Jesus and Paul. But considering the overwrought insistence on the "Jewishness" of Jesus and the earliest Christian communities (and the accusations aimed at those who produce a "non-Jewish" Jesus) it would be surprising, considering the current scholarly climate, that these similarities *did not* figure, at least implicitly, into the reconstructions of Marcion

and contribute to his supposed anti-Jewishness.[128] In other words, considering the antisemitic scholarship of the early part of the 20th century and the agenda behind the "Ways that Never Parted" and "Third Quest" for the Historical Jesus (Arnal 2005, 41-47), it seems that the superficial similarities between how Marcion has been represented and scholarly models that dovetail with Nazism, has contributed to the claim that Marcion was in some way "heretical" in his anti-Jewishness.

For example, as noted above, Marcion is represented like Harnack, as not thinking the "Old Testament" necessary for Christian appropriative claims; like Chamberlain, Marcion is to have claimed that Jesus was of "non-Jewish" origin and represented a god distinct from the Hebrew deity; like Rosenberg, Marcion is

---

[128] This phenomenon has been documented and convincingly critiqued by Arnal (2005, 16-19) who cites such examples as Sean Freyne's critique of John Dominic Crossan, in which he states that "to water down the Jewishness of Galilee not only has the potential for anti-Semitism. . . it also invites a refusal to acknowledge that the Christian understanding of God is also grounded in the Jewish religious experience" (Freyne 1997, 91). N.T. Wright also makes a similar assertion that some Q scholars wilfully construct "[a]n early Christian community, for whom the Jewish stories, both form and content, were not particularly important. The focus instead was on a different style and content of teaching: the Hellenistic philosophy know as Cynicism, on one hand, and, on the other, a tradition of teaching which offered secret wisdom, a secret Gnosis. [Q scholars] have created a community that would have been just as happy with the Gospel of Thomas, Jesus as a teacher of aphoristic, quasi-Gnostic, quasi-Cynic wisdom." (Wright 1992, 437) Finally, one of the clearest examples of this discursive malaise comes from Birger Pearson who claims that "[t]he Jesus of the Jesus Seminar is a non-Jewish Jesus. To put it metaphorically, the Seminar has performed a forcible epispasm on the historical Jesus, a surgical procedure removing the marks of his circumcision. The result might arouse some disquiet in the minds of people who know the history of the 30's and 40's of our century. But the Jesus of the Jesus Seminar is much too banal to cause us to think that the ideology producing him is like that which produced the 'Aryan Jesus' of the 1930's" (Pearson 1996, 42). According to Arnal "[t]he insistence in the Jewishness of Jesus has become, in the last decade or so, increasingly shrill, dogmatic and polemical. In the 1970's and 1980's, the inclusion of the words "Jew" or "Judaism" in the title of a book on Jesus was a refreshing rejoinder to the scholarship of previous decades. By the 1990's and into the third millennium, it seemed that one could hardly write about Jesus without actively asserting his Jewish roots . . . [and e]ven more striking has been the proliferation of charges that certain contemporary reconstruction of the historical Jesus are unJewish or even—it is implied—anti-Jewish" (Arnal 2005, 16).

constructed as requiring a "different" Gospel than those that were in circulation, one that was purged of all Judaic references to reflect Jesus' non-Jewish "ethnicity"; and finally like Grundmann, Marcion is understood to have also understood Jesus' rendering of God as fundamentally different than that of "the Jews" and that the New Testament needed to be purged of "Judaic" references in the interest of "saving" Jesus from being the Messiah of Jews.

Again, while the various representations of Marcion were very different than the agendas of Harnack, Chamberlain, Rosenberg and Grundmann, as the flip side of the "Jewish Jesus hoopla" (Mack 2001, 25-40) there is not only an almost desperate need of modern scholars to distance themselves from the antisemitic scholarship of the previous century, but also a need to rationalise it, to find its pedigree, and to quarantine it from "proper" scholarship and "pro-Jewish" Christianity. And what better way to do this than drawing (tenuous) links to Marcion, who, on one hand, loomed so large in the fears of the heresiologists and figured so prominently in the construction of Christian "orthodoxy" (Knox 1942; Tyson 2006), but, on the other hand is all but lost to modern constructions? As the Essenes can function as a convenient—and fundamentally unknown—Judaism in

which to root and claim the Dead Sea Scrolls (Fairen 2008, 53-67) for a whole variety of purposes[129] so too Marcion can function as an antisemitic *tabula rasa*.

For example, while assumptions of Marcion's anti-Judaism are part of the "goes without saying" of Christian origins scholarship, a similar phenomenon can be found scattered throughout historical studies of Nazism that seem to feel the need to preface their discussion on the "deviance" of German Christian religious expressions under Hitler with a discussion of the (implied) deviance of Marcion (Heschel 2008; Bergen 1996; Davis 1974) or of "inauthentic" political religion (Stowers 2007; Evans 2007). It is this need to distance Christianity from Nazism, and the superficial similarities between the antisemitic scholars and theologians with Marcion, that has contributed to the assumption that Marcion's rendering of Christianity was anti-Jewish, anti-Judaic and even at times antisemitic, even though the "evidence"—as fragmented and secondary as it is—simply does not support this position.

Indeed, without even addressing the issue of the supposed "historical" Marcion, the claim that he must have been antisemitic by virtue of his theology, his version of Christianity or his lack of use of the Hebrew Bible is not only far

---

[129] For example, Laurence Schiffman makes the case for the modern state of Israel by virtue of the presence of the ancient Dead Sea Scrolls. "The scrolls help us clarify our own relationship to the Land of Israel . . . the discovery of the scrolls binds contemporary Jews to their past through the land. For it was there that so much of ancient Jewish history took place. And it is there that the future of the Jewish people is being shaped." (Schiffman 1994, xxv)

too simplistic for the messy reality our sources seem to indicate, but it also seems to be an attempt—as Pilate who washed his hands of the whole affair—to sanitise modern, Western and Christian-centric cultures from any blame or complacency they may have had in the greatest example of antisemitism of the last century. Again, while we may be sympathetic to the agenda that is trying to offer a corrective to the old, antisemitic scholarship of the past, something smells a little worse than fishy about the whole enterprise and the stench needs investigating. As Russell McCutcheon states:

> It falls to the culture critic to sniff out the faint waft of dung which inevitably hangs in the air when we attempt to sanitise the unsightly and unruly by means of binary distinctions portrayed as natural. For it is the faint odour of rhetorical bullshit that provides evidence that the world of cultural artefacts is infinitely more complex than the representations of those who pit naïve innocents against the coldly calculating guilty would have us think (McCutcheon. 2005, 58).

Chapter 3

Apples and Dragons: *Q*, Marcion and the (De) Contextualization of Divine Wisdom.

3.1.1 Introduction

As argued above, while there have been a surprising number of representations of Marcion from the second to the 21st centuries, a few general assumptions have remained constant, in no small part due to the mutually reenforcing nature of our sources (BeDuhn 2013, 11). Generally speaking, Marcion has been constructed as the paradigmatic, "heretical other": the one who deviated from the truth of the "Gospel," or the one who corrupted / innovated what eventually became the Roman Catholic Church. In either case, Marcion *must* sit outside the bounds of what was understood as "normative" Christianity, however that is defined. And as noted,[130] this "normative" Christianity has been intimately tied up with issues of identity. This is true not just with our ancient representations that seek to define "heresy and orthodoxy" but also with our modern scholarly ones.

It is with this modern agenda in mind that we can see a shift in how Marcion's representations have gone from being a demon-inspired "heretic" to the first Christian "antisemite" whose apparent dislike for the Jews offers a

---

[130] And will be explored in more detail in Section 3, Chapter 2; particularly "Christianities'" relationship to, and construction of, "Judaisms."

convenient archetype for the sad history of Christian anti-Judaism. In other words, in much the same way that ancient representations of Marcion offered a *successio haereticorum* that could be used in the service of quarantining other "heretics," the "anti-Jewish" Marcion in scholarly constructions of the last 50 years offers a means to quarantine the "heretics" of the modern Christian and Western world: the Nazis and the Christian-centric attitudes that spawned them (Arnal 2005, 8-20).[131]

So even considering that we have no first-hand evidence for what Marcion may or may not have said or thought, the way he has been represented has nonetheless nicely served as Christianity's paradigmatic boogyman in both the theological debates of antiquity and during the "Jewish Jesus Hoopla"[132] of modernity. Indeed, it is this recent "anti-Jewish" understanding of Marcion that has been the lens though which we look back into the past to create our modern representations of this ancient figure.

But what would a representation of Marcion look like without this modern filter? Can we account for the various "Marcions"—however he was represented

---

[131] As noted, in a way similar to antisemitic scholars like Chamberlain and Grundmann, Marcion did not uphold the "Old Testament" as appropriate for Christian claims, he challenged the "Jewishness" of Jesus, understood the God of the Hebrew Scriptures as radically different than the God proclaimed by Jesus and was interested in "purging" the "Gospel" of all Judaizing influence. This provides easy fodder for scholars who have uncritically assumed the anti-Jewishness of Marcion. See Section 1 Chapter 2.

[132] It should be noted that the Jewishness of Jesus is in essence a red herring (Arnal 2005, 20-39). Jesus was neither Jew, nor Greek; he was a myth based upon the needs of those who created his representations.

in antiquity—without resorting to the modern assumptions of his supposed anti-Jewishness?

While the following is certainly *not* claiming to create a Marcion that is closer to the "historical" figure (even if that was possible), it is an attempt at an alternative representation that tries to account for the continuity of our ancient "sources" (Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian) and the intellectual context in which a "Marcion" or "Marcions" of this ancient type may have made sense.

By building upon the work and models of John Knox and Joseph Tyson, the following will offer an alternative representation of Marcion that avoids the modern claim that he was anti-Jewish by first giving an outline of how a "Christianity" of the type constructed as Marcion's would have made sense in antiquity. By expanding upon the thesis that Marcion did not redact *Luke* as is widely assumed (as is supported by his supposed "anti-Judaism"), this chapter will use *Q*[133] as both a methodological wedge and as an analogous framework for looking at the fuzzy shape of what could be Marcion's *Euangelion* which—when the filter of his supposed anti-Judaism is removed—seems to emphasize the novelty of Jesus as a de-contextualized and unprecedented Wisdom figure of a new and Alien God.

---

[133] The Sayings Gospel *Q* (from *Quelle*, meaning "source") is a hypothetical collections of sayings attributed to Jesus, that was discovered within the common material shared by *Matthew* and *Luke* and is thought by scholars to be one of the earliest "Christian" gospels. See Kloppenborg Verbin 2000.

1.3.2. Q as Method

In the last paragraph of *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*, Burton Mack writes:

> So goodbye Q. You might be taken up by many different hands. Do take care. You are no longer as strong and illustrious a text as once you were. Christians may think you embarrassing, and critics may find you trite. So much has changed since first you were read. But my, what a difference you could make if read anew and seriously questioned. Who knows? The story of things lost and found may never sound the same (Mack 1993, 258).

Despite the tone of whimsy, Mack nicely articulates the potential *Q* has for reconstructing the social histories of early Christianities. If *Q* is taken seriously—as both a coherent document and as a full-fledged expression of nascent Christianity (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000, 332)—scholars will have a methodological wedge to help revise traditional notions of what "normative" Christianity *should* have been in antiquity.[134] But while *Q*'s utility has helped

---

[134] For instance, *Q* has provided a means for conceiving Christianity outside of the *a priori* assumption that all Christians attributed salvific meaning to the death and resurrection of Jesus (Robinson, 2005 [1975], 129). This conclusion has been given credence by the archaeological evidence which, according to Graydon Snyder, shows that "[m]any of the scenes [of Jesus of the pre-Constantine era] portray him as a deliverer, the heroic Jesus, who conquers disease . . . Later Jesus appears as a boy wonder-worker who miraculously multiplies the loaves and the fishes or changes the water into wine . . . This all fits well with the observations made here. Jesus did not suffer or die in pre-Constantine art. There is no cross symbol, nor any equivalent . . . [Christian] faith in Jesus Christ centres on his delivering power. More, their Christology fits more the heroic figure of Mark (without the cross) than the self-giving Christ of the Apostle Paul" (Snyder 2003, 109-110). In summary, Snyder claims that "from 180 to 400 [CE] artistic analogies of self-giving, suffering sacrifice, or incarnation are totally missing. The suffering Christ on a cross first appeared in the fifth century, and then not very convincingly" (Snyder 2003, 298)

"reclaim" texts from caricatures of "Gnosticism" (Davis 1983, 100-104) and provided social analogies for early Jesus movements that do not rely on "biblical" or stereotypical "Jewish" paradigms (Mack 1988, 67-68; 1993, 114-20; Vaage 1994, 10-15), the explanatory power of *Q* has not been exhausted, particularly in examining the "story of things lost and found" (Mack 1993, 258). Indeed, when one considers that both are "hypothetical" and that both have been primarily redacted out of *Luke*, it is surprising that the methodological utility of *Q* has not been used in regards to Marcion's *Euangelion.*[135]

While this lack may be due in part to the incorporation of the heresiological representations which claimed that the *Euangelion* was a theological hack-job in which Marcion "expung[ed from *Luke*] all the things that oppose his view . . . but retained those things that accord with his opinion" (Marc IV.6.2), it is more likely to be a product of the default frames of references that are used by scholars. For instance *Q*, an early first-century example of the Jesus movement, with its Deuteronomistic theology (Jacobson 1982, 386; Kloppenborg Verbin 2000, 121-22) and its appeal to the wisdom traditions of mythic Israel, is

---

[135] Matthias Klinghardt (2008) in an attempt to address the synoptic problem has claimed that the Gospel of Marcion could be a way to "dispense" with *Q*. "The inclusion of [Marcion] avoids the methodological weakness of the 2DH with regard to the minor agreements and hypothetical character of *Q.* Compared to 'Q', [Marcion] is clearly less 'hypothetical', even though its text must be critically reconstructed. . .On the other hand, the basic observation that lead to the hypothesis of 'Q' in the first place. . .[is] equally confirmed. . .by Marcion [as the text] easily explains the ambiguity of the material" (Klinghardt 2008, 26). See also BeDuhn who states that if the Euangelion, "rather than Luke, is taken as the point of comparison with Matthew to establish the text of Q, all of [the problems of the 2DH) evaporate with one stroke." (2013, 95. See also Hays 2008 and Grant 1984)

on the surface a far cry from the second-century Christian "heretic" Marcion who preformed an epispasm on *Luke*'s Jesus by representing him as docetic figure who promoted an "anti-Jewish" ditheism that included a "rejection" of the Hebrew Bible.[136]

On the surface, at least, we are not comparing apples and oranges: from this perspective, it is a comparison of apples and dragons.

Recent studies, however, have provided an opportunity to possibly re-examine the parameters of what may have been the *Euangelion* outside the context of an anti-Jewish redaction of *Luke*. In particular Joseph Tyson (2006), building on the work of John Knox's *Marcion and the New Testament* (1942), has made the case that large portions of the Lukan text that have traditionally been understood to have been excised from the *Euangelion* due to their "Jewishness," should instead be thought of as Lukan additions to an earlier source to counter the growing threat of Marcionism (Tyson 2006, 79-123). In other words, these uniquely Lukan sections—such as the infancy narrative, genealogy, post-resurrection account and the story of the prodigal son (Tyson 2006, 88-89)—were not excised by Marcion from *Luke* in the service of his "anti-Judaic" purge as has been a staple of scholarly representations, but were later Lukan additions in the

[136] See Section 1 Chapter 1 and 2.

service of a "anti-Marcionite" agenda to a pre-Lukan source and as such not available to Marcion (BeDuhn 2013, 29. See also 93-94).

Beyond convincingly making case for a "late" composition of *Luke-Acts* (Tyson 2006, 1-23) and seriously challenging the traditional assumption that Marcion edited *Luke*, Tyson's model also suggests that a comparison between the *Euangelion* and *Q* would be a fruitful area of inquiry; one that can use the utility of *Q* for examining ancient Christian social history, offering a method for examining Marcion outside of his status as editorial "anti-Jewish arch-heretic" and as Mack claims, help tell a "story of things lost and found [which] may never sound the same."

For example, in a comparison of *Q* with a relatively conservative reconstruction of the *Euangelion*[137] some interesting parallels come to light.

a) Approximately half of the *Euangelion* is made up of *Q*.
b) Out of the 62 sections or units of *Q*, 46 have a parallel the *Euangelion*.[138]
c) Out of the approximately 250 verses in *Q*, only 52 are not found or do not have parallels in the *Euangelion*.

While these points of contact are interesting and give credence to Tyson's case, what is most intriguing are the "omissions" claimed by Marcion's representations

---

[137] The "sources" for this conservative estimate are Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* IV&V, Adolph von Harnack's *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (1924) and BeDuhn *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (2013).

[138] The units or sections of Q referred to above are the divisions found on pages 35-74 of *Q-Thomas Reader* (Kloppenborg, John S., Meyer W. Marvin, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael Steinhauser, eds. 1990. Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press).

and what rhetorical purpose this kind of redaction could have made. For instance, while Marcion's "omission" of *Q* 3:2, 7-9, 16b-17 and 4:1-13 could be interpreted as indicative of his "anti-Judaic" agenda, this conclusion gets its weight primarily from the assumption that the above was omitted as part of redacted *Luke*. But in light of Tyson's claims,[139] when one considers the deployment of *Q*'s Jesus as the *primus inter pares* of Israel's emissaries of Wisdom (Robinson 2005 [1975], 122) Marcion's replacement of the above with his own *decentus Christi* (Marc. IV.7.1: Hoffman 1984, 226-28) is strikingly analogous with *Q*'s rendering of Divine Wisdom. The major difference is that while *Q*'s deployment of Jesus is rooted in the mythic history of Israel, the Jesus of Marcion's *Euangelion*—as the revealer of a new god—was unprecedented and as such could not have been predicted by *any* mythic history, be that of Israel or otherwise (Hoffman 1984, 220-26).

By first offering a "fuzzy" outline of how the *Euangelion* has been (re) constructed, and then comparing it with *Q,* we will offer an alternative representation of Marcion that does not rely on an "anti-Jewish" Christ that has been assumed from a perspective of a Lukan redaction, but was one that was

[139] According to Tyson, Marcion based his Gospel on a source text that "bears substantial similarities to what we now have in Luke 3-23" (Tyson 2006, 119).

similar to *Q*.[140] The difference is that, while *Q* deployed Jesus as the *primus inter pares* of Israel's emissaries of Wisdom, Marcion's Jesus of the *Euangelion*—while rendered analogously to a Wisdom-like figure—is best understood as one that is utterly de-contextualized, novel and without genealogy, a state that reflects the "newness" of our representations of Marcion's Alien god.

1.3.3: Where to Begin? The Problems in a (Re)construction of the Euangelion

Before a comparison of *Q* and the *Euangelion* can take place, the issue of whether or not a reasonable reconstruction of Marcion's text is even possible needs to be considered. For while the *Euangelion* is (like *Q*) "hypothetical" in that no copy of it exists and (again, like *Q*) has been thought to be recoverable out of *Luke*, there simply is no methodological equivalent of the Two Document

---

[140] While BeDuhn attempts a reconstruction of the text of the *Euangelion*, he nonetheless recognizes that, given the nature of the sources at hand, his "reconstruction does not claim to retrieve the exact Greek *wording* of [the text] even though in many cases fairly reliable conclusions about that wording are drawn. But since conclusions about the exact working of the texts cannot be resolved in many cases, I confine the reconstruction offered here to an English text, both to signal that it should be considered an approximation of the original, and to provide accessibility of the information to a broad readership, who can make use of it in a variety of constructive ways even without a word-for-word Greek text." (BeDuhn 2013, 53) Please note that, while the following outline does not make even the tentative and qualified claim of reconstructing Marcion's text as it perhaps *was* (*pace* BeDuhn) it does in general agree with the reconstruction offered by BeDuhn (2013). The important difference is that the "fuzziness" of this outline is due to self-consciously maintaining the position that we can only know how the *Euangelion* was *represented* by its detractors and not on what may or may not have been written in the text.

Hypothesis (2DH) or a rigorous methodological basis (as per the International Q Project) for Marcion's *Euangelion* (Robinson 2000, lxvi-lxxi).

Even more problematic, the only site for the recovery of the *Euangelion*—unlike anonymous *Q* which was "discovered" within, and excavated out of, *Luke* and *Matthew*—is within the hostile commentaries of heresiologists whose rhetorical agendas go to great pains to represent Marcion, his *Euangelion* and his interpretation of Christianity as the antithesis of "true" belief. In other words, within all of our secondary sources, there was no attempt by any ancient author to render Marcion in anything resembling non-biased or non-"mythical" terms.[141]

---

[141] According to BeDuhn "[b]ecause it is evident that Tertullian had an actual copy of Marcion's New Testament in front of him as he worked, modern researchers universally rate his evidence very highly...This has proven problematic, however. Research since Harnack has pointed out that Tertullian, in all his writings, quotes the Bible loosely, sometimes from memory, sometimes paraphrased. Although Tertullian is being careful in [*Adversus Marcionem*] to argue against Marcion on the basis of the content of passages actually included in the Marcionite Bible, there is no reason to think that he reliably quotes these passages verbatim" (BeDuhn 2013, 34-35). While BeDuhn is correct that we should be cautious regarding the reliability of Tertullian's quotations, his caution unfortunately does not go far enough. BeDuhn assumes that Tertullian was "being careful in [*Adversus Marcionem*] to argue against Marcion on the basis of the content of passages actually included in the Marcionite Bible" and as such must have had "an actual copy of Marcion's New Testament in front of him as he worked." While this *may* perhaps have been the case there simply is no evidence that this was true. Indeed, considering that Tertullian's opening paragraphs of *Adversus Marcionem* is so loaded rhetorical hyperbole and name-calling that it is a bit of a surprise that scholars assume *any* kind of accurac*y* on the part of Tertullian regarding Marcion, let alone that Tertullian would faithfully record what Marcion may have written. *Adversus Marcionem*'s agenda is not about preserving the words of a "fellow" Christian, but of utterly debunking and de-legitimating what Tertullian thought was the worse kind of "heresy." Therefore it seems that the need and the ability to "find" the "historically" reliable nuggets of what Marcion *actually* wrote or thought within the polemical rhetoric of the writings of a heresiologist such as Tertullian is more about modern desires for accuracy than a reflection of what can actually be winnowed from the data. Of course, limited as we are by the lack of first-hand sources, scholars must rely upon writers such as Tertullian, but considering the nature of such heresological writings, the "facts" taken from them must be seasoned with more than just a few grains of skeptical salt.

Despite the problems noted above, this does not mean that an outline of how the *Euangelion* was (re)constructed in the heresiological representations is impossible. Indeed, there have been a number of attempts at this kind of reconstruction, with perhaps the most cited and comprehensive being that of Adolph von Harnack (Tyson 2006, 40). Assuming that the *Euangelion* was an edited version of *Luke*, Harnack incorporated the short commentaries found in Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* with the 78 short *scholia* from Epiphanius' *Panarion* and proposed that the *Euangelion* consisted of 682 verses that were attested to by the heresiologists, plus an additional 184 verses that Harnack considered "uncertain" (Tyson 2006, 40) but would seem to fit with Marcion's overall theological stance (Harnack 1924).[142]

However, despite the effort and detail of Harnack's work, there are certainly problems in his reconstruction, in both his assumption of a Lukan redaction and his additions of probable material based on supposed Marcion's theology (Harnack 1924; BeDuhn 2013, 48-54), particularly given that Marcion's theology is only mediated via hostile rhetoric. As noted by David S. Williams, by being uncritical of Tertullian's claim that Marcion excised *Luke,* a model such as Harnack's

---

[142] BeDuhn also includes *Adamantius*, *Pseudo-Ephrem A*, *Acts of Archelaus* (44-45), *P. Oxy. 2383* and the Marcionite Prologues to Paul's Letters (BeDuhn 2013, 34-46).

> disguises the fact that, in reality, very little of the actual character of the text of [the *Euangelion*] is known with any surety. What little is known seems in many instances to run counter to traditional claims made concerning the document. . .[and] the standard judgement that [the *Euangelion*] was simply a bowdlerized version of Luke needs to be reassessed (Williams 1989, 478).

In particular, Williams notes six basic concerns in establishing any *exact* reading of the *Euangelion.*

1) Our major witness for the *Euangelion*, Tertullian and Epiphanius, write in different languages, Latin and Greek (Williams 1989, 480).

2) Both witnesses are inconsistent with the "type and extent of the attestation they provide. Tertullian's main concern is to convict Marcion of heresy out of Marcion's own gospel" where as Epiphanius limits his critique to "about seventy specific passages" (Williams 1989, 478-79).

3) Tertullian's quotes from the *Euangelion* sometimes appear in different forms (Williams 1989, 479).

4) "Tertullian varies between giving direct quotations, indirect quotations, and mere allusions . . . [where as] the references are so

vague that the wording of Marcion's text cannot be restored at all." (Williams 1989, 479-80)

5) "Several times Tertullian charges Marcion with omitting material which does not appear in Luke at all. Although Tertullian identifies Marcion's text base as Luke, he periodically charges Marcion with excision of material that does not appear in Luke but is found in Matthew or Mark" (Williams 1989, 480). For example, in *Marc* 4.7.4; 4.9.15 and 4.12.14, Tertullian claims that Marcion omitted a statement that is not found in *Luke* but is paralleled in Matt. 5:17.

6) "Marcion's text seems to have undergone widespread changes after the time of Marcion himself" (Williams 1989, 480).

With the above in mind, Williams proposes limiting the data for the *Euangelion* to "explicated correlated readings" (Williams 1989, 481) which are cited in *both* Epiphanius and Tertullian with a high degree of agreement. However, this criterion can only account for about twenty-three citations consisting of only twenty-six verses and so "is a minimalist reconstruction of the *Euangelion*, and as such it fails to provide any sense of what that gospel might have looked like" (Tyson 2006, 42).

However, sitting roughly in between the maximalist model offered by Harnack and minimalist model of Williams is the reconstruction of the *Euangelion* as offered by Jason D. BeDuhn. According to BeDuhn, "the following five steps constitute the basic procedure used in reconstructing the text of the [the *Euangelion*]" (BeDuhn 2013, 54).

1) "Include in any passage to which our sources refer, however allusively, only the elements of each passage the sources explicitly mentions. Take account of any peculiarities in the way it is quoted...that, with good probability, reflect actual wording rather than the result of paraphrase on the part of the source" (BeDuhn 2013, 54).

2) "Resolve or explain any apparent contradiction in the source, either to the inclusion of a passage or its wording [with comparison to "Catholic" versions of the text]" (BeDuhn 2013, 54).

3) "Omit passages expressly stated to have been lacking in Marcion's text." (BeDuhn 2013, 54)

4) "Omit passages unattested in our sources...Do not treat an omission in our sources as positive evidence of the absence of the material from

Marcion's text, on the basis of any presumed ideological editorial principle of Marcion." (BeDuhn 2013, 55; *pace* Harnack)

5) "Retain [in plain type in brackets] connective content necessary for the directly attested material to have coherent meaning." (BeDuhn 2013, 54-55)

As illustrated by the positions of Harnack, Williams and BeDuhn, there are a number of problems inherent in reconstructing the *Euangelion,* not the least of all being the lack of scholarly agreement on even how to proceed. Two issues, however, mark a reconstruction of the *Euangelion* as fundamentally different than a reconstruction of *Q*.

1) As shown by Williams, because the two major sources that can be used to reconstruct Marcion have so little in the way of overlap, using "explicated correlated readings" (Williams 1989, 489) such as in minimal *Q*, is hardly useful (Robinson 2000, lxviii)

2) Unlike *Q*, which while being embedded within *Matthew* and *Luke* is still within the New Testament as such is conceptualized as part "orthodox" and "scholarly" canon, the *Euangelion* has been presented to—and subsequently by—scholars in such a way as to emphasizes it's heresy and

its supposed "deviation" from the "norm" of "proto-orthodox" Christianity; particularly his "anti-Jewishness." In way of analogy, if *Q*'s discovery was like finding a new high-quality diamond in the rough, the *Euangelion* has always been preserved as a cheap cubic zirconia in a garish setting that no one wants to wear.

This does not mean, however, that a general or "fuzzy" (re)construction of the *Euangelion*, as it may have been represented in antiquity, is impossible. Indeed, what seems to be called for is a position similar to BeDuhn, but less reliant on assuming the accuracy of the heresiological sources in recording what Marcion "really wrote." Indeed, any reconstruction must be one that is suspicious of what our sources claim—such as Marcion's "mutilation" of *Luke* (*pace* Harnack; Tyson 2006)—but also flexible enough in recognizing that, by the very nature of our sources, *any* picture of the *Euangelion* can not hope to excavate the exact wording of the text, and must only be a general outline of how the *Euangelion* was represented in ancient heresiological deployments.

Therefore, in the interest of caution—and while acknowledging the inexactness of any construction—this attempt at an outline will consider three methodological points.

1) This reconstruction will not engage in guess work of what *should or should not have been* in the *Euangelion*, based on any assumptions of his

theological agenda. Hence, Harnack's "uncertain" texts will not be considered.[143]

2) Nonetheless since the double attestation simply leaves too little to work with, single attestation will have to suffice.

3) In light of Williams' point 6 and considering the relative dates of Marcion (100-150 CE) in comparison of both Tertullian (160-220 CE) and Epiphanius (320-403 CE) Tertullian will be given precedence as chronologically closer to the dates of Marcion.[144]

Again it must be stressed that, from this starting position any reconstruction of the exact wording of the text is impossible and at best will be a "fuzzy" representation that can only provide a general outline of what the *Euangelion* might have looked like. Anything more precise—as per the International Q Project[145]—is simply impossible with the sources available.

---

[143] And again, to make clear, any construction of the *Euangelion* can not be assumed to represent what the "historical" Marcion actually thought or wrote. Again, all that can be gleaned is a more nuanced picture of the heresiological representations and perhaps account for what kind of "Christianity" this could have represented without resorting to the assumption that it was "anti-Jewish."

[144] While being chronology closer to Marcion, it should not be assumed that Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* is the most accurate representation of Marcion. However, because Tertullian is the most detailed, it has been a template for how Marcion and his Gospel has been reconstructed in both ancient and modern representations.

[145] The International Q Project (IQP) is the group of scholars that established the text of Q; the source for sayings of Jesus used by both Matthew and Luke. See *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Fortress Press, 2000)

However, while a rendering of a precise text is impossible, a more methodologically precise way in which to *account* for a Christian expression that might have looked like the *Euangelion* is certainly conceivable, particularly if we look past the assumption that Marcion's text was a heretical and "anti-Jewish" redaction of *Luke*. So in much the same way that *Q* needed to be divorced from the canonical "norm" of what constituted a full gospel in order for it to be taken seriously as an "authentic" expression of nascent Christianity,[146] so too does the *Euangelion* need a methodological frame that allows it to be examined outside of the rubric of *Luke*'s heretical and anti-Judaic redactor, and as potentially a legitimate "Christian"[147] configuration in its own right.

---

[146] For example, with the publication of James Robinson's article ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: On the *Gattung* of Q (1964) which traced the trajectory of the genre "saying of the sages" from "Jewish" wisdom texts such as Proverbs and the Wisdom of Solomon through *Q*, to the *Gospel of Thomas* and finally to *Pistis Sophia,* a way to conceptualize *Q* outside of the context of its supposed "inadequacy" was established, allowing it to be taken seriously as legitimate and complete expression of nascent Christianity, even with its lack a passion and / or resurrection account. "One of the major ideological objections to the existence of Q has been the inability to conceive of anyone in primitive Christianity who would write a gospel without including a passion narrative. This is because primitive Christianity has been too monolithically conceived in terms of the sole kerygma of cross and resurrection, from which the gospel form of Mark and John is in part derived. The Deuteronomistic and sapiential concepts of the rejection and death of the divine emissary as documented in Q could well explain how a primitive Christian in good standing, namely standing in that tradition, would have recorded the Jesus traditions important to him as a collection of sayings without a passion narrative" (Robinson 2005 [1975], 129). As Kloppenborg Verbin so cogently stated, "[i]n a single stroke, Robinson had offered an explanation both for the generic peculiarities of Q—its lack of narrative framework and its concentration upon sayings—and for its theological distinctiveness—its association of Jesus with Heavenly Sophia and the absence of any interest in developing any a salvific understanding of Jesus' death" (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000, 348).

[147] See Section 2 Chapter 1 and 2, and Section 3 Chapter 1 for the problematic use of the terms "Christian / Christianity", "Jew / Judaism" and "Gnostic / Gnosticism."

Of course, the articulation of this methodological need is not something new. For example in 1942, John Knox stated his dissatisfaction with the nominal deployment of Marcion as the heretical redactor of Luke, and asked;

> [If] Marcion 'omitted' a much larger portion of the peculiar Lukan material than of the common synoptic material . . . [w]hy should he have done this? If he did not like what was distinctively Lukan, why did he choose this Gospel when, according to the usual view, he had all the Gospels at hand, including Mark and John? (Knox 1942, 110).[148]

The answer given by Knox (and later taken up by Tyson) was not the traditional assumption that *Luke* (or more accurately *Luke-Acts*) preceded Marcion who then subsequently redacted it.

> If, however, canonical Luke appeared after [the *Euangelion*] was in circulation, and if the prevailing view of the synoptic relationship is correct, it would not be surprising to find that a substantial portion of the material not in Marcion but in canonical Luke is from the Lukan *Sondergut*. In this case the added material was not known to Marcion and so could not have formed part of the gospel he used (Tyson 2006, 86. See also BeDuhn 2013, 29).

For instance, while the omission of *Luke*'s genealogy by Marcion could be explained simply by its unpalatability to his "anti-Judaism," there are also a number of verses that were omitted—if the prevailing view is true—which would have been *eminently amicable* to his supposed anti-Judaic agenda. For instance,

---

[148] According to Harnack—and following Tertullian—Marcion felt that "all four Gospels as they exist are, in their superscriptions and their contents, forgeries of the Judaists. . . However, one of them must not be forged but, like the epistles, of Paul, only adultured, for otherwise the gospel of truth would have indeed perished. Marcion decided for the Gospel that 'the Judaistic tradition' falsely identified as that of Luke" (Harnack 1924, 29).

the massacre of the Galileans (Luke 13:1-9), the Pharisees warning Jesus that Herod wanted to kill him (Luke 13:31-35) and the parable of prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32) would have been easy fodder for Marcion's supposedly "anti-Jewish" agenda. If Marcion edited canonical *Luke* to fit his own "anti-Jewish" agenda, then these "omissions" are at best puzzling.[149]

Without speculating on the make-up or even existence of Knox's "primitive" gospel,[150] if Marcion is extracted from the perspective of *Luke*'s anti-Jewish redactor and compared with *Q*, certain methodological and textual problems noted by both Knox and Tyson are addressed.

> It is doubtful that we will ever know just what was in this source gospel, but it is not imprudent to suggest that the text bears substantial similarities to what we now have in Luke 3-23. Having said this, it is most important to stress our fundamental conclusion: *Whatever text lies behind* [the *Euangelion*] *and canonical Luke, it almost certainly did not contain the birth narratives or the preface, and it probably had only a trace of the resurrection account that now appears in canonical Luke* (Tyson 2006, 119, emphasis original).

Considering that *Q* predates Marcion, contains no birth narrative, no resurrection account and roughly parallels *Luke* 3-23, it not only seems prudent to examine the

---

[149] See Section 1 Chapter 2, n. 30.

[150] "The relation between [the *Euangelion*] and canonical Luke is not accurately described either by the simple statement that Marcion abridged Luke or by the simple statement that Luke enlarged Marcion. The position would rather be that a primitive gospel, containing approximately the Markan and Matthean elements which our Luke contains and some of its peculiar materials, was somewhat shortened by Marcion or some predecessors and later enlarged by the writer of our Gospel, who was also the maker of Luke-Acts" (Knox 1942, 110; see also Roth 2008).

overlaps between what we can reconstruct of the *Euangelion* with *Q*, but is something that is sorely in need of investigation.

1.3.4 Q and the Euangelion: Jesus and Wisdom's (De) Contextualization

As noted above, when *Q* is taken seriously and used as a methodological and comparative wedge, critical re-evaluations of some of the normative tropes of Christian origins must follow. While space limitations curtail a thorough investigation of all points of contact and divergence between how the *Euangelion* was represented and *Q*[151] there are some elements that seem particularly relevant in exploiting the methodological utility of *Q* in an examination of Marcion's representations outside of his heretical and "anti-Jewish" framework.

But to exploit the methodological utility of *Q* in comparison with the *Euangelion*, the presence of textual overlaps is simply not enough. Indeed, considering the traditional view that Marcion simply redacted *Luke*, overlap between *Q* and the *Euangelion* would be hardly surprising. But to deploy Marcion outside of the paradigm of *Luke*'s redactor, generic or thematic similarities between the *Euangelion* and *Q* would have to be present. Or to put it another way: if Marcion did not simply redact *Luke* and considering the textual overlap, what was it about *Q* that *could have* made it (or something like it)

[151] For example there is all but verbatim overlap between *Q* 6:20-7:28, 9:54-13:28 and what is found the *Euangelion*.

palatable to Marcion as he compiled his Gospel? What conceptual tasks did *Q* accomplish, that could have been amenable to the Marcion of our representations? In comparing the two, it seems that *Q*'s understanding of personified Wisdom and Jesus not only offers an important insight in accounting for a Christianity like that represented in the *Euangelion*, but might provide the appropriate thematic or generic overlaps between it and *Q*.

a) Wisdom within the context of Mythic Israel in Q

There are two important factors in looking at the figure of Wisdom and its relationship to Jesus as found in *Q*: its overall continuity with earlier wisdom expressions and its incorporation of Deuteronomistic theology. First, the Wisdom expressions in *Q* are best understood in continuity not only with "Judaism" but with the overall ancient Near and Middle Eastern tradition of wisdom and its tendency to anthropomorphize the figure of divine Wisdom as one who sat within the heavenly court, who helped create through the use of divine law, according to a divine, written plan and mediated the desires of heaven to the earthly realm below (J.Z. Smith 1982, 103). Or as Perdue summarizes:

> Wisdom . . . held a position second only to God himself. In the sapiential tradition, wisdom was the divine skill used to originate and sustain the cosmos, the mediator between God and the world inhabited by humans, the indwelling spirit that nourished creaturely life, the worldly and divine knowledge whose possession enabled the wise to experience well-being and to live in

> harmony with God and creations, and the system of values that guided humanity in the question for moral life. (Perdue 1990, 468)

For example, within the tradition of mythic Israel, Wisdom is present at the beginning when God creates the universe (Prov. 8:22), is part of the gift granted freely to humanity by God (Sir. 1:14), is granted a cosmic function (Wis. 7:22) and takes divine attributes (Hartin 1993, 38-40).

However, while "Wisdom's greatest desire is for humanity to accept her and her will to guide and protect" (Hartin 1993, 127; see Prov. 8:4-5, Sir. 24:1-11, Bar. 4:1-12) a common trope from these kinds of expressions and one that influenced later renderings like *Q*, is the rejection of Wisdom.

> Wisdom cries out in the street; in the squares she raises her voice. At the busiest corner she cries out; at the entrance of the city gates she speaks: "How long, O simple ones, will you love being simple? How long will scoffers delight in their scoffing and fools hate knowledge? Give heed to my reproof; I will pour out my thoughts to you; I will make my words known to you. Because I have called and you refused . . . Because they hated knowledge and did not choose the fear of the Lord, would have none of my counsel, and despised all my reproof, therefore they shall eat the fruit of their way and be sated with their own devices. For waywardness kills the simple, and the complacency of fools destroys them; but those who listen to me will be secure and will live at ease, without dread of disaster." (Prov. 1:24-33)

This rejection of wisdom is best understood within the framework of "Deuteronomistic theology" (Jacobson 1982, 386), a mythical narrative that depicts the "history" of Israel

> as a repetitive cycle of sinfulness, prophetic calls to repentance (which are ignored), punishment by God, and renewed calls to repentance with threats of judgement. Common in this schema is the motif of the rejection of the prophets and even of their murder, in spite the fact that the Tanak itself records no instance of the murder of a named prophet (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000, 121; Jacobson 1982, 384-86).

While "the notion of Wisdom as sender of prophets as part of the Deuteronomistic tradition is not attested in pre-Christian tradition or elsewhere in early Christian traditions, even though [it] was adapted by Christians very early" (Jacobson 1982, 387; Davis 1983, 88) it is this merging of Deuteronomistic understanding with Wisdom that according to Jacobson, is indicative of *Q*'s interest in Jesus.

> Wisdom plays an important role in Q. Jesus is implicitly a messenger of Wisdom . . . but [at times] he functions more as a prophet than a wise man. Q is formally a collection of wise sayings but it includes a large amount of prophetic material. These phenomena are comprehensible in terms of the Deuteronomistic tradition, where a Wisdom component was long at home and . . . . where the Deuteronomistic and Wisdom traditions have merged (Jacobson 1982, 387).

For example, in *Q* the figure of Divine Wisdom is quoted as saying:

> "I will send them prophets and apostles, some of whom they will kill and persecute and that the blood of all the prophets that has been shed from the foundation of the cosmos will be required of this generation, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah

> who was killed between the altar and the inner temple; Yes I tell you, it will be required of this generation" (Q 11:49-51).[152]

As noted above, *Q* presupposes, and is in continuity with, the Deuteronomistic theological rendering of mythic Israel,[153] particularly in how it casts both Jesus and John within the continuum of (rejected) emissaries of Wisdom (Hartin 1993, 118).

> To what then shall I compare this people of this generation, and what are they like? They are like children seated in the agora and addressing one another, 'We piped to you, and you did not dance; we sang a dirge and you did not mourn.' For John came neither eating bread nor drinking wine and they say, 'He is a demon.' The Son of man came eating and drinking; and they say, 'Behold a glutton and a drunk, a friend of tax collectors and sinner!' Yet Wisdom is vindicated by her children. (Q 7:31-35)

According to Jacobson the "integration of the figure of Wisdom into the Deuteronomistic sketch of history served to draw John and Jesus into Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* as the last in a series of Wisdom's envoys" (Jacobson 1983, 388).

---

[152] διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν· Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώξουσιν, ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἄβελ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

[153] "In wisdom literature. . .the line of sages [extends] back through holy history [and the] great recipients of God's successive revelations in history are standardized into a sequence of emissaries through whom Sophia spoke. . . [As wisdom is portrayed in the Wisdom of Solomon] one finds a similar understanding . . . in one of the Q passages most closely related to the wisdom tradition (Q 11:49-51)" (Robinson 2005 [1974],120-21).

However, while John and Jesus are *both* emissaries of Wisdom, in *Q* there is a presupposition of a hierarchy between them, granting Jesus a place of greater significance than John. For example, *Q* quotes Jesus as saying;

> The queen of the South will arise at the judgement with this generation and condemn them; for she comes from the ends of the earth to hear the Wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here. The Ninevite men will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of John, and behold, something greater than John is here (Q 11:31-32).[154]

By deploying Jesus as "greater than John," *Q* is displaying "in its wisdom sections a tendency to relativize the uniqueness of Jesus by embedding his pre-eminent message within a long chain of wisdom's spokesmen thought the Old Testament and, though culminating in John and Jesus, continuing in the community" (Robinson 2005 [1974], 123). Particularly, Jesus is not just the best mediator of Wisdom in the history of Israel, but "describes [Jesus] as the sole mediator of divine knowledge"[155] (Kloppenborg 1987, 201). For instance;

---

[154] βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

[155] "Jesus has shared the role as Sophia's spokesman with John the Baptist, but also with the prophets of the Old Testament and the community. . . Jesus, rather than being identified with the exclusive Sophia, has been identified as the *primus inter pares*, the most important, of her many spokesmen. But at least in the last stage of the Q tradition this no longer prevails. The exclusivity of Sophia is attributed to the Son, who is identified with Jesus. Although one may concede the inappropriateness of speaking of Sophia Christ logically in Q by and large, if by that one would mean Jesus is identified as the pre-existent Sophia incarnate (in analogy to the Johannine prologue) it seems appropriate that one acknowledge at least at the last stage of Q that the shift to a Sophia Christology has been made" (Robinson 2005 [1974], 126).

> "I praise you Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you have hidden these things from the sages and the learned and revealed them to babes. Yes, Father, for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows the son except the Father, or the Father except the Son and any one to who the Son wishes to reveal him" (Q 10:21-22; see also Q 10:16).[156]

b) Wisdom (De)Contextualized in Marcion

While there is broad textual overlap between the *Euangelion* and *Q,* it is important to note that of all the passages from *Q* involving the personification of Wisdom, it is only *Q* 10:21-22 that is paralleled in the *Euangelion.* The implications of this, particularly in regards to the hermeneutic provided by *Q* to re-examine Marcion, is telling.

Like other Christian expressions of antiquity, such as *Q*, *Matthew* and *James*, Marcion is represented to have thought of Jesus as sitting in a unique position in regards to the divine (Hoffman 1984, 222-23; Marc I.11.8). However, unlike *Q*, *Matthew* and *James* who portray Jesus as functioning as either the *primus inter pares* of Wisdom's emissaries of the Hebrew God (Robinson 2005 [1974], 122) or as personified Wisdom of mythic Israel (Hartin 1993, 135), Marcion's *Euangelion*—while maintaining Jesus' unique position in regards to the

---

[156] Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν· Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου. πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

divine—is represented as having gone through great lengths to *separate* Jesus from any affiliation with the traditions of not just mythic Israel, but any other ancient cultural genealogy. But while the *Euangelion* is represented as separating Jesus from any previous revelation, it nonetheless casts Jesus in terms that are still recognizable as a Wisdom-like figure from the ancient Near and Middle East. Marcion's Jesus *is* Wisdom, but a Wisdom who is decontextualized.

Take as analogy *1 Enoch*, where the figure of Wisdom is presented as descending to Israel to reveal the word of God. However, in keeping with a Deuteronomistic understanding, Wisdom is rejected and re-ascends to heaven.

> Wisdom found no place where she might dwell; Then a dwelling-place was assigned her in the heavens. Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the child of men, And found no dwelling-place: Wisdom returned to her place, and took her seat among the angels (1 Enoch 42:1-3).

This kind of motif of descending / ascending Wisdom was easily appropriated by early Christians as a method of interpreting Jesus' passion account[157] acting as a method of drawing continuity between Jesus and mythic Israel.[158] However, while some Christians went to great lengths to cast Jesus in

---

[157] For instance, the prologue in *John* is a clear adoption of this motif (Hartin 1993, 42; Droge 2007 / 2008).

[158] "The wisdom tradition did not end with Jewish wisdom writings. It is precisely this wisdom tradition which forges a bridge between the Old and the New Testaments. . .In his speeches Jesus makes use of Hebrew parallelism (Mark 4:22) while his parallels are extended to proverbs, using the Old Testament device of the marshal (Matt. 6:19-21). More important is the fact Jesus makes use of the thought and message of the wisdom teacher. He takes over the inheritance of the Old Testament and makes it his own, expanding it and give it an entirely new direction" (Hartin 1993, 41-42).

continuity with the myths of Israel, this was not how Marcion is represented. For example, unlike other Gospels that cast Jesus within convoluted "Jewish" genealogies (*Luke*, *Matthew*) or in continuity with mythic history of Israel (*John* and *Q*) this is not a concern for the *Euangelion* which abruptly begins "[i]n the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, Jesus descended [out of heaven] into Capernaum, a city in Galilee, and was teaching [in the synagogue] on the Sabbath days." (Euan. 3:1a / Luke 4:7) While this sudden descent out of heaven is unlike wisdom expressions like *1 Enoch* in that it historicises Jesus at a specific time, it is analogous to other appearances of Wisdom throughout the mythic history of Israel and other ancient Near and Middle East contexts (J.Z. Smith 1983 [1975], 103). However, unlike the Wisdom of *1 Enoch* or of *Q* who was in line with genealogies of the myths of Israel, Marcion's Jesus is represented in our ancient sources as utterly unanticipated and unpredicted by any cultural expression from antiquity, Israelite or otherwise (Marc 1.19, 4.25; Harnack 1924, 67; Hoffman 1984, 155-208; Tyson 2006, 44). Hence, while *Q* 10:21-22 deploys Jesus as the *primus inter pares* of nostalgic Israel's emissaries of Wisdom, Marcion's version—while maintaining Jesus' Wisdom-like status—renders his uniqueness as decontextualized from nostalgic Israel: a reflection of Jesus' "new" and unprecedented revelation of the "new" and alien god.

> I thank you and I praise you, Lord of heaven, because of those things that are hidden from the sages and the learned and revealed them to babes. Yes, for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me; and no one knows the son except the Father, or the Father except the Son and any one to who the Son wishes to reveal him (Euan 10:21-22 / Marc. 4.25).

While the representations of Marcion's understanding of Christianity has been seen as fundamentally anti-Jewish[159] this kind of evaluation is in a large part based upon[160] the assumption that Marcion purged from *Luke* any reference of Jesus' "Jewish" genealogy and his affiliation with the Hebrew God. However, without denying that if Marcion used *Q* he consciously omitted any links between Jesus and mythic Israel, as Williams points out:

> [C]laims made concerning Marcion's editorial technique are based on the assumption that what appears in Luke and is missing from [the *Euangelion*] was omitted by Marcion. Since the makeup of Marcion's *Vorlage* cannot be determined with certitude, this methodology is inappropriate. For the majority of cases, it is not justifiable to assume that Marcion ever saw what he is accused of omitting (Williams 1989, 483. See also BeDuhn 2013, 28-30).

As a comparison with *Q* shows, and in light of the work of Tyson and Knox, the *Euangelion* would not only have been textually closer to *Q* than *Luke*, but what is perhaps more important for the moment is that it is thematically more like a wisdom expression such as *Q* than it is simply an anti-Jewish hack-job truncated from *Luke*. Indeed, even though Marcion seems to have understood that

---

[159] See Section 1 Chapters 1 and 2

[160] See Section 1 Chapter 2

the pedigree of nostalgic Israel was ultimately irrelevant to Christianity in terms of its value as "revelation" or as a method of authenticating Christian claims, it appears that he nonetheless saw it as an accurate rendering of human history.

> In this sense [Marcion saw the Hebrew Bible as] trustworthy Scripture, accurately describing the Creator-God, giving a truthful account of history. . .But Marcion was pointed in his criticism of this God. A Creator-God was no more acceptable to Marcion as to the Gnostics, although he was not interested in describing the creative activity in those terms. For him, neither the creation stories of Genesis nor the Torah as a whole was to be challenged on the grounds of their accuracy but rather in terms of the god portrayed in them (Tyson 2006, 33; Moll 2010, 78).

If Marcion was as anti-Judaic as he has been represented by virtue of his supposed editorial work of *Luke*, it is somewhat surprising than that our representations of Marcion from antiquity would have left "Judaism" relatively intact.

It is this refusal of Marcion to appropriate "Judaism" for his Christianity that lead Tertullian to accuse Marcion of essentially being a Judaizer (Adv. Marc 1, 20:1 2, 21:2; 3, 5:4,).

> Marcion's second ["Jewish"] Christology is historical . . . The Christ of the Jews will be known as Emmanuel (*Adv. Marc* 3.12.1; Isa 7:14); he will be a warrior and delivered (*Adv. Marc* 3.13.1), "born of a young woman" (*Adv. Marc* 3.13.5); he will take up the strength of Damascus and the spoils of Samara against the king of Assyrians (Isa 8:4; *Adv. Marc* 3.13.1). In nature his is the "the son and the spirit and the substance of the Creator" (*Adv. Marc* 3.6.8). But it is not prophesied in Scripture that he will suffer and die on a cross (Hoffman 1984, 228).

Like other "Christians" before and after him, Marcion grappled with reconciling the relationship between "Judaism," the myths of Israel, and "Christianity."[161] But unlike some, such as Justin Martyr, who required a complicated exegesis of the Hebrew Bible to appropriate the salvation history of nostalgic Israel *from* the Jews (Dial. 29) Marcion left "Judaism" relatively intact and deployed his Christ as new and *sui generis*. With this in mind, and considering the overlaps between the *Euangelion* and *Q*, the *a priori* assumption of Marcion's anti-Judaism should be seen as academically naïve at best.

Hence, considering that Marcion's own words are lost to us and can only be mediated by hostile commentaries, the value of *Q* in deconstructing the theological / academic assumptions about Marcion is hardly overstated. Indeed, as Burton Mack has told us "[t]he story of things lost and found may never sound the same" (Mack 1993, 258).

---

[161] This relationship will be taken up in more detail in Section 3.

SECTION TWO

John's Not So Secret Revelation

Chapter 1

Christian...but Not Jewish Enough

2.1.1 Introduction

A second example of nascent "Christianity" that has—like Marcion—been represented in scholarship as *a priori* anti-Jewish is the second-century text *the Apocryphon of John.* Unlike Marcion, however, who has lurked in the second-hand representations of Christian scholars and theologians for close to two thousand years, the *Apocryphon of John*, while known in antiquity, has only come to light with the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Library.[162] But its "newness" has not insulated it from being cast, like Marcion, as "heretical," "other" or, as it is understood in current parlance, "anti-Jewish." Because the *Apocryphon of John* allegorically expands *Genesis,* adding a mythical "second tier" to a cosmos that is populated with a variety of Aeons, Archons, and a negatively represented Biblical Creator— all of which is distinct from a transcendent highest deity— modern scholars assume that the *Apocryphon of John* must constitute a non- or anti-

[162] Unlike Marcion which we only know from second-hand sources, the *Apocryphon of John* was a text that was partially known to scholars via Irenaeus, but also 1 copy in the Berlin Codex, and 3 copies (of 2 versions) in the Nag Hammadi Library (King 2006, 8).

Jewish stance. So in contrast to Marcion's "literalistic"[163] anti-Judaism—with its two gods, two Christs and two Revelations— the *Apocryphon of John*'s is anti-Jewish for being not literalistic enough and of "allegorically" (mis)appropriation Judaism to "prove" its version of Christianity.

But of course, this has caused issues for scholars in their historical reconstructions. While the idea of the (mis)appropriation of the salvation epic of ancient Israel in the *Apocryphon of John* was understood as theologically "heretical" in antiquity (Irenaeus, Haer 1.10:1-12:5), an understanding that was then taken up by past scholars as an indication of the text's inappropriate / irrelevant / secondary status for historical reconstructions[164] (King 2006, xii-24), recent scholarship has realized that the designation "heresy" is highly problematic for non-theological scholarship (Fairen 2008, 69-73; King 2003, 2–3). And while this should have changed how scholars used texts like the *Apocryphon of John*, placing it on par in intellectual significance[165] with other contemporary (and retroactively categorized "canonical") discourses of the time, this unfortunately

---

[163] As opposed to sources like Justin (Dial 40) or *Barnabas* (9:7-9) that use the Hebrew Bible to justify their version of Christianity in a manner that "verge very much on the abstruse and the curious" (Lüdemann 1996, 152)

[164] Of course, this (mis)appropriation was assumed by virtue of the "proper" appropriation of the salvation epic of ancient Israel by the "orthodox" examples found in the New Testament.

[165] "[The *Apocryphon of John*] was the first Christian writing to formulate a comprehensive narrative of the nature of God, the origin of the world, and human salvation." (King 2006, vii)

has not been the case. It appears that while the variety of Christianities in antiquity are (rightly) no longer classed along lines of their relative "orthodoxy" and "heresy," they seem to have nonetheless been (re)classed or rebranded according to their assumed "pro-" or "anti- Jewish" stance. This has serious implications, particularly in regard to the *Apocryphon of John*.

For example, while previous scholarship insisted on rendering nascent Christian movements—particularly as they were represented in the New Testament— as "breaking" away from Judaism by casting Jesus, Paul, the Gospels, etc., as being against "the Jews"[166] there has been a recent and concerted effort to show that these expressions were not antithetical or against "Judaism," but should be understood as in continuity with, and rooted in, the Jewish cultural matrix of the time (Fredriksen & Reinhartz, 2002; Becker & Reed 2007; Boyarin 2012).

And rightly so. This is a sorely needed and important corrective to how scholars approach the notion of "Christian origins," providing a far more accurate representation of the porousness of the boundaries between those discourses that eventually became retroactively classed as "Jewish" and "Christian" configurations.

---

[166] Examples abound regarding the "Parting of the Ways" model of previous scholarship such as those produced by the usual suspects like Bultmann and Harnack. For a general summary and introduction to the history of the "Parting of the Ways" see Goodman (2007, 119-129) and Becker & Reed (2007, 1-34).

But while this rectification was sorely needed—especially considering the legacy that past supersessionist scholarship was a product of, and contributed to, the intellectual environment of events like the Holocaust (Arnal 2005; Fredriksen & Reinhartz, 2002; Mack 1988; Reuther 1974)[167]—the scholarly construction of what was "Jewish" within these rectified models is, to say the least, highly problematic. For as James G. Crossley has pointed out in relation to Jesus, but applicable here:

> [T]here is one recurring theme in the continual emphasis on Jesus the Jew in contemporary scholarship: Jesus may be Jewish but he usually, so the scholarly arguments frequently go, overrides at least one of the key symbols of Jewish identity as constructed by contemporary scholarship...it remains one of the dominate issues in contemporary scholarship involving lip service being paid to "Jesus the Jew" (at least Jewish identity as constructed in modern scholarship). And as Jesus is frequently seen to be "Jewish"—with book titles frequently reminding us of this—but noticeably different from his Jewish context. [But for] all John Meier's emphasis on the Jewish Jesus, his Jesus does remain a *marginal* Jew. (Crossley 2008, 177 emphasis original; see also 179-89, 81-82)

And while this in and of itself is worrisome,[168] what is more problematic (at least for our purposes) is that where some Christianities can "override" elements of these constructed versions of "Judaism" yet still remain Jewish, others such as the

---

[167] Many scholars that use the "Ways that Never Parted" model seem to have some concern with not just reconfiguring ancient history, but also addressing modern issues and anxiety, such as the Holocaust (Arnal 2005, 47-50).

[168] See Jonathan Z. Smith, 1990; particularly 83.

Apocryphon of John, which also "override key symbols of Jewish identity as constructed by scholarship," are nonetheless consistently rendered as *a priori* anti-Jewish. Implicit in this is not only a construction of "normative" Judaism(s), but one that is normatively a Christian-centric short hand for marginalizing "heretical" expressions.[169]

So even though texts like the *Apocryphon of John* are clearly indebted to what are recognized as Jewish tropes (such as the *Genesis* creation account) and use them in ways analogous to other expressions that are understood to be Jewish (such as *1 Enoch* or Philo) or the retroactively labeled "Pro-Jewish" Christian sources (Paul or the *Gospel of John*), there is still an assumption that the *Apocryphon of John*'s rendering is somehow a (mis)appropriation of Judaism. When one considers the effort, mental contortions and the anxiety that has gone into "authenticating" some Christianities[170] by sanitizing them of their "anti-Judaism" the insistence on the "anti-Jewishness" of texts like *the Apocryphon of John* seems less about proving its supposed animosity to "Judaism" and more about making sure it is not authentically Christian. To borrow from Crossley, while some Christianities are "Jewish...but NOT *that* Jewish" (Crossley 2008,

---

[169] See Crossley (2008) 173-193 and Arnal (2005) 20-39.

[170] See Section 1, Chapter 2 and Arnal 2005, 50.

173) expressions like *the Apocryphon of John* are "Christian...but NOT Jewish *enough*."

But before an examination of how the *Apocryphon of John* supposedly transgresses acceptable boundaries of what was ancient "Judaism," the scholarly strategies used to cast other "Christian" texts, such as those found in the New Testament, as on one hand subverting a key element of "Judaism" but on the other still on the spectrum of what was "Jewish" in the second century, needs to be illustrated.

2.1.2: Jewish...but NOT *THAT* Jewish: Exceptions in the "Ways That Never Parted."

As noted, while previous scholarship had rendered Jesus, the New Testament, and earliest Christianity as discourses or expressions that had broken away, reacted against, or should be distinguished from the "Judaism" / Jewish cultural matrix of the early first century, the scholarly climate changed in the later half of the 20th century.[171] From the late 1960s,[172] a critical rectification was put

---

[171] "As strange as it might sound to twenty-first century persons, both 'Christian' and 'Jew' are difficult terms to define in the first century. In this period of great diversity and change, 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' were not monolithic nor readily distinctive entities." (Carter 2007, 156). See Section 3.

[172] James Crossley has noted that the emphasis on a "Jewish" Jesus (and early Christianity)—implicitly being a reaction against the Nazis and the Holocaust—nonetheless did not really become a scholarly mainstay until after 1967 and the Six Day War (Crossley 2008, 145-151).

forward in which Christianity was not depicted as "breaking away" from Judaism, but as a product of the Jewish cultural matrix of the first centuries of the common era (Fredriksen & Reinhartz 2002; Becker & Reed 2007; Boyarin 2004, 2012).[173]

But there is something odd in what seems to be in the interest of rectifying these past problematic models of Judaism in the first centuries before and after the Common Era.[174] As noted before, but worth repeating, William E. Arnal has pointed out:

> After all, it must surely strike one as odd that all the supposed definitional hallmarks of ancient Judaism are precisely these features that have been evoked in traditional anti-Jewish Christian polemics. Temple, Torah, the land of Israel, ethnic

---

[173] "Judaism is not the 'mother' of Christianity; they are twins, joined at the hip." (Boyarin 5, 2004). While articles and books abound regarding the methodological improvements brought about by the "Ways that Never Parted" (for instance, Becker and Reed, 2007), what is perhaps the most telling evidence that this idea has taken ahold of scholarship is not any specific argument, but how the model has become utterly entrenched in scholarly and popular representations. For instance, *The Jewish Annotated New Testament NRSV* (Levine & Brettler eds. 2011) is according to the back cover "a ground breaking text for scholarship, interfaith dialogue and secular or religious readers." How is this groundbreaking? According to the Editor's preface "The word 'Jewish' in the title The Jewish Annotated New Testament serves several roles. First, this volume highlights in its annotations and essays aspects of the first- and second-century Judaism that enrich the understanding of the New Testament: customs, literature, and interpretations of biblical texts" (Levine and Brettler 2011, xi). Levine & Brettler note that the New Testament texts have a strong affinity to various "Judaisms" such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, Josephus, the Pseudepigrapha and Deuterocanonical literature and the Targumim. But what seems most salient is the claim that "Jesus was a Jew, as was Paul; likely the authors known as Matthew and John were Jews, as were the authors of the Epistle of James and the book of Revelation. When writing, the 'parting of the ways" has not yet occurred'" (Levine and Brettler 2011, xi). Indeed the main reason for casting the main characters of the New Testament as Jewish is what appears to be ecumenical discourse; so that Christians can not only see the Jewish back ground to the New Testament but also Jewish readers can "recover some of [thier] own history... [and] addresses problems that Jewish readers in particular may find in reading the New Testament, especially passages that have been used to perpetuate anti-Judaism and the stereotypes that non-Jewish readers sometimes bring to the texts" (Levine and Brettler 2011, xii). It is interesting to note that the date given for the editorial preamble is 28 Sivan 5771 / 30 June 2011. The use of the Hebrew and Julian / Gregorian calendars is an elegant way to link "Judaism" with "Christianity."

[174] See Section 1, Chapter1.

> identity, circumcision—are these not precisely the features that Christians, historically, have grasped as the salient points of their distinction from Judaism? Should we not worry that some Christian scholars are insisting on such an identity for Judaism precisely so that a distinctive Christian identity can be maintained?[175] (Arnal 2005, 58; See also Crossley 2008, 173-193)

The answer to Arnal's question is a resounding "yes." But what is most salient for our discussion at this stage is how these rectified or rebranded models have been used. When one considers that many of the scholars who insist on the Jewishness of earliest Christianity are actively claiming that their work is a direct refutation of old supersessionist scholarship,[176] it is more than just a little strange that in the service of this agenda, they are nonetheless recycling the old tropes that were the hallmark of these problematic models. The difference now is that what was "Jewish" is given an inverse value. In other words, what used to define Judaism as *distinct from and lesser than* Christianity— "Temple, Torah, the land of Israel,

---

[175] Arnal (2005, 47-53) has noted that one of the undercurrents in the "Jewish Jesus" debate is not just casting Jesus as "Jewish" but in also casting other scholars who allegedly construct " 'non-Jewish' Jesus [to] make *explicit* references to anti-semitism and the great anti-Semitic event of the twenty century, the Shoah" (2005, 47). It seems that the Jewishness of Jesus is not just about reconstructing ancient history, but also reflects modern anxieties as well (Arnal 2005, 50; see also Section 1, chapter 2).

[176] In fact, it should be noted that no scholar is claiming that Jesus was NOT Jewish and that many scholarly models are attempting to actively refute these old supersessionalistic models. The issue and the accusations about "non-Jewish" Jesus are about what constitutes "Judaism" (Arnal 2005)

ethnic identity, circumcision" [177]—are now the same categories that are used to show that what is termed "Christian" is best understood *within* the cultural matrix of Judaism.[178] The problem is that since many of these categories now used to root Christianity within Judaism, were initially created as a means of differentiation between the two, this of course requires a fair amount of academic pushing and grunting to make these square pegs fit into the round holes that were carved out and fashioned by past scholars.[179] As noted by Crossley;

---

[177] For examples pre-Holocaust of such problematic scholarship, see Harnack (Section 1). However, as noted by Crossley, while one would think that these models would have been challenged after the horrors of the Holocaust became known, they continued after 1945 (Crossley 2008). For example "[a]s interpretation of the will, the demand, of God, Jesus' message is a great *protest against Jewish legalism*—i.e., against a form of piety which regards the will of God as expressed in the written Law and in the Tradition which interprets it, a piety which endeavors to wind God's favor by the toil of minutely fulfilling the Law's stipulations...the result is not merely that a mass of ordinances which have lost the meaning they once had under earlier conditions remains in force and so have to be twisted by artificial interpretation into relevance for today; not merely that regulations appropriate to the present have to be wrung out of the ancient Law by artificial deduction to meet the new condition of life...The real result is that motivation to ethical conduct is vitiated" (Bultmann 1955, 1:11; emphasis original). Also, according to Käseman, when it came the teachings of Jesus "there are no Jewish parallels, nor indeed can there be. For the Jew who does what is done here has cut himself off from the community of Judaism—or else he brings the Messianic Torah and is therefore the Messiah...which Jesus may have made his appearance in the first place in the character of a rabbi or prophet...he can not be integrated into the background of the Jewish piety of his time. Certainly he was a Jew and made the assumptions of Jewish piety, but at the same time he shatters this framework with his claim." (Käsemann 1964, 37-38)

[178] For example, while Paul's distinction between the Law and Gospel has been a central axiom of the older scholarship for the distinction between Christianity and Judaism, it is now a indication of his "Jewishness" (Gager 2000).

[179] For instance, the Law has been cast by many previous scholars as that which is not only the *sine qua non* of Judaism but also that which Christianity dispensed with (see Section 1, chapter 2; Section 2, Chapter 1, n 15). However, while what is "Jewish" or "Judaism(s)" was and is up for debate (Smith 1982; Lightstone 2006 [1984]; Boyarin 2012 and *passim*), it is curious that these older, highly problematic models of Judaism are still being used by those who are rightly trying to rectify them. In other words, why is it that the standard indictors of Judaism as constructed by past supersessionalistic scholarship are still being used in models that attempt to rectify them? (See Arnal 2005, 29-37, 56-69)

> [T]here is one recurring theme in the continual emphasis on Jesus the Jew in contemporary scholarship: Jesus may be Jewish but he usually, so the scholarly arguments frequently go, overrides at least one of the key symbols of Jewish identity as constructed by contemporary scholarship...Like Jesus, the "Jewishness" of Paul has been increasingly emphasised since the 1970's. But unlike Jesus, there is plenty of evidence—thought certainly not unambiguous—for Paul advocating an overriding or rejection of various aspects of Jewish Law. Yet in the case of modern scholarship on Jesus and other aspects of Christian origins, the reconstruction of the differentiation is often done by stressing the "Jewishness," then having their Jesus (so someone of some group in Christian origins) overriding aspects of their constructed "Jewishness" without discussing powerful evidence to the contrary. (Crossley 2008, 177; 189)

This kind of overriding is of course unsurprising, especially considering that the very tropes that once were invented as a means of defining Judaism as separate from Christianity, are being turned 180 degrees to "prove" how the early Christians are now a part of Judaism. The result, if one is limited to the terms and the horizons implied with what these scholars insist is "Jewish," is that Christianity will only "fit" awkwardly at best.

A prime exemplar of this—as noted by Crossley (2008)—is the work of N.T. Wright. In an effort to refute the old supersessionist models and to place Jesus within the boundaries of what he sees as Judaism, he is forced to perform an amazing feat of mental gymnastics. On the one hand, since Wright keeps the horizon of Judaism essentially limited to the standard litany of cliches as noted by

Arnal (2005, 58),[180] he is forced to place Jesus in continuity within them. But on the other hand, since these tropes are in and of themselves a product of active theological and supersessionist rhetoric that some Christians have historically employed to construct Christianity as different from Judaism, he is forced awkwardly to grapple with his "Jewish" Jesus looking less and less like the "Temple, Torah, the land of Israel, ethnic identity, circumcision" Jew that his model seems to require.

As illustrated by Crossley, Wright takes as one of his "hallmarks" of his Judaism to be that of the family and the importance of ethnic ties, such as evidenced in *Ezra* 10. But then Wright has a problem. How does one rationalise the importance of the Jewish family to the "Jewish" Jesus, with some of the constructions of family in *Mark* (3:21, 31-35), *Matthew* (8:21-22) or *Luke* (9:59-60, 11:27 or 14:26).[181] Indeed, even though Wright himself claims that Jesus, "to put in mildly, set a time-bomb beside this symbol...and realised that some of the symbols had now become (not wicked or shoddy but) redundant" he still manages to land on his feet and preserve Jesus for Judaism, by stressing that "this does not mean Jesus thought that such a symbol [as ethnic / family was]

---

[180] Also see Section 3, Chapter 1.

[181] "Whoever comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, yes, and even life itself, cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14:26)

inherently bad, or even second rate" (Wright 1996, 399-402). As summarised by Crossley:

> It is notable that Wright repeatedly tells us how Jesus works in a Jewish context yet the end results are structurally no different to the anti-Jewish results of a previous generation of Christian scholars (whom Wright correctly criticises); the key symbols still go, irrespective of whether we call them "wicked" or "redundant" (Crossley 2008, 180).[182]

But these overridden hallmarks are not simply found in dubiously and erroneously named "Historical Jesus" reconstructions,[183] or in the work of apologetic scholars like N.T. Wright.[184] The problem is that these kinds of overridden hallmarks of a constructed Judaism can be found in more rigorous reconstructions of other "Christianities."

---

[182] According to Crossley "Wright, perhaps more than any other Jesus scholars, relentlessly tells us how thoroughly Jewish Jesus was. Yet at the same time he consistently stresses that Jesus remained radically different from his social and theological context. Wright says that the general thrust of this argument is 'of a very Jewish Jesus who was nevertheless opposed to some high-profile features of first-century Judaism, which seems to be the most viable one'" (Crossley 2008, 179)

[183] See Section 1, Chapter 1 and 2 regarding the issues with the so-called "Historical" Jesus.

[184] See also Crossley's deconstruction of how "the Land" and "the Temple" have been cast as fundamentally "Jewish" by scholars, who then in turn are forced to go through a series of awkward mental contortions to rationalize a "Jewish" Jesus fitting within the narrow boundaries of this Judaism (Crossley 2008, 181-186).

2.1.3: The Jewish Matthew: Anthony J. Saldarini

In *Matthew's Jewish-Christian Community* (1994), Anthony J. Saldarini sums up the one of the key issues addressed by the "Ways that Never Parted" model.

> Many studies of early Judaism and Christianity have erroneously retrojected later, classical forms of Judaism and Christianity into the first two centuries. To a greater or lesser degree, such treatments have denied the variety of form and expression found in each tradition and supported a harmonised picture of emerging orthodoxy that devalues minority views. Both Judaism and Christianity have sought to reaffirm clear and separate identities, often at the expense of the other. Christians have denigrated Jews as legalistic, effete and unfaithful to God. Jews have dismissed Christians as misguided deviants from the Jewish tradition and sought to dissociate rabbinic Judaism from Christianity as early in history as possible. With these tendencies at work in the theology and scholarship, common traditions have been treaded as secondary and accidental in favour of a supposed essence of each religion. Contrary to this idealised picture of mutually exclusive salvation histories, most mid first-century believers-in-Jesus were Jews, and even at the end of the first century a substantial minority still were. (Saldarini 1994, 194)

In light of this, Saldarini offers a reconstruction of the *Gospel of Matthew* that is a corrective to more traditional modes that advocated a "Christian replacement" theology.[185] However, according to Saldarini,

---

[185] Within *Matthew*, Jesus is cast as the the only correct way to understand the law (Matt 15:1-2-; 19:3-11) via a "better righteousness" tied to the following of him (Matt 5:17-2O). Also *Matthew* 23—with its bitter denouncement of Scribes and Pharisees—has been interpreted as part and parcel with Christian replacement theology (See Freyne 2005).

> Jesus [in *Matthew*] is not pictured as hostile to the Temple itself, much less to Jewish (that is biblical) law. Rather he is against the business as usual at the Temple. Through Jesus, the author of Matthew directs his own polemics against rival leaders and their competing programs for understanding and living Judaism in the late first century. He alleges that they have misunderstood and rejected God's will and so they will be replaced by a new group of leaders...Matthew and his group are in a struggle for the hearts and minds of their fellow Jews. They propose their teacher and leader, Jesus, and their understanding of God's will as the appropriate response to God, the law and the prophets and as a viable response to the loss of the Temple and the execution of Jesus by hostile Jerusalem authorities. The people of Israel are only condemned in the narrative only when they blindly follow the community leaders and firmly reject Jesus (and Matthew's teaching about him). For the most part, Israel is portrayed as neutral or positively disposed toward the teaching of Jesus (Saldarini 1994, 196).[186]

In other words, Saldarini is not claiming that *Matthew* is a Christian replacement of Judaism. Instead, for Saldarini, *Matthew* is offering a *intra-Jewish* replacement for elements of the *Jewish* leadership of the first century (Saldarini 1994, 201). With this in mind, Saldarini states that it is inappropriate to take the Jesus of *Matthew*'s interpretation of issues such as divorce, Sabbath, purity, etc., (Saldarini 1994, 124-164) as an indiction of a "rejection" of the Law. Instead, this

---

[186] Donald Hagner (2003; 2004) offers a counter proposal to the "Jewishness" of Saldarini's Matthew. For Hagner, the Jesus of Matthew is not within the boundaries of Judaism because Jesus' authority is portrayed as displacing the law. "[I]t is not the law in of itself that is Matthew's concern, but only the law *as mediated through the teachings of Jesus*...[T]he law remains significant for these Jewish Christians [such as Matthew] bit only as it is taken up in the teaching of Jesus" (2003, 202-203 emphasis original; see also Hare 2000). Unfortunately Hagner assumes a limited construction of what can and should be Jewish (Torah) and Christianity (Jesus). See Section 3.

should be read as part of the heated, sectarian debate over competing interpretations of what it meant to be Jewish.

> The gospel's teachings and disputes about observance of the law shows that it's author was an informed participant in a number of first-century Jewish legal debates. Second Temple Jewish documents, such as the Book of Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and the Covenant of Damascus, as well as the early strata of Mishnah, show that Jewish Sects and reform movements disagreed concerning many points of interpretations. They argued over tithing duties, the validly and suspension of oaths and vows, the conditions for divorce, the exact requirements of the Sabbath and the interpretation of purity and dietary laws. Matthew joins this debate as a serious defender and teacher of his groups understanding of how one should live Judaism according to the teachings of Jesus. His arguments are based on Scripture and the types of reasoning found in Jewish literature of the first century. Matthew's polemics against his opponents and their positions are typical of sectarian conflict (Saldarini 1994, 197).

This re-imaging of *Matthew*'s agenda has important repercussions that fit into the model of the "The Ways that Never Parted." While "The Law"—or a very literalistic interpretation of it—has at times been rendered as a central feature of what was understood as "Judaism"[187] Saldarini suggests that *Matthew*'s community with its competing interpretation of the Law is not only "Jewish" but should then be seen as evidence that Jewish interpretation of the Law was not as "legalistic" as previous models would suggest. In other words, Saldarini's

---

[187] Ironically, one of the more persistent tropes of "anti-Jewish" scholarship has been the insistence on a "legalistic" or "literalist" interpretation of the Law as an indiction of what is "Jewish" (or in the case of Marcion, heretical) according to Tertullian and taken up by previous scholarly models (see Section 1, Chapter 1 and 2).

construction gives credence to the idea that despite notions of past scholars, first century Judaism did not require a static interpretation of the Law (that could in turn be used as a means to juxtapose "Jews" from "Christians").

But of course, while Jewish "legalism" is no longer a concept that has any traction, there does nonetheless seem to be ways to adhere to the law that are more "Jewish" than others.[188] According to Saldarini, while *Matthew*'s interpretation of the Law was recognised by other Jews as Jewish, at best it was an interpretation that was also deviant. "[O]ther Jews, including the community authorities...sees Matthew's group as deviant.[189] That is, they are not outside of the Jewish community, but they are objectionable to the majority of the community" (Saldarini 1994, 196; 198; 107-116). Objectionable or not, however, does not mean that Saldarini's *Matthew* in turn "rejects" the "majority of the community."

> When we look closely at Matthew's terms for the people of Israel and their land—"Israel," "people," "Jews," "crowds," "this generation'—and examine their narrative roles in relationship to Jesus (and the Matthean group) it seems clear the he sees himself and his groups as part of Israel and that he hopes to attract members of the larger Jewish community to his form of Judaism, just as Jesus did. Contrary to many commentators on the gospel, Matthew's narrative is not a general indictment of Israel, nor does his presentation of the people

---

[188] See Hagner 2003.

[189] Saldarini is basing his notion of "deviance" in part on the work of Becker (1963), Pfuhl (1980) and Stark and Bainbridge (1985), with the idea that "majority" is implicitly normative.

> imply the Jewish nation as a whole rejected Jesus or that the Jewish mission of early Christianity has ended. Rather, condemnation of Jesus opponents...is limited to specific subgroups within Judaism. Matthew attacks only those who reject Jesus definitively, specially those in authority who lead the people away from Jesus. The crowds and the Jewish people as a whole remain, in the eyes of the author of Matthew, fertile ground for sowing the teachings of Jesus concerning Judaism. (Saldarini 1994, 195)

What is interesting about this statement is not so much that Saldarini is claiming a "Jewish" antecedent for *Matthew* or even that the Matthean community is "deviant." What is interesting is that *Matthew*, while Jewish, nonetheless overrides some central feature of what Saldarini constructs as the "core" of Jewish legal interpretation and Jewish structures of authority, but still remains "Jewish" enough that the author can spread the teachings of Jesus within the context of Judaism and *not* Christianity. Matthew's Jesus is not a "breaking away" or succession from Judaism, but just a different, if deviant, way to be Jewish.

Of course, interpretations of the Law was not the only Jewish, yet "deviant" element of Saldarini's *Matthew*. Any discussion of the "Jewishness" of *Matthew*—or any New Testament discourse for that matter—must also consider the statuses of the various and multiple Jesus*es*.[190] While in the past the figure of

---

[190] In discussing the relative "Jewishness" of *Matthew*, Warren Carter points out that the debate about how to classify a text like *Matthew* is "a matter of emphasis and centers in the interaction between Torah and Jesus" (Carter 2007, 158). Of course, this assumes that Torah is standing in for "Judaism" and "Jesus" is standing in for Christianity.

Jesus has been assumed to be the *sine qua non* of what makes Christianity distinct from Judaism,[191] within the "Ways that Never Parted" model, this simplistic demarcation has been seriously and convincingly challenged.[192] This of course, is considered by Saldarini.

> Jesus fits comfortably within first century Jewish understanding of how God guides and acts in human affairs though divinely empowered agents. The figures of anointed one and son of David appointed to rule and care for Israel originated in the Bible and are developed in various ways in Second Temple Literature. Jesus' roles as authoritative teacher and power healer fit the expectations of the culture and the time. Typological associates of Jesus with Moses, personified wisdom, and the prophets resonate deeply with first-century Jewish understanding of their history and heroes. The rich and ambiguous meaning of "Lord" and "Son of Man," two common designations for Jesus, and the constant reference to Scripture to validate Jesus' life and teachings support the extensive claims Matthew makes for Jesus as God's presence among his people. More than the titles and the biblical quotations and allusions, the pattern of Jesus' life and divine approval—along with this powerful deeds—convey Matthew's understanding of Jesus' importance for Israel and the nations (Saldarini 198, 1994).

---

[191] As noted by Frankfurter, "Christ's very presence in heaven or the world to come is deemed [by some scholars] such an unusual, arresting feature that it could only indicate the text's shift to an entirely *new* religious worldview. The alternative perspective—that the authors may not have regarded these details as a shift out of Judaism in any way—is deemed unimaginable" (Frankfurter 2007, 133-134). See also Boyarin 2012 and *pace* Yarbo Collins, 1985.

[192] One of the clearest challenges to the idea that references to Jesus / Christ must equal a "Christian" stance as opposed to a "Jewish" stance has been formulated by Daniel Boyarin in *The Jewish Gospels* (2012, especially 25-70). But to summarize, "[Jesus] stands ripe for identification with the Davidic Messiah, as he is in the Gospel and also in non-Christian contemporary Jewish literature such as Enoch and Fourth Ezra. The usage of 'Son of Man' in the Gospels joins up with evidence of such usage from these other ancient Jewish texts to lead us to consider this term used in this way (and, more important, the concept of a second divinity implied by it) as the common coin—which I emphasize does not mean universal or uncontested—of Judaism already before Jesus" Boyarin 70, 2012).

However, despite the "Jewishness" of not just *Matthew*'s Jesus, but the claims made about him being part and parcel with Judaism, Saldarini reminds us that in *Matthew*, while Jesus is Jewish, he is not *that* Jewish.

> Though Matthew draws his interpretation of Jesus from Jewish tradition, the emphasis on Jesus and the high status accorded to him make the gospel different from other Jewish literature. Second Temple literature contains accounts of biblical figures and their final testaments, but none gives as important and unique a role to its central figure as that given to Jesus by Matthew (Saldarini 193, 1994)

It seems clear that for Saldarini, even though Matthew's interpretation overrides elements of the Law, its quest to replace the leadership of the Jewish religious authorities, and the (semi-) divine claims it makes about Jesus, while casting the community as deviant according to *other* Jews of the time, can not be taken as *Matthew* "breaking away" from Judaism. It is with this in mind, and within the expanded boundaries that the "Ways that Never parted" model provide, that Saldarini can make the following statement that 50 years ago would be taken as nonsensical. "Matthew is at once the most Jewish of the gospels in its traditions and interpretations and the most critical of gospels in its attack on certain forms of Judaism" (Saldarini 1994, 205).

2.1.4: The Jewish John: John Kysar

A similar kind of rectification that incorporates the "Ways that Never Parted" model can also be found in the (re)construction of the *Gospel of John* as put forward by Robert Kysar. In *John: The Maverick Gospel,* while Kysar claims that "[n]o other Gospel appears to set the Jews so radically over against the Christians as their enemies [as does *John*]" (Kysar 1993 67)[193], he correctly points out that *John*'s "anti-Judaism" is far more complicated issue than the superficial interpretations that have been the hallmark of the Christian-centric reading of the text.[194] For instance, Kysar correctly notes that the predominately negative signifier of the "Jews" in *John* is used by the author inconsistently.

> In 11:45, for instance, the term appears simply to identify a group from which some believers in Christ emerged. In 4:22 Jesus says (speaking as a Jew himself) that it is from the Jews that salvation comes. This is supplemented by the fact that the mighty figures of Judaism's past are recognised to be important forerunners of the revealer (5:46; 8:39). (Kysar 1993, 67).

---

[193] See Hakola (2007, 182-183) for a summary of the "parting of the ways" approach of previous scholarship on *the Gospel of John.*

[194] Rosemary Ruether correctly points out that the Christian interpretation of *John* renders the "Jews" as "the very incarnation of the false, apostate principles of the fallen world, alienated from its true being in God...[and] because they belong essentially to the world and its hostile, alienated principle of existence, their instinctive reaction to the revelation of the spiritual Son of God is murderousness." (Ruether 1974, 113)

However, while there are inconsistencies in the use of the term, Kysar does not gloss over the point that the majority of the uses of "Jews" in *John* are deeply polemical and utterly negative. For example:

> You [Jews] are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies. But because I tell the truth, you do not believe me. Which of you convicts me of sin? If I tell the truth, why do you not believe me? Whoever is from God hears the words of God. The reason you do not hear them is that you are not from God. (John 8:44-45)[195]

Therefore, even with some ambiguity or inconsistency, Kysar is right to note that

> The Jews are most often the villains in the Gospel. They persecute Jesus (5:16), they misunderstand him (8:22), they attempt to stone him (8:59); they are responsible for his arrest and crucifixion (18:12; 19:12). Most characteristically, they are the ones who refuse to believe in him (10:31-39). (Kysar 1993, 68)

For Kysar, however, this is not a rejection of and / or a critique of "the Jews" *per se*. While—like Saldarini—he sees this as a rejection in part of the Jewish authorities that were in conflict with Johannine community (Kysar 1993, 68; Brown 1979, 40-43), the term also includes a wider class of opponents.

---

[195] ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν. ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ. ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ, ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι.

> The Jews are *stylised types* who reject Christ, and that usage illuminates this strange category. The specific ethnic characteristic is lost...The term no longer designates a religious[196] body of persons, because the Fourth Evangelist has used it to make them simply a type, not specific persons...the interest in [the Jews] is restricted to the role they play as *types of unbelief.* (Kysar 1993, 68).

For Kysar then, even the designation of "the Jews" [197] as the villains of the Johannine narrative means that "we must not conclude that [the author] had an

---

[196] The term "ethnic" and "religious" will be explored in Section 3

[197] Claims like Kysar's, while more common in how scholars reconstruct early Christianity, are not of course accepted universally. For instance, Raimo Hakola claims that the Johannine community's relationship is more problematic than Kysar's understanding. "It has been quite common in recent studies to include the community behind the Fourth Gospel among various forms of first-century Jewish Christianity. It has become all the more evident that even John's distinctive ideas about Jesus come from various Jewish traditions. Though scholars have not denied that many features of John suggest a break with those tenets most often regarded *as distinctive to Jewish identity*, they rationalize these features by placing John in the context of a conflict with rabbinic Judaism that explains *the distancing of the Johannine Christians from the basics of Jewishness*. But if the evidence for such a conflict is meager, as I claim, the definition of the Johannine group as a Jewish-Christian group becomes problematic. Rather than seeing in John's portrayal of the Jews and Jewishness a response to the violent policy of John's opponents, I take this portrayal to suggest that the Johannine Christians themselves saw their faith in Jesus not only *in continuity with earlier Jewish tradition but also in contrast with that tradition.* John's ambivalent attitude towards Jewishness and some fierce attacks against characters who seem to to represent some types of Jewish Christians indicates that it may be misleading to label the Johannine Christians as Jewish Christians, even though there is no way of denying that the roots of these Christians were firmly on Jewish ground" (Hakola 2005, 181). While perhaps Hakola's basic model is better than Kysar's at taking into account the issue of the vitriol of *John*'s polemic, there nonetheless is the assumption that there are very specific ways of being a "Jew" of the first century that—for one reason or another—Hakola's *John* has but aside. In other words, *John* is not a representation of the variety of Judaisms of the time—or even of a (mostly) Jewish Christian tradition—but of a group that may have begun as "Jews" but are no longer so. For Hakola, this accounts for the derogatory use of the term "Jew" and how "originally Jewish elements may well have contributed to the emergence of an identity that was not founded on basic matters of Jewishness but was, at least at some points, created in conscious opposition to them...John and his community no longer understood themselves in terms of Jewish identity and, consequently, chose to refer to other Jews using a word covering the widest possible referent; they thus acknowledged that those things that were common to different Jewish groups were no longer theirs" (2007, 198-199). This allows Hakola's *John* to be both in "continuity with earlier Jewish tradition but also in contrast with that tradition." It seems that, in this case, one can have their cake and eat it too: but only if there was a stable or normative "Jewishness" that *John* not only was against, but has consciously separated itself from. See Section 3 for more on "Judaisms" and the construct of Jewish-Christianity / Christian Judaism.

anti-Semitic motive in mind...The casting of the characters is a strategy for telling the story." (Kysar 1993, 69)

So what is this story?[198] According to Kysar, and in line with the "Ways that Never Parted" model, this story is best understood as embedded within the context of intra-Jewish dispute, one that has perhaps boiled over into the realm of violence (Kysar 1993, 69) and appears to be a reaction to what is perhaps charges levelled against the Johannine community "by their former brothers and sisters in the synagogue." (Kysar 1993, 69)

Kysar then is quite comfortable in claiming, despite the vitriol of the polemics in *John* against "the Jews", that

> We may even assume that the writer of the Gospel is of Jewish ancestry, or that at least a large number (even a majority) of those in the local Christianity community were Jewish. Hence the Gospel is not issuing a judgement on the Jewish people as a group. It implies, however, that the Jewish opponents of the church at the time and place are typical of the human failure to accept Christ. The Gospel represents that kind of rejection with the symbol of "the Jews...[where any] *person who refuses to accept the human identity proposed by*

---

[198] "Let me suggest an analogy. In the sundry adventure and mystery stories involving private investigators, the official police play a consistent role. They are always dull, slow, bogged down in red tape, and easily thrown off the scent. They are the foil with which the writer demonstrates the skill and brilliance of the private detective, the writer's hero. We can say that in these stories the police have become stylized types, who have distinctive personalities. The author is interested in them for one reason, namely, as a contrast to the hero. Hence, there is in this literary and media genre a massive generalization. The analogy helps us understand what the Fourth Evangelist has down with the Jews. There is no interest in them as people. There are often no significant distinction drawn among them (except occasionally when some seem to believe in Jesus). The interest in them is restricted to the role they play as *types of unbelief*." (Kysar 1993, 68; emphasis original).

> *Christ in the Gospel is for the Evangelist a "Jew."* (Kysar 1993, 69; emphasis original)

2.1.5: The Jewish Apocalypse of John: John W. Marshall

We now turn to what has been understood as a fundamentally Christian text, the *Apocalypse of John*. Like Saldarini and Kysar, John W. Marshall has attempted to take the *Apocalypse of John* out of the interpretive context of "Christianity" and reposition it within the conceptual horizons of Judaism. Basing his work on the model put forward by Jonathan Z. Smith (1982, 1-19), Marshall aims to challenge a "monothetic theory of classification" that has consistently placed Jesus as the *sine qua non* of not just Christianity, but also as a way of differentiating it from Judaism (Marshall 2001, 45).[199] This assumption, according to Marshall, has incorrectly lead scholars to not only assume the *Apocalypse of John*'s "Christian" status, but also to infer that any "criticism" that might be levelled against "the Jews" must *a priori* have a supposed non- or anti-Jewish edge.

For instance, the *Apocalypse of John* states, "I will make those of the synagogue of Satan *who say that they are Jews and are not*, but are lying—I will

---

[199] Marshall points out that generally speaking "belief in Jesus as the essence of Christianity and of belief in general as the *sine qua non* of a taxonomy of religions" (Marshall 2001, 175).

make them come and bow down before your feet, and they will learn that I have loved you" (Rev. 3:9; 2:9 emphasis added). According to Marshall, because of the assumed "Christian" authorship of the *Apocalypse of John,*

> [t]he first move in the conventional interpretation of this text is to reverse it so those who are not Jews become Jews. More broadly, the conflict that leads John to make such accusations is frequently construed as a conflict over the status of Jesus in which John draws a line between his community, which 'accepts' Jesus, and his enemies, who 'reject' Jesus. The problems with such interpretations are the lack of controversy over Jesus in the surrounding text, the reversal of what the text actually says,[200] and the lack of conflict with Judaism in the Apocalypse in general. (Marshall 2001, 12).

Marshall has recast the *Apocalypse of John* not as an attack against Judaism but, taking into consideration the "Ways that Never Parted" model, as an insider expression within the wider conceptual horizon of Judaism. In particular, for Marshall, the *Apocalypse of John* is offering an "insider" critique of those who the

---

[200] Marshall claims that for more than seventeen centuries, interpreters have changed "'*those* who say they are Jews' to '*the Jews* who say they are Jews and are not.'...This unexamined reversal of what the text says is ubiquitous in contemporary scholarship on the Apocalypse. This is where the problems become almost irreparable...John reverses a reversal. Non-Jews say they are Jews, and John says, in effect, 'only insofar as they are a synagogue of Satan.' Following John's rhetorical strategy, if not his rhetorical purpose, contemporary interpreters add a third reversal; the non-Jews are Jews again. John's Apocalypse becomes, then in significant measure a polemic against Judaism, and from outside Judaism." (Marshall 2001, 13). While issues of "who gets to be Jewish" will be addressed in Section 2, Chapter 2 and 3, and Section 3, Chapter 1, it is interesting to note that Marshall is taking the author of the *Apocalypse of John* at his or her word that the members of the "Synagogue of Satan" are in fact non-Jews and are of course lying about their Judaism. Without of course denying that the *Apocalypse of John* IS "Jewish," (however that is defined) one has to wonder why Marshall assumes that the author of the text is giving us an accurate "reporting" of the (lack of) Jewishness of his opponents, as opposed to simply attempting to deny them the legitimating links to the tradition that they claim, as part of his own polemic. In other words, why can they not *both* be "Jewish"? Perhaps because of the "radicalness of [Marshall's] argument" (Marshall 2001, 6) the requirement that the *Apocalypse of John* is Jewish also requires the insistence that its author is *also* the arbiter of who gets to be authentically Jewish in antiquity.

author feels are just not Jewish enough. "And so I read the 'synagogue of Satan' as referring to a group of people who do not stand in opposition to Rome and the wider Greco-Roman culture in the way that John does" (Marshall 2001, 133). And while Marshall points out that the exact status of the *Apocalypse's* adversaries are unclear,

> it seems that [the author's] concerns about integration with Greco-Roman religion and culture as well as his concerns about using the term 'Jew' suggest that the group he opposes consists of a mixture of Pagan Godfearers and comfortably Hellenizing Jews[201] who welcome the Godfearers without requiring a substantial [in the author's eyes] separation from Greco-Roman culture in either themselves or their adherents...[the author] is opposed not to Jews or Gentiles who undertake Jewish practice, but to people who participate in Greco-Roman religious cultural life in a way that he understands as overly accommodating." (Marshall 2001, 134)

Again, we do not have a "Christian" text that is offering a critique of Judaism *per se.* Despite the inclusion of the figure of Jesus and such polemical reference as in Rev. 3:9 and 2:9, Marshall claims that his analysis of the *Apocalypse of John* results in

> the (preliminary) reconstruction of a Judaism that honours Jesus and that understands its Judaism, in the context of the Judean War, in stark opposition to the wider Greco-Roman cultural complex. It is also worth noting that the first and last texts I reread (Rev. 2:9, 3:9 and 11:1-14) are the only pillars of the mistaken view that John is undertaking a conflict with the Jews, and that it is largely Christian

---

[201] It is unclear, but seems safe to assume, that for Marshall (and given the above and his claim that those of the synagogue of Satan are non-Jews [12]) that these "Hellenizing Jews" are in his rendering not properly Jewish.

> strategies of reading that enable these texts to function as a foundation for anti-Semitism (Marshall 2001, 175-176)

From this interpretive starting point, Marshall can then revision those who wrote and read the *Apocalypse of John* as *not* "a community 'alienated from the Judaism of [its] time to a significant degree' [Yarbo Collins 1984b:1278] but an author and a community deeply invested in one of the Judaism of its time" (Marshal 2001, 192).

The effects of such an understanding of the setting of the *Apocalypse of John* are, according to Marshall, immense.

> The unavoidable blanks in a picture of John's social practice are filled in a way opposite to that of traditional Christian exegesis. And so, in the absence of direct discussion of sabbath in the Apocalypse of John, the conclusion that John's religious conviction 'probably involved the rejection of traditional observance of the sabbath' (Yarbo Collins 1984b:1278) is reversed, and the prominence of the number seven, the pattern of rest after six events, and so forth, serve to indicate the basic status of sabbath as a foundation of John's speculative understanding of the cosmos. This is but one example of what follows from the understanding of the Apocalypse of John as a Jewish document. (Marshall 2001, 192)

There are a couple of interesting points to this claim. While Marshall is right in casting the *Apocalypse of John* as "Jewish," how he has constructed it as "Jewish" is notable. For Marshal, despite claims of avoiding a "monothetic theory of classification," he nonetheless insists that "Sabbath observance" is key to

understanding the "Jewish" identity of the author of the text. And while observance of Sabbath *could* of course be an indication of "Judaism," one has to wonder: is it required to make something "Jewish" any more so than the presence of Jesus makes it Christian?[202] For Marshall, when it comes to the Sabbath, this appears to be the case, so much so that even though the *Apocalypse of John* contains no references to the Sabbath, since it is *a priori* a Jewish text, Sabbath references *must* be there. To make it Jewish he is forced to "find" indications of the sabbath, such as "the prominence of the number seven, the pattern of rest after six events, and so forth" (Marshall 2001, 192). In other words, the producers of the *Apocalypse of John* must be sabbath observant without any sabbath observances.

This is of course not to say that the *Apocalypse of John* is not Jewish.[203] But the question needs to be asked, why does Marshall insist that Jewish identity *requires* observance of the Sabbath[204] any more than other cliché expressions of Judaism such as "Temple, Torah, the land of Israel, ethnic identity,

---

[202] While the Sabbath appears to be one of Marshall's tell-tales of "Judaism"—along with ethnic identity, Temple, Priesthood, the 144,000 (Rev 7:4) and the vision and trial of the Holy City, and its destruction (Rev 11:1-14)—and as such avoids a strict "monothetic theory of classification," the simple fact that he limits his horizon of Judaism to what amounts to the litany of Christian-constructed tropes is notable. (See Arnal 2005, 56)

[203] As per the concerns of Marshall, I would not want to misinterpret or parody this apparently "radical" interpretation of the *Apocalypse of John* (Marshal 2001, 6).

[204] Is this not as problematically "Jewish" as to insist on Jesus a telltale of what it is to be Christian?

circumcision" (Arnal 2005, 58)? Why must his Judaism be so limited? For if this is the case, then Marshall's *Apocalypse of John* overrides his constructed element of what is Jewish in such a "subtle" way that—in contrasts to other Judaisms that he seems to be contrasting the *Apocalypse* to—references to the Sabbath must be "discovered" despite being central to "Jewish" understanding.

2.1.6: The Jewish Paul(s): John Gager and Daniel Boyarin

To serve as the final exemplar of the trend in scholarship as noted by Crossley in which traditionally understood "Christian" texts are repositioned within the context of first century Judaism, Paul and the Pauline literature need to be examined. Indeed not only is Paul traditionally understood as making a clear break between Judaism and Christianity (Gal. 2:15-21) he also has been "regarded as the source for Christian hatred of Jews and Judaism...[and] among Jews he has been the most hated of all Christians" (Gager 2000, 4). As such a polarising figure, casting him within the "Ways that Never Parted" model requires multiple strategies, depending on the intent of the scholar. Therefore, two very different scholarly perspectives will be considered, that of John Gager and Daniel Boyarin.

First, according to John Gager:

> For nearly twenty centuries Jews have suffered periodic episodes of hatred, discrimination and genocide at the hands of Christians (and others). On the Christian side, the anti-Judaism of the New Testament, with Paul at its center, has contributed significantly to this story. Not surprisingly, many Jews came to see Paul—the renegade Pharisee—as the enemy. No great effort was required here, for Jews simply adopted the anti-Jewish image of Paul presented to them by Christians. (Gager 2000, 150)[205]

However, this situation according Gager is not due to any anti-Judaism on the part of Paul and his letters *per se*. The problem is how later readers have interpreted Paul. According to Gager, because Paul is at times inconsistent and seems to contradict himself in his letters as to the status of "Judaism," this has forced his interpreters to privilege one side of Paul's inner "debate" or set of readings, and use them as an interpretive lens when looking at the other seemingly contradictory side. These two contradictory sets of texts roughly fall into what Gager calls the "Anti-Israel Set," which is in turn used to interpret what he deems as the "Pro-Israel Set." For example if the "Anti-Israel Set" is read first:

> "For all who rely on the world of the law are under a curse" (Gal. 3:10).
>
> "Now it is evident that no man is justified before God by the law" (Gal. 3:11).

---

[205] Gager continues with stating that "[b]ut with the founding of the state of Israel, in 1948, the story of Jews as a persecuted minority came to and end. For many Jews, Christians were no longer the enemy in the castle. Many Western countries recognised the state of Israel, and by implications its Jewish roots and character, as a living reality. It is within this framework, I would suggest, that it has been possible for Jewish readers to recover Paul as a Jewish figure and to pry him loose from his anti-Jewish past" (Gager 2000, 150; see also Dunn 2000).

"For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumscion, but a new creation" (Gal. 6:15).

"For no human being will be justified in his sight by the world of the law, since through the law comes knowledge of sin" (Rom. 9:31).

"Israel who pursued righteousness which is based on the law did not succeed in fulfilling that law" (Rom. 9:31).

"But their minds were hardened; for to this day, when they read the old covenant, that same veil remains unlifted, because only through Christ is it taken away. Yes, to this day, whenever Moses is read a veil lies over their mind; but when a man turns to the Lord the veil is removed" (2 Cor. 3:14)

And is then used to interpret the so-called "Pro-Israel Set":

"What is the advantage of the Jew? Or what is the value of circumcision? Much in every way" (Rom. 3:1)

"Do we overthrow the law through faith? By no means. On the contrary, we uphold the law" (Rom. 3:31)

"What shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means" (Rom. 7:7)

"Thus the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good" (Rom. 7:12)

"To the Israelites belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the Temple, and the promises. To them belong the patriarchs and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ" (Rom. 9:4).

"Has God rejected his people? By no means" (Rom. 11:1).

"All Israel will be saved" (Rom. 11:26).

"Is the law then against the promise of God? Certainly not" (Gal. 3:21).

Then, according to Gager,

> the problem emerges. Point by point, the two sets appear to contradict each other: Circumcision is of great value; it counts for nothing. The law is holy; it places its followers under a curse and cannot justify

> them before God. All Israel will be saved; they are enemies of God and have failed to fulfil their own law. (Gager 2000, 7)

And while the inconsistency of Paul *is* an issue, what seems to be of greater concern for Gager is that this "inconsistency" has lead to an interpretive stance used by scholars and theologians that gives the erroneous impression that Paul was anti-Jewish since the Anti-Israel Set subordinates any positive statement about "Judaism" in the Pro-Israel Set. Gager argues, however, that Paul was not anti-Jewish and has only been finessed to fit the role of the proto-typical anti-Jewish Christian. To combat this, Gager argues that by

> [f]ocusing on the pro-Israel pasages...I will argue that Paul need not, indeed cannot, be read according to the Contridictionists[206] and that he is entirely innocent of all charges lodged against him by his critics: [1] He is not the father of Christian anti-Judaism. [2] He was not the inventor of the rejection-replacement theory. [3] He did not repudiate the law of Moses. [4] He did not argue that God had rejected Israel. [5] His enemies were not Jews outside the Jesus-movement but competing apostles within. [6] He did not expect Jews to find their salvation through Jesus Christ. (Gager 2000, 9-10)

With this interpretive strategy, Gager then sets forwards what he calls the "New View" of Paul that takes those passages that seem to repudiate the Law and recasts them. For Gager's Paul, the Law is not an out-dated remnant but is valid

---

[206] For Gager, the "Contradictionists" are those "intelligent readers...[who] recognize and admit the tensions between the two sets of passages" (Gager 2000, 7). For Gager, these Contradictionists use four basic techniques to rationalize this problem. 1) A psychological reading of Paul that claims that he was lost in intellectual and emotional inconsistency. 2) The resigned technique that leaves the contradictions as they stand. 3) Removal strategies which just eliminate the "offending" passages and finally—and the one that is being addressed by Gager—has been the dominant strategy of subordinating the Pro-Israel Set to the Anti-Israel Set (Gager 2000, 7-9).

in very specific situations. While it can not be valid for Gentiles under the dispensation of Christ, for Paul it remained valid for Jews.

> Here a basic observation is in order...[and] difficulties disappear when we apply the law established earlier—*when Paul appears to say something (e.g., about the law and the Jews) that is unthinkable from a Jewish perspective,*[207] *it is probably true that he is not talking about Jews at all. Instead we may assume that the apostle to the Gentiles is talking about the law and Gentiles.* (Gager 2000, 58)

This is how Gager can rationalise the two seemingly contradictory stances of Paul. The Law is only meant to be for Jews, and not Gentiles. But if Paul's message is on one hand about the acceptance of the Gentiles and on the other he does not repudiate the Law for Israel, does Gager envision two distinct paths that need to be followed for the Gentiles and Jews? Or does Paul foresee the redemption of Israel through conversion to Christ? (Gager 2000, 59).

> [I]t is clear that Paul thinks of the two ways as a temporary, provisional stage in the story of salvation. [1] Abraham is the father of both Jews and Gentiles; they are one seed, one inheritance. [2] Abraham's faith / faithfulness is source and model for Jews and Gentiles. [3] The promise to Abraham (Rom. 4:13), that is, to be the father of many Gentiles (Gen. 17:5; quoted in Romans 4:17) is one. In the end there are not two peoples of God but one. Jews and Gentiles —humanity in its entirety—form one corporate body, not identical with Israel and certainly not with any Christian church. They are seen as common heirs ("the Jew first and then the Greek"—Rom. 1:16;

---

[207] While at first blush one wonders: what constitutes "unthinkable" for a Jewish perspective? Of course, since Gager is working with a very limited notion of what is Judaism, it is not difficult to guess that this involved the litany of "Temple, Torah, circumcision," etc as noted by Arnal. But why the need to cast first century Judaism as mentally circumcised?

> 2:10) of the divine promise to Abraham, as the children of God (Rom. 8:19). (Gager 2000, 60-61)

Without getting into *why* the supposed "pro-Israel" set must be arbitrary privileged over the "anti-Israel" set,[208] Gager's Paul manages a neat trick. His Paul is able to negotiate between what has been assumed to be the "Christian" and "Jewish" positions. This leaves Paul the Jew intact— with his adherence to the Law and the insistence of it being relevant to ethnic "Jews"—while not sacrificing the inclusion of the Gentiles within the convent of God a position that avoids Christian supersessionism.

A different take on Paul and his relationship to the Law and Judaism is provided by Daniel Boyarin. While Boyarin's reading is perhaps more sophisticated than Gager's[209] something to consider is that Boyarin is not coming from the usual starting position of most Pauline scholars. Unlike the Christian theologically loaded and / or Christian-centric models that have been a hallmark of Pauline scholarship, Boyarin reminds us that he is coming from the "perspective of a practicing Jewish, non-Christian, critical but sympathetic reader of Paul [that leads him] to ways of understanding his work that are necessarily

---

[208] Beyond the need to erase the contradictions of Paul and to have him make sense in light of the "Way that Never Parted" model, there is no reason to privilege one set over the other beyond personal preference regarding the palatability of one's constructed Paul.

[209] Gager states that Boyarin's evaluation of Paul's Judaism is one that is "inauthentic" (Gager 41, 2000). See below.

different from the ways of readers of other cultural stances" (Boyarin 1994, 1). This has some interesting repercussions. For a start, even though Boyarin finds throughout Paul the cliché "Christian"[210] distinction between the "Sprit" and the "Flesh" (Boyarin 1994, 37-85),[211] this does not require Boyarin's Paul to go through a "re-Judaization" (as per Gager 2000, 54-57).

> I would like to reclaim Paul as an important Jewish thinker. On my reading of the Pauline corpus, Paul lived and died convinced that he was a Jew living out Judaism. He represents, then, one option which Judaism could take in the first century. Paul represents a challenge to Jews in the first century, and I will argue that he presents a challenge to Jews now as well." (Boyarin 1994, 2)

Like Gager's construction, Boyarin also claims that Paul has an "impulse towards universalism, toward the One...that which both enabled and motivated

---

[210] Or better yet "Lutheran" (Boyarin 1994, 41;51;209-214). This seems particularly salient considering Boyarin's focus on the "Spirit / Flesh" dualism of Paul (Boyarin 1994, 15-16; 60-64) which has traditionally been understood as the Lutheran distinction between Law and Gospel (Harnack 1924, 30).

[211] For Boyarin, "Paul is motivated by as thoroughgoing a dualism as that of Philo...Moreover, the morphology of Paul's dualism has to be carefully delineated, *because it does not imply a rejection of the body.* Various branches of Judaism (along with most of the surrounding culture) became increasingly platonized in late antiquity. By platonization I mean here the adoption of a dualist philosophy in which the phenomenal world was understood to be the representation in matter of the spiritual or ideal entity which corresponded to it. This has the further consequence that a hierarchical opposition is set up in which the invisible, inner reality is taken as more valuable or higher than the visible out form of reality. In the anthropology of such a culture, the human person is constituted by an outer physical shell which is non-essential and by an inner spiritual soul, which represents his [sic] true and higher essence" Boyarin 1994, 59). Boyarin goes on to state that "I am not claiming for Paul a radical dualism which denies the value to the phenomenal world, but rather a dualism of the sort which has characterized Western thought practically from its inception, that is, the understanding of human beings, the world, and language as all composed of a material and a spiritual component in correspondence with each other...There is, in this sense, nothing striking in claiming that Paul was such a dualist; if anything the bold step that I am making is to claim that the Rabbis (as opposed to both earlier Hellenistic Jews and later ones) *resisted* this from of dualism." (Boyarin 1994, 85)

Paul's move toward a spiritualizing and allegorising interpretation of Israel's Scripture and the Law as well" (Boyarin 1994, 8; see Gager 2000, 59-60). Therefore, instead of interpreting Paul's stance as a rejection of the Law,

> Paul's declarations that observance of the Law are adiaphora, matters of indifference, represent rather a cultural 'tolerance.' His argument is precisely *against* those that think that what one eats is of significance. It is, however, this very tolerance that deprives difference of the right to be different, dissolving all others into a single essence in which matters of cultural practice are irrelevant and only faith in Christ is significant...the question for [Boyarin] is *not* the relative statuses of Jewish and gentile Christians but the statuses of those—Jews and others—who choose not to be Christians. (Boyarin 1994, 9)

Boyarin's Paul is therefore not outside of the conceptual horizon of what was "Judaism" of the first century. Using *Romans* as an exemplar, Boyarin claims that

> Paul is not condemning Jews who *keep* the Law—as Reformation readers would have it—and certainly not attacking Judaism in general but rather criticising Jews who believe that they are exempt from divine judgement, or even that they will be favoured at the divine Assizes, simply by virtue of being Jewish without respect to their actual performance of the Law...This condemnation is often taken to be an attack on simply hypocrisy, while I am suggesting that the person being attacked is not so much a hypocrite but rather a Jew who believes sincerely that mere possession, hearing, of the Law will save him. (Boyarin 1994, 87)

For Boyarin then, it is clear that not only is Paul *not* anti-Jewish, but is best understood as clearly within the horizon of Judaism of the time with clear

parallels with other Jewish expressions,[212] such as the *Psalms of Solomon* (Boyarin 1994, 88) and of course Philo. If anything, Paul is best understood as a "Jewish cultural critic" (Boyarin 1994, 137) who is using strategies similar to Jewish *midrash* that "read certain halakhic verses as metaphors for something else. Thus, for example, the verse of Leviticus which prohibits placing a stumbling block before the blind is understood by the Rabbis as a prohibition on aiding someone to sin" (Boyarin 1994, 155).

For Boyarin, however, Paul's insistence on the spiritual interpretation of the Law—one that can be then applied to Gentiles—is, while within the boundaries of Judaism, nonetheless seriously pushing against the fences and upsetting the border guards (Boyarin 2004, 1-36).

> By understanding that the Law according to the flesh was the signifier of an allegorical Law of love according to the spirit and that those, *including ethnic Jews*, who receive the spirit were absolved of the requirements of the Law according to the flesh, Paul was not apologising for Law and particularity, for Jewish difference, like other Hellenistic Jewish writers cited, but *annulling* Jewish difference... "Remain as I am, for I have become as you are" (Galatians 4:12). In the pathos of this verse is the centre of Paul's ministry. He has given up his specific Jewish identity in order to merge his essence into the essence of the gentile Christians and create a new spiritual people of God. If they now turn away from this transition into the allegorical and become Jewish Christians, they will have thereby lowered themselves and left Paul alone. (Boyarin 1994, 155)

---

[212] *Pace* Gager's claim (2000, 41).

Boyarin goes on to claim that while Paul may be a Jew, his interpretation—which insists on collapsing all difference between Jew and Gentile—illustrates that while "Paul's argument is not anti-Judaic, then, in the sense that certain interpretations would have it be...[and I] argue that while Galatians is not an anti-Judaic text, its theory of the Jews nevertheless is one that is inimical to Jewish difference, indeed to all difference as such" (Boyarin 1994, 156). For Boyarin then, while Paul is Jewish, according to the title of his book, he is nonetheless "a Radical Jew."

2.1.7: The Jewish Q: William Arnal.

While not generally a central concern with scholarly models[213] that insist on rebranding various New Testament texts part of "Judaism," the ambiguity of what the term "Jewish" could have referred to in antiquity[214] should be addressed.

> The issue is foremost and fundamentally one of *classification*: both the classification of "religious traditions," their boundaries and characteristics, and, more problematically, the question of what *type* of classification the term "Judaism" really refers to...The problem is, of course, that the term "Jew" is even today used to refer to an *ethnic* identity (that is, an identity related to national, linguistic or cultural placement or ancestry), and, quite distinctly,

---

[213] For notable exceptions, see Saldarini (1994) where *Matthew* is clearly constructed as "ethnically" Jewish, and Boyarin (1994) where Paul is also assumed to be ethnically "Jewish," but one that is ideologically "radical."

[214] This is will be taken up in detail in Section 3, Chapters 1-2.

> to a *religious* identity (that is, an identity due to voluntary participation, via belief and practice, in a certain kind of distinctive ideological discourse). The one need not imply the other; one can be of Jewish descent and wholly irreligious or be a devout convert to Judaism without being of Jewish descent. Self identification as a Jew, consequently, may be akin to asserting that one is, say, Italian, or it may be more akin to asserting that one is, say, Muslim; or both types of assertions may be intended. The same potential duality appears in Hellenistic-Roman antiquity:[215] one may be of Jewish descent without adhering to any significant aspects of Jewish "religion"; conversely, one may be of Gentile descent, but wholly committed to multitudinous aspects of Jewish religious practice (Arnal 2007, 130).

So in attempting to classify a given text as either being ("pro-" or "anti-") "Jewish," scholars should be aware that they are attempting to answer two very different and distinct questions that should not be conflated.

> [The first question is] about the ethno-cultural background of the people responsible for the document, and the other about the ideological commitments expressed in it...In the first century (and apparently for some time afterward), one could be a Jew, both ethically and ideologically, and adhere to the beliefs of the Jesus people...[and] conversely, one could adhere to the beliefs of the Jesus people without being Jewish. (Arnal 2007, 130)

This consideration has been taken up by William Arnal in his analysis of *Q*. According to Arnal, when *Q* is compared to traditionally understood "Christian"

---

[215] As will be discussed in Section 3, Chapter 2 the concepts discussed by Arnal could better reflect the ancient world (and avoid any possible anachronistic misunderstandings that draws a distinction between "religion" and "culture" or "ethnicity") as not a "duality" but as consisting of perhaps as many as "six different balls, including all the prominent spheres of ancient thinking about human life" (Mason 2007, 482).

texts such as *Matthew*,[216] *John*, *Revelation* and the Pauline Letters which require much scholarly effort to rebrand them as "Jewish," Arnal's reconstruction does not appear to require the same kind of scholarly finesse to illustrate the "Jewishness" of *Q*. This is telling; not because *Matthew*, *John* or Paul do not have as strong a grounding in "Judaism" as *Q*, but the perceived "distance" one has to go to emphasize the "Judaism" of the text is lessened due to its limited and ambiguous[217] "Christianization,"[218] or its status as being part of a "Jesus movement" (Arnal 2007, 133).

For example, in his discussion of *Q*'s three literary strata,[219] Arnal notes that:

> Of the six typical attributes of the Jesus movement present in Q, only three (interest in Jesus, belief in the God of Israel, and

---

[216] See Boring 1994 where the argument is made that *Matthew* is the summation of *Q*'s "paradoxical" trajectory where an increase and sharpening of the "Jewish" elements coincide with an increase in more overt "Christianization."

[217] "To put this in perspective, consider the number of these distinctive and typical traits possessed by more 'central' members of the category of Jesus people, Paul and Mark. Of the eleven features discussed above, Paul lacks one: an interest in John the Baptist. Mark possesses all eleven. Of course both the Gospel of Mark and the Pauline corpus are significantly larger than Q and so will include more details. Nonetheless, the picture we get of the particular 'Jesus movement' behind Q is one that is far less distinctive, less 'typical,' than what we encounter in either the letters of Paul or the Gospel of Mark. Q seems to represent a *peripheral* member of the class of 'Jesus people'" (Arnal 2007, 137).

[218] While this could perhaps be a hold over from the understanding that *Q* is "incomplete" (See Hurtado 2003; Pearson 2004), this position should not be taken seriously.

[219] John Kloppenborg proposes that the three layers of Q consist of the earliest, Q^1, which contain the "wisdom speeches," such as the Sermon on the Plain/Mount and the Missions Discourse. The next stage Q^2 contained the judgment against Israel (preaching of John the Baptist, the the demand for signs, the Q apocalypse) and the third and final stratum, Q^3 contained the temptation story, which presents Jesus as a model for one's relationship to God. (Kloppenborg 1987)

> possible fictive kinship language) appear in Q^1 considered alone; the remaining three (ascriptions of the titles of Jesus; interest in the Baptist; treatment of the Hebrew Bible as predicative) are added at the Q^2 level. To be rather flippant about it, Q^2 is *twice* as "Christian" as Q^1 ...[while Q^3] does not add any new definitional features of the Jesus movements. Q^3 *may,* however, uniquely of the documents strata, show—albeit only implicitly—an awareness of and engagement with other strands of the Jesus movement (Arnal 2007, 136).

However, according to Arnal when it comes to the "Jewishness" of *Q* there is little ambiguity and clear evidence that the people responsible for the text "considered themselves ethnically Jewish[220] at every stage of the document's development. Interestingly, however, Q became more ideologically Jewish over time; it appears to have developed more and more 'typical features' of Jewish religious belief at each stage of its development" (Arnal 2007, 137-138).[221]

For example, the *Q* people worshiped the god of Israel ($Q^{[1]}$ 6:36; 11:2), held that the Temple and Jerusalem where significant, if negatively so, with the city itself a place of murder and where the prophets are rejected ($Q^{[2]}$ 6:22-23; 11:49-51;13:34-35), the Hebrew literary epic is used to authenticate the social

---

[220] See below regarding the classification of Galilean practice as "Jewish."

[221] In spite of the fact that the "Jewishness" becomes more emphasized as it becomes more "Christian."

program of *Q* (Q[2] 6:23; 7:26; 10:24; 11:47; 7:22; 13:35) and Jesus' teachings are placed in line with the Torah (Q[3]).[222]

This, combined with the fact that the interlocutors of *Q* were themselves Jews [223]—ethically and ideologically—from a modern (and some ancient) perspectives, the *ethnos* that the writers of *Q* seem to best identify with might have been "Jewish."

> Nonetheless, Q itself never uses the term "Jew." and for good reason. The Greek word normally translated as Jew, *Ioudaios*, was derived from, and in fact also meant, *Judean*. This terminology, at least in some circles in antiquity, implied that Jews were Judeans, and Judeans were Jews. Q, however, derives from and is concerned with *Galilee*, not Judea. It appeals to Jerusalem—albeit negatively —as the holy city of the biblical epic and the location of the temple, not as the locale of its main interlocutors. And when it refers to the Jewish people *in tot* it does so with the term "Israel" (Q 7:9)...or "children of Abraham (Q 3:8), terms that are inclusive of the residence of Galilee in the north and that do not prioritize the culture or lines of descent of the Judeans to the south. Thus, although we may identify the Q people as ethnic "Jews" with minimal qualifications, they themselves would probably have objected to that particular label (Arnal 2007, 140)

And while of course the distinction between Judean and Galilee does not negate the shared ideological identity of *Q* with "Judaism," it is important to note that the identification of *Q* as "Jewish" —while perhaps convenient for modern

---

[222] Please note that while these "Jewish" adherence become more overt from Q^1-Q^3, "Q witnesses a group of ethnic Jews who find in Jesus an authoritative spokesperson" (Arnal 2007 151).

[223] In fact it seems that Q rejected the inclusion of Gentiles within the "Jesus movement" (Arnal 2007, 135-136).

classification—is, if not as anachronistic as claiming Paul or *John* as "Christian," nonetheless a problematic descriptor regarding the ethnic element of the *Q* people.

> I say this without prejudice to the issue of cultural difference between Judea and Galilee and the differences that may have existed in religious practice. The fact that Q recognizes the people of Jerusalem as among the unrepentant 'generation" they castigate is an indication that they, at least, view both Judeans and Galileans as belonging to the same *ethnos*, whose behavior is contrasted to 'the Gentiles.' Note, too, that the Samaritans identified themselves as "Israel," and most defiantly not as Ioudaioi ('Judeans' / 'Jews'). The Samaritans, however, associated their identity with Mount Gerizim, not Jerusalem. (Arnal 2007, 321 n16).

This is an important distinction. While Galilee and Judea *may have* understood themselves as "ethnically" distinct from each other, they nonetheless saw each other—along, perhaps with the Samaritans—as having a shared ideological position. In other words, while they were not both ethnically "Jewish" they nonetheless were "religiously" so. But despite the recognition of this fact, what is interesting is the modern resistance to emphasize this distinction; to subsume Galilean *Q* within not just the ideological class of "Jewish / Judaism" but the ethnic one as well. But considering that attacks made against "non-Jewish" Jesuses (see Section 1, Chapter 2), the lack of emphasis on distinctly Galilean practices of "Judaism" seems at least in part tied to maintaining the modern understanding of the "Jewish" status of Christianity, and perhaps tied to residual anxiety over how "Galilean" has resonance with the antisemitic "Aryan Jesus"

models of Chamberlain and Grundmann (see Section 1, Chapter 3 and Section 3, Chapter 2). And while of course Arnal does make this distinction, and clearly deconstruct the term "Jewish" as meaning both ethnic or ideological adherence, the fact that *Q* is still classed as "Jewish"—while not inaccurate—does not do justice to the ambiguity of the term "Jewish / Jew / Judaism(s)" as applied to antiquity and does raise the question of its usefulness in describing the ancient world.[224]

2.1.8: The Exceptions that Make the Rule

With the recognition that a stable or static "Judaism"—"normative" or otherwise[225]—could not have existed in the first century becoming more and more a staple of academic discourse, it is not surprising that scholars like Boyarin, Saldarini, Marshall, Kysar and Gager have been able to offer more "polyvalent" configurations of what was "Judaism" in the first century;[226] so much so that what used to be understood as paradigmatically "Christian" can now easily be understood as a configuration of first-century Judaisms.

---

[224] See Section 3.

[225] For example, Jonathan Z. Smith noted that "[t]he wide range of uses and interpretation of circumcision as a taxic indicator in early Judaism suggests that, even with respect to this most fundamental division, we cannot sustain the impossible construct of a normative Judaism. We must conceive of a variety of early Judaisms, clustered in a variety of configurations" (Smith 1982, 14).

[226] Constructions of the "religion" of "Judaism" or "Judaisms" of antiquity, along with how "polyvalent" these models are, will be examined in Section 3, Chapter 1.

But as noted by Crossely, while there is a correct insistence on the "Jewishness" of many traditionally understood "Christian" discourses, and that the boundaries between the two "religions" were much more malleable than has been constructed in the past, there does nonetheless seem to be an insistence that in some way or another these expressions remain on the periphery of what is rendered as "Judaisms" by overriding some element of what is constructed by the scholar at hand as centrally Jewish.[227]

As noted, the interpretation of the Law and its christology by Saldarini's *Matthew*, while still constructed as part of the Jewish community of the first-century, was nonetheless understood as "deviant" by other Jews (Saldarini 1994, 196). Kysar's *John* insists on casting the ethnic identity of "the Jews" in the role of arch-villains, yet Kysar argues that *John* was most likely composed by and received by Jews (Kysar 1993, 69). Marshall's *Apocalypse of John* also seems to contain similar attacks against "Jews" and an elevated christology that would normally be seen as a very "Christian" rejection of what was "Jewish," yet Marshall argues that the *Apocalypse of John* was in fact not "Christian" but advocating a higher standard of adherence towards "Judaism" (and a rejection of syncretistic accommodation with the greater Greco-Roman world). For Marshall,

---

[227] "[T]here is one recurring theme in the continual emphasis on Jesus the Jew in contemporary scholarship: Jesus may be Jewish but he usually, so the scholarly arguments frequently go, overrides at least one of the key symbols of Jewish identity as constructed by contemporary scholarship" (Crossley 2008, 177).

this Jewishness is so integral to the text that, even though it contains no overt reference to "Jewish Sabbath observance," that this utterly "Jewish" social practice must have been a part of the community that produced the *Apocalypse of John* (Marshall 2001, 192). The Jewishness of Gager's Paul, despite the so called "Anti-Israel Set" of readings is nonetheless the proper way to understand Paul because of his "Protean adaptability"[228] (Gager 2000, 148). And finally Boyarin's Paul, despite his dualism and interpretation of the Law that annuls any ethnic difference, is still constructed as a Jew, just one that happens to be "radical," as the title of his book tells us.

In all instances, despite overriding what each scholar constructs as something that is central to their own version of Judaism, there is an insistence that Paul, *Matthew*, *John* or the *Apocalypse* should still be understood within the conceptual horizon of Judaism. And as it has been stated repeatedly, this is correct. As Smith and others have convincingly argued, to develop a model of "Judaism" in the first century

> students of religion need to abandon the notion of "essence," of a unique differentium for early Judaisms as well as the socially impossible correlative of a community constituted by a systematic set of beliefs.

---

[228] Gager is clear to maintain Paul is NOT inconsistent. For example, when Paul describes his missionary methods in 1 Cor. 9:22— "I became a Jew to Jews...to those outside the law I became like one outside the law"—Gager insists that this is "not a description of inconsistency or self-contradiction but rather of *Protean adaptability*" (Gager, 2000, 149 emphasis added).

> The cartography appears far messier. We need to map the variety of Judaisms, each of which appears as a shifting cluster of characteristics which vary over time. (Smith 1982, 18)

But as noted by Crossley, however, these "previously-Christian" Judaisms seem to not be as "Jewish" as those against which they are constructed. In other words, while the boundaries between what is "Jewish" and "Christian" are now understood to be far more malleable than in the past— "a shifting cluster of characteristics"—this malleability has its limits. Explicitly or not, there seems to be an assumption that there are more "Jewish" ways to adhere to Judaism: ones (taking into consideration the above) that DO preserve (and do not criticise) the ethnic identity of "Jews"; that interpret the Law in a more literalistic (i.e. "Jewish") fashion;[229] and do not have a place for the figure Jesus (divine or otherwise). It seems, to borrow from Crossley, that while it is perfectly acceptable to cast these Christianities as "Jewish" it is best to make sure that they are not *that* Jewish (Crossley 2008, 173).

So the question needs to be asked: why do some scholars of Christian origins like Wright, Gager, Kysar, Marshall, Saldarini and Boyarin—particularly those invested in refuting the old models that rendered Judaism as a static caricature—-still rely on the same stagnant tropes of what "Judaism" was in order

[229] Ironically, a "literalistic" reading of the Law was a staple of the supersessionist models of Christian origins scholars of the past and theological discourse of antiquity (Harnack 1924, 22; Marc. III.6.2). Of course this was understood to be more "legalistic" than "literalistic."

to awkwardly root their Christianities within a Jewish cultural matrix?[230] Why is it that the terms with which the earliest Christianity is being awkwardly rendered as "Jewish" are composed of the litany of clichés that were the staples of anti-Jewish scholarship produced in the earliest part of the last century? Considering that the Judaisms of late antiquity consisted of broad, multivalent and shifting discourses (J.Z. Smith 1982; Lightstone 2006 [1984]; Boyarin 2004; Mason 2007) that involved a whole variety of options beyond the "Temple, Torah, the land of Israel, ethnic identity, circumcision" horizon, why does it seem that many scholars interested in offering a corrective to the old supersessionist scholarship construct their Judaism(s) in such a way as to a) not only consist of a "normative" core or cores, but b) core(s) that were the staples of the past scholarship which they are attempting to rectify? In other words, why are Judaisms of the Bultmanns and Harnacks so similar to those of the Boyarins, Marshalls and Gagers? Even considering that Christianity is no longer constructed as superior and superseding

---

[230] It should be noted that the examples above are not meant to be a comprehensive list. They are meant to be exemplars and a sampling of the scholarly impulse to cast "Christianity" as part of Judaism...but not *that* Jewish. It should also be noted that these various reconstructions do not consistently represent their "Christianities" as "Jewish" in the same way, or that the constructed "Judaism(s)" that these discourses are apparently embedded in need to be understood in a similar fashion; the differences between Gager and Boyarin can attest to that. None of these models are consistently within a "true Judaism" since such a creature does not exist. And for our purposes that is not really the point. What is the point is that for each of these deployments, there is 1) a need to root a traditionally understood "Christianity" within the conceived borders of Judaism and 2) grapple with the issue that despite its "Jewishness" that the Christianity at best only awkwardly fits and subverts some element. Again, it is not the details or the specifics that matter, but the scholarly intent to correctly rectify old supersessionalist models and cast these discourses more in line with the general model of "The Ways that Never Parted."

an invalidated Judaism, but "joined at the hip" (Boyarin 5, 2004), why must these previously Christian expressions still be Jewish...but just not *that* Jewish? Or better yet not *that* Jewish in the way that Judaism is being forcibly constructed so that previously Christian "deviations"—while part of the family—can only be distantly related?

While this situation could simply be a lack of sophistication in scholarship, or due to the fact that scholars have not thought out the implications of their models, at least when it comes to some Christianities, it appears that Judaism or what is "Jewish" is in some instances being used as a cipher for some other issue. While part of the problem is that the horizon of Judaism is limited,[231] it is also being limited in a way to help define what is fundamentally Christian.[232]

> After all, if Jesus the Jew turns out to be defined mainly in terms of such things as, say, belief in God, interest in prophetic scriptures, interest in ethical behaviour, the prioritisation of love of one's neighbour and one's personal duty over against the strictures of custom, and so on, then might it not turn out that Judaism could and can include and embrace everything that Christianity claims to be? And if so, why bother to be a Christian at all? So it seems to me that, perhaps, Christians, or Gentiles from a Christian background that may still mean something to them, do indeed have a vested interest in defining a normative Judaism, in order to define themselves. (Arnal 2005, 58)

---

[231] See Section 3

[232] While one can assume that this is certainly not the case with Boyarin, the ideological resonance of his model is nonetheless similar to what more apologetic scholars like Wright are doing (if for substantially different reasons).

As Arnal has pointed out, through the rhetoric around the "Cynic-Jesus" and the desire to show the "Jewish" roots of "authentic" Christianity (Arnal 2005, 8-19), some scholars have limited themselves to a small number of "Judaisms" that can provide a proper "Jewish" context for Christianity. But on the flip side of this there is also the implication that any model or "influence" that does not fall within this narrow spectrum can be no Judaism at all and hence, can not influence any "authentic" Christianity. What is interesting—or, better yet, disheartening—is that this construction of Judaism is not a reflection of the various ideological options available to Jews in antiquity, but rather a scholarly shorthand used as a method of constructing the boundaries of what is Christianity (Smith 1990, 83).

It is this function that "Judaism" is being forced to play, where the insistence on a supposed "anti-Jewishness" can be used as a means to quarantine texts like the *Apocryphon of John,* keeping them as essentially "heretical" and, as such, secondary in historical significance. While it may be recognised by scholars that both Judaism and Christianity constituted a multiplicity of conflicting discourse that nonetheless are equally important to scholarly reconstructions, when it comes to texts like the *Apocryphon of John* they may be Christian...but not Jewish *enough.*

But the question that needs to be asked: is this actually the case? Is the *Apocryphon of John* a "Christianity" that is less "Jewish" than Paul, *Revelation* or *John*? Does it actually constitute an "anti-Jewish Christianity" in antiquity; an exception to "Ways that Never Parted" model? Or does the *Apocryphon of John* call into question not only what it meant to be Christian in antiquity but also what constitutes the "Judaisms" so important to the "Ways that Never Parted" model? It is with this short-hand function of what "Judaism" is for Christian Origins in mind, that the scholarly rhetoric of marginalization of the *Apocryphon of John* begins to make sense.

Chapter 2

The Weirdo at the Table: the *Apocryphon of John* and constructing "Christianity"

2.2.1 Introduction

The *Apocryphon of John* is weird. Like a socially awkward and long lost second cousin at a family dinner, its mere inclusion at the table is bound to cause tense silence and sideways glances as the rest of the family tries to deal with the interloper. How will s/he dress? Will s/he know a salad fork from a desert spoon? Is s/he vegetarian? Vegan? Will s/he burp? Or even worse, will s/he care if s/he does?

And of course these fears can be justified when our "guest" speaks, and tries to be part of the conversation. Not knowing the specific social rules of the gathering, not knowing her or his place, the *Apocryphon of John* asks questions and makes observations that, while perfectly reasonable at the types of dinner parties s/he is used to, are not what one should bring up in "polite" company.

And this is in part what makes the *Apocryphon of John* such a weirdo. Preserved in two versions in four copies, the *Apocryphon of John* appears to have been a popular expression of what we moderns would understand as

Christianity[233] in the ancient world. The problem is, while it may have been known then, and was a possible invitee to the dinner party,[234] it is for all intents and purposes "new" to modern readers and as such just doesn't "fit" within the horizon of what is now classified as Christianity (Plese 2012).[235]

And this is very different from our previous example of supposed anti-Jewish Christianity: Marcion. In the approximately 1900 years that Marcion has been represented in Christian discourse and despite his "heretical" nature, he still "fits" and has a clearly demarcated place at the family table. While Marcion was certainly not Jewish,[236] he nonetheless was represented as a "Christian," if of a limited and problematic Pauline variety.[237] He was the first to develop a canon (Knox 1942, 19; BeDuhn 2013) someone who successfully mined (and perhaps preserved) Paul to great effect (Bauer 1971 [1934]; Knox 1942; Tyson 2006) and whose movement was a significant presence in the Greco-Roman world. And

---

[233] The *Apocryphon of John* seems to have been known, at least in part, by Irenaeus of Lyons around 180 CE (Haer 1.29), was preserved in the fourth century within three independent translations (from Greek to Coptic) by Pachomian monks, and in a fifth century manuscript known as the Berlin Codex (King 2006).

[234] Or better yet—if one takes the polemics of the Church Fathers and such discourses as the Nicene Creed—part of the Do Not Allow To Enter list.

[235] While the Berlin codex was discovered in 1896, it was not until the discovery of Nag Hammadi Library in 1948 and its eventual dissemination, that the *Apocryphon of John* was available to scholarship (King 2006, 8; see also Plisch 2012).

[236] See Section 1, Chapter 2 regarding the "Jewishness" of Marcion and how he has been represented.

[237] "Marcion departed very far from Pauline theology, but it is quite conceivable that he was not aware of doing so. Other people in the early Church [also] found Paul hard to understand (cf 2 Peter 3:16)" (Barton 2007, 351).

while his imagining of Jesus was "misguided"[238] it nonetheless worked as a catalyst for the formation of texts, such as *Luke-Acts*, and the formation of what became the New Testament (Tyson 2006, 121-131). In a way, his representation can also be seen to have helped define for later Christian imagination what was "Judaism" by his literalistic (i.e. "Jewish") reading of texts and his supposed "purging" of "Jewish" elements from Paul and *Luke*. In fact, as the paradigm for the anti-Jew, his representation helps define not only what was "Jewish" but—depending on the time and the author employed—what is the appropriate stance of a "Christian" vis-à-vis the Jewishness that he apparently rejected.

But this is not the case for the *Apocryphon of John.* While Marcion's representation was created, used, and deployed in the service of these boundaries for close to two millennia, the *Apocryphon of John* has only recently shown up to the party and as such has simply not been part of the discussion of what is or was "Christian" or "Jewish." And by not being "involved" in the construction of the modern boundaries of what gets to be Christian or Jewish, it's very existence challenges convention.

For example, the *Apocryphon of John* is clearly indebted to various Greek philosophical models, such as Plato's *Timaeus* and *Parmenides*, like many other "Christian" and "Jewish" texts. But the "Greekness" of the *Apocryphon of John*

---

[238] See Sebastian Moll's *The Arch-heretic Marcion* (2010) for a recent attempt at disqualifying Marcion from claims to authentic Christianity.

is really odd, with "both a deep resonance and clashing dissonance with these philosophical accounts" (King 2006, 198; *pace* Lewis, 2013).[239]

The *Apocryphon of John* is also clearly understood as a "Christian" text, with references to a salvation that is offered by a post-resurrection Jesus, as we find in other "Christianities" like *Matthew* (28), *Luke-Acts* (24) and *John* (20-21). But the post-resurrection Jesus of the *Apocryphon of John* says and does some strange things that are not found in these other texts. For example, after discussing the nature of the transcendently divine "Monad" with James (ApocJohn 4:2),[240] Jesus then reveals that

> Barbelo requested the invisible virginal Spirit to give her Fo[re]kn [ow]ledge. And the Spirit stared. When [It stared], Fore-knowledge was revealed [an]d stood with [P]ronoia. She is fr[om] the Thought of the invisible [vir]ginal Spirit. She glorified It a[nd] Its perfect power [Ba]rbelo, fo[r] it was b[eca]use of her that she had come into being. A [nd ag]ain she reque[st]ed (It) to give her In[destr]uct[ibility]. And It stared. And in [Its staring], Indest[ruct]ibility [was reveal]ed. And she stood with Thought and Foreknowledge. She glorified the Invisible one and Barbelo, for they had come into being because of her. And Barbelo requested (It) to give her Ete[r]nal L[ife]. And the in[v]isible

---

[239] In particular, Denzey Lewis points out that the author of the *Apocryphon of John* (along with the author of *On the Origin of the World*) were not cosmic pessimists (versus Greek philosophical positivists) and did not "subvert *pronoia* into a malevolent *heimarmene.* Rather, these writers sought to develop the philosophical systems of the Middle Platonists within a Biblical hermeneutical framework...These authors offered in place of 'cosmic pessimism' an understanding of sacred history in which 'evil,' such as *heimarmene*'s involvement in the creation of bodies, only set the stage for higher Providence to intervene and awaken humans from their enslavement" (Denzey Lewis 2013, 52).

[240] Considering the following is concerned largely with the scholarly reception of *the Apocryphon of John*, citations will follow the most common academic translation of Waldstein and Wisse (1995). However, the numbering system will be that used by King (2006) for ease of reference. Also, please note, any corrections and / alternative translations will be my own from the Coptic, and will be noted.

> Spirit stared. And in Its staring, Eternal Life was revealed. And [they s]to[od]. They glorified the invisible [Spir]it and Barbelo, for they had come into being because of her. And again she asked (It) to give to her Truth. And the invisible Spirit stared. Truth was revealed. And they stood. They glorified the invisible Spirit who was approving and his Barbelo, for they had come into being because of her. This is the pentad of the Aeons of the Father, who is the first Human, the image of the invisible Spirit. This is Pronoia, namely: Barbelo, Thought, Foreknowledge, Indestructibility, Eternal Life, and Truth. This is the androgynous pentad of the Aeons which is the decad of Aeons, the Father. (ApocJohn 6:1-26)

Stranger and stranger. Could it then be a Jewish text? The *Apocryphon of John* is clearly interested in and uses Jewish wisdom speculation and literature (MacRae 1970). And it is heavily indebted to the Hebrew Bible, *Genesis* in particular, and uses the figure of Wisdom / Sophia. It even reconfigures parts of *Genesis* in ways similar to Philo, but despite the similarities and "double reading of *Genesis*" (King 2006, 223), it is indebted in a way that is more than a little uncomfortable, especially for modern sensibilities For example,

> And when [The Creator] saw the creation which surrounded him and the multitude of the angels surrounding him who had came into being from him, he said to them, 'I am a jealous God and no other god exists beside me.' But his proclamation indicated to the angels who dwell with him that another God does exist. For if there were not another who exists, of whom would he be jealous? (ApocJohn 14:1-4)

Again, the *Apocryphon of John* is the weird interloper who just might eat with her / his hands, belch at the table, or strip off all of her / his clothing while singing Iron Maiden's "The Rime of the Ancient Mariner."

What are we to do with this weirdo? Even though it is part of the family, where are we to put it? Of course, being discovered as part of the "Gnostic" Nag Hammadi library helped provide an initial place for the *Apocryphon of John.* But even though the term "Gnosticism" and what was "Gnostic"[241] has lost analytical currency,[242] the rhetorical space that the "Gnostics" or "Gnosticism" occupied still seems to be required in scholarship. There is still a need to find a place for the "weirdos,"[243] to quarantine these texts and expressions that are the "other" in relation to what is constructed as normative Christianity.[244] So while in much the same way Judaism(s) has been reconfigured to represent a variety of discourses (Smith 1982; Lightstone 2006 [1984]; Mason 2007) Christianity or Christianities

---

[241] Two scholars, David Brakke (2010) and Birger Pearson (2004), have attempted to preserve the classification of "The Gnostics" or "Gnosticism" to varying degrees of success. Brakke attempts to construct "the Gnostics" as a social category "one that recognized itself as such —and was so recognized by others. I believe that it is possible to identify and describe such a gnostic movement without succumbing to the dangers of rigid essentializing boundaries, and rectification that concern scholars today" (Brakke 2010, 27). While I would argue this attempt does not work (see below), it is nonetheless better that the utter failure of Pearson who—basing his assumptions on Ninian Smart's notion that "religions" have seven dimensions (doctrinal / philosophical, mythical / narrative, practical / ritual, experimental / emotional, ethical / legal, social / institutional, and material[1968])—claims that collectively the Nag Hammadi library text provide evidence for all seven and as such constitutes a religion (Pearson 2004, 201-224).

[242] For example, Marcion (Moll 2010) and Valentinus (Dunderberg 2008) used to be classed as part of the "Gnostics" (Markschies 2002) but as more robust models for mapping earlier "Christianities" have been developed, these designations are no longer used. See also Fairen (2008) and King (2003) for how many of the "power cords" of what was Gnostic are 1) understood to be part and parcel with "orthodox" groups (such as those found in the New Testament) or 2) invented whole cloth (King 2003, 109).

[243] Or a place that helps define something as odd or weird. For analogous strategies, see Smith (2004, 215-229) on how the classification of Magic has been deployed to keep discourses from being understood as "legitimately" religious.

[244] See Section 2, Chapter 3

is best understood as a multiplicity of expressions.[245] Nonetheless, despite this multiplicity, there still seems to be an assumption of some kind of normative core. To again (ab)use the metaphor of the dinner party, this core would not even consist of the expected guests, but only the folks who host it.

So what is "normative" Christianity? While of course the terms have changed over time, it does appear that the principles involved have remained relatively constant. From the time of Irenaus' construction of "orthodoxy" and the canonisation of the New Testament, through the catholic / protestant polemics that underscored the first wave of Biblical "academics" (Smith 1990; see Harnack 1961 as an instructive example) to modern historical research post-Nag Hammadi, this core has been relatively stable: the texts of the New Testament and the expressions that they supposedly represent constitute "normative" Christianity, while non-canonical sources simply can not.

So while terms like "heresy" / "orthodoxy" are no longer used outside theologically biased and / or methodologically sloppy scholarship, and there is a recognition that there were multiple and competing "Christianities" in the first few centuries of the common era, one of the best ways to maintain the quarantine

[245] See Section 3.

of those expressions that used to be heresy[246]—especially considering the climate of the "Ways that Never Parted" model—is to rebrand them as anti-Jewish. [247]

Initially, this might seem to be a bit of a conceptual leap from the theological category of "heresy," to the academic category of "Gnosticism," to the

---

[246] Two examples will suffice to illustrate this point, one apologetic but the other systematic of the prioritization or the "orthodox" status of the New Testament in scholarship. According to John P. Meier, the documents of the Nag Hammadi library are not of the same importance in the invention of the Historical Jesus (see Section 1, Chapter 1 and 2) as the texts of the New Testament. "[E]ven such key works [from the Nag Hammadi] of Christian gnosticism as *the Gospel of Truth* turn out to be a theological tract or homily, *completely different from the narrative form of the four canonical Gospels*. Some of these tracts-called-gospels (e.g. *the Gospel of Philip*) do contain words or deeds of Jesus, some paralleled in the canonical Gospels, some not. In the case of *the Gospel of Phillip,* these words and deeds are scattered throughout a rambling document that seems to have as its main object instruction on Christian Gnostic sacraments. The material about Jesus is somewhat on the level of the fanciful gospels seen above. For example, Jesus goes into the dye works of Levi, takes 72 different colors, and throws them into a vat; they all come out white (Gos. Phil 63,25-30). Still more bizarre, Joseph the carpenter grows a tree from which he makes the cross on which Jesus is later hanged (Gos. Phil 73, 8-15). *This is the stuff of the Last Temptation of Christ, not the Historical Jesus*" (Meier, 1987, 123-124 emphasis mine). As I have noted before "Considering however, that the New Testament also has its share of (conflicting) theological tractates, sacramental instructional passages (Matt 26:26-29; Luke 22:14-23; 1 Cor 11:23-26), extremely rambling arguments (1 Cor 11:1-16) and a variety of fanciful (Matt 21:6-7 as fulfillment of Zech 9:9) and bizarre images —such as turning water into wine (John 2:6-9), walking through walls (Luke 24:36), walking on water (Matt 14:22-33) curing the blind with saliva (John 9:9-12) or (when compared to the irrationally use of 72 dyes) the very reasonable action of raising the dead (Luke 7:11-17, John 11:1-44)" (Fairen 2008, 106, n 156).

A less polemical (and as such, perhaps more problematic) example, is the standard in which the academic work on Christian origins cites sources. "[A]bbreviations for the Hebrew Bible / Old Testament, New Testament, Apocrypha, and Septuagint titles do not require a period and *are not* italicized" (Alexander, Kutsko, Ernest & Decker-Lucke 1999, 73 emphasis original). While on the surface this may seem an innocuous and stylistic quirk, what is important to note is that even in what should be the non-theological writings of scholarship there is nonetheless a desire to pars-off "biblical" (i.e. "canonical," "orthodoxy") writings from their supposed non-canonical (i.e; "heretical") counterparts such as those in the Nag Hammadi Library. So while the agenda of these two examples are of course different, the results—the prioritization of one retroactively collected set of texts over another on the grounds on "theological" preference— is disheartening.

[247] Of course discussing or offering an analysis of the construction of orthodoxy and heresy in antiquity, is one thing, but nothing is self evidently orthodox or heretical (King 2002, 2-3, 24; Boyarin 2004, 4-13; Fairen 2008, 69-93).

historical category of "anti-Jewish."[248] But considering that what is heretical is that which is *not* "orthodoxy" and that the so-called "Gnostics" have from the beginning of their scholarly classification post-Nag Hammadi been understood as having some anti-Jewish animus,[249] the linking of the two is not all that surprising.[250]

So, even though terms like "heresy" and "Gnosticism" are no longer used in most modern scholarship, the fact that the rhetorical place of what is "Gnostic" is still required. And again, in light of the agenda of the "Ways that Never Parted" model, what better way to keep an expression from being authentically Christian or outside of the "norm" then to render it as anti-Jewish?

In this way the *Apocryphon of John* could very well be an example of the "classic gnostic myth," even if not in the way that Logan would wish (Logan 2012).[251] While it certainly does not prove the existence of a "Gnostic" religion in antiquity, it does provide evidence for the scholarly mental gymnastics needed

---

[248] Especially since what was "orthodox" 50 years ago, was that which was a "distinct" religion that was superior and superseded the "religion" of Judaism.

[249] While perhaps not the first time formulated as such, Hans Jonas' claim that "Gnosticism" was at its core "anti-Jewish" (Jonas 1965, 287) clearly sets the parameters of how the two must be diametrically opposed. And while the substance of Jonas' analysis has largely been abandoned, the diametrically opposed relationship he established between what is "Gnostic" and what was "Judaism" still carries weight (King 2002 135-137).

[250] "The Christian construction of Judaism was a central factor in defining orthodoxy and heresy among early Christians, even as it is for modern historians" (King 2003, 175).

[251] "Judging by its popularity and longevity (second to fifth centuries and beyond) the *Apocryphon* [*of John*] then does seem a text of fundamental importance when trying to establish the nature and trace the development of the 'classic' gnostic myth...*The Apocryphon of John* evidently enshrined the 'classic' Gnostic myth..." (Logan 2012, 137-138).

to keep the *Apocryphon of John* within the rhetorical place that "Gnosticism" has in the past occupied, be it the heretical other of past scholarship or as a prime example of supposed ancient anti-Jewish polemics as understood in modern reconstructions.

Let the games begin!

2.2.2 Qualities of Anti-Jewishness:Construction of Sophia and Divine Wisdom

While ancient constructions of Divine wisdom were not limited to Judaism, but were rather a common scribal trope in the Ancient Near and Middle East (J.Z. Smith 1983 [1975]; Fairen 2008), its use / appropriation in the *Apocryphon of John* is particularly indebted to how the figure of Divine Wisdom / Sophia was used and constructed by the Hebrew literary tradition (MacRae 1970; King 2006; Pearson 2007, 108-113).

Variously throughout Hebrew literature, Divine Wisdom has been described as a mediator in human history (Wis 10:1), giving the Law to Moses (Sir 24), inspiring the prophets, (Q 11:49-51), appearing to humanity in a variety of guises in order to offer wisdom and guidance (Prov 1:20-33; 8:1-11) and being the co-creator with God (Prov 8:22-30).

Within the *Apocryphon of John,* Sophia is also a represented as a figure involved in creation. However, instead of working *with* the Highest God, Sophia works *in spite* of divine authority.

> Sophia of the Epinoia, being an Aeon, thought a thought from within herself and the thought of the invisible Spirit and Foreknowledge. She willed a likeness to appear from within herself without the will of the Spirit—It had not approved—and without her partner and without his consideration. For the countenance of her masculinity did not approve, and she had not found her partner. She deliberated apart from the will of the Spirit and the understanding of her partner. She brought forth (ApocJohn 10:1-6).

While numerous allusions and overt references to Wisdom as she is portrayed in Hebrew literature can be found in the *Apocryphon of John* (King 2006, 226-232), according to Karen King these kinds of appropriations are problematic.

> In the first place, however extensive, [*the Apocryphon]of John*'s appropriation of the Wisdom tradition is highly selective. Those traditions that identified the true God with the creation of the world and the goodness and beauty in it are never cited. Nor are places where Sophia's mission was deemed successful, for example in inspiring the righteous throughout the history of Israel or in giving the Law to Moses. Second, the characteristics and roles given to the single figure of divine Wisdom in Jewish literature are spread among a variety of figures in [*the Apocryphon] of John* including Pronoia, Epinoia, Sophia and Eve. (King 2006, 225-226)

While the notion of selective appropriation is of course accurate, this is hardly surprising or unique within the literature of the first and second centuries of the ancient Near and Middle East, let alone from the "Christian" and "Jewish"

traditions or by "Christians" and "Jews."[252] For example, the *Gospel of John* is quite mercenary in its appropriation of Divine Wisdom, reconfiguring the myth so that it not only applies to Jesus as a demiurgical co-creator with God (Droge 2007 / 2008) but also changing the gender of female Sophia to male Logos (John. 1:1-4). Also, we find a "splitting" of divine wisdom in 1 Corinthians; "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God" (1 Cor 2:12).[253]

But while Paul and *John* are rightly seen as being on the spectrum of Judaism and therefore *not* anti-Jewish, why is this not the case with the *Apocryphon of John?* Why are the types of criticisms leveled against the *Apocryphon of John* regarding Wisdom not leveled against the *Gospel of John* or against Paul?[254] Again, as an exemplar—even after detailing the various ways

---

[252] For example, in the nominally "Jewish" Dead Sea Scrolls, the figure of Gilgamesh is one of the children of the fallen Watchers. "[Gilgamesh said] I have made war against [the angels of God]; but I am not[. . .] able to stand against them, for my opponents [. . .] reside in Heaven, and they dwell in holy places" (4Q531 Frag. 1. 4-6). This of course is not surprising considering the "international" nature of the ancient Near and Middle Eastern scribal class (Smith 1983; Shiftman 1994).

[253] ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν·

[254] In the case of Paul, this "splitting" of Wisdom is not a "Gnostic" trope (Rudolph 1987 [1977], 76) within the Pauline letters, as it seems to be implied in texts like *the Apocryphon of John*. Instead, scholars have apologetically constructed 1 Cor 2:12 as an orthodox indictment of Gnosticism. Hence, the "positive" use of the "Spirit of God" is the Pauline adoption of legitimate Jewish wisdom, but the negative "spirit of the world" is actually an anti-Gnostic polemic (H-W. Kuhn 1998, 241–53; see also Bultmann 1971 [1964], 8–9).

that the *Apocryphon of John* seems to parallel "Jewish" wisdom tropes—King claims that

> the portrait of Sophia in [the *Apocryphon*] *of John* is more parody than parallel. She is not the first creation of the true deity, but the last of the aeons. She is powerful, but ignorant. While she is responsible for all that comes forth in the lower world, that is not an occasion for praise but for repentance. The creator God of the lower world is not her source but the product of her ignorance. While it is Sophia who introduces light into the world below, the light becomes entrapped by the forces of darkness, making her the agent not of salvation but of enslavement...[t]he wisdom of the lower world in folly. Just as the [the *Apocryphon*] *of John* satirizes *Genesis* by exposing the creator as an arrogant, theriomorphic pretender, so it takes equal pleasure in parodying Jewish wisdom tradition by portraying divine Wisdom as an ignorant and foolish female (King 2006, 231, 233)

While the degree or amount of speculation of course differs between *John*, Paul, and the *Apocryphon of John*, they are nonetheless analogous. Therefore, the question needs to be asked: what is it about the *Apocryphon of John*'s use of Wisdom that leads even a scholar of King's caliber to assume it's appropriation in the *Apocryphon of John* is somehow a "parody" or a "satire" of Judaism? Is it "anti-Jewish" or has this been assumed *a priori*? Or put another way, what are the interpretive tasks that the *Apocryphon of John*'s use of Wisdom accomplishes that lead King to assume this?

2.2.3 Qualities of Anti-Jewishness: Genesis 1-3

In the Creation accounts found in *Genesis* 1 and 2, YWHW creates the Cosmos in an act of divine will, separating the "the light from the darkness" (Gen 1:4). He then proceeds to fill the various parts of his creation with types appropriate to each level of the Cosmos: sun and stars for the heavens, birds in the air, fish in the water and animals on the earth. Finally, he creates humanity "in our image, according to our likeness" (Gen 1:26). Within *Genesis* 2, the story of the creation of Adam and Eve is explored in greater detail, culminating in an explanation for the source of evil and suffering in the human sphere. In this second account, after the creation of Adam (Gen 2:7)

> The Lord God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, "You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die" (Gen. 2:15-17).

God then decides that Adam was alone and needed a companion. He puts Adam to sleep and from "the rib that the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. Then the man said,'This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; this one shall be called Woman, for out of Man this one was taken'" (Gen 2:22-23).

At this stage in the narration, all is well. Creation, in all its glory, is fundamentally good (Gen. 1:31). That is, until the serpent intervenes. By first

promising Eve that she will not die and be like God, the serpent convinces Eve to not only eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, but to share the fruit with Adam. "Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made loincloths for themselves" (Gen. 3:7).

The consequences of their meal, of course, are dire.

> God curses creation by placing enmity where harmony had reigned; between animals and humans, between man and woman, between humanity and earth. The final blow is the establishment of death by sealing off human access to the Tree of Life and casting Adam and Eve out of the Garden of Eden (King 2006, 217).
> .

Within the account—particularly *Genesis*—while the world may have eventually become a place of death and despair (Gen. 3:13-19), it nonetheless *began* as a place of goodness. It is hubris, the overstepping of boundaries with Adam and Eve placing their own desire over that of divine command, that is understood to be the cause of the fall. "Eating the fruit introduces a crucial rupture in the political order of the ruling: the disobedience by the created toward their creator" (King 2006, 216).

In the *Apocryphon of John* however, while the basic thematic steps of *Genesis* are covered, the interests, motivations and results of the creative act are interpreted as fundamentally different. For, while in both the world is a place of death and despair, in the *Apocryphon of John,* Creation was never good. It did not

degrade as a result of human hubris but, because of hubris found in the (semi) divine realm, Creation in and of itself was a negative act.

In a kind of "prologue" or an expansion to *Genesis*, the *Apocryphon of John* gives a detailed description of the creative process of the heavens *before* the creation of the world:

> The Monad [is a mo]narch[y with]out anything existing over it. [It exists as the God] and Father of the [A]ll., the [invisi]ble which dwells above [the All, ...] imperishableness which exi[sts as the] pure light upon which it is not pos[sible for any eye to] gaze. [It is the] invisible [Spirit], and It is not appropriate [to consider It] to be like the g[o]ds or that It is something similar. For It is more than divine, [without anything] existing over It. For nothing lords [over It] (ApocJohn 4:2-6).

The Supreme Being / Monad did not remain alone long, but instead creates from itself a plethora of semi-divine aeons and powers who live in perfect harmony in the heavens along side the Monad (ApocJohn 6:1-9:14).

However, the last of the created Aeons—Sophia—desired to create something parthenogenically and apart from the divine totality "of the androgynous pentad of the Aeons, which is the decad of the Aeons, of the Father" (ApocJohn 6.26). In other words, much like the rupture in the *Genesis* account because of Eve's hubris, there is also a rupture in the Pleroma due also to the hubris of Sophia or Divine Wisdom (ApocJohn 11:2-11). It is this

unauthorised act of creation that resulted in the birth of the monstrous entity, Yaltabaoth.

> Because of the unconquerable power within her, her thought did not remain idle. And an imperfect product appeared from her, and it was different from her pattern because she created it without her partner. And it was not patterned after the likeness of its Mother, for it had a different form. When she saw (the product of) her will, it was different, a model of a lion-faced serpent. His eyes were like flashing fires of lightning. She cast him out from her, outside of those places so that none among the immortals might see him, for she had created him in ignorance.And she surrounded him with a luminous cloud. And she placed a throne in the midst of the cloud in order that no one might see him except the holy Spirit, who is called the mother of the living. She named him Yaltabaoth. This is the Chief Ruler, the one who got a great power from his Mother. (ApocJohn 10:7-19)[255]

Cast off, isolated and unaware of his corrupted origins, or of the divine realm above him, Yaltabaoth concluded that only he himself existed and, using some of the power inherited from his mother, created the material world:

> And he withdrew from her and he abandoned the place where he had been born. He seized (another place). He created for himself another aeon inside a blaze of luminous fire, which still exists now. And he was stupefied in his Madness, the one who dwells within him, and he begat some authorities for himself. The name of the first is Athoth, the one whom the generations call the [reaper]. The second is Harmas, who is [the eye] of envy. The third is Kalila-Oumbri. The fourth is Yabel. The fifth is Adonaiou, who is called Sabaoth. The sixth is Cain, whom the generations of humanity call

---

[255] See King 2011 on the how gender is used / interpreted in the *Apocryphon of John*

> the sun. The seventh is Abel. The eighth is Abrisene. The ninth is Yobel. The tenth is Armoupieel. The eleventh is Melcheir-Adonein. The twelfth is Belias; he is the one who is over the depth of Hades. And he set up seven kings over the seven heavens, one per firmament of heaven, and five over the depth of the abyss so that they might rule. (ApocJohn 11:1-29) [256]

It is here that the *Apocryphon of John* begins more closely to follow the narrative track of *Genesis*, but with a very different emphasis than was established by the "prologue." Where *Genesis* sees the creation of the world as an initially positive act that was degraded by the actions of humans, this is simply not the case with the *Apocryphon of John*. For the *Apocryphon of John,* the creation of the material world is in itself a rupturing of the divine perfection, doomed to be an imperfect realm of corruption and death. This juxtaposition is made explicitly clear when one compares the *Genesis* and the *Apocryphon of John*'s descriptions of the Garden of Eden. *Genesis* states: "And the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, in the east; and there he put the man whom he had formed out of the ground the Lord God made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food" (Gen. 2:9). In the *Apocryphon of John,* the emphasis is very different:

> And the Rulers took him and they placed him in paradise. And they said to him, 'Eat that is in idleness. For indeed their delight is bitter and their beauty is licentious. For their delight is deception and their trees are impiety. And their fruit is an incurable poison and their promise is death. And in the midst of paradise, they planted

---

[256] See Section 3, Chapter 3 for how this arrangement by the demiurge mimics imperial power structures of antiquity.

> the tree of their life...Its root is bitter and its branches are deaths. Its shade is hate and deception dwells in its leaves. And its blossom is the anointment of evil. And its fruit is death, and desire is its seed, and it blossoms from the darkness. The dwelling place of those who taste from it is Hades, and the dark is their resting place. (ApocJohn 20:1-17)

The Garden is not a paradise in the *Apocryphon of John*, but a means of entrapping and co-opting humanity and the divine spark it contains. Instead of being a place of bliss as Eden is interpreted in *Genesis*, here it is a place of enslavement.[257]

It is these kinds of juxtapositions that have led scholars to evaluate the *Apocryphon of John* as antithetical to Judaism:

> The dissimilarities between [*the Apocryphon*] of *John* and *Genesis,* especially in the evaluation of the creator God, are obvious and have often been noted, primarily by portraying [*the Apocryphon*] *of John*'s account as an impious "reversal" of the Biblical portrait of God's goodness in creation (King 2006, 217; see also Williams 1996, 57-79).

Again, the question needs to be asked: does this imply "impiety"? And even if it does, does it equal "anti-Jewishness"? Or is "impiety" simply a subjective category that has more to say about the boundaries of "piety" among the categorizers, than it does about the categorized?

---

[257] Unsurprising, considering the emphasis of both accounts, the Flood is not the act of cleansing as it is portrayed in *Genesis*, but an act of aggression. While both are to quash humanity, the emphasis is very different.

For example, there are other reconfigurations of *Genesis* found throughout "Jewish" literature. The *Book of Watchers* (1 Enoch 1-36) is a more elaborate rendition of the *Genesis* account, particularly the story of the Nephilim (see Gen 6:1–4), in which the Watchers or Angels come to earth, disseminate forbidden knowledge to humanity, and mate with women to create destructive "giants" who sow discord and corruption in their wake, forcing God[258] to bring the Deluge.[259] Unlike the canonical "history" of the Bible, which located sin with a human "fall," the *Book of Watchers* places the origin of overwhelming sin within the heavenly realm.[260] For the author(s) of the *Book of Watchers* humanity simply "wanting forbidden fruit and fratricide were not sufficient as explanations for the violence and sin before the flood. Evil grew so powerful because it has received a supernatural boost" (VanderKam 1995, 42; see also Fairen 2008, 141-166).

We find similar treatments by Philo, particularly in *On The Creation*.

> It is on this account that Moses says, at the creation of man alone that God said, 'Let us make man,' which expression shows an assumption of other beings to himself as assistants, in order that God, the governor of all things, might have all the blameless intentions and actions of man, when he does right attributed to him; and that his other assistants

---

[258] In *1 Enoch*, however, God is not portrayed as all knowing and needs to be told by Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel what trouble the Watchers are up to on Earth (1 Enoch 9:1-11).

[259] Compare with Gen 6:5: "The Lord saw that *the wickedness of humankind* was great in the earth and that every inclination of their thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually" (emphasis mine)

[260] While the "fall" in *Genesis* is still seen as part of the overall narrative of *the Book of Watchers,* the presence of overwhelming or endemic sin within the world seems to have needed a "supernatural" agency.

> might bear the imputation of his contrary actions. (*On the Creation*, XXIV)

In his integration of Plato's division of Being and becoming with the *Genesis* account, Philo postulated that the first creation story was concerned with the immaterial world of ideas, while the second creation story was concerned with the material world (King 2006, 221; see also Runia 1986).

In both of these cases, the re-interpretation of *Genesis* in and of itself does not, of course, equal an anti-Jewish stance. And nor should it, irrespective of the fact that scholars see both as "Jewish" sources. Even if these were defined as "non-Jewish" sources, one would question the claim that they are in of themselves "anti-Jewish." As has been noted, scholars have recognized that there are many ways to be "Jewish," even ones that were "Christian."[261]

So what is it that renders the *Apocryphon of John* antithetical to Judaism, when expressions such as Philo's or the *Book of Watchers'* reconfigurations of *Genesis* are still placed within the boundaries of Judaism? The problem, it seems, is not so much the use of Wisdom or the reconfiguration of *Genesis*. For scholars, the problem, or the interpretive lens that has rendered the *Apocryphon of John*'s use of Sophia or *Genesis* as "anti-Jewish" or of constituting a "non-Jewish" stance, is ultimately a product of the *Apocryphon of John*'s demotion of the

---

[261] See Section 2, Chapter 1

Hebrew Creator God as not the supreme deity. In other words, because the *Apocryphon of John*'s degradation and demotion of YHWH can only be in the service of an "anti-Jewish" stance, any other "Judaisms" within the text, such as Wisdom or use of *Genesis*, must by default be interpreted as serving this anti-Jewish agenda.

2.2.4: Origins of Anti-Jewishness: Spiting the Divine and an Ignorant Creator

According to the *Apocryphon of John,* after Yaltabaoth created the material world as an imperfect reflection of the divine realm,

> when he saw the creation which surrounded him and the multitude of the angels surrounding him who had came into being from him, he said to them, 'I am a jealous God and no other god exists beside me.' But his proclamation indicated to the angels who dwell with him that another God does exist. For if there were not another who exists, of whom would he be jealous? (ApocJohn 14:1-4)

For the author(s) of the *Apocryphon of John* not only is the creator God ignorant of both his true origin and his status as less than divine, but also by evoking *Isaiah* (46:9), the author(s) are making it very clear that this corrupted, ignorant being is to be identified with the creator deity of the Hebrew Bible, YHWH.

While it seems that it is this rendering that has caused scholars to evaluate the *Apocryphon of John* as fundamentally "anti-Jewish" (Pearson 1990, 125,130;

see also Williams 1996, 218; King 2006) the idea of a Creator deity that is distinct from the highest divinity is, as noted before, a relatively common idea in late antiquity, considering the philosophical concern with preserving the purity of the divine realm from the material (King 2006, 191-214). For example in *Timaeus,* Plato makes similar a distinction, but between the three original principals: the Demiurge, Ideas and Matter. The Demiurge is understood as God, the father, the creator and the underlying cause of all creation. The Ideas—which exist outside of the creator—constitute the pattern on which the Demiurge modeled the cosmos. However, the cosmos is only an imperfect reflection—made from Matter —of the perfect ideal (Tim 29a).

Later philosophers took a variety of stances on *Timaeus*, partly in response to its confusion and underdeveloped mythology (King 2006, 194-195), but also in reaction to the growing need to differentiate the transcendent divine from the mundane world. For instance, Plutarch postulated a "maleficent soul, which had at some stage itself broken away from the intelligible realm" as a rationalization for the "chaos" of the material realm (Dillon 1977, 202).[262] Others, such as

---

[262] According to Dillon, this soul "such as seems to be described in *Timaeus* 52 eff., and in *De Is.* is represented by the elder Horus" (Dillon 1977, 204). ἡ μὲν γάρ, ἔτι τῶν θεῶν ἐν γαστρὶ τῆς Ῥέας ὄντων, ἐξ Ἴσιδος καὶ Ὀσίριδος γενομένη γένεσις Ἀπόλλωνος αἰνίττεται τὸ πρὶν ἐκφανῆ γενέσθαι τόνδε τὸν κόσμον καὶ συντελεσθῆναι τῷ λόγῳ τὴν ὕλην, φύσει ἐλεγχομένην ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἀτελῆ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν. (De. Is 373 C.) Dillon goes on to claim that "Isis herself, being equated with the Receptacle of the *Timaeus* and with Matter (372e) as well as with Wisdom (351. eff)...takes on very much the same character as Sophia in Philo's system" (Dillon 1977, 204).

Numenius, postulated distinct entities for the various functions of Plato's God, with the Ideas essentially being the Supreme God, with the demiurge being demoted to a secondary position, and matter becoming the third god[263] (Kenney 1991, 68; Dillon 1977, 367-368).

This separation of the creator from the transcendent divine was not limited to "Greek" philosophy but also could be found in "Jewish" discourse as well. For instance, it appears that the Samaritans[264] believed that it was not YHWH who was the Creator, but an Angel of the Lord who held demiurgical power via possession of the Divine Name (Fossum 1985a, 4, 19, 24, 281); a position that was analogous to that of the author(s) of *the Similitudes of Enoch* (1 Enoch 69:13-25) and the purveyors of the "Two Powers in Heaven" heresy (Segal 1977, 84-135). While these examples have been nominally understood as being on the fringes of Judaism, this separation of creator and transcendent divine also can be found in more "mainstream" Judaisms such as Philo with the distinction between God and *Logos* (Martens 2003, 78) and the author(s) of the *Wisdom of Solomon,*

---

[263] As claimed by Proclus' hostile commentary, "Numenius proclaims three gods, calling the first 'Father,' the second 'Creator' and the third 'Creation'; for the cosmos, according to him, is the third god. So, according to him, the Demiurge is double, being both the first god and the second, and third god is the object of his demiurgic activity" (In Tim. I 303). According to Numenius, the "Father" is separate from all activity, with the Demiurge is the active agent in creation. As "the farmer sows the seed of every soul into all things which partake of it; while the lawgiver plants and distributes and transplants what has been sown from that source into each on of us" (Fr. 13)

[264] The relative "Jewishness" of the Samaritans will be explored in Section 3, Chapter 1.

who also proposed that Divine Wisdom was "the fashioner of all things" (7:22) and was distinct from the transcendent God.

Also, while the creator god is not rendered in either Paul or *John* in negative terms, both do understand that the god affiliated with the "world" was not the highest deity nor a deity of goodness (2 Cor 4:4-5; John 12:30–31;[265] see also 14:30), an understanding that is also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls where "Belial [who] is unrestrained in Israel" is understood as the default god of the world (Geniza A. 4:13; see also 1QS Col. 1:17–18).

Of course, while these serve as analogies, these cosmological configurations are not the same as ones found in the *Apocryphon of John*. While there are similarities, there are important differences such as the ignorant and corrupted status of the Creator identified as YHWH.

But the question than needs to be asked is, does the *Apocryphon of John*'s configuration of Creation and its Creator equal a negative stance towards Judaism? Taking into account the analogous expressions, the philosophical climate of the time, and considering the variety of ways "Jews" or "pro-Jewish" Christians configured these sources and constructed their own narratives, why

---

[265] "[T]he Gospel of John itself begins by alluding to the opening words of Genesis, 'In the beginning' (1:1), and in an astonishing tour de force goes on to attribute the creation of all things to the demiurgic activity of the Logos (1:3–5)" (Droge 2007 / 2008, 3).

must the *Apocryphon of John*'s rendering of creation and the Creator god, by default be antithetical to Judaism?

On its own, it is not. Unlike many other sources (e.g., the "Jewish" *Gospel of John)* that construct the "Jews" as villains (5:16, 8:22, 8:59, 18:12, 19:12) there is no direct attack against any identifiable group in the *Apocryphon of John*, Jewish or otherwise.[266]

The problem, it seems, is that it simply does not fit within the established scholarly paradigms of what it was to be "Jewish" in antiquity, be it the "Christian" variety or otherwise. This is the crux of the issue. The data from the *Apocryphon of John* simply does not fit with the models that dominate scholarship. It is the weirdo at the table.

As noted before but worth repeating, "How could Jews have produced a religion in which the creator God of Genesis was portrayed as a weak, arrogant, malicious and inferior deity?" (King 2003, 181) The answer, it seems, is "no Jew at all." Of course, "Jew" in this context is a very narrow and Christian-centric construction that becomes ever more fragile when data like the *Apocryphon of John* is incorporated.

This data, however, has not been incorporated; at least not in the same way that expressions like Paul, *Matthew* or *John* have. Even though the *Apocryphon of*

---

[266] *Pace* King 2006, 236. See Section 3, Chapter 1.

John (re)constructs its "Jewish" sources in a fashion comparable to other "Christianities" there is nonetheless a general insistence that it can not be Jewish: even of a "deviant" variety that overrides some element of Judaism. Instead of being Jewish...but not *that* Jewish, the *Apocryphon of John* is Christian...but NOT Jewish enough.

2.2.5: If Not Jewish Enough...Then What?

So what are scholars to do? How does one deal with the data like the *Apocryphon of John*? While there has been some rethinking of what could be "Jewish," "Christian" or "Gnostic" with the general acceptance of the "Ways that Never Parted" model and by scholars such as Jonathan Z. Smith, Karen L. King and Michael Williams, what has not happened is a general consideration of what kind of conceptual problems the "place" such terms have had (and still do) for modern constructions of ancient "religious" history.[267] This seems especially true considering how what is constructed as "Jewish," "Christian" and "Gnostic" (or their rhetorical places) interact with each other. Despite any blurring between the three, they still demarcate the borders of the maps on which scholars can place data.[268] In other words, if something is placed within the rhetorical space of

---

[267] See Braun 2000, 3-6 and the notion of "specter."

[268] For more on the boundaries see Section 2, Chapter 3.

"Gnosticism," then there is only a very limited number of ways that one can account for its "Christian" and "Jewish" elements, ways that dictate the social location of the producers of the text. Hence, instead of perhaps thinking about the *Apocryphon of John* as another example of a "Judaism" in which "Jews" or "Christians" could legitimately think about their world,[269] we instead see scholarly contortions to find a rationale for why a datum like the *Apocryphon of John* is "anti-Jewish."

Therefore, faced with this non-"normative" representation of the Creator deity coupled with the *Apocryphon of John*'s reliance on what are understood as Jewish tropes, scholars must 1) come to terms with the text's proximity to and appropriation of "Judaisms" like *Genesis* and 2) also provide a means for its exclusion from the conceptual horizon of Judaism[270] (King 2006, 16).

And one of the most common ways to do this, is that of the hoary old discourse of origins.

a) Psychological Alienation and Nihilism.

---

[269] Something that has happened partially with the "Ways that Never Parted" model where the arbitrary line between "Christianity" and "Judaism" has been nicely eroded.

[270] As noted above, many other Christianities are finessed to be Jewish by scholars.

According to Hans Jonas—one of the first and most important scholarly attempts at defining what was "Gnostic"[271]—the essence of Gnosticism can be found not so much in its sources, or its pedigree, but its spirit.

> For Jonas, origin did not point toward the earliest historical moment in which a motif appeared, nor toward its most primitive form. Rather, it referred to the existential experience that made a particular arrangement of motifs meaningful. To get at that experience, Jonas turned toward philosophy, psychology, and social history (King 2003, 119).

And this spirit, according to Jonas is essentially nihilistic. For, as Jonas asks:

> What is the spirit of this use [of Jewish myths]? Why it is the spirit of vilification, of parody and caricature, of conscious perversion of meaning, wholesale reversal of value-signs, savage degrading of the sacred—of gleefully shocking blasphemy. . .Is it merely exuberant licence, pleasure in the novel and bizarre? No, it is the exerciser of a determined and in itself toughly consistent tendency. . .[Hence] the nature of the relation of Gnosticism to Judaism—in itself an undeniable fact—is defined by the anti-Jewish animus[272] with which it is saturated (Jonas 1965, 287).

This kind of understanding was also put forth by Karl-Wolfgang Tröger, who claimed that

> the issue of Gnostic origins does not depend on common tradition and similar tendencies found in [both Gnosticism and Judaism] but their intrinsic essence and spirit...the Gnostic Religion is neither a degenerated sort of Judaism nor degenerated Christianity. Rather,

---

[271] Like Harnack's work on Marcion, Jonas has left an indelible mark on the study of "Gnosticism" (King 2003, 115-137; Williams 1996, 43-44)

[272] Accordingly, Stephen G. Wilson "the deliberate inversion of Jewish values that the Jewish material is so often used [by Gnostics] in such a radically anti-Jewish way that the notion of its arising within Judaism is neither provable nor credible" (Wilson 1995, 205; King 2003, 181).

> it is a religion of its own—that is to say, a religious movement with an anticosmic attitude...[and] is something beyond and essentially different from certain pessimistic attitudes within Judaism or disappointed apocalyptic aspirations (Tröger 1981, 96).

A similar stance is also put forward by Giovanni Filorama, who claims that Gnosticism's "new mental focus [is based on] radical anti-cosmic and anti-somatism...features that are almost entirely absent from the Jewish texts known to us"[273] (Filorama 1990, 144-145).

Most recently, a very similar stance was also advocated by Roelof van den Broek, who claimed that while "gnostic views exerted a strong pull on second century Christianity" across the Greco-Roman world "the gnostic mood was in the air. In the second and third centuries the cultural and religious attitude of people was imbued with a gnostic tendency" (van den Broek 2013, 226). And while van den Broek does of course recognize the use of "Jewish myths" such as *Genesis* as being central to his construction of a gnostic religion,[274] this tradition could not have developed from any kind of Judaism.

> This is not to say that the basic gnostic ideas themselves should therefore be explained from Judaism, since the gnostic views on God and the world are at odds with the fundamental principals of the Jewish religion...Only one conclusion is possible. For all the many

---

[273] This is true only if these kinds of texts were not of "Jewish" origins.

[274] "The gnostic exegesis of Genesis should therefore not be seen as originating from an anti-Jewish outlook, but rather as expressing the conviction that the books of Moses secretly contained ancient Wisdom. As we have remarked earlier, the author of the first gnostic exegesis need not necessarily have been a Jew or a Christian, though he [sic] must have been familiar with Jewish traditions" (van den Borek 2013, 228)

> Jewish elements included in certain gnostic myths—possibly even incorporated into them by ethnic Jews—the underlying view is certain un-Jewish and any attempt to explain the fundamental experience from the Jewish religion is therefore pointless. (van den Broek 2013, 212)

What is clear from these examples is that they all do consider Gnosticism as its own entity, perhaps even a religion.[275] But because it is based on an anti-cosmic attitude it cannot be part and parcel with Judaism.

Beyond the serious problems in defining a "religion" based on its psychological abstraction or experience[276] (Williams 1996, 216-17; Scott 1992)—especially from people who have been dead for close to two thousand years no less!—what is most salient for our discussion is that the supposedly anti-cosmic attitude, while finding antecedents in, or resonances with, Judaism (or Christianity as per van den Broek), it must by virtue of its overall hermeneutic be *a priori* anti-Jewish (Williams 1996, 217):

---

[275] All four examples cited above assume that religion is something unproblematically definable and self contained. However, van den Broek does claim that "Gnostic religion in the first centuries CE was an early representative of the esoteric current in Western culture. What distinguished it from later movements was a specific and highly variegated mythology, which gave expression to the basic gnostic ideas. *The gnostic myths are for the greater part artificial, sometimes even carefully constructed...They were not adherence to a clearly gnostic religion, characterized by a coherent set of ideas and rituals and practices in an identifiable social group,* but they were people with a distinct gnostic mentality, a gnostic frame of mind, which could manifest itself in various religious contexts. Gnostic religion...is characterized by the fact that it could easily attach itself to already existent religious or philosophical systems" (van den Broek 2013, 8 emphasis added). Beyond some of the obvious notions of what is a religion and the lamprey-like nature of his "gnosticism," (see also Logan 2006) one has to wonder for van den Broek what myths he can point to that are not "artificial" or "carefully constructed"? Facepalm.

[276] Another utter failure in this regard is noted above with Moll and his attempt to rationalize Marcion's "deviance" via pseudo-psychology (Moll 2010, 28 and 132).

> On the matter of origins, therefore, the real question is not the phenomenological one of how different the "essence" of Judaism is from the alleged 'essence' of something called "gnosticism." The real issue is whether Jewish tradition was such that Jews would never have been likely to understand innovations such as these demiurgical myths (Williams 1996, 218; see also 219).

The answer to this "real" issue, at least assumed by the examples of Jonas, Tröger, Filorama and van den Broek is an emphatic "no." The problem is of course that this implies that not only were "Jews" essentially incapable of (re)thinking their own myths in such a way as to include demiurgical cosmological imagination,[277] but also what the normative boundaries of what Judaism in antiquity could or must have been.

b) Christianity and "Heretical" Alienation

While many of the older models for the "origin" of Gnosticism did initially postulate a "foreign" source or one outside of Judaism or Christianity (King 2003, 83-106), this position has largely been abandoned, not in the least due to the ideological "baggage" these models carried. For instance, when the "origin" of Gnosticism was deemed to be from the "Oriental East," the scholarly endeavors were so utterly indebted to all the issues and anxieties related to "Orientalism" as to become unworkable (Fairen 2008, 78-81; Said 1977). Similarly when Gnosticism or more specifically the idea of a corrupted demiurge

---

[277] As noted by Arnal "Real people—even Jews!—have different views and behave in multiple ways" (Arnal 2005, 31).

was understood to come from "Hellenistic West"—beyond the obvious links between texts like the *Apocryphon of John* and Plato's "Hellenistic" *Timaeus* (King 2006, 191-214)—this too encoded a whole series of problematic assumptions, not least of all the implied binary between "hellenism-syncretism" and "*sui generis* Judaism" (Fairen 2008, 74-78, 107-111; Smith 1990; see also Schwartz 2010).

Considering the above, it should come as no surprise that most scholars have looked for an "in house" source for Gnosticism. For example, in *A Separate God* Simone Petrement understands that Gnosticism[278] is a development that could only have evolved from Christianity, particularly the Johannine and Pauline branches. While she concedes that Gnosticism certainly gained its impetus from Judaism—considering that its primary literary sources seem to be the Hebrew Bible—the fact that the Gnostic character is so different from "Judaism" must show that they must be of non-Jewish origin (Pétrement 1990, 482-486). For Petrement, the only explanation can be Christianity:

> Gnosticism cannot be explained by either Judaism or by Hellenism or by any other tradition known to us among those earlier than Christianity—and still less by a simple fusion of diverse traditions. If Christianity can explain its main characteristics, if the point where it differs from it the most, that is, the distinction between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the Christians, can itself

[278] For Petrement, it is the distinction of the Demiurge from the highest god that is the *sine qua non* of "Gnosticism" (Pétrement 1990, 9; see also Stroumsa 1984)

> be explained by the history of Christianity (a history that is at once bound up with Judaism and separated from it), one certainly has the right to judge that Christianity is by far the most important source, the essential basis of this intuition (Pétrement 1990, 213).

The idea of a Christian source for Demiurgical speculations has also been championed by both Alastair P. Logan and Gerard P. Luttikhuizen who both, on their work specifically on the *Apocryphon of John* (even in its "pre-Christian" form[279]), claim that it must be a product of Christian hermeneutics.

> The idea that the creator and ruler of the world is an abortive son of Sophia is one of the most striking features of the demiurgical-gnostic myth. It will be clear that this idea cannot possibly be traced to a Jewish tradition. (Logan 2006, 46)

This understanding is echoed by Luttikhuizen:

> The appeal to Christ in the (secondary) frame story proves that at least in the present versions, the polemical passages were leveled by Christians at others Christians...If we are able to explain the critical revision of the Old Testament concepts and narrative items in *ApJohn* from a situation in early Christianity, there is not need to trace this phenomena back to a development within Judaism (Luttikhuizen 2006, 28)

In all three cases, while narratives such as the one found in the *Apocryphon of John* are understood to have been in contact with, or at least indebted to Judaism, there is still the claim that they must not or can not be Jewish. At best, texts like the *Apocryphon of John* are Christian, but Christian outside the normative "pro-

---

[279] For many scholars, Haer 1.29 is a "pre-Christianized" version of *the Apocryphon of John.* (Logan 1996; King 2006)

Jewish" boundaries of the New Testament. As stated before, Christian...but NOT Jewish *enough*.

c) Judaism: Crisis and Conflict

However, despite the above claims, the most widely accepted "source" for the origin of Gnosticism and demiurgical speculation[280] is that of Judaism. Considering the concern with, and use of, such nominally "Jewish" sources as *Genesis*, it is not surprising that data such as the *Apocryphon of John* is understood to be at least in "proximity" to Judaism. That being said, even if it is in proximity *with* or *to* Judaism, it cannot be *of* Judaism; it must exist either on the Jewish deviant (Hellenistic / Syncretistic / inauthentic) "fringe" or be a marker of "Jews" who have left their authentic traditions (van den Broek 2013, 211-219; Smith II 2004, Pearson 1990, 125,130; Pearson 1990, 130).

For example, *pace* Jonas, Giles Quispel has argued that this kind of demiurgical speculation began as a product of the Magharians, a proposed Jewish sect (pre-70 CE) who, motivated by a need to protect god from philosophical

[280] The "link" between Gnosticism and demiurgical speculation will be explored in Section 2, Chapter 3.

anthropomorphism, postulated that creation was accomplished by an Angel of the Lord acting as God's agent (Quispel 1974, 173-195, 213-220).[281]

A similar position was taken up by a student of Quispel, Jarl Fossum. Because he felt that the evidence base for the Magharians was too small, Fossum claimed that Demiurgical speculation was most likely the product of the Samaritans (Fossom 1985).[282]

While both scholars postulate the source of this kind of speculation within (or in proximity to) the Jewish cultural matrix, both are still not *of* Judaism: either attributed to groups that are poorly attested (Magharians)[283] or those that can easily be denied membership within the rubric of "Judaism." In both cases, since

---

[281] "There is however, as far as I know, only one Jewish text [10th century CE] which attests that there were Jews who taught a highest God and an inferior creator of the world. This is Al-Quirqisãni's Account of the Jewish Sects. It tells us that a pre-Christian Jewish sect of the Magharians in Palestine distinguished between God, who is beyond anthropomorphism, and one of his angels, who is responsible for all the anthropomorphic features contain in the Old Testament, and who is the creator of the world: 'They do not strip such anthropomorphic descriptions of God (in scripture) of their literal sense, but rather think that these descriptions apply to one of the angels, namely the one who created the world'" (Quispel 1974, 215).

[282] "There apparently were people among the Samaritans who distinguished between Elohim and YHWH, thus believing in two gods according to the orthodox judgement...The Angel of the Lord was a demiurgic being should not be dismissed as a late innovation, for the laicising movement among the Samaritans originated in the 2nd century B.C.E. I do not argue that the Samaritans were the authors of this idea or that the rabbis opposed Samaritans; apparently several groups— e.g., laicising Samaritans and Hellenistic Jews such as Philo—maintained the same tenet, which stems from a time when the borderlines between the various divisions within the wider phenomenon of Judaism were vague." (Fossum 1985, 237; see also 25-55 and Bowker 1969).

[283] It is interesting to note that the Essenes are also—like the Magharians—poorly attested, yet have become essentially a *tabula rasa* of Jewishness (Fairen 2008, 52-68).

neither are properly Jewish,[284] they can both represent a source that can be constructed as in proximity to and, as needed, antagonistic towards "Judaism." This is how one can explain the "radical dualism and the anti-Jewish sentiment" (Fossum 1985, 338) that these speculations supposedly represents.

However, some scholars recognize that the proximity of "Jewish" sources to Gnosticism must mean that these expressions are located nearer the "centre"[285] of Judaism, at least initially. Because notions of a corrupted Demiurge are understood to be a critique of their supposed parent religion, if it had begun as "Jewish," it simply can no longer be so. For example, Nils Dahl, Alan Segal and Pheme Perkins have all argued that this "ridicule" of the Creator is a religious polemic aimed at "orthodox" Jews by their "heterodox" cousins. These heterodox Jews were apparently concerned with preserving the transcendence of God in light of the anthropomorphisms in Jewish scriptures (see also Quispel and Fossum). When their more "orthodox" Jewish contemporaries criticized them for flirting with polytheism,[286] these "gnostic" Jews began to treat the Demiurge not as only a subordinate figure to the transcendent divine, but also as an object of

---

[284] This construction of the Samaritans and the Magharians is the flip side of how the *Yahad* and the Dead Sea Scrolls are cast as the fundamentally Jews, despite deviations of what is constructed as Judaism (Fairen 2008, 58-68)

[285] It should be noted that the "fringe" and "centre" of "Judaism" are not to be taken as a means of defining the normative boundaries of an entity called "Judaism" but are only used in relation to a fictive centre assumed by scholars.

[286] See Fredriksen (2006) and Boyarin (2012) for a critique of "monotheism" as a means of defining "Judaism" in antiquity.

contempt that was aimed as a critique at their "orthodox" cousins (Segal 1977, 260-267; Dahl 1980-81, 689-712; Perkins 1980, 191-201).

A similar stance has been promoted by Birger Pearson, who, while claiming that many of the demiurgical speculations like the *Apocryphon of John* on the surface appear to be similar to Jewish *midrashic* passages, and that their sources are Jewish, these kinds of discourse nonetheless cannot be Jewish.

> Given the massive Jewish influence discoverable in Gnostic texts, how does one interpret the Gnostics' attitude vis-à-vis their roots? It is obviously not enough to speak of "Jewish Gnosticism" for once the Gnostic hermeneutical shift has occurred one can no longer recognize the resultant point of view as "Jewish". One finds, instead, an essentially non-Jewish, indeed anti-Jewish, attitude, and one must interpret this attitude on its own terms as a radically new hermeneutical program, giving birth to a radically new religious movement. . . .The Gnostic attitude to Judaism, in short, is one of alienation and revolt, and though the Gnostic hermeneutic can be characterised in general as a revolutionary attitude vis-à-vis established traditions, the attitude exemplified in Gnostic texts, taken together with the massive utilisation of Jewish traditions, can in my view only be interpreted historically as expressive of a movement of Jews away from their own traditions as part of a process of religious self-redefinition. The Gnostics, at least in the earliest stages of the history of the Gnostic movement, were people who can aptly be designated as "no longer Jews" (Pearson 1990, 125,130; see also Williams 1996, 218).

More specifically, Carl B. Smith II in *No Longer Jews* (2004) has claimed that, in the wake of failed apocalyptic expectation after the Bar Kochba Revolt,[287] part of

---

[287] See a similar treatment of failed apocalypticism and / or the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, as the crucible of "Gnosticism" in the work of Robert Grant (1966) and Edwin Yamauchi (1973).

the Jewish community in Egypt "gnosticized" the mythical narrative of ancient Israel, resulting in something that can no longer be properly considered Jewish.

> That Jewish intellectuals experimenting with various hermeneutical methods, responding to Hellenistic challenges and perhaps incorporating religious and philosophical ideas from the intellectual averment of the ancient world is one thing; *to say that these factors led them to abandon fundamental principles of their faith, particularly monotheism and a positive image of the creator and his creation, is quite another. It is difficult to imagine a Jewish intellectual not keeping speculations in check, unless of course, there were some mitigating circumstances that led to the abandonment of foundational presuppositions*. . . What is advocated here, it must be remembered, is not that all Jews became Gnostic, but only that some did, and in so doing *defined a new innovation in direct juxtaposition to the faith they once espoused* in the disruptive historical context surrounding the Jewish revolt under Trajan (Smith II 2004, 43, 244, emphasis mine).

As noted above, underlying each scholarly reconstruction of a source or origin of so-called "Gnosticism," it is assumed *a priori* that the Gnostic speculations of a demiurge—even if it can be found in a Jewish matrix—cannot be properly Jewish. For scholars these represent either a critique of other, more "orthodox" (i.e., authentic) Jews or signifies a reaction of "intellectuals" (i.e. fringe) Jews reacting to a specific trauma (be it the destruction of Jerusalem or the failure of Bar Kochba). In other words, the "Gnostics," while perhaps starting out "Jewish," must no longer be Jews.

Chapter 3

A Demiurgical Bastard and the Oxymoron of Jewish Gnosticism.

"Let me give you some advice bastard. Never forget what you are. The rest of the world will not."
Tyrion Lannister: A Game of Thrones.

Introduction 2.3.1

According to Karen King

> ...to define Gnosticism, one needs to have a "normative" Christianity to juxtapose it to. Gnosticism is, rather, a term invented in the early modern period to aid in defining the boundaries of "normative" Christianity...So long as the category of Gnosticism continues to serve as the heretical other of orthodox Christianity, it will be inadequate for the interpretation of the primary material and for historical reconstruction. (King 2003, 2-3)

If one then maps this along side the observations made by Jonathan Z. Smith, in which he points out that when it comes to constructions of Christian origins, the category of

> Judaism has served a double (or, a duplicitous) function. On one hand hand it has provided apologetic scholars with an insulation for early Christianity, guarding it against 'influence' from its 'environment.' On the other hand, it has been presented by the very same scholars as an object to be transcended by early Christianity. (Smith 1990, 83).

In light of both Smith and King, we find a rough tripartite model in which what is Gnosticism and Judaism(s) have been traditionally cast to act as "book ends" that define and bracket what is understood as "normative Christianity," however that is conceived.

Gnosticism <====> Christianity <====> Judaism.[288]

And while the names of the categories (and their contents) have shifted over time—with what gets to be "Jewish," "Christian" and "Gnostic" ebbing and flowing with tides of scholarly opinion— it is important to note that regardless of where the boundaries are drawn, the need for the rhetorical space that each has occupied has nonetheless remained relatively constant. In other words, for an identifiable "normative Christianity" (be it "orthodox", "the core," "pro-Jewish," etc,) to exist, on each "side" of this construction there is the need for that which can sit in the rhetorical place of what is "Jewish" and that which is "Gnostic" (Fairen 2008, 168).

This seems particularly true in light of the "Ways that Never Parted" model, where most constructions (rightly) incorporate the porousness of that which is "Christian" and "Jewish" (Becker & Reed 2007; Fredriksen 2007; Boyarin 2007 & 2012; Kraft 2007). "Normative" Christianity has now been rebranded as "pro-Jewish" and has been moved into closer proximity to the scholarly construction of Judaism or, better yet, "Judaism(s)."

Gnosticism <====> Christianities < / > Judaisms

---

[288] While not central to the topic at hand, one could easily add "Paganism" to this model as that which sits in front of Gnosticism or surrounds it. This would account for the Paganism / Hellenism of the Gnostics AND act as an insulating buffer for Christianly and Judaism.

As Crossely has claimed and what has been illustrated above, those which are normative Christianities are Jewish...just not *that* Jewish.

But while the links between "Judaism" and "Christianity" have become more and more entwined with the "Ways that Never Parted" model, this has not been the case for the other side end of the tripartite model, Gnosticism. It seems that Gnosticism, while still occupying one of the "book end" spaces, it is cast farther and farther away from what is Christian. But despite this distance, its role as the "other" to normative Christianity must still be cast diametrically opposed to what has been constructed as Judaism, as noted above. In other words, despite Christianity and Judaism being in close proximity to or of Judaism, those Christianities that are "Gnostic" brands, are still apparently the one way they *did* part.

"Gnostic" Christianities <===> "Pro-Jewish" Christianities < / > Judaism(s)

It must be stressed, however, that it is not "Gnosticism" *per se* that is being preserved and that which is diametrically opposed to Judaism. Most scholarship has begun the deconstruction of the category of Gnosticism (Williams 1996; King 2003; Fairen 2008) if not outright abandonment of the idea that any

form of "Gnostic Religion" existed in antiquity.[289] Again, what seems important for scholarship is the rhetorical space that Gnosticism occupied; it is the "other" to whatever is constructed as normative Christianity.[290] This seems especially important in light of the "Ways that Never Parted." While the boundary between Christianities and Judaisms has eroded, there nonetheless still is a need to account for those "Christian" expressions, such as the *Apocryphon of John*, that can not have been "Jewish" and therefore could never have been "authentically" Christian.

So while many of the tropes that were understood to be "gnostic" in the past have now been rightly "rebranded" as part and parcel of both Judaisms and "authentic" (i.e., pro-Jewish) "Christianities"— such, as noted above, allegorical

---

[289] For example, in reaction to Karen King's *What is Gnosticism?* (2003), Logan does not engage her methodological critique in any meaningful way, but simply avoids it. "Despite appeals to the sheer variety of the texts and lack of correlation with the heresiologists' accounts, despite appeals to the multitude of approaches and multiform religious movements of antiquity and to the paucity and incompleteness of our knowledge, perhaps in this case the simplest hypothesis. . .is most likely to be the right one" (Logan 2006, 6). And while the term "Gnostic(ism) may be losing traction within scholarship, it still appears in titles of books and articles with some frequency: *Gnostic Religion in Antiquity* by van den Broek (2013), *The Gnostics* by David Brakke (2010), *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy* by Alistair Logan (2006), *passim*.

[290] "Gnosticism has been constructed largely as the heretical other in relation to diverse and fluctuating understandings of orthodox Christianity. This means that modern historical constructions of Gnosticism reflect many of the characteristics and strategies used by early Christian polemics like Irenaeus and Tertullian to construct heresy . . . Indeed, it is largely apologetic concerns to defend normative Christianity that make Gnosticism intelligible as a category at all" (King 2003, 2–3).

interpretation of *Genesis*, Wisdom speculation, dualism[291]— there is still one last-hold out that can not be "Jewish" and as such can not be authentically Christian. In other words, there is one element that is the "sick sign" of Gnosticism[292] or the final place holder of the rhetorical book end that it occupied, and that is Demiurgical speculation or the idea that the Creator God is a ignorant and corrupt pretender that is utterly separate from the supreme or highest deity.[293] So while previous elements of what was Gnosticism have been peeled away, Demiurgical speculations still remain.

Dualism *Wisdom speculation*

Demiurgical Speculation <===> "Pro-Jewish" Christianities < / > Judaism(s)

Genesis *Allegory*

---

[291] "This invocation of dualism as part of the hermeneutical binary between the Nag Hammadi Library and the New Testament requires a great deal of apologetic finesse when one considers that most religions of Late Antiquity were at some level inherently dualistic; delineating between right / wrong, male / female, heaven / earth, etc. Also, considering that "dualism," like "syncretism," is an imprecise term loaded with negative connotations, positing it as an essential characteristic of the Nag Hammadi Library is highly problematic. While some texts in the Nag Hammadi Library do contain dualistic tendencies (*Thomas the Contender, Apocryphon of John*, etc.), there is also a similar degree of dualism in a variety of "orthodox" texts, such as *Revelation*, the *Gospel of John* and the *Charter for a Jewish Sectarian Association*" (Fairen 2008, 109).

[292] Demiurgical speculation is still *the* essential "sick sign" of the "Gnostic heresy" (Williams 1996, 4).

[293] For example, even though Michael Williams has seriously problematized the entire notion of Gnosticism as "burdened at the onset by certain clichés that have come to be almost routinely evoked" (Williams 1996, 52) he nonetheless determines that "biblical Demiurgical traditions" should be rendered as a distinct expression, despite the fact that the adjective "biblical" not only excludes other Demiurgical modes such as Platonism, but also constructed Demiurgical speculation as that which is "other" or deviant from nominal biblical exegesis (Williams 1996, 51-53; see also King 2006, 241).

Again, this is a bit surprising. As noted, it was not uncommon for ancient models of the cosmos to feature a transcendent god that was higher and distinct from a lower "fashioner" of the material world. This was simply part of the philosophical currency of the ancient Mediterranean and was used by both Jews and Gentiles without any "anti-Jewish" overtones.[294] But it seems that when this kind of speculation is deemed to have been done by "Christian," "Gnostic," "Sethian" or "Marcionite" people, because of the postulation of a less than positive role for the Creator,[295] it is assumed by modern scholars to be offering a critique of Judaism or to be anti-Jewish. In other words, while it seems that it is not a Demiurgical creator in and of itself that is the problem, it is rather when this model is applied in such a way as to be a "degradation" of YHWH, that it is the most "offensive."[296]

Again, as noted by Karen King,

> Although many arguments for the Jewish origin of Gnosticism are framed genealogically, in fact the crux of the argument lies elsewhere: how to explain the anti-Jewish animus in Gnostic myth. This question is particularly poignant for those supporting the Jewish origins of Gnosticism. If the origin of Gnosticism is to be

---

[294] See above Section 2, Chapter 2.2

[295] While the *Apocryphon of John*'s depiction of the Creator is that of a corrupted and illegitimate demi-god, Marcion is represented as portraying the Creator as a stern judge (*pace* Moll 2010, 55-58).

[296] "In fact, the category 'biblical Demiurgical' would include a large percentage of sources that today are usually called 'gnostic,' since the distinction between the creator(s) of the cosmos and the true God is normally identified as a common feature of gnosticism." (Williams 1996, 52)

> found in Judaism, what kind of Judaism could this have been? How could Jews have produced a religion in which the creator God of Genesis was portrayed as a weak, arrogant, malicious and inferior deity? Such a position appears so anti-Jewish as to be impossible to attribute to devout Jewish imagination; hence scholars resort to Jonas' notion of Crisis and alienation (King 2003, 181).

The answer to the question—considering how the categories have been constructed and within the climate of the "Ways that Never parted" model—can only be no Jew at all, regardless of the permutations of that which is "Gnostic," "Christian" or "Judaism" constructed by scholars. Demiurgical speculation is simply "impossible to attribute to a devout Jewish imagination" considering how the question has been framed and the rhetorical spaces that are occupied by what is being questioned.

And while there are many examples of Demiurgical speculation that scholars have rendered as "anti-Jewish,"[297] because of the number of copies found in the Nag Hammadi Library, its presence in the Berlin codex, and the fact that it was likely known at least in part to Irenaeus (Haer 1.1:26), the *Apocryphon of John* has served in scholarship as essentially a "Gnostic manifesto" or representing the "Classic Gnostic Myth" (Logan 2012) and, as illustrated above, has been a perfect exemplar for our purposes: not just because the *Apocryphon of John* was a widely disseminated example of Demiurgical speculation in antiquity,

---

[297] For example, *Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World*

but the academic discourse around it serves as a prime example of the scholarly gymnastics required to keep this "Christianity" from being given parity with its "pro-Jewish" siblings such as *John* or Paul (King 2006, 241).[298]

So despite all the other similarities between the *Apocryphon of John* and other contemporary "Jewish" and "Christian" discourses, the Demiurge will always remain the unwanted bastard child.

And herein lies the problem. Because of the links made between Demiurgical speculation and Gnosticism and the assumed "otherness" of "Gnostic phenomena," anything that is classed as Demiurgical cannot be by its very nature properly "Jewish" and—considering the incorporation of the "Ways that Never Parted"—part of authentic "Christianity."

Since Demiurgical speculation has been the Gnostic "sick sign" *par excellence,* many of the terms, stances and theories for "Gnosticism" have simply been transposed to the "origin" of Demiurgical speculation (Williams 1996, 51-53, 213-234).[299] In other words, what is now Gnostic is really just what is

---

[298] See Section 2, Chapter 2.

[299] The side of this dualistic worldview which is opposed to the divine pole—often described as "light"—is "darkness," which is often described in very varied fashion but principally in physical terms as matter and body (corpse), or psychologically as ignorance or forgetfulness . . . In [Gnosticism] however the realm of this anti-divine pole is very widely extended; it reaches even into the visible heavens and includes this world and *the rulers who hold it in slavery, in particular the creator of the world* ...The Gnostic dualism is distinguished from [other types] in the one essential point, that is it is "anti-cosmic"; that is its conception includes an unequivocally negative evaluation of the visible world . . . it ranks as a kingdom of evil and darkness."(Rudolph 1987 [1977], 58; 60 emphasis mine).

Demiurgical. And regardless of how it is named it must *a priori* be that antithesis of what is "Jewish."

2.3.2: The Apocalypse of Adam and Jewish Gnosticism

While it is easy to divorce "Gnostic" texts from "Judaism" when there is an obvious "Christian" element that can be finessed to helped it deviate,[300] the scholarly anxiety and the problems inherent in the supposed "anti-Jewishness" of Demiurgical speculation are most pronounced when one encounters expressions that are understood to be either non- or minimally "Christian" in origin, or coming from a "Jewish" background. It is these kinds of Demiurgical texts that throw the constructed categories of "Judaism," "Christianity," "Gnostic" and their respective "pro-" or "anti-Jewish" gradients in sharp contrast and tension.

And while the "pre-Christian" version of the *Apocryphon of John* has potential in this regard,[301] perhaps the best example of this kind of "Gnosticized

[300] This is a strategy used by Yamauchi (see below)

[301] Haer 1.29. See also Logan 2006 and 2012.

Judaism" is the *Apocalypse of Adam*[302] and the best example of the anxiety around the text is illustrated by Birger Pearson.[303]

The *Apocalypse of Adam* begins with a dream vision given to Adam, which he subsequently narrates to his son, Seth.

> Listen to my words, my son Seth. When God had created me out of the earth, along with Eve, your mother, I went about with her in a glory which she had seen in the aeon from which we had come forth. She taught me a word of knowledge of the eternal God. And we resembled the great eternal angels, for we were higher than the god who had created us and the powers with him, whom we did not know. Then God, the ruler of the aeons and the powers, divided us in wrath. Then we became two aeons. (ApocAdam 64:1-24)

As is typical of other Demiurgical narratives, when Adam discovers the true nature of his and Eve's creation,

> the eternal knowledge of the God of truth withdrew from me and your mother Eve. Since that time, we learned about dead things, like men. Then we recognised the God who had created us. For we were not strangers to his powers. And we served him in fear and slavery. And after these things, we became darkened in our heart (s). Now I slept in the thought of my heart. (ApocAdam 65:10-26)

Then, in a fashion similar to other (mis) / (re) interpretations of *Genesis*—such as the Demiurgical *Hypostasis of the Archons* or the non-Demiurgical *Book of*

---

[302] Please note that all citations for the *Apocalypse of Adam* come from the Nag Hammadi Library, and are not from "The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol. 1" eds James H. Charlesworth.

[303] Pearson's example illustrates that the scholarly anxiety around the figure of a Demiurge is not just about *the Apocryphon of John* or any other "Christinaitized" text *per se*, but the idea of Demiurgical speculation itself. Even when Jewish it must not be *really* Jewish. One can not help but be reminded of Bultmann's worry over the dualism of *John* and its affinities to his construction of Gnosticism (Bultmann 1971, 8-9).

Watchers—the author of the *Apocalypse of Adam* casts the apocalyptic resolution of the Deluge into the form of a *vaticinium ex eventu* (Fairen 2008, 21). This author depicts the Deluge as an indication of the corrupted status of the Creator who will try to destroy the "saving knowledge" that was transmitted to Adam via the "three men. . .whose likeness [Adam] was unable to recognise, since they were not the powers of the god who had [created us]" (ApocAdam 65:28-32).

> For rain-showers of God the almighty will be poured forth, so that he might destroy all flesh [of God the almighty, so that he might destroy all flesh] from the earth on account of the things that it seeks after, along with those from the seed of the men to whom passed the life of the knowledge which came from me and Eve, your mother. For they were strangers to him. Afterwards, great angels will come on high clouds, who will bring those men into the place where the spirit of life dwells [...] glory [...] there, [...] come from heaven to earth. Then the whole multitude of flesh will be left behind in the waters. Then God will rest from his wrath. And he will cast his power upon the waters, and he will give power to his sons and their wives by means of the ark along with the animals, whichever he pleased, and the birds of heaven, which he called and released upon the earth. And God will say to Noah - whom the generations will call "Deucalion" – "Behold, I have protected <you> in the ark, along with your wife and your sons and their wives and their animals and the birds of heaven, which you called and released upon the earth. Therefore I will give the earth to you - you and your sons. In kingly fashion you will rule over it - you and your sons. And no seed will come from you of the men who will not stand in my presence in another glory" (ApocAdam 69:2-71:9).

This use of the Deluge prefigures the Creator's attempt to destroy the "Illuminator," a figure who embodies a salvific knowledge of the true nature of

the cosmos and who represents "the generation without a king" (ApocAdam 82:19-20)[304] or those ultimately "saved" for the world.

Considering the lack of "Christianization" of this Demiurgical account and the use of nominally "Jewish" mythical tropes such as the *Genesis* creation story and the Deluge, some have determined that the *Apocalypse of Adam* is possibly a form of "Jewish" Gnosticism.[305]

> [The author] of this material is therefore not only dependant on early Jewish Adam traditions. . .[but the *Apocalypse of Adam* also] represents a very early type of Gnosticism in which the Jewish components are central. . .[and] represent[s] a form of Jewish Gnosticism which resisted the kind of Christianization we have noted in the case of the Apocryphon of John" (Pearson 1986, 29, 33).

Claims that the *Apocalypse of Adam* is of non-Christian origin are not universally accepted. A key example of such a claim is Edwin Yamauchi, who argues that the "Illuminator" figure[306] is in actuality a Christ figure: one whose "flesh is punished, upon whom the holy spirit descended, who does signs and

---

[304] See also *The Damascus Document* in which the apocalyptic political re-ordering at the end times will not include the re-instalment of the Davidic line, but "[w]hen the total years of the present age are complete, there will be no further need to be connected to the house of Judah, but instead each will stand on his own tower" (Geniza A. 4:10-12).

[305] As opposed to the Christianization found in such texts as the *Apocryphon of John* (King 2006, 244-57).

[306] One who is "out of a foreign air, from a great aeon, the great illuminator came forth. And he made the generation of those men whom he had chosen for himself shine, so that they could shine upon the whole aeon" (ApocAdam 82:25-83:4).

marvels and who is opposed by the powers is not Iranian or Jewish [Figure or construct but must be],[307]...Christian" (Yamauchi 1973, 132).[308]

More generally, despite the obvious indebtedness to the Hebrew creation account and mythical characters, and the lack of any overt "Christianization" in the text, some scholars still insist that even if the *Apocalypse of Adam* might represent "Jewish" Gnosticism, by virtue of its Demiurgical innovation, it can no longer be understood as properly Jewish: this is a notion that is based more on the reification of "nominal" Judaism as that which it can never be.

To quote Birger Pearson:

> The Apocalypse of Adam. . .shows how a Jewish Gnostic text could retain its essential features without taking on a Christian cast. . .We have seen, in [these Demiurgical texts] how biblical and other Jewish texts and traditions have been radically reinterpreted

---

[307] "The author of The Apocalypse of Adam has taken over a well-established Jewish pattern, rooted especially in Isaiah 52-53 and developed fully in Wisdom 1-6. . .that is fully intelligible without reference to Christian history" (Pearson 1986, 31-32).

[308] Despite similarities to the mythical Christ figure, however there is no reason that this similarity requires a dependence on Christian tropes. Indeed, beyond the consideration that "Christian" tropes are essentially "Jewish," just as convincing a claim can be made that the figure of the Illuminator can be inferred from both Jewish sources such as Divine Wisdom and from "pagan" sources that assume a salvfic being from heaven who hold a "divine spark" such as the Persian Zand-i Vohuman Yasn where the "illustrious Pesyotan [will] arrive to these Iranian villages which I, Auhrmazd, created, to the Arvand and the Veh rivers; when the wicked, those of the seed of darkness, the unworthy ones, see him, they will totter" (7:39) and the Egyptian Potter's Oracle where a nostalgic king who is "a giver of good things, who is appointed by the greatest goddess Isis so that the ones who survive will pray that the ones who died before will arise in order that they may share in the good things" (P2. Col.1: 40-43). Hence, despite Yamauchi's claim that the "Illuminator" is Christian, there are numerous analogues for The Apocalypse of Adam's salvific figure that come from non-Christian Near and Middle Eastern traditions. But that being said—and again considering the "Ways that Never Parted" and how scholars have been insistant that the presence of Jesus in a narrative does not require a text to be "Christian" (Marshall)—it seems that a Christian designation is more about making sure it isn't Jewish.

> in the service of a high gnosis which denigrates the Creator and his world and overthrows the centrality of the Law. The "building blocks" of this new gnosis, as expressed in literature, are Jewish; yet the interpretation can be seen to be "anti-Jewish" in the extreme, if by "Judaism" we mean [at least] devotion to the Creator, his Law and his people. . .[Therefore, the authors of Demiurgical texts like The Apocalypse of Adam] in reinterpreting their Jewish religious traditions. . .burst the bonds of Judaism and created a new religion. We are thus presented with the anomaly of Jews who finally intended to be 'no longer Jews.' (Pearson 1986, 34-35; 1997, 141-146)

It appears that, even with an example of non- or un-Christianized "Gnosticism" that for all intents is "Jewish," it is impossable to construct a "Judaism" that is also Demiurgical.

Really, the more things change, the more they stay the same.

SECTION THREE

Cipher Judaism(s) and a Game of *Nostalgic Israel*

Introduction: The Problem as it Stands

While issues of how scholars use the model of the "Ways that Never Parted" have been noted and critiqued, the actual proposition that "Christianity" at its earliest inception was "Jewish"—given the way that the question has been framed—is an important conceptual leap forward. The "Ways that Never Parted" not only offers a corrective to the supersessionalistic scholarship of the past, it also helps account for the porousness between the various discourses that have eventually, and retroactively, been classed as the "Judaisms", "Christianities" and "Gnosticisms" of the first few centuries CE. The methodological utility of this model *should* have provided the means for scholars to rethink the way that these groups are classified in antiquity and—more importantly—in modern discourse as well.[309]

Should, but unfortunately this has not been the case, at least in any consistent fashion. While New Testament and Christian Origins scholars have generally used the "Ways that Never Parted" model to draw connections between

---

[309] See Becker & Reed 2007, Boyarin 2004 and 2012 for explicit constructions of the "Ways that never Parted." But also see Section 2 for examples of "rebranded" Christianities (*Revelation*, *Matthew*, Paul etc) that have been, and are now best understood as examples of "Judaisms." See also Jackson-McCabe (2007) for an analysis of how "Jewish-Christianity" as a classification in no longer applicable given the "Ways that never Parted."

some Christianities—such as those represented in the New Testament—and some forms of Judaisms or configurations of what is "Jewish" as a means to address past issues of supersessionism, this application has been highly selective. As noted in Section 2, Chapter 3, while scholars have gone through great pains and mental contortions to construct the groups responsible for texts like *Matthew, Revelation* and *John* to be part of some form of "Judaisms," and have casted figures like Paul and Jesus[310] as "Jews," the same effort has not gone into those *other* Christianities that had in the past been deemed "heretical" or "gnostic." In fact, if any kind of examination of the relationship between these groups and "Judaisms" is undertaken, it is generally superficial, and relies upon a narrow understanding of what "Judaisms" must have been in antiquity,[311] an understanding that seems more about casting these groups as *a priori* anti-Jewish than about reflecting the various cultural options that were available to, and practiced by, ancient Jews. This has interesting consequences. While theologically based classifications such as "heresy" or "heretic" no longer have historical or scholarly traction (King 2003; Fairen 2008) scholars still manage to quarantine expressions such as Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* from

---

[310] At least the various Jesuses of the New Testament.

[311] As opposed to some form of variety that allows texts like *Matthew* and *Revelations* to override some element of what is "Judaism" yet still be within the acceptable spectrum of what is Jewish. See Section 2 Chapter 3.

historical reconstructions[312] using the "Ways that Never Parted" model. So instead of overlooking them because they were "heretics," scholars have simply rebranded them as "anti-Jewish." So even though Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* were Christian...they were just not Jewish enough. And since under the auspices of the "Ways that Never Parted" earliest Christianity *was* Jewish, there is therefore no need to be take Marcion or *Apocryphon of John* in parity with those other groups (such as found in the New Testament) that are the "core" of nascent and pro-Jewish Christianity.[313]

But this strategy has a few issues, particularly the conceptual work the terms "Jew","Judaism(s)" etc., do for Christian Origins scholars, and the plethora

---

[312] For example, introductory books on "Christian" history, while generally devoting chapters to figures like Paul and Jesus (?!) usually only place Marcion as a deviant footnote (McCulloch 2009) or if Marcion is the focus of the study he is generally rendered as "heretical" (Moll 2010). The same can also be said for the *Apocryphon of John.* Despite being the first "Christian" writing to "formulate a comprehensive narrative of the nature of God, the origin of the world, and human salvation" (King 2006, vii) it rarely is examined in the same detail as texts like *John* or is generally used as a means of constructing a "Gnostic" (i.e., heretical and secondary) version of Christianity (Logan 1991, 1996 and 2006).

[313] What is interesting—and distressing—is that what is the *sine qua non* of Judaism seems more about its compatibility to the Christian centric constructions than actually examining the various "religious" options adopted and promoted by ancient Jews. While appropriative pedigree is certainly an issue in Christian Origins scholarship (J.Z. Smith 1990), if one takes into account the specific nuances of what is underwriting the discourse on Demiurgical speculation, one has to wonder if, in this instance, this construction is less about ensuring a proper pedigree for Christianity and more about quarantining texts like the *Apocryphon of John* and thinkers like Marcion from "authentic" Christianity. For ultimately, if these kinds of expressions can no longer be quarantined as "heretical" and are also shown to be NOT anti-Jewish, then how would this affect our understanding of what could have been authentically Christian or Jewish in antiquity? How are we to classify them? Considering the reaction of scholars against using the "Gnostic" *Thomas* as a source for the sayings of the historical Jesus, or the incorporation of a "Cynic" model (Arnal 2005, 21-29) imagine the ideological issues and scholarly reconfigurations needed if figures like Marcion, or texts like the *Apocryphon of John* (or for that matter the *Hypostasis of the Archons* and *On the Origin of the World)* were included in historical reconstructions as not just "Gnostic," "heretical," or "fringe" expressions, but as texts that are as intellectually significant as *Mark*, *John,* or Irenaeus? Or *Daniel*, *Community Rule* or other Judaisms?

of modern issues these terms encode. For as noted above, even though Marcion is represented as essentially leaving "Judaism" intact and refraining from any kind of allegorical appropriation of the Hebrew Bible or the mythical history of Israel —and as such has no investment in the supersessionism of the "Jews" that was the hallmark of other traditionally interpreted Christian configurations (such as Justin Martyr or *Matthew*)—because his representation in *antiquity* evokes *modern* anxiety in scholars, Marcion is therefore seen as "anti-Jewish" and as such, has been marginalized in historical reconstructions and deemed secondary in intellectual significance.[314] This has affected how modern representations of Marcion are and must be constructed. Because of Marcion's supposed purging of Paul and *Luke* of all "Jewish" reference and his construction of a "proto-Aryan" Jesus, this assumes a superficial similarity to the racist scholarship of Chamberlain, Grundmann and—to a lesser extent, Harnack (May 1987/88)—which has coloured Marcion and cast him as the genesis of anti-Jewish Christianity (Davis, 1975; Bergen 1996; Heschel 2008). This has become so much the case that even when we have no first-hand account of what Marcion

---

[314] See Moll in which he claims that—despite the influence he must have exerted on the "Church"— Marcion can not have been the important figure that Harnack wished. "[Marcion] thus may have initiated the situation [canonization of the New Testament and the Christian appropriation of the Hebrew Bible as a means of supersessionism] but his complete inability to offer a real and lasting solution to it labels his contribution, while crucial, as purely negative and indirect. Among other things, it is this failure on Marcion's part which makes him ineligible for a comparison with such great men as Martin Luther. It is no accident that Marcion's movement remained an episode in the history of the Church, whereas Luther's became an era." (Moll 2010, 162; see also Schmid 1995 and Tsutsui 1992)

said or wrote, he is still accused of and is best known for—without any qualification or more problematically without any scholarly challenge to the claim —"[hating] Jews and everything Jewish" (Ehrman 2003, 111).[315]

We find a similar *a priori* reaction in regard to the academic discourse surrounding the *Apocryphon of John,* but for a very different reason. While Marcion's "literalism," lack of appropriation of the Hebrew Bible and dithesim have been constructed as the indicators of his anti-Jewish stance, because the *Apocryphon of John* is *too* allegorical, particularly in its adoption and reconfiguration of *Genesis* and YHWH*,* it is seen in scholarship as (mis) appropriating "Judaism." In other words, even if reinterpretations of *Genesis* can be found in "Jewish" (*1 Enoch*, Dead Sea Scrolls) or "pro-Jewish" Christian sources (Paul, *John*), because of the "spirit" of its use in the *Apocryphon of John* — particularly mitigated by its recasting of the Creator as both the god of the Hebrew Bible and as an ignorant pretender—it must *a priori* be anti-Jewish, being a product of 1) gentiles creating anti-Jewish myths, 2) "Jews" on the fringe of Judaism reacting to its normative centre, or 3) "Jews" who, because of a historical crisis, have left "Judaism."

---

[315] A more tepid interpretation of this claim has been put forward by Joseph Tyson (2006) who claims that while Marcion may have been anti-Jewish, he was no more so than his "orthodox" opponents. See Section 1, Chapters 1 & 2.

We can see this assumption made explicitly clear in the work of Karen L. King. While King is perhaps one of the most methodologically sophisticated scholars on the topic of "Gnosticism" and the *Apocryphon of John*, she nonetheless makes a claim as problematic as Ehrman's claim regarding Marcion. According to King:

> Pharisees play the role of antagonists of Jesus in both [the *Gospel* and *Apocryphon of John*] and the anti-Judaism in the [*Apocryphon*] *of John* would certainly fit a reading of passages in the *Gospel of John* such as 8:42-44: "Jesus said to them, 'If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and now I am here. I did not come on my own, but he sent me. Why do you not understand what I say? It is because you cannot accept my word. You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies." (King 2006, 236)[316]

This truly is a spectacular leap in logic, especially considering that unlike the "evidence" she uses from the *Gospel of John,* the *Apocryphon of John* make no reference to "the Jews,"[317] their "murderous" ways or their apparent relationship to Satan. None. This can not be overstated. King's claim simply can not be

---

[316] While "a [Pha]risee named Arimanious" told John that "[This Nazorene] deceived you (pl) with error. He filled [your (pl.) ears with lies], and he shut [your hearts. He turned you (pl.)] from the tradi[tions of your fathers...]" (ApocJohn 2:4-5) this is certainly not on the same level as *John.* It is only King's *a priori* assumptions that can find such a link.

[317] And while a Pharisee named Arimanius does challenge John, claiming that "[w]ith deception did this Nazarene deceive you (pl.), and he filled your ears with lies, and closed your hearts (and) turned you from the traditions of your fathers" (ApocJohn 1:5-18) this is a far cry from the claims made in such texts as *John* 8:42-44.

qualified with any evidence taken from the text itself. It can only be made based on the modern assumptions that the *Apocryphon of John* is *a priori* reacting against what must have been "Jewish" in antiquity.

But beyond the fact that King makes the statement at all, what is striking is that the claim—and others like it[318]— have not been challenged in scholarship. Even though no corroborating evidence is offered that "the anti-Judaism in the [*Apocryphon*] *of John* would certainly fit a reading of passages in the *Gospel of John* such as 8:42-44," there does not seem to have been any scholarly inquiry to the nature of the evidence for this claim. This is instructive. Considering that scholars in general are not shy about pointing out "flaws" in models they disagree with,[319] and that the supposed job of scholarship is to interrogate evidence (or lack thereof) and sniff out problems, the fact that the kind of claims made by King have not been challenged despite no evidence to support them, strongly implies that the affiliation between the text and "anti-Judaism" exists as a "goes without saying" truism in scholarship, a truism that has, as noted above, dictated how we must construct the social history of the people responsible for the *Apocryphon of John.*

---

[318] Logan 1991, 2006 and 2012; Luttikhuizen (2006)

[319] Considering the nature of this project, a prime example would be the hand-wringing and accusations of anti-Jewishness leveled at other scholars over the brouhaha of the "Non-Jewish Jesus" (Arnal 2005).

So while the quality of the scholarship between Ehrman and King is vastly different in object, sophistication and quality, and the sources they are working with are of differing natures and cohesions, it is notable that both Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* are interpreted as not just anti-Jewish—however this needs to be defined—but that such claims have become essentially unchallenged staples in scholarly work.

As shown, these assumptions have a number of serious methodological problems and implications that not only skew our data, but also force what direction any historical reconstructions of Marcion or the *Apocryphon of John* must take.

1) Despite the all but unchallenged claims to the contrary, when it comes to how Marcion or the *Apocryphon of John* have been represented, there is simply no evidence that they were in any way anti-Jewish—however that is to be defined—outside of the constructed origins proposed by scholars or their superficial similarities to modern ideological options, like Nazism. These expressions even lack the previously understood "anti-Judaism" of newly minted "pro-Jewish" texts such as *Galatians* or the *Gospel of John* which, while (correctly) understood as "part of Judaism" nonetheless are quite clear in their critique of supposed key Jewish elements, such as dismissing the Law (Gal. 3:1) or constructing "the Jews"

as the villainous antagonists of a narrative (8:42-43).[320] Similar stances simply cannot be found in either Marcion's representations from antiquity or within either version of the *Apocryphon of John.*

2) Considering that the *sine qua non* of the "anti-Jewishness" of these expressions is their demiurgical speculation in which the Creator God of the Hebrew Bible is identified as less than a higher "unknown" deity—either due to his "judicious nature" (Haer 3.25:3) or "ignorance" (ApocJohn 11:9-10)—this implies a certain normative construction of what *could or must have been* Jewish in antiquity, or implies that there was only a very limited number of "authentically Jewish" ways Jews could configure their cosmological myths.[321]

3) While this modern concern for what was Jewish in antiquity is a discourse loaded with a wide variety of contemporary implications (see Fairen 2008; Arnal 2005), what is most interesting and problematic in regards to the scholarship on demiurgical speculation such as that of Marcion's representation or the *Apocryphon of John* is the very Christian-centric nature of the discourse. Considering the current corrective of the old scholarly models of Christianity

---

[320] See Section 2, Chapter 2 for more examples of how pro-Jewish Christianities override key elements of what scholars construct as "Judaism" but still remain within the spectrums of what was Jewish.

[321] For instance, while "polytheism" has been half-heartedly used as an excuse to render both Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* as "beyond the Jewish pale" neither Marcion nor the *Apocryphon of John* are "polytheistic." Indeed, both expressions are best understood as being indebted to the philosophical currency of the time that saw the divine realm as being "organized as a hierarchy" (Fredriksen 2002, 21).

"breaking away" from Judaism (through the "Ways that Never Parted") with a concern in showing the "Jewishness" of such figures as Paul or Jesus or texts like *Matthew* or *Revelation* (and the mental contortions this entails), the persistent insistence on demiurgical speculation's anti-Jewishness—despite analogous discourses in antiquity—seems invested in constructing an ancient Judaism that is congenial for modern Christian appropriative purposes. Put another way, "Judaism" is being used as a cipher for defining "normative" boundaries of what could be "authentically" Christian.[322]

4) While modern scholarship has done away with the "heresy / Gnostic" versus "Orthodox / Catholic" binary that was the hallmark of so many apologetic and theological reconstructions, it is conspicuous that those exact same groups / texts that used to be "heretical" and "orthodox" are now simply cast as "anti-" and "pro-Jewish" Christianity. Since Demiurgical speculation is the last true "heretical" hold-out, the insistence on the anti-Jewish flavour of expressions like Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John*—by being either too literal in its reading of Judaism and requiring a second higher god of love, or not literal enough and requiring a demotion of YHWH as a pretender—seems more about *de-authenticating* Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* as proper Christianities. This

[322] As noted below, the understanding or use of "Judaism" is not limited to simply Christian-centric discourse, but also seems to be part and parcel with discussions on the nature of antisemitism and attendant discourses.

demotion is not because they are in essence anti-Jewish, but because they do not resort to the "orthodox / pro-Jewish" strategies and configurations in their appropriation of "Judaism." To put it bluntly, the names have changed, but the results have remained the same: a static and isolated Judaism that can be appropriated (and reinforced) by "pro-Jewish" Christianities as a way of de-authenticating other Christianities as "anti-Jewish" because they do not fit within the "orthodox" schema.

So, without denying that representations such as Marcion's or texts like the *Apocryphon of John* have very different conceptual goals and agenda than *Revelation*, *Matthew*, *1 Enoch* or Paul, making the leap from something not fitting an arbitrary "normative" reading[323] to it being "anti-Jewish"—especially considering the effort that scholars have gone through to awkwardly cast the New Testament as "pro-Jewish"—seems not just an example of sloppy scholarship, but also indicates what is perhaps an underlying concern scholars have beyond the accuracy of historical models.[324] And while this concern could be the desire to

---

[323] However, "normative" Judaisms in antiquity are more a product of modern concerns than ancient reality (Boyarin 2004; J. Z. Smith 1982; Lightstone 2006 [1984]; Mason 2007).

[324] This is made abundantly clear by Birger Pearson, for even when he questions the notion of "normative" Judaism (Pearson 1997, 104) he still claims that "What the Gnostics do, of course, is split the transcendent God of the Bible into a supreme, ineffable being (I.A.1) and a lower Creator responsible for the material world (I.B). It is precisely this radical dualism that marks the decisive point in [the formation of] a new religiosity, that that can hardly any longer be included within the boundaries of [normative] Judaism" (Pearson 1997, 130-31).This statement—while close to 20 years old—nicely articulates the contemporary assumptions that are rife in scholarship. That not only is ditheism and / or a lower status of the Creator God indicative of a non-Jewish stance, but that it must also be on some level a critique of Judaism and the Jews.

protect some theological categories—of keeping the heretics heretical (Moll 2010 and Logan 2006)—this does not generally seem to be the case. What seems to be of greater concern is the interaction between very specific examples of Christianity with what is constructed as "Jewish" or "Judaisms."

So of course this begs the question of why? Why is there a need for scholars not only to brand some Christianities as part of "Judaism" or "Judaisms" but also to insist that other Christian groups are non-or anti-Jewish? Considering that "Judaism" and "Christianity" were utterly entwined in the first and second centuries CE, what is behind this insistence that groups like *Matthew* or *John* or thinkers like Paul are "Jews" where other groups like the *Apocryphon of John* or figures such as Marcion, simply cannot be Jews or are against Judaism? To gain some insight into this issue. What first needs to be explored is the idea of what is "Jewish" or what constitutes the "Judaisms" that these sources are for or against.

Chapter 1

Look at all the Judaisms!

3.1.1: Introduction

While the sheer variety of material that is or can be classed as "Gnostic"—of a "Christian" variety or otherwise—makes such a construct highly problematic and one that *should* have been abandoned in scholarship, this has not been the case. In particular, there have been a few recent scholarly attempts to (re)invent some form of "normative" Christianity or Gnosticism in antiquity.[325] And while

[325] For example, Moll insists that there was an "orthodox" or "Catholic" Church that Marcion must have abandoned as a means to keep him classed as a "heretic" (Moll 2010). Alastair Logan has also claimed that despite the evidence to the contrary and because it is simpler, there must have been a "gnosticism" (2006, 6) and of course a Catholic Church in antiquity (2006, 24-25, 61). David Brakke has taken a slightly different approach by claiming that the "'Gnostics' (perhaps if we dare, 'Gnosticism') can be retrieved as a *social category*, one that corresponds to a group that recognized itself as such—and was so recognized by others" (Brakke 2010, 27). However, Brakke's "social categories" are not simply a reorganization of how ancient people classified themselves and others, but a scholarly grouping "that they believe correspond, unusually imperfectly, to how ancient people actually saw and organized themselves" (2010, 16). This is a subtle, but important point. While Brakke does recognize that these categories do not map exactly onto ancient data and that scholarly interpretation of what constitutes a social category is required, this is nonetheless a valid method of classification. "For example, scholars of early Christianity routinely speak of 'Johannine Christianity,' by which they mean a tradition associated with the Gospel of John and the three Letters of John in the New Testament. These four works share a distinctive vocabulary and patter of thought that sets them apart from the other texts in the New Testament and from early Christianity, and they seem to reflect the peculiar history and experience of a specific group of Christians" (Brakke 2010, 16-17). Brakke goes on to say that, while those who produced the Johannine texts may-not have identified themselves as Johannine Christians, it is nonetheless a given in scholarship that this designation accounts for the surviving literary evidence. However, while Brakke does use the "Gnostic" material in the Nag Hammadi Library (problematically assuming that it is Gnostic in the first place) his reliance on the usefulness of the term comes first and foremost from the heresiological writers who call their opponents the "Gnostics" (Brakke 2010, 29-52). However, Brakke does not give enough weight to the idea that "Gnostic" is not a descriptive term employed by writers such as Irenaeus, but is part of his own theological discourse of "othering." Nonetheless, Brakke then applies the term to the "gnostic" texts and unsurprisingly finds overlaps of a "Gnostic" social movement or category. However, since he is relying on the "evidence" of the *use* of the term "Gnostics" as it is found in heresiological sources and *not* of the so-called gnostics themselves, a "social category" in this context is really nothing more than a polite and scholarly rebranding of the term "heresy."

not found evenly in all scholarly inventions of what is "Christian", many of the attempts to define "Christianity" and "Gnosticism"[326] are based around assumptions of what is "pro-" or "anti-" Jewish, or "in" or "outside" of Judaism. This is notable, especially when one takes into account that much of what was apparently "pro-" and "anti- / non-" Jewish map along the same lines as that which used to be classed as being "orthodox" and "heretical / Gnostic." In other words, while some Christianities—notably those that were "orthodox" or "canonical"— get to be "Jewish," the flip side is that many of the expressions that were classed as heretical or gnostic—while still understood as "Christian"—are assumed to not be part of the appropriate spectrums of what could be Jewish in antiquity. Either being non-Jews means making attacks against Judaism or those who started out as Jewish and are no longer Jews. So while they are Christian...they are just not Jewish enough.

And *assumed* is the best way to frame this. Considering the scholarly gymnastics that have gone into the "rebranding" of *Matthew* or Paul, there has not been the comparable effort in performing a theological epispasm on thinkers like Marcion or texts like the *Apocryphon of John.* For all intents and purposes, the

---

[326] For example King (2003) has noted the variety of "Christian" expressions that have been classed as "Gnostic" (2003, 24-54). Taking this into consideration with the variety in the Nag Hammadi Library, the various thinkers and movements (Marcion, Valentinus, Irenaeus, Montonism) and even considering the variety within the New Testament itself (Fairen 2008, 88 n 126) the sheer variety of what is, has been and should be classed as "Christian" is staggering.

procedure to remove the marks of "circumcision" from them has never been required because the assumption has simply been that the *Apocryphon of John* and Marcion *can not* be Jewish, *can not* represent any form of Judaism, or that they *must be* in some way anti-Jewish.[327] So despite the variety of what gets to be Christian there nonetheless seems to be a "stable" way to classify this variety: their assumed stance vis-à-vis what is constructed as Judaism(s).

The problem is what is the "Judaism" that is being claimed? What gets to be "Jewish" according to these scholars? Who's Judaism is it? And why is it being used as a way to classify a variety of Christianities, despite the assumed porousness of the early histories of what only eventually and much later get to be two distinct "religions"?

For as is the case with the "Christianities" of the first and second centuries CE, the "Judaisms" of this same period also encompassed a huge variety of competing and contradictory discourses with no one being representative of any kind of "normative Judaism." According to Daniel Boyarin, when it comes to the "Judaisms" of this period instead of:

> thinking of Enochic or Mosaic Judaisms (or priestly or pharisaic Judaism), we need to think of converging and diverging strands and moments, of eddies and currents, whirlpools and backwaters, in the vast river of the religious practices and beliefs of the ethnic group we have come to call Jews (Boyarin 2010, 360).

---

[327] See Section 2, chapter 3.

This idea is generally reflective of the current scholarly climate in reconstructing the Judaisms of the early Common Era. Not only does it allude to the variety of what can and should be classified as Judaisms for this period[328]— "a reconfigured post-Judaisms Judaism that comprehends all of the forms of the religious expression of the Jews without centralized, marginalizing or rectifying any of its forms" (Boyarin 2010, 329; see also Smith 1982; Lightstone 2006 [1984]; Stone 2011, 8; Albertz & Wöhrle 2013; Frevel & Nilhan 2013)—but also makes it clear

[328] As noted by Willi Braun, "take the term 'Judaism' at least as a multivariate category, a plural entity perhaps better explicitly pluralized as 'Judaisms' despite the inelegance of this pluralized abstract noun. Since a monothetic definition of Judaism has no cognitive or explanatory advantage and tends, moreover to be tightly allied with apologetic and theological agendas, why not opt for a polythetic definition of Greco-Roman Judaism?...Greco-Roman Jews were neither wholly other, thus unique and incomparable with respect to their Gentile neighbors, nor must all Jews be pigeoned holed into being "Jewish" just so if they are to be reckoned as members of Jewry. The polythetic classificatory principles makes possible both intramural and extramural comparisons with respect to specific practices, beliefs, rituals, world views" (Braun 2006, xi-xii)

that even the idea of a "normative" Judaism or Judaisms is as problematic as a normative Christianity.[329]

3.1.2: Problemitizing Judaism(s)

This is of course not a new idea, nor one original to Boyarin. In 1982, Jonathan Z. Smith famously noted the methodological problems of even defining what were the "Judaism"(s) of the Common Era. For Smith,[330] given the evidence of the variety of Judaisms in antiquity and the inherent problems of classification

---

[329] However, a prime example of a hold-out who constructs "nominal" and static scholarly construction of Judaism (*pace* Smith) has been articulated by E.P. Sanders. According to Sanders, while "[i]n the first-century world, Jews and Gentiles agreed on a lot of things" (Sanders 1993, 33) there were nonetheless unique "theological ideas and religious practices that *distinguished Jews from others*" (Sanders 1993, 22 emphasis mine). For Sanders, this "unique" theology consisted of: 1) **Monotheism** which was based on the Ten Commandments, and found in examples like Paul and was "common" to Jews who held to the belief and worship of only one true God (Sanders 1993, 25,33); 2) **Divine Election of Israel and the Sacredness of the Law,** in which "Jews believed that God had chosen Israel and created a covenant with the Jewish people, which bound them to obey him and bound him to guide and protect them. . .and the revelation of the divine law to Moses on Mount Sinai" (Sanders 1993, 34). 3) **Repentance, Punishment and Forgiveness,** where ancient Jews who "transgressed the law should make reparations if their misdeeds harmed other people. . .those who did not repent were subject to divine punishment. . . [and] in general the same system applied to the nation as a whole" (Sanders 1993, 34). 4) **Centrality of the Temple.** Even though Jews in Diaspora went to the Temple only rarely and could "legitimately" pray in the Synagogue, Sanders maintains that worship of God was primarily conducted in the Temple, particularly because "the Bible requires Jewish males to attend the Temple three times each year" Sanders 1993, 35). We find a similar presentation of "Judaism" in the work of John P. Meier who in constructing a "normative" Judaism for Jesus, claims that "[t]he story was the national myth of God and Israel: the one true God. . .who had chosen Israel as his special people, freed it from slavery by the exodus from Egypt, given it the covenant and Torah. . .led it into the promised land of Palestine. . .Yet Israel had often proved unfaithful to the covenant and disobedient to God's prophets. . .Though God had justly punished his people with exile, he had mercifully brought them back to their land. . .This is the story of Israel, the salvation history that undergirded Jewish faith, [which] would have been repeated regularly in the study and teaching of the Scriptures conducted on the Sabbath in local religious meetings called 'synagogues'" (Meier 2001, 617).

[330] The following summary is taken from Arnal (2005 31-34)

and definition, scholars cannot assume a "differential quality" that distinguishes "Jews" from non-Jews or gentiles in the first few centuries CE. As was part of the overall scholarly project that cast religion as *sui generis*, Smith noted that

> scholars have engaged in the quest for the unique and definitive *sine qua non*, the "that without which" religion would not be religion but rather an instance of something else. In the main, the results of this enterprise have not been convincing; they have failed to achieve consensus. They have been poorly formulated and violate the ordinary canons of definition. But this is less disturbing than the fact that presuppositions of the monothetic enterprise have been deliberately tampered with for apologetic reasons (Smith 1982, 5).

Instead, Smith advocates a polythetic mode of classification in which a "class [should be] defined as consisting of a set of properties, [with] each individual member of the class to possess 'a large (but unspecified) number' of these properties....but no single property to be possessed by every member of the class" (Smith 1982, 4). For example;

> imagine a group of six individuals, each possessing three characteristics of a set. A-H. Individual 1 has characteristics A,B,C; individual 2 has B,C,D; individual 3 has A,B,D; individual 4 has A,C,D; and 5 and 6 have F,G and H in common. Hence 1-4 would be formed into a polythetic group sharing a number of characteristics, [with] no one characteristic found in all four individuals. Hence no one characteristic is definitive. (Smith 1982, 4-5).

Through the lens of this polythetic model, Smith looks at both the practice of circumcision in antiquity as an example of the assumed *sine qua non* of

"Judaism" and also Jewish funerary markers as evidence of Jewish self identification.

In a short survey of ancient literature on circumcision, Smith finds that the relative "Jewishness" of circumcision varies from source to source, and writer to writer. For some, such as Paul,[331] circumcision is that which is all that is required for a male to be a Jew (Smith 1982, 11-12). For others, circumcision is not just a simply indicator of Jewishness but for all intents and purposes has cosmic significance as it is "an eternal ordinance [fore]ordained and written on the heavenly tablets" (Jub. 15:25). But on the other hand, there were clearly some Jews who understood that circumcision was *not* a requirement for Jewish identity such as those that Smith names the "uncircumcision party" (Jub. 15:33-34; 1 Macc. 1:15).[332]

In addition, Smith also notes that while some Jews did not circumcise, many non-Jews *did* get circumcised;[333] and not as simply a means of "converting" to Judaism, but as part of their own native ancestral practices. For example, according to Philo, circumcision was understood to be found cross-culturally.[334]

---

[331] καίπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων πεποίθησιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί. Εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἄλλος πεποιθέναι ἐν σαρκί, ἐγὼ μᾶλλον· (Phil 3:4-5)

[332] This of course does not include approximately 50% of ancient Jews who happened to be women.

[333] While "the practice [of circumcision] may have been common, even near-universal, within Judaism...it was not unique to Judaism" (Arnal 2005, 32)

[334] Spec. Leg 1.2-3.

"For Philo, the practice seems to have little to do with either ethnic or religious identity...[but was] practiced by intelligent peoples for hygienic reasons" (Smith 1982, 14).

The cross-cultural understanding of circumcision is even reflected in the prohibitions enacted by Hadrian against the practice. According to Smith, these prohibitions were not directed against Jews *per se* or even seen as being limited to them, but were regarded as general prohibitions against bodily mutilations within the Empire for any number of reasons and applicable to any number of groups (Smith 1982, 11).[335] Therefore, Smith concludes that

> [t]he wide range of uses and interpretations of circumcision as a taxic indicator of early Judaism suggests that, even with respect to this most fundamental division, we can not sustain the impossible construct of a normative Judaism. We must conceive of a variety of Judaisms, clustered in varying configurations (Smith 1982, 14).

Along with circumcision, Smith also looks at the evidence of Jewish funerary markers and inscriptions as a means of gauging Jewish self-construction and self-identification. Out of the 944 grave inscriptions he examines (from Rome, Egypt and Galilee) more than 75% are written in Greek or Latin, with the majority of names also of Greek or Latin origin (Smith 1982, 15). In addition, only 11 mention YWHW and / or the Law, only 9 use the designation "Hebrew,"

---

[335] "Hadrian's law was an extension of the prohibitions of Sulla, Domitian, and Nerva against castration to include circumcision" (Smith 1982, 11)

only seven refer to the dead as a "Jew," one to "Israelite" and one to "Judaism" (Smith 1982, 15).[336]

With just these two data sets, Smith nicely problematizes not only the notion of a normative "Judaism" in antiquity, but points out some of the serious methodological problems in assuming a "unique" status for religion itself, Jewish or otherwise.

> As the anthropologist has begun to abandon a functionalist view of culture as a well-articulated, highly integrated mechanism and has slowly turned to accepting the sort of image...of culture as a "heap of rubbish," a "tangle," a "hotch-potch," only partially organized, so we in religious studies must set about an analogous dismantling of the old theological and imperialistic impulses towards totalization, unification and integration. The labor at achieving the goal of a polythetic classification of Judaisms, rather than a monothetic definition of early Judaism, is but a preliminarily step toward this end (Smith 1982, 18).

Of course, Smith is not alone in recognizing the issues of (de)constructing and (re)classifying Judaisms.[337] Like Smith, Jack Lightstone in *The Commerce of the Sacred* (2006 [1984]) attempts

> the dismemberment of a particular beast, Judaism in the Greco-Roman diaspora. To furnish the requisite comparative perspective,

---

[336] "Of course, the fact that a trifling 0.84 percent—less than one in one hundred—of these inscriptions identify their honoree with the words 'Jew' or 'Judaism" many not indicate that this identity was insignificant. Even in the cases of Rome and Alexandria, Jewish identity in a funerary context was probable taken for granted, and more personally distinctive features stressed. But in a way, this is just the point: *within a Jewish context* being a Jew is not all that salient a detail, and may have little to do with the particular self-conception of a given individual" (Arnal 2005, 33; see also Kraemer 1989).

[337] See also Smith 1990, 81-83.

> however, I first lay out alongside Greco-Roman Judaism the homological structures of its antecedent (and later contemporary) Judaic universe that centered in the Jerusalem Temple of the Second Commonwealth. I shall argue that Judaism of the Greco-Roman diaspora reflects a different configuration in appropriating and mediating the sacred, a shamanistic model in many respects. Removed first by distance (before 70 CE), and later (after 70 CE) by the cult's demise, from the "socio-systematic" sacred order of the Temple, the Yahwehist of the Greco-Roman world depended upon various and varied local loci at which the sacred could be had —this to effect health, order, and prosperity in this lower realm. (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 5)

In other words, what Lightstone does is not just accept what is normally interpreted as the "best" or most authentic Jewish taxa (such those that focus on the Temple, its priesthood and the land of Israel) with "extramural" bits such as those found in the Diaspora only being grafted onto these more recognizable "Jewish" configurations. Instead Lightstone recognizes that there were other and equally valid ways to be Jewish in antiquity with no one way being more authentic. Instead, Lightstone examines and interprets his data as whole polyvalent systems and options of what it was to be Jewish that only differed depending on location and time. But what is important is that while both "systems" may (or may not) have been in competition with each other and cast each other as "less-than" Jewish or as "heretical," because both share the same "homological structures of its antecedent (and later contemporary) Judaic

universe" there is nothing less Jewish about the Diaspora's "shamanistic" model than the Temple-centric one.

The list of examples mustered by Lightstone is extensive as he takes full advantage of a polythetic system of defining the Judaisms of the Greco-Roman Diaspora. For example,[338] Lightstone details that—perhaps unlike Jews who lived in proximity to Jerusalem[339]—Diaspora Jews were believers in, and exorcists of, demons (Chapter 2), that there was a thriving cult of the dead in which tombs functioned in a fashion similar to that of the Temple altar (Chapter 3), that the Torah was a relic and portable locus of the sacred within a decentralized and denationalized "Judaism" (chapter 4), that it did not define a "comprehensive system of cosmic order" (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 116) for all Jews and that—contrary to the rabbinic claim—the synagogue was not a substitute "small sanctuary" in Diaspora communities (chapter 5).

What Lightstone manages is not just to provide evidence for alternative "shamanistic" Judaism(s) that functioned outside of the confines of the Jerusalem Cult. What he provides is evidence of, and a model for, Judaism(s) that were NOT secondary or fringe in relation to a "core" rooted in or around Jerusalem, but

---

[338] The following is taken from Braun 2006, xii.

[339] This is not to say of course, that these "Judaisms" noted by Lightstone were not present in non-diaspora communities. But the scholarly conversation has generally maintained the idea that in Israel there was a very distinct ways one could be Jewish and any deviations were in a sense "heresies." See Lightstone's discussion on Jewish "magic" (1984 [2006], 12-40) and Smith 2004, 215-229.

that shared in both the same homological structures as the "normative" Jerusalem cult yet represented a different and equal means one could be Jewish in antiquity. In other words, despite what seems to be conflicting, oppositional or "non-Jewish" elements in the Diaspora, both systems were equally Jewish despite what might be misgivings of the ancient groups who have been defined by scholars as representing the normative option.

> The self evidently inappropriate behavior and views for Torah-loyal Jews were, apparently, no longer self-evidently inappropriate for Jewry in the Greco-Roman diaspora, in spite of their own loyalty to Scripture...[So for instance] the "gut feeling" of knowing the dead and their tombs to be unclean has faded before the comparably effectively grounded knowledge of the semi-divine character of the dead...[t]hus for some, tombs remain unclean; for others, sites of mediation between heaven and earth. For the former, moreover, we would expect animals that straddle taxonomic boundaries to be unclean, for the later, they will be deemed sacred species. For the former, man-god would constitute an impossibility and claims to such status, blasphemers; to the later, such beings would prove to be saviors. For the former, persons who mediate across defined social boundaries will constitute a danger—so magicians, heretics and demon-worshippers; for the later they may be welcomed individuals. (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 112-113)

Lightstone also notes that this "gut feeling" of knowing what is "Jewish" in antiquity is not just limited to the people of the ancient world. He also dissects how this idea of what "should be Jewish" functions within the realm of modern academic discourse.

> We use words like "magic" and "religion," "Christian" and "Jew," "Christianity and Judaism," as if their appropriate referents are self evident. And to the extent that we feel so, the classification of data represents less analytical judgement, than a prejudicial restatement of our own cultural categories. (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 1)

And these cultural categories are, according to Lightstone, based upon the rectification of certain types of ancient discourses that are seen as normative.[340]

> [I]n the main what one has is a scholarly refinement of rabbinic literature's own account of its own literary history. This account, distilled and refined becomes the [scholarly] description of the early rabbinic and proto-rabbinic social formation, in terms of which the literary history and character of the rabbinic documents are explained, and in which frame work their meaning is elucidated. 'Catch-22!' (Lightstone 1997, 278)

This idea of both rabbinic scholarly refinement and the "gut feeling" of what gets to be "Jewish" is particularly salient within understanding the "Jewish" construction of YWHW and the idea of ancient "monotheism." As repeatedly noted above, this has been a central concern of scholars regarding so-called "Gnosticism" as it has been *a priori* an indication of a non- or anti-Jewish stance

---

[340] "To wholly adopt the classifications, unable to move beyond them in acts of interpretations, is to become a member of the group [one studies], bound by its frame work" (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 4). As noted by Braun "Lightstone is critical of a historiography that (usually quite unwittingly but passionately) looks to the past to legitimate states and responses to contemporary social, cultural and political realities. What one holds dear and wants to preserve is normative, intramurally and extramurally, in a given socio-religious formations...[and] may be authorized by means of inscribing current interests on the past as what has always been the case, thus a given" (Braun 2006, x).

of groups like the *Apocryphon of John*[341] and to some extent Marcion. But while configurations of "monotheism" in antiquity are hardly as stable as one would imagine the understanding that "Jews" practiced a "strict monotheism" in antiquity has been a scholarly staple.[342]

But even without considering the idea of Jewish "polytheism,"[343] "Jewish" monotheistic beliefs in antiquity— as with other "monothetic" taxa regarding Judaism—encompassed a wide variety in interpretation of what could be considered "monotheistic" simply as part of the overall cultural currency of the ancient Greco-Roman and Mediterranean world.

For example, the very concept of monotheism in antiquity is not as clear cut as modern configurations, nor as modern sensibilities, would assume. According to Paula Fredriksen:

> Ancient "monotheism" spoke to the imagined architecture of the cosmos, not to its absolute population. Ancient monotheism means "one god on top," with other gods ranged beneath, lower than and in some sense subordinate to the high god. People of sufficient education who thought philosophically about relations between levels of divinity might see these lower gods as ontologically contingent on the high god; less philosophical monotheists were content simply to assert that their own god was the biggest or the

---

[341] See Section 1 on how Marcion's "ditheism" has been used as a means of constructing him as anti-Jewish and Section 2 on how the *Apocryphon of John*'s rendering of YHWH as a demiurge who is less than the Invisible Father—while monotheistic—is still nonetheless anti-Jewish.

[342] "The most fundamental characteristic of God in Judaism is absolute unity. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one'" (Smith [eds.] 1995, 594-595).

[343] Dijkstra 2000, 33; see also Dever 2005.

> most powerful or the best god. The Bible itself, prime textual residence of the god of Israel, of course acknowledges frequently the existence of other gods, who are the deities of "the nations." "All the peoples walk, each in the name of its god" says the prophet Micah, "but we will walk in the name of the Lord our god forever and ever." (4:5; and frequently elsewhere, especially in Psalms). Exodus 22:28 LXX taught that Israel was not to revile *tous theous*; "the gods." That these other gods existed was a matter of experience, not a question of "belief"; Paul, for example-often identified as an "exclusive" monotheist-complains about the lesser divinities who try to frustrate his mission (2 Cor. 4:4, the *theos tou kosmou toutou)*...Philo, another ancient, philosophically sophisticated biblical monotheist,who quite unselfconsciously designated the heavenly firmament as "the most holy dwelling-place *theôn emphanôn te kai aisthêtôn,* of the manifest and visible gods," (On the Creation of the World 7.27) . My point, quite simply, is that ancient monotheists were polytheists. (Fredriksen 2006, 241-242).

According to Fredriksen, modern interpretations and understandings of the word "monotheism" —of one singular god with no others existing—confuses and skews our understanding of the conceptual universe of those ancients we retroactively call Christians or Jews, forcing them adhere to a modern cosmological understanding as opposed to one that is reflective of the realities of antiquity.

For example, while the "pagan" complaints of Jews being "unsociable" and of living apart from others have been interpreted by modern scholars as indicative of the Jews being "exclusive monotheists" (Fredriksen 2006, 243), this does not take into account all the instances in which "Jews" appear to show

respect to non-Jewish or foreign deities through such acts as participating in a games dedicated to a deity, the mastery of the Hellenistic curriculum, being part of the military or being involved in local town politics (Fredricksen 2006; Gruen 1998). While it has been previously understood that this is indicative of "henotheism"—a scholarly short hand for preserving modern requirements of "monotheistic" modes in ancient "polytheistic" contexts—Fredriksen makes the case that this is simply a reflection of what was "normal monotheism" as practiced in antiquity.

> Modern monotheism—belief that only one god exists—arose only with the disenchantment of the universe in the modern period. Modern science swept away a lot of cosmic clutter, reducing radically the number of divine personalities needed earlier to account for the way the world worked. As a result, the god of modern monotheist imagination is a lonely punctum in a relatively underpopulated metaphysical heaven. The ancient world, by contrast,was filled with gods, and the people who lived in it-even members of Jewish and of Christian communities-knew this to be the case. They encountered these lower gods, and felt their effects fairly often. They developed techniques and ritual protocols to cope with this fact. We would cope with it better, too, if "monotheism" were retired as a term of art for thinking about ancient religion (Fredriksen 2006, 243).

And while Fredriksen does offer a more nuanced understanding of the cosmology of the ancient Mediterranean world, her model is also supported by

ample evidence of the variety of ancient Jewish monotheism.[344]

3.1.3: Monotheism?

Take for example, in *Daniel,* a text attributed to, and claimed by, "monotheistic" Judaism:

> As I watched, thrones were set in place, and an Ancient One took his throne, his clothing was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool; his throne was fiery flames, and its wheels were burning fire. A stream of fire issued and flowed out from his presence. A thousand thousands served him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood attending him. The court sat in judgment, and the books were opened. I watched then because of the noise of the arrogant words that the horn was speaking. And as I watched, the beast was put to death, and its body destroyed and given over to be burned with fire. As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away, but their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him. To him was given dominion and glory and kingship, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed (Dan. 7:9-14).

In the narrative of *Daniel*'s vision, there are clearly two divine figures; the Ancient One and one who looks as a young man, who receives his own throne and

---

[344] "I begin by offering some ideas to hold in mind while I present my arguments. These are generalizations that I find helpful to think with when looking at the ancient Mediterranean and tracking the interrelations of its two main populations, gods and humans. In Antiquity: ~ gods run in the blood; ~ cult is an ethnic designation /ethnicity is a cultic designation;~ cult makes gods happy; ~ unhappy gods make for unhappy humans" (Fredriksen 2006, 232)

is invested with the divine power[345] of dominion, glory and kingship over all the world,[346] and as such was fertile ground for "Jewish" cosmological speculation.

For example, while of course there were "unitary" Judaisms in antiquity, there were also Jews who believed in "two powers in heaven" (Segal 1987, 1-3; 1977, 150). According to Alan F. Segal, in some *Mekhilitot* literature (Bahodesh 5 and Shirta 4) there is evidence that there were "heretical" Jews—from the perspectives of the *Mekhilitot* authors—that understood the various interpretations of YHWH (such as in Ex. 15:3) and the dual manifestations of God such as in Daniel—"one, a just, young man, appearing at the sea; the other, a merciful, old man, appearing at Sinai" (Segal 1987, 4; see also 1977, 33-158; 1987 84)—as indications of Jews who believed that there were "two powers in heaven." Analogous representations of this can also be found in Samaritan sources, where the "Angel of the Lord" was given demiurgical power (Fossum 1985) and the

---

[345] "The act of coming with clouds suggests a theophany of [YHWH] himself. If Dan. vii. 13 does not refer to a divine being, then it is the only exception out of about seventy passages in the [Hebrew Bible]" (Emerton 1958, 231-232). And as Matthew Black puts it "This, in effect, means that Dan. 7 knows of two divinities, the head of Days and the Son of Man." (Black 1976, 61).

[346] This claim seems to be belied by the continuation of Dan.7 15-28, which has been used to claim that the junior god is in fact not a second divinity but a symbol of Israel (Boyarin 2012,43). However, "[B]oth sides of the argument are right. As we have just seen, Daniel's vision itself seems to require that we understand 'the one like a son of man' as a second divine figure. The angelic decoding of the vision in the end of the chapter seems equally as clearly to interpret 'the one like the son of man' as a collective earthly figure, Israel or the righteous of Israel...The text seems to be a house divided against itself. The answer to this conundrum is that the author of the Book of Daniel, who had Daniel's vision itself before him, wanted to suppress the ancient testimony of a more-than-singular God, using allegory to do so In this sense, the theological controversy that we think exists between Jews and Christians was already an intra-Jewish controversy long before Jesus" (Boyarin 2012, 43).

authors of the *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 En 69:13-25). And while these examples have generally be rendered as being at best on the "fringe" of Judaisms, more mainstream examples hold similar configurations, such as the *Wisdom of Solomon*[347] which grants divine and cosmic functions to an anthropomorphized Wisdom (Hartin 1993, 38-40).

This kind of speculation on a "Jewish" binarism is not simply limited to those the Rabbis considered heretics, or lesser known texts and expressions, but is also mirrored in the writings of Philo and his concern with divine anthropomorphism. Philo, like the "Two Powers" speculators, makes similar distinctions between God and Logos (Martens 2003, 78) and can be seen as representing

[347] "I learned both what is secret and what is manifest, for wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me. For in her there is a spirit that is intelligent, holy, unique, manifold, subtle, mobile, clear, unpolluted, distinct, invulnerable, loving the good, keen, irresistible, beneficent, humane, steadfast, sure, free from anxiety, all-powerful, overseeing all, and penetrating through all spirits that are intelligent and pure and most subtle. For wisdom is more mobile than any motion; because of her pureness she pervades and penetrates all things. For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness." (Wis. Sol. 7:21-26)

> one branch of pre-Christian Judaism [where] there was nothing strange about a doctrine of *deutros theos*,[348] and nothing in that doctrine that precluded monotheism...Further, it can hardly be doubted that for Philo the Logos is both a part of God and also a separate being, the Word that God created in the beginning in order to create everything else: the word that both is God, therefore, and is with God...Philo oscillates on the point of the ambiguity between separate existence of the Logos, God's Son, and its total incorporation with the godhead. If Philo is not on the road to Damascus here, he is surely on the way that leads to Nicaea and the controversies over the second person of the Trinity. (Boyarin 2001, 249-51; see refinement of this argument in 2012)

And while Philo seems to believe that while the "second God" is an appropriative title for the divine "helper," he also criticizes those who can not make the

---

[348] "And he would not err who should raise the question why Moses attributed the creation of man alone not to one creator, as he did that of other animals, but to several. For he introduces the Father of the universe using this language: "Let us make man after our image, and in our likeness." Had he then, shall I say, need of any one whatever to help him, He to whom all things are subject? Or, when he was making the heaven and the earth and the sea, was he in need of no one to co-operate with him; and yet was he unable himself by his own power to make man an animal so short-lived and so exposed to the assaults of fate without the assistance of others? ... Now it was a very appropriate task for God the Father of all to create by himself alone, those things which were wholly good, on account of their kindred with himself. And it was not inconsistent with his dignity to create those which were indifferent since they too are devoid of evil, which is hateful to him. To create the beings of a mixed nature, was partly consistent and partly inconsistent with his dignity; consistent by reason of the more excellent idea which is mingled in them; inconsistent because of the opposite and worse one. It is on this account that Moses says, at the creation of man alone that God said, "Let us make man," which expression shows an assumption of other beings to himself as assistants, in order that God, the governor of all things, might have all the blameless intentions and actions of man, when he does right attributed to him; and that his other assistants might bear the imputation of his contrary actions. For it was fitting that the Father should in the eyes of his children be free from all imputation of evil; and vice and energy in accordance with vice are evil. And very beautifully after he had called the whole race "man," did he distinguish between the sexes, saying, that "they were created male and female;" although all the individuals of the race had not yet assumed their distinctive form; since the extreme species are contained in the genus, and are beheld, as in a mirror, by those who are able to discern acutely." (*On Creation* 24:72-76)

distinction between YHWH as the highest god and this secondary god (see also Segal 1987, 9; 1977, 159-181).[349]

Taking into consideration the various “two powers” speculations (Segal 1977, 149-151), texts like the *Wisdom of Solomon*, thinkers like Philo and those

---

[349] “A very glorious boast for the soul, that God should think fit to appear to and to converse with it. And do not pass by what is here said, but examine it accurately, and see whether there are really two Gods. For it is said: "I am the God who was seen by thee;" not in my place, but in the place of God, as if he meant of some other God. What then ought we to say? There is one true God only: but they who are called Gods, by an abuse of language, are numerous; on which account the holy scripture on the present occasion indicates that it is the true God that is meant by the use of the article, the expression being, "I am the God (*ho Theos*);" but when the word is used incorrectly, it is put without the article, the expression being, "He who was seen by thee in the place," not of the God (tou Theou), but simply "of God" (*Theou*); and what he here calls God is his most ancient word, not having any superstitious regard to the position of the names, but only proposing one end to himself, namely, to give a true account of the matter; for in other passages the sacred historian, when he considered whether there really was any name belonging to the living God, showed that he knew that there was none properly belonging to him; but that whatever appellation any one may give him, will be an abuse of terms; for the living God is not of a nature to be described, but only to be. And a proof of this may be found in the oracular answer given by God to the person who asked what name he had, "I am that I Am,” [Ex.3:14] that the questioner might know the existence of those things which it was not possible for man to conceive not being connected with God. Accordingly, to the incorporeal souls which are occupied in his service, it is natural for him to appear as he is, conversing with them as a friend with his friends; but to those souls which are still in the body he must appear in the resemblance of the angels, though without changing his nature (for he is unchangeable), but merely implanting in those who behold him an idea of his having another form, so that they fancy that it is his image, not an imitation of him, but the very archetypal appearance itself.” (*On Dreams* 34.1.224-232) See Lightstone (2006 [1984], 119-130) regarding how scholars by default use Philo as representing what is normative for “Hellenistic” Judaisms.

rebranded "Judaisms" that were previously considered Christian[350] including groups that assumed the divine status of Jesus,[351] it is an indefensible scholarly claim that "unitary monotheists" were or must have been normative for Judaism (s) in antiquity.

So therefore, even in some of the most "basic" understandings of what must have been "Jewish" in antiquity—circumcision, monotheism, Temple, Torah—there simply is no "normative" understanding of Judaism(s). Indeed, considering the amount of variety explored above, what was "Jewish" could potentially encompass everything from the Torah-observant, proto-Rabbinical members of the mythical Yavneh council to demon exorcising, speaking Greek, uncircumcised shamanistic Jesus-as-Messiah Jews who had a binaristic

---

[350] "...Christianity hijacked not only the Old Testament but the New Testament as well by turning that throughly Jewish text away from its cultural origins among the Jewish communities of Palestine in the first century and making it an attack on the traditions of the Jews, traditions that, I maintain, it sought to uphold and not destroy, traditions that give the narrative its richest literary and hermeneutical context...If the interpretations offered here hold water, then the New Testament is much more deeply embedded in second temple Jewish life and thought than many have imagined even...in the very moments that we take to be most characteristically Christian as opposed to Jewish: the notion of a dual godhead with a Father and a Son, the notion of a Redeemer who himself will be both God and man, and that the notion that this Redeemer will suffer and die as part of the salvation process. At least some of these ideas, the Father/ Son godhead and the suffering savior, have deep roots in the Hebrew Bible as well and may be among some of the most ancient ideas about God and the world that the Israelite people ever held" (Boyarin 2012, 157-158). See also Arthur Droge (2007) for how *John*'s Jesus functions as a demiurge.

[351] "John could (and did) designate Christ as *theos* and still be an ancient monotheist, because of the hierarchical arrangement of his heaven: logos is subordinate to *ho theos*, just as "son" is to "father." As long as one god reigned supreme at the peak of the theo-ontological pyramid, the base could be as broad as needed. (The Christian Basilides conjectured 365 divine entities; other Christian thinkers made do with fewer.) And the theologians of the generation of Chalcedon (451 CE), who complicated Christian monotheism to the point of paradox with their creed, still thought easily in terms of multiple lesser gods. After all, in their period, the emperor too was divine." (Fredriksen 2006, 243; see also Bowersock 1997).

cosmology. Both permutations—and everything in between and around—could have and did claim the mantle of "Jew" in antiquity. So in much the same way that there was no orthodoxy or singular Christianity:

> We need a way of thinking about the varieties of Jewish religious experience...that successfully accounts for the eddying and swirling of different currents of thought in a larger, more complex field of difference and similarities, one that enables us to speak of both he Rabbis and the *Notzrim* as historically—not normatively—expressions of Judaism. (Boyarin 2012, 20)

It should be stated again that the resistance to claiming a "normative" Judaism is by and large reflective of current trends in scholarship. That being said, despite how scholars have in varying degrees incorporated the multiplicity of what could be "Judaism" in antiquity, there does seem to be a scholarly insistence that there were nonetheless better ways of being Jewish or more authentic ways to adhere to Judaisms in antiquity. But these ways appear to be more about modern considerations than reflective of what was the "best way" to be Jewish in antiquity.

As noted by William Arnal regarding the "Judaism" of the so-called Historical Jesus,

> The real form of Judaism that is being advocated here is, as I noted above, one that tends to have significant affinities with certain forms of contemporary, albeit traditional, Judaism. In the Judaism of the Jewish Jesus, there tends to be a focus on Torah, the interoperation thereof and obedience thereto. The temple figures

> significantly, as does, at times, eschatological expectations. So too does the concern with the holy land of God's promise, Israel, and the native Semitic speech of the inhabitants. Jesus is a rabbi and debates with rabbis; he is attendant at festivals and honours the Sabbath; he is circumcised. The question that arises here is precisely why, if indeed, this construction of Judaism is intended to be normative, and why of these scholars would care at all about the current construction of the Jewish religion, especially since very few of them are themselves Jewish. (Arnal 2005, 56)

While this might be in part a method for scholars to preserve some kind of theological preferences—of creating and retrojecting a normative rabbinic tradition back into antiquity as a method of constructing some kind of pedigree—what seems to be more the concern is that how "the Jews" and "Judaism" in antiquity act as a cipher for many modern concerns and modern anxieties. In other words, the best ways of being "Jewish" in antiquity are intimately tied up and resonate with issues about conceptual tasks "Jewish" does in modernity. So even despite the variety briefly reviewed, and the actual problems in even "finding" and defining "Judaism," some scholars nonetheless do require a stable identity for ancient "Jews" and "Jewishness" but as a cipher for something else, and as a means of dealing with modern issues.

It is this, perhaps more than anything, that has impacted the interpretation of texts like the *Apocryphon of John* and representations of Marcion.

Chapter 2

Steve Mason, the *ethnoi* of the Judaens and the Case of the Vanishing Jews

3.2.1: Introduction: Steve Mason

These modern anxieties that scholars seem to be grappling with regarding the "Jew" in antiquity, can be clearly illustrated by two recent publications, one in 2007 and in 2014.

In 2007, Steve Mason very systematically proposed a de/reconstruction of the modern translation of ʼΙουδαϊκός from the traditionally rendered "Jewish" to "Judaen,"[352] and Judaens for Ιουδαῖοι instead of "Jews." For Mason, this was done as means reflecting ancient modes of thought into modern English translations.

> We begin with some observable facts. First, no ancient Hebrew or Aramaic words map closely to our "Judaism." The *Yehudim* were known from the time of the Babylonian Exile (ca. 586-537 B.C.E.) as the people of *Yehudah*, or the region was known as their place, but there was no corresponding system of *Yahadut*: *Yehuda-ness* or *Yehuda-ism,* or Shaye Cohen's "Jewishness." Second, the Greek and Latin words that appear to correspond, namely Ιουδαϊσμός and *Iudaismus*, have a different and peculiar history. The Greek is used four times by one Jewish author in the unique situation of the 160s B.C.E., or by his epitomator some years later (in 2 Maccabees), and once by an author inspired by this work (in 4 Maccabees). It turns up again in *Ioudaios*-authored compositions only in two third-century C.E. inscriptions. The term does not appear at all in

[352] While the spelling "Judean" / "Judaen" tends to change (for example, many of the responses to Mason's article use "Judean" as opposed to Mason's own "Judaen") the following will adopt Mason's usage. Other spellings will be used in context of quoting other writers.

> the large Greek-language corpora by Philo and Josephus, who both wrote extensively about *Ioudaioi* and their ways, *or in literature by any of their compatriots.* Greek and Latin authors mention the Ioudaioi and their laws or customs dozens of times, but it did not occur to them to invoke Ιουδαϊσμός / *Iudaismus*. Why not? Third, though the apostle Paul and Ignatius initiated Christian usage in narrowly restricted contexts, Christian writers from 200 to 500 C.E. *did* employ these terms liberally. (Mason 2007, 460-461)

According to Mason, when one considers that the term "Jew" or "Judaism" is not just a modern English word, but also reflects the modern invention and conception of "religion," it can not simply be mapped upon any ancient term or accurately represent any ancient concept. In other words, despite the convention of translating ᾽Ιουδαῖοι for "Jews," ᾽Ιουδαϊκός for "Jewish" and ᾽Ιουδαϊσμός for "Judaism," this is anachronistic as these translations are reflective of the modern concept of "religion" that as such can not be found in antiquity.

> Modern European languages distinguish perhaps five senses of -ism words, namely: (1) an action or its result (criticism, plagiarism, embolism, exorcism, synergism); (2) a system, principle, or ideological movement (Anglicanism, Marxism, Liberalism, Communism, Hinduism, McCarthyism; more generically, imperialism, feminism, theism); (3) a peculiar idiom in language (an Americanism, Britishism, Latinism; archaism, barbarism, solecism); (4) a pathological condition or disease (alcoholism, rheumatism); and (5) a criterion of prejudicial discrimination (racism, sexism, ageism). Of these five, only (1) and (3) have parallels in ancient Greek. The modern category (2), in which "Judaism" is generally understood to fall, as a term denoting a system of thought and practice, has no counterpart in Greek or Latin before the third century C.E. The rare form ᾽Ιουδαϊσμός is

> therefore a "false friend" to the English -isms of system. (Mason 2007, 461)

This has interesting consequences. As noted by Mason, considering that the first attestation of Ἑλληνισμός coincided with the first use of Ἰουδαϊσμός in 2 Maccabees, it is certainly reasonable to claim that "[f]ollowing the patterns we have already observed, Ἰουδαϊσμός appears to have been coined in reaction to cultural Ἑλληνισμός which the author may also have been the first use in the sense of 'Hellenizing'" (Mason 2007, 464).

For Mason then, Ιουδαϊσμός is not a general term for the "religion" of "Judaism" but rather a certain kind of activity performed as a means to counter the pull of foreign influences.

> The contest becomes clearer when the author invokes Ἑλληνισμός which is also not a static system or culture, but an energetic movement away from one's own traditions to embrace foreign ones: a "Hellenizing." [In 2 Macc 4:10-12] Jason and his group, the writer narrates, introduced foreign ways—Greek cultural institutions, education, sports, and dress (4.10-12)—into Jerusalem, with the result that: "There was such a pinnacle of hellenizing and an inroad of foreignizing (ἀκμή τις Ἑλληνισμοῦ καὶ πρόσβασις ἀλλοφυλισμοῦ), on account of the towering profanity of that impious high priest—not!—Jason, that the priests were no longer eager for the service of the sacrificial altar. Rather, disdaining the sanctuary and caring nothing for the sacrifices, they hurried at the summons of the gong to share in the illicit activity of the wrestling hall! Reckoning their ancestral honours as nothing, they regarded Greek distinctions as the finest." Here, Ἑλληνισμός

> (like ἀλλοφυλισμός) cannot indicate a culture or system; it labels a defection that threatens the heart and soul of Judaean tradition.[353] (Mason 2007, 466)

With this in mind and given the way that ᾽Ιουδαϊκός / Ιουδαῖοι / Ιουδαϊσμός is used in ancient sources, Mason claims that these terms can not be mapped closely onto modern concepts of "religion," as that would be anachronistic. Mason, however, is quick to point out that

> I do not mean to say that our western forebears were not religious. Rather, I mean this. Modern westerners recognize a category of life called "religion."[354] We know (because we constructed these categories) that Judaism, Islam, and Buddhism are religions, whose representatives may take turns appearing on the religious features of BBC Radio or Canada's Vision TV; they are religions that may be studied in courses on religion, within departments for the study of religion. Since at least the American and French revolutions, this category has been isolable from the rest of our lives: religious

---

[353] Notice, for example, how Josephus frames his rebuttal of Apion, a writer often described as "anti-Jewish," though Josephus casts him as anti-*Judaean*. The issue is the treatment of one's *ethnos* by members of another, or foreigners, not the treatment of one "religion" by another. Josephus claims (Apion 2.237) that it is traditional among the Judaeans to preserve their own legal precepts or conventions (νόμιμα) and to refrain from criticizing those of foreign peoples (τῶν ἀλλοτρίων). Of Apion he remarks (2.144): 'Healthy-minded people need steadfastly to maintain their domestic laws concerning piety with precision (τοῖς μὲν οἰκείοις νόμοις περι τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἀκριβῶς ἐμμένειν) and not abuse those of others. But he [Apion] shirked his own, and spoke falsely about ours!'Josephus cannot talk about Apion as member of another *religion* because the category did not yet exist. The concept of *religion*, which is fundamental to our outlook and our historical research, lacked a taxonomical counterpart in antiquity. Whereas we often study Josephus and Judaea within departments devoted to the study of religion, if we try to produce the ancient terms that express this category we come up empty" (Mason 2007, 481).

[354] "'Hinduism' furnishes an egregious example of the West's transforming or abstracting a whole culture into a belief system in order to simplify comparison with Western faiths, though "the people involved could have had no use for a term or concept 'Hindu' or 'Hinduism'. I have already mentioned the familiar specter of Orientalism: the systematization, reification, and indeed creation of a concept called the "Orient," to be explored by outsiders as an object and to give contrastive relief to the "Occident" of the explorers. Whereas these problems are much discussed in connection with the West's conceptualization of the Near and Far East, I am proposing that we misunderstand also the ancient homeland of Judaism and Christianity when we impose the modern category of religion upon it" (Mason 2007, 481).

> systems may be adopted or abandoned. Whereas questions such as "Are you religious?," "What is your religion?," or "What do you think of religion?" are easily intelligible to us, there was no way to frame such questions in the ancient world, which knew no separate category of "religion." The various elements that constitute our religion being inextricably bound up with other aspects of their lives. Walter Burkert could write a magisterial treatise on Greek Religion, to be sure, but he had to concede in the introduction: "Ritual and myth are the two forms in which Greek religion presents itself to the historian of religion." That is: two categories that are ancient lend themselves to critical study, but we cannot study an ancient category called religion.When surveys of the Roman world come to speak of "religion," they often observe that no Greek or Latin (or Hebrew or Egyptian; cf. Indian and Chinese, etc.) word corresponds to our category—not even Latin *religio*. After discussing government, the military, architecture, social and family life, such surveys explain that what we seek to understand as religion permeated all of these parts and more of ancient existence, without yet being identifiable with any one of them. (Mason 2007, 481-82).

Given the above, Mason proposes that the discourses from antiquity that do get classified anachronistically as "religion" should be seen as coming from six broad spheres in the ancient world.

1) *ethnoi* : According to Mason, ancient thinkers assume that "[e]ach *ethnos* had its distinctive nature or character (φύσις, ἦθος), expressed in unique ancestral traditions (τὰ πάτρια), which typically reflected a shared (if fictive) ancestry (συγγενεία); each had its charter stories (μῦθοι), customs, norms, conventions, mores, laws (νόμοι, ἔθη, νόμιμα), and political arrangements or constitution (πολιτεία)...According to both insiders and outsiders, the'Ιουδαῖοι

(just like Egyptians, Syrians, Romans, etc.) were an *ethnos* with all of the usual accoutrements." (Mason 2007, 484)

2) *National Cult* : "This cannot be isolated from the *ethnos* itself, since temples, priesthood, and cultic practices were part and parcel of a people's founding stories, traditions, and civic structures. There was usually a close connection between the aristocracy and the priesthood, whether the priesthood was itself hereditary and the main base of the elite (as in Egypt, Judaea, and the East) or the elite were expected to assume priestly functions once they acquired sufficient rank, on a rotating basis or for life (as in Greece and Rome)...Yet cult and *ethnos* may be distinguished for our purposes, partly because there was no one-for-one match between a people and a single cultic system. The major centres of the world (e.g., Rome, Lugdunum, Carthage, Antioch, Athens, Alexandria, Ephesus, Jerusalem) typically housed their civic cults in prominent sacred precincts (τέμενος, τὸ ἱερόν, *templum*), with a shrine or house (ναός, *aedes*) for the deity in question. But most cities were happy to host a number of cults, the relative importance of which could change over time, and cities also exported their ancestral cults to foreign centres along with their emigrés. Further, alongside the civic cults were quasi-private "mystery" cults, for initiates only (e.g., the followers of Mithras, Cybele, and Isis, or the Eleusinian *mystai*), whether they had stable cultic centres (e.g., Eleusis) or depended upon itinerant charismatic adepts

(e.g., Dionysus, Cybele).The dispersed Judaean communities did not for the most part take their cultic apparatus with them, restricting its use to the mother-city Jerusalem.[355] Paradoxically, whereas the sacrificial cult was the ancient category that most conspicuously involved "religious" language, with respect to consecration, purity, and attendance upon the Gods, it is probably the one most alien to modern conceptions of religion" (Mason 2007, 486).

3) *Philosophy*: According to Mason

> philosophy was in its ancient form rather close to our religion....That is why Philo (Prob. 75-91, esp. 88; ap. Eusebius, Praep. ev. 8.11; Vit. cont. 2, 16) and Josephus (War 2.119, 166; Ant. 13.171-173; 18.12) describe groups that we incline to consider religious—Essenes, Therapeutae, Pharisees, and Sadducees—as philosophers. This was no deceit: they were using the most appropriate category. "Religion" was not in the lexicon. (Mason 2007, 486)[356]

4) *Familial Traditions:* what religion provides for moderns, "such as—rites of passage at birth, marriage, and death, primary education in the laws and the founding stories of the (sub-) culture, consecration of food, formal commemoration of the departed—in antiquity came from familial traditions" (Mason 2007, 486-487)

---

[355] *pace* Lightstone (2006 [1984]).

[356] See below for Joan Taylor's classification of Judaism as a philosophy (Taylor, "'Judean' and 'Jew', Jesus and Paul.")

5) *Voluntary Associations:* Analogues to modern institutions of church, synagogue, or mosque were the ancient "voluntary associations" (collegia, θίασοι).[357] "Some associations were cultic, comprising devotees of a particular deity; others were for members of trade guilds; others were social and drinking clubs. Whatever their specific purposes, collegia tended to have regular celebratory meals involving sacrifice to the patron deity, and to mark at least some rites of passage for members, notably funerals. Although they included important elements our religion, again collegia did not come close to matching the whole conception in our world" (Mason 2007, 487).

6) *Magic*: Two other ancient categories that included elements of our religion were astrology and magic.[358] (Mason 2007, 487)

In summary, Mason states that

> These are only the larger rooms in which we might look for religion in Graeco-Roman antiquity. A more exhaustive survey would take us through political and military cultures, educational and athletic institutions, and large-scale public entertainments, including tragic performances based on ancient myths, all of which included sacrifice and attention to the deity. What we would recognize as "religious" activities were everywhere, but there was no phenomenon understood as "religion."...In the absence of either "religion" or "Judaism," I have argued, the *Ioudaioi / Iudaei* of Graeco-Roman antiquity understood themselves, and were

---

[357] See Phil Harland 2003.

[358] See Smith 1990 for a detailed analysis of "magic" and the Greek Magical papyri in antiquity.

> understood by outsiders, as an ἔθνος, a people comparable to and contrastable with other ἔθνη. It remains to elaborate this point and to draw consequences from it for historical work" (488-489).[359]

According to Mason, however, this understanding of "Judaisms" as *ethnoi* is closer to its modern "religious" meaning during the third century CE as part of Christian intellectual constructions of self, in which "Judaism" is forced to play a dubious role.

> From the early third century, things begin to change dramatically among Christian writers. To the church fathers Tertullian (24 occurrences), Origen (30), Eusebius (19), Epiphanius (36 occurrences in the *Panarion* alone), John Chrysostom (36), Victorinus (about 40), Ambrosiaster (21), and Augustine (27), we owe a new use of ʼΙουδαϊσμός and *Iudaismus*, now indeed to indicate the whole belief system and regimen of the *Ioudaioi*: a true "-ism," abstracted from concrete conditions in a living state and portrayed with hostility. Among these authors, ʼΙουδαϊσμός retroactively covers the whole history of the *Ioudaioi* under Asyrians, Babylonians, and Persians (C. Cels. 3.3); it is now host to various sects, including Pharisees and Sadducees (C. Cels. 3.12). But it has become a kind of intellectual diminutive, the vestige of a

[359] Mason musters examples from both "Jewish" and "non-Jewish" writers such as Strabo and Posidonias (489-490), Philo (490-491) and Josephus (491-493).

> once-grand culture that, after paving the way for "*Christianism*," has lost all nobility. (Mason 2007, 471)[360]

Perhaps in anticipation of some of the criticism leveled against his proposal, Mason concludes by making it very clear that he is not claiming that there were no "Jews" in antiquity or that he is attempting to "erase" Judaism from the historical record.

> It is quite proper that modern histories of the Jews or Judaism should track the vicissitudes of this people across millennia, in the same way that one may write histories of the English, Greeks, Italians, Germans, and Christians over twenty or more centuries. But in all such cases we recognize that ancient conditions,

---

[360] In particular, for Mason, Tertullian seems to be the pivotal figure in this rebranding. "Tertullian...for the first time use[d] both *Christianismus* (4 times) and *Iudaismus* (about 24 times). Further, every occurrence of *Christianismus* is paired with *Iudaismus*. But the juxtaposition no longer highlights two possible directions of movement, as in Ignatius, the Greek -ίζω base having fallen away: now it contrasts a living system with a defunct precursor. Thus, Tertullian interprets Marcion's distinction between Law and Gospel as one between *Iudaismus* and *Christianismus* (Marc. 4.6); he declares that John the Baptist marked the end of *Iudaismus* and beginning of *Christianismus* (4.33); he paraphrases Paul to the effect that *Christianismus* had a noble lineage in Abraham, whereas the slave woman Hagar produced the legal bondage of *Iudaismus* (*Iudaismi servitutem legalem*; 5.4); and he asserts that Isa 3:3 predicted Paul's departure from Judaea, "that is from *Iudaismus*, for the construction of *Christianismus*" (5.6). From these passages it emerges that Tertullian requires formally parallel terms to contrast with belief in Jesus, and he resorts to the -ismus form to enhance the contrast. When he is not making such contrasts, he has a rich vocabulary for *Christiani* and their faith, and so does not need *Christianismus*; for the Judaeans, however, choices are limited and so he employs *Iudaismus* often. This usage strips away all that was different in Judaean culture—its position among ancient peoples, ancestral traditions, laws and customs, constitution, aristocracy, priesthood, philosophical schools— abstracting only an impoverished belief system. It is of this formerly great and blessed *ethnos* (*gens*, *genus*), now landless, abandoned, and eclipsed by *Christianismus*, that Tertullian uses the term Iudaismus. And this will be the new function of the word that had formerly found such patchy employment. For Christian authors, *Iudaismus* is Judaean culture deprived of all that had made it compelling to Judaizers, an ossified system flash-frozen with the arrival of Jesus, which will now suffer—construed as a system of postulates—by comparison with *Christianismus*." (Mason 2007, 473-474) However, as Boyarin notes "[i]t should be remembered, however, that this is a Christian meaning of Ioudaismos/Iudaismus, not a 'Jewish' one, nor even a non-Jewish one, as Mason shows, adducing the usage of Ioudaioi/Iudaei in parallel with other ethonyms in ancient writers, 'pagan' and Jewish, while Christianismos/mus is paralleled with the names for mystery cults." (Boyarin 2009, 8-11)

> terminology, and categories were different from our own. Hellas was of course not modern "Greece"; the *Germani* of Tacitus or the later Angles were not without further ado "Germans" and "English." That the modern words "emperor," "prince," and "Kaiser / Czar" have developed from *imperator, princeps*, and *Caesar* does not justify substituting the modern terms for the ancient, because those words meant some-thing different. In the same way, although "Jew" and "Judaism" have developed from Ἰουδαῖος / Ἰουδαϊμός and cognates, the Greek and Latin terms carried a different charge in their ancient contexts. ...If the foregoing argument is valid, important consequences follow, not least for the comparison of "Judaism" and "Christianity." It becomes increasingly clear being a "Judaean" and being a follower of Jesus were incommensurable categories, rather like being a Russian or a Rotarian, a Brazilian or a Bridge player. Scholars know this well, but our continued use of "religion," as if this were the genus of which "Judaism" and "Christianity" were two species, tends to de-historicize and obfuscate the matter. (Mason 2007, 510-511).

There is much to admire in Mason's argument. By preferring to translate ᾽Ιουδαϊκός as Judaean instead of the traditional rendering, Mason provides a general methodological means to place the ancient people who we identify as Jews in antiquity, not anachronistically within our own categories, but as part of the greater Greco-Roman context of the first few centuries CE; they were one of many *ethnoi* of the period. And while one can disagree with Mason's claim that one can find the "religion" in the 3rd century, his focus on the 2nd century nicely destabilizes many of the cliche constructs that have littered reconstructions of "Judaism" in past Christian Origins scholarship and current apologetics who

construct Judaism as a *sui generis* "religion" that can provide an isolated pedigree for modern traditions (Fairen 2008; Smith 1990).

That being said, and considering Mason's insistence that there is some form of continuity between ʼΙουδαϊκός and modern Jews / Judaism, it is surprising to see the tone of some of the rejections of his proposal. Many scholars have rejected Mason's ideas not on the grounds of historical inaccuracy *per se*, or because his model is a problematic rendering of ancient categories, but instead on the basis of what seems to be modern issues.

3.2.2: I'm Not Saying You Hate Judaism, But...

For example, the *Marginalia Review of Books* (August 24, 2014) hosted an academic online "forum"[361] in which Steve Mason's translation of ʼΙουδαϊκός as Judaen was not only discussed, but also acted as a sounding board for a whole host of other concerns. An initial catalyst of the discussion was a reprint of Adele Reinhartz's essay in which she states that

> ancient Jews are being replaced by "Judaens." We can trace this trend back to a small number of widely-read publications that have appeared in the last ten to fifteen years, the most cited of which is Steve Mason's 2007 article, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." Mason and others argue that "Judean" is both a more precise and a more ethical translation of *ioudaios* than is "Jew ": more precise because it

[361] <http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/>

corresponds more closely to the complex meaning of *ioudaios* in ancient Greek sources, and more ethical because it counteracts the anti-Semitism that historically has been associated with some of these Greek texts, most notably the New Testament. I am all for historical precision and sharply attuned to potential anti-Semitism. Yet as a scholar and a Jew, I am alarmed by the growing invisibility of Jews and Judaism in English translations of ancient texts and scholarship about them.[362] The use of "Judeans" to translate all occurrences of *ioudaioi* achieves neither the scholarly precision nor the ethical high ground that scholars claim. On the contrary, the proliferation of "Judeans" inadvertently creates confusion and misunderstanding and merely sidesteps the issue without addressing the anti-Jewish or even anti-Semitic potential of texts such as the Gospel of John (Reinhartz, "The Vanishing Jews of Antiquity.")

---

[362] Mason responds specifically to Reinhartz by clarifying that "Adele Reinhartz's piece in Marginalia (June 24) gives the impression that I have insisted on Judean: she chides me for not explaining why Jew is incorrect. The explanation is that I don't consider Jew incorrect. The 2007 article to which she refers was also not my effort to tell other scholars what to do. It was framed as my attempt to explain my unorthodox preference, which had drawn a range of responses from polite questioning to indignation. Most were not in print, and I deliberately chose the mild challenge from a sympathetic review as my departure point, to neutralize the seemingly obvious heat. I also sought to reposition the Judean issue by considering it last after mapping out a much larger framework of ancient assumptions and categories. Reinhartz's essay expresses alarm over "the vanishing Jews of Antiquity." That concern may seem surprising, given the growth in Jewish Studies over the past three decades, with a reach that typically includes ancient Israel and Greco-Roman Judea. In Toronto I belonged for two decades to a Centre for Jewish Studies that had such breadth, and it was a wonderful experience. When our History department developed a Collaborative Program with the University of Toronto, I succeeded in establishing ancient Jewish texts as part of the scene, which otherwise would have focused only on Greece and Rome. Many doctoral students were interested at least partly in Judea, so this was a reasonable development. Scholars elsewhere have been doing similar things, with the result that the last generation has witnessed both the establishment of ancient Jewish history as a field and the broadening of Greek and Roman history to include it. Now we have many journals, conferences, and book series devoted to the whole and its many parts — for their own sake and no longer as "preparation for the gospel." Intensive study of the Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, Josephus, Philo, and post-biblical Jewish texts has never flourished as now. We have long been stuffed with commentaries on classical, biblical, and New Testament texts, but international teams are now producing the first commentaries to Philo and Josephus. Doctoral seminars and dissertations in these areas are appearing at such a pace one can hardly keep up. In what sense, then, are Jews and Judaism vanishing from the academy?" (Mason, "Ancient Jews or Judaens? Different Questions, Different Answers.")

Reinhartz's angst is clearly on display. Her primary concern is not the accuracy of translation of an ancient category *per se,* but "anti-Jewish or even anti-Semitic potential" this translation may have for modern readers. This of course is not only a valid concern, but an important one as well. Antisemitism, especially in Christian Origins and New Testament scholarship, has a long and shameful history that still resonates with scholars today in part because of the intellectual contributions such work provided for atrocities such as the Holocaust.[363] No one can nor should deny that. But what is surprising is not that Reinhartz is expressing these kinds of concerns, but the shape her concerns take and the hyperbole that she employs. For example, in addressing the "geographical" nature of Mason's use of Judaen (Mason 2007, 483) as perhaps being too limiting to account for the shifting nature of identity construction in the ancient world—a valid and needed questioning of Mason's position—her critique drifts from the salient to the overwrought.

> In theory, of course, one could cut the problem out at its root by revising the original Greek. Such revision — though for the purposes of supporting rather than eliminating anti-Semitism — *was undertaken by pro-Nazi German theologians in 1936. This revision omitted references to Moses and the prophets, as well as to all Hebrew place names and Jewish inhabitants of the Galilee, but retained references to the Jew's culpability for Jesus' death. Revision is hardly a viable option, however, for those who respect*

[363] See Ruether 1974; Mack 1998; Arnal 2005, 47-51 and Crossley 2008, 143-172.

> *the integrity*[364] *of the text and its canonical status.* While some translate *ioudaioi* according to its context within the Gospel of John (see, for example, the New Living Translation), others replace some or most instances of Jews with Judeans. (Reinhartz, "The Vanishing Jews of Antiquity." Emphasis added) [365]

It is embarrassing to see how Reinhartz arguments escalate into hyperbole, a shift that is simply not needed in an analysis of Mason's interpretation of Ιουδαϊκός. If anything, this exaggeration lessens the critical punch Reinhartz might have been trying to make in regards to ancient identity construction. But of course, this is not simply about interpreting an ancient word or how ancients thought of themselves and others. For Reinhartz this is clearly an issue about modern concerns and worries.

---

[364] One would think that "integrity" would imply accuracy. If that is the case, then it seems that Mason is attempting to preserve the integrity of the authors of the texts, as opposed to those who wish the "canonical" status to remain static.

[365] "But why broaden the referent of Judean from its primary geographical meaning when there is a perfectly good English word — Jew — ready to hand? As the Pew Report and many previous surveys and sociological studies have shown, Jewish identity includes the same elements — including ethnic, political, cultural, genealogical, and, yes, geographical — that, in Mason's view, are conveyed by the Greek terminology. To define Jew solely or even primarily in religious terms is simply wrong. Further, erasing Jews from Jewish antiquity, while presumably solving one historical problem, creates another historical dilemma: how to account for the sudden appearance of Jews in late antiquity as a fully-formed ethnic and religious group that saw itself — and was seen by others — as continuous with the ioudaioi of the Greco-Roman era? Scholars of the Greco-Roman period may not feel called upon to answer such questions, but the dilemma cannot be ignored.And yet, the trend to adopt Judean as the default translation of ioudaios is increasing. Many now use the term without any comment, or with merely a footnote citing Mason's 2007 article. Ironically, the widespread usage, intended to be more precise, often introduces vagueness, ambiguity, and even confusion. To describe Josephus as a Judean historian, or the revolt of 66-74 as the Judean war, strikes me as excessively narrow given their broad importance for Jewish history. We could perhaps excuse this usage, given that Josephus lived for the most part in Judea and the first Jewish revolt against Rome was centered in Judea. But on what grounds is Philo of Alexandria a Judean philosopher? How did the Hebrew Bible become the Judean Scriptures and Judaism the Judean religion? And why, pace Mason, refer to Josephus's grand history of the Jews as 'The Judean Antiquities' when the narrative covers far more geographical and chronological ground?" (Reinhartz "The Vanishing Jews of Antiquity.")

For instance, while historical revisionism is generally part of conducting good historical scholarship,[366] Reinhartz's pairing of it with "pro-Nazi German theologians in 1936" and implying that Mason's translation is similar to the "purging" of texts as was done by the *„Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben"* is nothing more than a ham-fisted attempt to give a more sinister tone to a scholarly proposal that is simply not there. But why would one attempt this? What could be behind the implication?

On the surface this could be because the point of Mason's argument has been lost on Reinhartz; that the word "Jew" (which she herself points out is an English term) is not being "purged," but does not map accurately onto the ancient concepts implied with ᾽Ιουδαϊκός, ᾽Ιουδαῖοι or ᾽Ιουδαϊσμός. But this is obvious. Not only does Mason make it clear, but it seems that Reinhartz herself also recognizes that purging[367] as she deploys it, is NOT what Mason is doing. So why the link? Why does she seem to feel the need to tangentially link her disagreement with Mason's translation of an ancient concept with the modern tragedy of Nazism?

---

[366] See Kuhn (1972 [1970], 6.

[367] Purging implies changing the original meaning. If anything it seems Mason is attempting to restore the original meaning.

It seems that this conflation is not out of a lack of understanding of Mason's point, but as a way to address modern issues on the stage of antiquity.

> Why not embrace a translation that has the Judeans, rather than the Jews, as the architects of the plot to kill Jesus and his followers (cf. John 16:1-4)? For one thing, there is no evidence that using Judeans instead of Jews deflects attention from Jews as guilty of Jesus's death. Jews do not have to be present, physically or linguistically, in order for anti-Judaism to exist. More important, however, eliminating the Jews lets the Gospel of John off the hook for its role in the history of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism. Whether or not centuries of readers and hearers were mistaken to associate John's ioudaioi with the Jews of their time, as Esler asserts, the fact remains that John's hostile portrayal of the ioudaioi did contribute to anti-Semitism, most obviously through the image of Jews as the devil. To be sure, translating ioudaioi as Jews risks perpetuating the rhetorical hostility of the Gospel itself. But to use Judean instead of Jew whitewashes the Gospel of John and relieves us of the difficult but necessary task of grappling with this gospel in a meaningful way. As Amy-Jill Levine notes: "The Jew is replaced with the Judean, and thus we have a *Judenrein* ('Jew free') text, a text purified of Jews … So much for the elimination of anti-Semitism by means of changing vocabulary."[368] *Continuing to use Jews as a translation of ioudaioi allows readers to see the link between the Jews that are vilified in the Fourth Gospel, and those who fell victim to anti-Semitism that arose out of long habits of vilification.* (Reinhartz, "The Vanishing Jews of Antiquity." Emphasis added).

Reinhartz's essay wears its fears on its sleeve, and does not require much in the way of analysis to unpack. As noted, even thought Judean *may be* the most accurate translation and *perhaps* most accurately reflects the categories people in the ancient world used to think of themselves and others, this is not the main concern for Reinhartz nor a focus of her critique of Mason. Instead, the ancient

---

[368] Levine 2007, 160.

classification of Judaen is being used by Reinhartz as a foil for modern issues and concerns; most obviously the modern concern with antisemitism and how the "Jews" have been portrayed in Christian imagining, particularly in the *Gospel of John*. But while issues of antisemitism *are* serious—within scholarship and without—one can not help but wonder why this translation requires an example that is both not the topic of Mason's article[369] nor of the idea of "Judenrein" is needed to add a helping of excessive hyperbole to the argument.[370] What is behind such a implied charge? To disagree with the accuracy of a historical translation is one thing. But to leap-frog from *ethnoi* in antiquity to not wanting to let *John* "off the hook" for how Christians have used it to promote modern crimes of antisemitism by evoking Nazism could not only be an example of Godwin's Law,[371] but also more importantly is symptomatic of a larger trend in the

---

[369] Despite the scholarly trend to see the *Gospel of John* as "Jewish," the antisemitism within the text (or interpreted out of the text) seems to be major concern for a number of the Marginalia Forum authors.

[370] As noted by Arnal in regards to the "Jewish Jesus" who correctly points out that this kind of rhetoric "trivializes real anti-Semitism and , as a corollary, racism in general. These kinds of accusations are often offered in lieu of real engagement with the issues and evidence raided by such scholars. One can ignore, for instance, the literary evidence of Mack in support of his Cynic-like Jesus simply by dismissing the final product as 'non-Jewish' and therefore intrinsically implausible...a rich rhetorical move, to be sure, but one that, as the boy who cried wolf discovered, may have unforeseen consequences. If the charge of "anti-Semite" can be leveled, by implication, at the likes of Robert Funk and the Jesus Seminar, an erudite, well-meaning, and rather innocuous group, then how seriously can the charge be taken when applied to real anti-Semites such as Jean-Marie Le Pen or Ernst Zundel? It seems to me that this charge is an extremely dangerous one, and should be reserved for serious and dangerous situations. To do otherwise is to degrade the currency. To invoke the charge as a rhetorical *tour de force* in debate about the historical Jesus is to trivialize it beyond belief" (Arnal 2005, 37-38).

[371] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Godwin's_law>

scholarship of various "Christianities" that encodes a whole variety of meaning, models, issues, anxieties and silliness with the term, meaning or use of "Jew." It seems that "Jew", "Judaism", "Jewishness," etc. in antiquity simply can not be about looking at people in the past, but involves the specter of antisemitism and how this is used to discuss modern issues relevant to scholarship (such as "religion") or scholars themselves (like historical continuity).

This deployment is not, of course, limited to Reinhartz. As noted in Section 1 and Section 2 this kind of charge is common in scholarship regarding Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* and the use of the term "Jew" as a cipher for other issues has been part of the rhetorical currency of modern scholarship on Christian Origins. But the fears of how "Jewish" is used and what the terms "Jews" or "Judaism(s)" means goes farther than simply discussing "Gnostics."

For example—and sticking simply with the *Marginalia Forum* as a current and concise exemplar of the discourse—Daniel Schwartz sees the category of Judaism / Jews as an appropriate translation of Ἰουδαϊκός because "it seems clear to me that many of those *Ioudaioi* were primarily defined as such by their common descent and/or allegiance to their religion — and that, accordingly, "Jews" is the most appropriate English term for them, just as 'Judaens' best fits many others" (Schwartz, "The Different Tasks of Translators and Historians").

For Schwartz then, it seems that because religion as a category of behavior can be found in antiquity, the modern term "Jew" is appropriate.

This idea of finding religion in antiquity is however problematized by Annette Yoshiko Reed who points out in the same forum that "[t]he genealogy of our current system of categorizing "religion" and "religions" owes more to modern European colonial and related contexts — as Talal Asad, Daniel Dubuisson, Tomoko Masuzawa and others have variously demonstrated." (Reed, "Ioudaios Before and After Religion.")

Here then are what appear to be two attempts at not just thinking about the accuracy of translating Ἰουδαϊκός, Ἰουδαῖοι or Ἰουδαϊσμός into modern English, but the methodological implications of such translations; it is simply not about one-for-one word replacement, but understanding the similarities and differences between how ancient and modern people think about their worlds.

That being said, Reed does seem concerned that in claiming "religion" as a modern construction, that the links between the "Jews" of antiquity and modernity could be severed.

> The second and third centuries might see the beginnings of a Christian discourse re-reading "Jewishness" (*ioudaismos*) as an entity more comparable to "Christianity" (*christianismos*) than "Hellenism" (*hellenismos*), but in these same centuries, Lucian could call himself "Greek" or "Syrian" depending on the point he wished to make; even Bardaisan could be variously described as "Christian," "Parthian," "Mesopotamian," "Babylonian," and

> "Armenian." Despite the tendency in Biblical Studies for scholars to describe even Paul as self-evidently "Christian," even this label is not "religious" in any manner always and everywhere distinct from ethnic reasoning; not unlike *ioudaioi*, the Greek term *christianoi* and its cognates continued to be reinterpreted in creative and productive ways into Late Antiquity and well beyond. *We may wish to be wary, thus, lest we refract the differences between ancient ioudaioi and modern Jews through the lens of a misleadingly static concept of "Christianity," as inventor and exemplar of 'religion.'"* (Reed, "Ioudaios Before and After Religion." Emphasis added).[372]

This is an odd concern. Again, despite it being the nominal topic under consideration, accuracy of how ancients might or might not have thought about their world is not really the central issue. While Reed points out that any kind of static reading of how ancient people constructed themselves does not take into account how terms of self-identification "continued to be reinterpreted in creative and productive ways into Late Antiquity and well beyond," this is also paired with the worry that links between ancient and modern Jews will be refracted or disrupted in some way. Again, this is odd. Whether or not direct links can be

---

[372] "The ancient Mediterranean world was hardly a realm of clear-cut bounded lands occupied only by autochthonous peoples. The same centuries that biblical scholars study as the Second Temple period (538 BCE-70 CE) saw the consolidation of forms of education whereby even elites with no connection to Greece could become "Greeks," and also the articulation of new spatial ideologies whereby Macedonians like the Seleucids could redefine what it meant to be "Syrian." Greek terms for peoplehood like *ethnos* may remind us of our words for ethnicity, but the etymological connection should not lead us to treat them as identical to what we now categorize as race or nationality. At times, Greek historians and Roman jurists may use terms of this sort when trying to impose order on the sprawling diversity of the ancient Mediterranean world. Nevertheless, labels for different *ethnoi* do not necessarily denote stable entities of the same sort. Even under the Roman Empire, there was no static sense of land-bound or genealogical identity from which Jews might be posited as the sole exception — or against which Christians might be heralded as the only agents of change." (Reed, "Ioudaios Before and After Religion.")

drawn between modern and ancient Jews—be it "historical," "fictive" or, in Bruce Lincoln's terminology, "mythic" links (Lincoln 1989, 23-26)—is really not the issue here. Again, the nominal topic is accuracy in rendering ancient concepts into modern English. But what is fascinating is how this translation becomes a cipher for much more; it is about "religion" in the ancient world and the "mythic" links and claims some modern people—in this case Jews—may make.

In a similar vein to both Schwartz and Reed is the essay by Malcolm Lowe, who eventually gets around to conditionally agreeing with Mason. But Lowe also claims that to dissemble "Judaism" from "religion" is problematic.

> For instance, the Hebrew word for a bridge, *gesher*, does not appear in the Bible. But it is cognate with the Arabic *jisr*. The word quite likely existed in biblical times, and it would be absurd to claim that no biblical author had any concept of a "bridge." The Hebrew word for repentance, *teshuvah*, does occur in the Bible, but not with that meaning. It is a noun derived from the verb *lashuv*. This verb, whose basic meaning is "to (re)turn," is used in various derived meanings and *teshuvah* corresponds to some of them in the Bible. The verb itself, however, is often used in the same sense of "to repent" as in later Jewish literature. So the concept of repentance already existed, whether or not the noun *teshuvah* was already used to denote it. Herein lies the biggest problem in Mason's approach. The second section of the 2007 article bears the title "Searching for Ancient Religion" and is devoted to the claim that "[t]he concept of religion, which is fundamental to our outlook and our historical research, lacked a taxonomical counterpart in antiquity." Yes, there is no word for it in antiquity. Yet, Mason overlooks precisely such a taxonomical counterpart in his quotation from the Against Apion of Josephus on that same page. The phrase Josephus used is *tois oikeiois nomois peri eusebeian*. Similar terminology occurs widely in ancient writers; the adjective *oikeios*

> may be replaced by another one (and sometimes *nomima* replaces *nomoi*). Such phrases can be translated as "the ancestral regulations concerning piety," where "piety" signifies the relationship of humans to gods, "regulations" can be replaced by "customs," and "ancestral" can be replaced with any of several other adjectives denoting one's belonging to a people. The defense of Socrates in the opening chapters of Xenophon's Memorabilia is based on the same concept of religion. So what one should say is roughly this: "The ancients had no word for religion, but they did express the concept in such phrases as 'the ancestral regulations concerning piety.' Typically those regulations pertained to a specific people and a specific land, which is why Christians claimed that they, too, were a people and that they, too, had a land, namely Heaven."... [Mason] is also correct in saying that "no ancient Hebrew or Aramaic words map closely to our 'Judaism.'" But again, does that mean that there was no such concept? (Lowe, "Concepts and Words.")

First, the the answer to Lowe's question is unfortunately no. There was no concept of "religion" in the ancient world.[373]

> The very concept of religion as such—as an entity with any distinction whatsoever from other human phenomena—is a function of these same processes and historical moments that generate an individualistic concept of it (in fairness, Asad [1993: 29] does hint at this). The concept of religion is a way of demarcating a certain sociopolitical reality that is only problematized with the advent of modernity in which the state at least claims to eschew culture per se. Further, one of the current

---

[373] Joan Taylor attempts to side step the whole issue. While she does link Mason with Bruce Malina (see below) with the attendant issues involved, she does attempt to side step the issue of Judaism and Religion by "I am therefore going to resist an either-or approach, and consider Judaism as a philosophical entity...that requires adherence to an interpretation of the law of Moses, one to which people can adhere (following a lifestyle) by conversion, and thereby be defined as Jews. We ourselves can rightly refer to it as a religion, even though in the ancient world the categories of thinking were not the same as ours: Judaism was a kind of philosophy governing life that also involved cultic aspects for its adherents...We can usefully talk about Diaspora Jews and Judean Jews. We can also talk about Judahites as opposed to other tribal groups, in even narrower ethnic terms" (Taylor, "'Judean' and 'Jew', Jesus and Paul.")

> political effects of this separation—one of the political ends served currently by it—is the evisceration of substance (i.e., collective aims) from the state. That is to say, the simple positing of religion as a coherent, distinct zone of human cognition, affectation, and action/organization is a covert justification for the modern tendency of the state to frame itself in increasingly negative terms...there is no such thing as "religion," that cross-cultural or nonspecific characterizations of so-called religious phenomena are distorting, that the phenomenology of religion is in fact a phenomenology of the modern state, and so on—and so the field is now littered with declarations of its own impossibility. It is appropriate, however, precisely because the recognition of this impossibility is probably the anthropological precondition for any (at least putatively) nonhegemonic analysis of those types of practices that we moderns tend to designate as religious. "Religion," in other words, may be an obstacle to cross-cultural (including cross-temporal) understanding; hence it must be theorized as a concept for that very reason. Such is the view promoted by the chapters that follow and by the recent work of such scholars as Maurice Bloch (2008),[374] Matt Day (2010), Daniel Dubuisson (2003), Timothy Fitzgerald (2000), and Craig Martin (2009), all following, in their various ways, Talal Asad's footsteps. (Arnal and McCutcheon 2013, 30. See also J. Z. Smith 1982; Braun 2000; Arnal 2000; Asad 2001 and McCutcheon 2007)

An analogous fallacy to Lowe's would be to claim that because the ancients had the word "angel" as a heavenly messenger who moved between the heavenly spheres, that they would also have the concept of space travel, even though there is no accurate ancient translation for the idea of the Voyager 1 spacecraft and the

---

[374] "The point of these historical excursions is to suggest that the separation of religion from the transcendental social in general is, even in the places where it appears at first to exist, superficial and transient. In any case, this superficial phenomenon has occurred in human history only relatively recently….To explain religion is therefore a fundamentally misguided enterprise. It is rather like trying to explain the function of headlights while ignoring what motorcars are like and for. What needs to be explained is the nature of human sociability, and then religion simply appears as an aspect of this that cannot stand alone." (Bloch 2008, 2060)

Oort cloud.[375] And while the "date" in which we have the invention of "religion" is perhaps debatable[376] it has been convincingly argued and generally accepted that it can not be found in the period that Lowe wishes it to be recovered and about which Mason is writing.

But again, the issue or insistence on religion during this time is not simply about finding such an understanding in antiquity or when we can date the beginning of this concept or phenomenon. It is about finding *Judaism as religion* in antiquity, and the modern conceptual tasks this entails and issues it addresses.

This is most embarrassingly articulated with the *Marginalia* essay by Jonathan Klawans.

> I also agree with Reinhartz's warning: does it make sense, in the cause of countering anti-Semitism, to disconnect current Jews from their claimed past? I suppose one could — and perhaps should — always be mindfully skeptical about the historical truth of any claim of descent. But let's face it: there are two ideologies that are well-served by disconnecting contemporary "Jews" from ancient "Judeans." The first ideology is anti-Zionism and the second is anti-Semitism. (To be clear: *to my perception, neither ideology is necessarily at work in any of these academic debates,* but that's not the point.) (Klawans "An Invented Revolution.")

Actually that is precisely the point. But first, let us be clear: Klawans is not offering a criticism of Mason's reconstruction of how ancients may or may not

---

[375] The intervention of Ancient Aliens excluded of course.

[376] Mason places it in the 3rd Century CE. Boyarin places the beginning of Religion in the 4th (2009), Masuzawa during European colonialism (2005), and as noted early Arnal and McCutcheon during modernity (2013).

have thought of their world. What he has done is changed the topic and tenor of the conversation to modern worries and anxieties of antisemitism and anti-Zionism. And worries and anxieties seem to be the best way to understand the shift, especially since Klawans first evokes the specter of antisemitism only to quickly retract it. Something is clearly at stake[377] despite denying that this is not the point of his claim. Again this is precisely the point, otherwise Klawans would not have mimicked Reinhartz's hyperbole.

> While I grant, in theory, that these two ideologies are potentially separable, the fact is they often bleed one into the other, precisely on the issue discussed: one can more easily oppose the existence of a Jewish state of Israel by denying any connections that contemporary "Jews" claim to those "Judeans" who lived there in the Roman era. (To wit, the Khazar hypothesis.) (Klawans, "An Invented Revolution.")

While Klawans does make a clear distinction between academic discourse and those who want to delegitimate the State of Israel and "Jew-haters"[378] he nonetheless uses his own position as an academic to claim that Judaism was not only a religion in antiquity, but as the *only* religion in antiquity. The question is

---

[377] See Arnal 2003, 36-38.

[378] "Perhaps I've strayed off course; but this is why I think the anti-Semitism argument is not just odd, but manipulative. It's a clarion call to take one side on an unsolved question (on "Jew" or "Judean") by appeal to a moral argument that is (or should be) one-sided (anti-Semitism, which is evil). Here's my view: anti-Semites can translate these terms as they wish. And they should go to hell. The rest of us should have an open conversation about this matter, without misleading ourselves into thinking that Jew-haters will somehow be countered by academics' semantic adjustments. I fear, not without reason, that some anti-Semites may just as likely find current revisionism on these matters conducive to their own pernicious ends. If that risk does not matter, then neither should any perceived benefit." (Klawans, "An Invented Revolution.")

why? How can such a claim be made? Again, the issue is not so much about ancient practice, but instead is being used as a stage to address his worries about antisemitism and anti-Zionism. He continues by stating that

> Another argument that strikes me as utterly irrelevant is all the debate about the category "religion," to the effect that if religion is a post-antique phenomenon, then so too should be the terms Jew and Judaism. Let me be clear: as a Professor of Religion, I certainly don't mean to downplay the importance of this term or category. Nor could I pretend that any of these questions are settled (which is to say, also, that while Mason's approach falls within range of the debates, his is not the only reasonable stance taken by thoughtful scholars of religion). The irrelevance of this question relates to the fact that a category requires multiple examples. *But the question before us (Jew/Judean) is singular.* We are not simultaneously considering how to translate a range of religious (or ethnic) terms. The category that matters is the nature of Jewishness. *The existence of Judaism doesn't require the existence of religion per se. It is conceivable that there was only one religion (in the modern western sense) at that time*...It seems to me that by many accounts throughout antiquity (from early to late), Jewish identity was a complex mix of ethnic, religious, and cultural factors. More than other ethnicities, *it does appear that Jews understood themselves as distinct not only by virtue of customs but also by belief* (Against Apion, 2.179-181) (Klawans, "An Invented Revolution." Emphasis added).

This is truly an amazing claim. In the interest of addressing the concerns of modern antisemitism and anti-Zionism, Klawans resurrects the hoary old discourse of constructing a *sui generis* Judaism. As a "Professor of Religion" one would have thought that Klawans would have been bit more cognizant of the

problems and history of claiming a unique status for ancient Jewish religion.[379] And while Klawans does not seem to be interested in providing a pedigree in which to root a *sans pareil* Christianity, as has been the usual agenda of such a discourse (Fairen 2008), his construction of "Judaism" as the only example of "religion" is as equally problematic, if the goals are at least not about supersessionism.[380]

Again, the question needs to be asked is why? Why does Klawans make a claim that simply can not be backed up in any way shape or form? Considering Klawans' analysis of the "Invented Revolution" in which Judaism shifts from an *ethnoi* to a religion is framed within the context of the debates of modern antisemitism and modern "Jew-haters" the answer is not hard to guess. But again, even though the initial point for this discussion has been the translation of the ancient terms ᾽Ιουδαϊκός, ᾽Ιουδαῖοι and ᾽Ιουδαϊσμός why has it become a cipher for a whole string of modern issues?

As a final example of the issue of combatting modern antisemitism via the stage of antiquity, the forum essay by James Crossley is most clear in expressing how the stage of antiquity is used for a discussion on modern concerns.

---

[379] And of course, the supposedly "utterly irrelevant...debate about the category 'religion'" which is somehow—and again anachronistically—about "belief." Again, face-palm.

[380] "In the present atmosphere of academic revisionism, it seems at times that nothing pains some historians more than continuity." (Klawans, "An Invented Revolution.")

> I have consciously chosen to continue using "Jew" because, while accepting all the complexities, historical changes, differences, and the like, is there not a connection between people who identified as "Jews" now and people we identify as part of that tradition 2000 years ago? I do not think "Judean" in English can do this particularly well, as Adele Reinhartz (and Amy-Jill Levine before her) have shown, though in certain cases advocates of the Judean hypothesis would be content with this result. But what I am also doing is making an ideologically-informed translation decision, just as Reinhartz did. So too do other people who have been involved in this debate (e.g., Danker, Esler, Mason, Elliott) by making it clear that they are in part driven by an ethical concern to combat anti-Semitism (Crossley, "What a Difference a Translation Makes! An Ideological Analysis of the Ioudaios Debate.")

Here is a clear articulation of how it is generally modern motives and worries that are fueling the discussion on ancient translations of ᾽Ιουδαϊκός, ᾽Ιουδαῖοι and ᾽Ιουδαϊσμός; even for some who prefer the translation of Judaen. Translation and meaning of these ancient terms is—more than anything—about modern cultural connections of Jews and of antisemitism.

For instance, throughout his piece, Crossley is very clear that his insistence on the terms Jew / Judaism instead of Judean is about maintaining a continuity between a group of people from the ancient world with modern people who claim the title Jews. And (at least as it appears from this article) this is not done necessarily out of a need for historical accuracy or as the best way to bring into English the meaning of ᾽Ιουδαϊκός. Instead for Crossley this choice is primarily about acting as a counter to, and critique of, another modern scholar,

Bruce Malina. According to Crossley "[i]t is helpful to contextualize Malina's work further, particularly as there are common, and related, comparisons made with Israelis and the modern state of Israel. In one recent essay[381] he labels all Israelis as "non-Semitic, central European people of Turkic origin." Elsewhere Crossley quotes Malina making the following claim:

> Consider the language used in the United States relative to contemporary Israel. Israeli squatters are called 'settlers'; Israel's army of occupation is called a "defense force"; Israel's theft of Palestinian property is called a "return"; Israel's racist anti-Gentilism is called "Zionism"; and any and all criticism of Israel's chosen people's behavior is labeled "anti-Semitism"! … Dissidence, as my statements indicate, is in essence a semiotic phenomenon employing meaningful signs that result in cognitive disorientation of true believers. Israelis and Christian fundamentalists in the United States find my statements quite disorienting; as a matter of fact, they are sufficient to label me 'an enemy of Israel,' or, more derogatorily, "an anti-Semite." (Malina 2000, 61)

Crossley continues by pointing out that "Malina is not positively disposed towards the state of Israel ought to be clear enough" (Crossley, "What a Difference a Translation Makes! An Ideological Analysis of the Ioudaios Debate"), especially considering Malina's stereotypical rendering of modern Israelis:

> By contrast, to 'have shame' meant to have proper concern about one's honor. This was positive shame. It can be understood as sensitivity for one's own reputation (honor) or the reputation of

[381] See Malina 2009, 154-193.

> one's family … To lack this positive shame was to be 'shameless' (compare the modern Hebrew term 'chutzpah,' the Israeli core value and national virtue; the word is often translated 'arrogance,' but means 'shamelessness,' that is, without positive shame or concern for honor) (Malina 2006, 370).

For Crossley, this stereotyping of Israelis is emphasized when Malina attempts to make a break between modern Israelis and ancient Judeans via the questionable "data" of manners.[382] However, Crossley continues by point out that:

> Malina also supports this potential removal of Jews from the New Testament, embedding his argument in his especially influential construction of the "the Mediterranean" as the overarching context for understanding the New Testament (Crossley, "What a Difference a Translation Makes! An Ideological Analysis of the Ioudaios Debate").

What is fascinating here is not that Malina is making a "break" between the ancient and modern to buttress his own political agenda. Malina's views are well known and hardly require much in the way of analysis, beyond the fact that his modern ideology and agenda are clearly the motivation for his highly questionable claims. But what is striking is that Crossley is employing a comparable strategy as Malina, if for opposite effect. By reversing Malina and drawing a connection between the "Jews / Judeans" in antiquity with "Jews / Israelis" in modernity, Crossley is using *antiquity* as a means to offer a critique of

---

[382] "Further, since they rarely say 'Thank you' in their interactions, it is equally untrue to think that ancient Judeans (or modern Mediterraneans) are simply an ungrateful people, or that they presume the world owes them a living anyway. While this attitude may be true of contemporary Israelis, it is not true of first-century Judeans" (Malina 1993).

not just *modern* issues but specifically of a *modern* scholar. In this instance, the accuracy of using the term Judean to describe how ancient people thought of themselves is not even part of the discourse; it is first used as a means to buttress an anti-Zionist argument (Malina) and is then rejected to critique the same position (Crossley).[383]

Reflecting what may have been the best understanding of ancient use of ᾽Ιουδαϊκός is, nor ever was, even a concern.

Clearly, just within this small sampling of very recent scholarship, the use of the terms ᾽Ιουδαϊσμός/ Jew / Judean is at best an ideological minefield loaded with the shrapnel of modern issues. For scholars it is simply not about the best understanding of ancient classification but is fundamentally entwined with and a cipher for modern issues and anxieties. In other words, one can not just talk about the "Jews" in antiquity with out evoking modern examples of antisemitism, the State of Israel, constructs of religion, etc. Claiming something as "Jewish" or is "anti-Jewish" is more than just trying to understand the ancient world; indeed it seems that this kind of claim is about everything *but* the ancient world. As Crossley has pointed out;

---

[383] "Malina has some support in this translation from a leading scholar of the ancient historian Josephus. Steve Mason, another participant in this forum suggests the translation of "Judeans" for the Greek term *Ioudaioi* in Josephus's writings" (Joan Taylor, "'Judean' and 'Jew', Jesus and Paul").

> "Jew" and "Judaism" are effectively designated to be a category with which to fill convenient western descriptions. Put it more bluntly, as it indeed needs to be, "the Jew" remains a subservient construct in this discourse, no matter how positive this figure has been in relation to the anti-Jewish and antisemitic past of New Testament scholarship. Judaism is Judaism on Christianised terms. (Crossley 2008, 191)

So the question then—at least for the project at hand—is how do we address claims that Marcion or the *Apocryphon of John* were anti-Jewish when the term / classification of "Jewish" "Judaism" etc., is not nor can it be employed in any other form than a cipher for modern issues? If the terms "Jew," "Jewish" or "Judaism" (with pro- and anti- varieties) are so loaded and top-heavy with modern concerns and fears, how can these classifications be used to talk about expressions from antiquity without becoming anachronistic?

Chapter 3

A Game of Nostalgic Israel and the Rectification of the Demiurge

3.3.1: A Matter of Perspective.

As noted above, since the "Judaisms" of antiquity were at best a polyvalent phenomena,[384] the modern insistence that Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* were in some way "anti-Jewish" relies in no small part to the interpretive preferences and agendas of scholars. So in much the same way that interpretive preference can manage to rebrand New Testament texts like *Matthew*, *John* or Paul's Letters as "Jewish" in some way shape or form[385], the "non-" or "anti-Jewishness" of Marcion and *Apocryphon of John* also requires an equal amount of interpretive finesse simply because what was "Jewish" in antiquity was hardly stable, self-evident or "monothetic" (Smith 1982, 5). Nonetheless, scholars do manage to cobble together what is their own version of what was "Judaism(s)", or what were "key features" of what was "Jewish" in which to juxtapose and classify "Christianity." But as noted, what gets to be "Jewish" for New Testament scholars is, more often than not, simply a way to classify a variety of "Christianities": either positive / authentic / New Testament / pro-Jewish "Christianity" or negative / inauthentic / Gnostic-heretical anti-Jewish

---

[384] See Section 2, Chapter 2 and Section 3 Chapter 1 for the variety of ways both scholars and the ancients classified and defined what could be "Jewish."

[385] See Section 2, Chapter 2

"Christianity." The question, however—especially given the ubiquitousness of the "Ways that Never Parted" model—is why when it comes to figures like Marcion and texts like the *Apocryphon of John*, that they are understood by default to be (mis)appropriating, (mis)interpreting or engaging in obviously "anti-Jewish" critique of "key features" of "Judaisms," where Paul, *Matthew* and *John* can get away with being Jewish...but not that Jewish? Are Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* so overt in their anti-Jewishness that even if what was "Judaisms" is hardly stable, no other conclusion can be drawn? Or can a case be made that, especially under the auspices of the "Ways that Never Parted," that both Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* could represent discourses that are pro-Jewish or within the spectrum of what is "Judaisms"? And if this can be shown to be the case, what could this say about scholarly classifications that insist on a "Judaisms" in which a Christianity is ether "pro-" or "anti-" against?

3.3.2: A "Pro-Jewish" Marcion?

While the assumption of Marcion's "anti-Judaism", as noted above, is based upon his rejection of the Hebrew Bible for Christian appropriative purposes, and his understanding that the God of Jesus and Paul was not YHWH, this conclusion is entwined with a modern interpretive stance that insists on casting Marcion as a forerunner of Christianity's anti-Jewish and antisemitic

history. And while Marcion certainly did appear to critique "Judaizers" (Hoffmann 1984; BeDuhn 2013, 19-23) how he is represented in antiquity does not give any indication that this criticism was due to hatred of "Jews" or "Judaism," even if such bounded classifications were at work in the ancient world. For Marcion it seemed, "Judaizing" was the "Christian" misunderstanding that the message of Jesus and Paul was not the novel revelation of the Alien God, but a continuation of "Jewish" revelation and / or a replacement of past "Jewish" salvation history. It appears that in Marcion's representation *both* "Jewish" and "Christian" revelation were valid and not mutually exclusive.

> Marcion's second ["Jewish"] Christology is historical . . . The Christ of the Jews will be known as Emmanuel (Marc 3.12.1; Isa 7:14); he will be a warrior and delivered (Marc 3.13.1), "born of a young woman" (Marc 3.13.5); he will take up the strength of Damascus and the spoils of Samara against the king of Assyrians (Isa 8:4; Marc 3.13.1). In nature his is the "the son and the spirit and the substance of the Creator" (Marc 3.6.8). But it is not prophesied in Scripture that he will suffer and die on a cross. It is this Christ whom the Jews expect and whom the Creator, in a moment of compassion, promised to the children of Israel; of any other saviour, both the Creator and the Jews are ignorant. Marcion, stressing this ignorance, evidently diverged from the popular view[386] that the Jews actively despised "the word and spirit, the Children of the Creator" in times past. (Hoffman 1984, 228)

---

[386] The standard anti-Jewish view that casts the Jews as "Christ-killers" is articulated by Tertullian. "The Jews rejected Christ and put him to death not because they took him for a stranger, but because through their own, they did not accept him." (Adv. Mar 3.6.9)

For Marcion, not only does it appear that the Jews were *not* responsible for the death of Jesus,[387] but that this second "Jewish" Christology was an affirmation of Jewish messianic expectations and also could be read as preserving the validity of "Jewish" interpretation of the Hebrew Bible.[388] To be sure, "Judaism" was the lesser revelation compared to that of the Alien God, but was nonetheless valid and historically accurate (Tyson 2006, 33; Moll 2010, 78). Indeed, Marcion seemed to have held that Jesus came not just for Gentiles, but also for the sake of the Jews because they had suffered the most under the Creator (Marc 2.13.3. See also 1 Cor. 2:8)[389] and as such they are perhaps the most eligible for salvation and "a reprieve from the law of death that reigned from Adam to Moses (Rom 5:14, 8:2, 11:1-2)" (Hoffmann 1984, 232).

> The message and mercy of the alien God is directed in the first instance to [the Jews], since they have been exceptionally dutiful children of the lesser God. They are beckoned to faith in the mystery of the divine love "hidden for ages from God the creator of the universe" (Eph. 3.0) and to partake in the riches of salvation (Eph 3:9; Rom 11:33). But their historical relationship with the Creator has clouded their understanding, and caused them to be suspicious of the revelation of unconditional grace. This does not mean the exclusion of the Jews from the promise [of Jesus] but

---

[387] "How could they have known, Marcion asks, that Christ has come to rescue them from the Creator? The blame for the death of Jesus must be charged to the God who has blinded the minds of men, and not those who, ignorant of any higher good, seem to keep his commandments (Marc 3.6.8; 5.6.5 Haer 4.29.1)" (Hoffmann 1984, 228)

[388] See Section 3, Chapter 3 and the results of the "Game of Nostalgic Israel" between Marcion and the Straw Rabbis.

[389] Please note that references to Paul's letters are post-Marcionite redactions as set forward by BeDuhn (2013).

> quite the reverse: that God's mercy is magnified in the attempt to save the children of wrath (Eph. 2:3; Rom 3:22-23). (Hoffmann 1984, 232-233)

Unlike the interpretive insistence of scholars like Bart Ehrman who claimed that Marcion "hated the Jews and everything Jewish" (Ehrman 2003, 111), it is plausible to show—depending on the interpretive stance—that Marcion's representation did not contain any anti-Jewish animus, but was perhaps a "Christianity" that does not require a degradation of the "Jews" and preserved the integrity of what could be called "Judaism."[390]

3.3.3: *A Jewish* Apocryphon of John*?*

While the similarities between a number of what are recognized as "Jewish" sources with the *Apocryphon of John* have been noted,[391] one of the most striking overlaps between the two is the use of "Jewish" Wisdom literature; a use that is not just limited to a variety of texts such as *Proverbs*, the *Wisdom of*

---

[390] While Wilson seems to assume the negative stance Marcion had towards Judaism when he argues that "it is as if the Marcionites said to the Jew: 'Keep your God, your Scriptures, your Messiah, and your law: we consider them inferior, superseded in every way by the Gospel'" (Wilson 1986, 58), his point does nonetheless articulate how Marcion was represented as "leaving" Judaism alone.

[391] See Section 2, Chapter 2

Solomon, *Sirach* and *Baruch*, but also a very "Jewish" construction of hypopstasised Wisdom (King 2006, 226-227; MacRae 1970, 86-88).[392]

For example, one of the hypostasised Wisdom-figures in the *Apocryphon of John*, Pronoia, is, like her "Jewish" counterpart, the first creation of the Invisible Father. "[Its thinking become a] thing...She is the first [power who came into] being before them a[ll. She appeared] from Its thought, [the Pronoia of the All]" (ApocJohn 6:13-17; BG 5:13-17). This same status for Wisdom is found in *Proverbs* where the "Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old...When he established the heavens, I was there...I was beside him, like a master workman; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing before him always (Prov. 8:22-30).

In the *Apocryphon of John,* Pronoia is not just the first creation but is also "the holy and perfect Mother-Father, the perfect Pronoia, the image of the Invisible, who is the Father of the All, in whom the All came into being, the first Human, taught them by revealing his likeness in a male model" (ApocJohn 15:6-7). This concept of Wisdom as the reflection of God is also found in the *Wisdom of Solomon*.

> I learned both what is secret and what is manifest, for wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me... For wisdom is more mobile

---

[392] While there "is no one passage in Jewish wisdom literature that presents precisely [the *Apocryphon of John*'s] portrait, all of these characteristics of Pronoia...are attributed to Wisdom somewhere, and many of them are repeatedly emphasized" (King 2006, 227).

> than any motion; because of her pureness she pervades and penetrates all things. For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness. (Wis. 7:21-26)

And while these overlaps could be seen as general functions of wisdom figures common in Ancient Near and Middle Eastern scribal traditions (Fairen 2008, 138-140) more specific examples of the "Jewish" influence and overlaps can be found with specific references to Jewish tropes and characters, such as Adam and Noah. For example,

> Wisdom protected the first-formed father of the world, when he alone had been created; she delivered him from his transgression, and gave him strength to rule all things. But when an unrighteous man departed from her in his anger, he perished because in rage he killed his brother. When the earth was flooded because of him, wisdom again saved it, steering the righteous man by a paltry piece of wood. (Wis 10:1-4)

This is also found in the *Apocryphon of John* portrayal of "Wisdom" where she not only taught and protected Adam (18:24-27) but also

> the greatness of the light of Pronoia taught Noah. And he preached to the whole offspring, that is, the children of the humans. But those who were strangers to him did not listen to him. It is not like Moses said that they hid themselves in an ark, but they were hidden—not only Noah, but many other people from the immovable generation. (ApocJohn 24: 20-24)

And in much the same way that "Jewish" Wisdom protects her children (Wis 9:10-18), grieving for them and entreating God to aid them (Bar. 4:17-22;), so does Wisdom in the *Apocryphon of John* petition the Father of All.

> The Mother began to wander. She understood her deficiency when the brightness of her light was diminished and she was darkened, because her partner had not been in concord with her... She repented with great weeping. And the entreaty of her repentance was heard and all the Fullness praised the invisible virginal Spirit on her behalf. The holy Spirit poured over her (something) from their entire Fullness. For her partner did not come to her (by himself), but it was through the Fullness that he came to her in order that he might correct her deficiency." (ApocJohn 14:5,23)

And while the cosmic population of the *Apocryphon of John* does consists of a multiplicity of "Wisdom" figures (with a splitting of Wisdom into "Higher" Pronoia and "Lower" Sophia,[393] along with Eve and Zoë taking on wisdom roles as compared to the singular hypostasis found in *Proverbs*), and has a cosmology far more stratified and detailed than found in texts like the *Wisdom of Solomon*, the references to, and uses of, what are understood to be specifically "Jewish" Wisdom motifs (along with other Jewish tropes such as the use of *Genesis*) *can* of course— depending on the interpretive preference of the scholar—lead to the reasonable conclusion that the *Apocryphon of John could* have been "Jewish." Indeed, it is not difficult to claim that the authors of the *Apocryphon of John* were

---

[393] Such as the "Jewish" Paul does in 1 Cor. 2:12. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν·

Jews engaging in the reinterpretation of the cosmological myths of Israel in a manner not dissimilar to other "Jewish" authors such as those who wrote Enoch and various Dead Sea Scrolls who expanded stories of the Flood and the Nephilim (Fairen 2008, 146-165).

Even with the demotion of YHWH / the Creator, this small sample of "evidence" of how Marcion "preserves" Judaism, and how "Jewish" the *Apocryphon of John* could be, the claim that both must constitute an "anti-Jewish" stance is simply not the argumentative slam-dunk that scholars have assumed. Only by employing a very specific interpretive stance—one that constructs a limited notion of what is "Jewish" which in turn can be juxtaposed against, and helps construct, what is a "pro-" or "anti-Jewish Christian" source—can Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* by default be fundamentally against Judaism. And considering the "polyvalent" nature of what can be Jewish, it is equally plausible that Marcion was "pro-Jewish" or that the *Apocryphon of John* was a part of Judaism. It really depends on how "Judaism", "Judaisms" or what is "Jewish" is defined, and how that definition is used by scholarship primarily concerned with what is "Christianity."

3.3.4: Redescribing

Within "On redescribing Christian origins" (1996) Burton Mack mapped out a methodological program for scholars to examine ancient "Christian" groups outside of their own mythic narratives; he proposed to break "the Christian imagination of Christian origins [that] has echoed the gospel stories contained in the New Testament" (Mack 1996, 247). Basing his program upon the work of Jonathan Z. Smith, Mack advocated for a critical re-description of not just what is understood as "Christianity" but also how scholars have modeled the process of its development.[394]

> It is the way in which [Smith] works that I would like to propose as a model for the project we have in mind. His method can be described as the performance of four operations, not necessarily in separate, sequential stages: description, comparison, redescription, and the rectification of categories. (Mack 1996, 256)

While the scope of the redescription and reclassification of categories under investigation ("pro-" or "anti-" Jewish of both Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John*) is more modest and limited, this project nonetheless dovetails into Mack's program. For example, according to Mack, the first two steps in this kind of critical redescription are

---

[394] "For almost two thousand years, the Christian imagination of Christian origins has echoed the gospel stories contained in the New Testament. That is not surprising. The gospel accounts erased the pre-gospel histories; their inclusion within the church's New Testament consigned other accounts to oblivion; and during the long reach of Christian history, from the formation of the New Testament in the fourth century to the Enlightenment in the eighteenth, there was no other story except satires of cabbage stocks and kings" (Mack 1996, 247)

> (1) After identifying a text, topic, myth, ritual, genre, practice, or social- historical item as interesting and worthy of additional attention, as full a description as possible is in order. That involves paying close attention to the forms of its documentation, social-historical incidence, cultural context, and the particular situation to which the item might be considered a response. Careful description is absolutely necessary to make sure we have noticed the details and have not assumed that we already understand what it is that has caught our attention. Thick description is absolutely necessary in order to locate our exemplum in the texture of its social, historical, and cultural environments, the texture that gives it significance. To emphasize the need for description keeps us honest, keeps calling us back to the arena of social and empirical reality, and makes sure that we treat our examples as human constructs...
>
> (2) The next step is to look for an example of a similar construct in some other cultural context. This second instance of a construct will be used for making a comparison. Comparison is fundamental to the cognitive processes whereby we notice, classify, define, and think about things...In setting up a comparison for the purpose of humanistic learning one must constantly keep an eye on the features that commend themselves as similarities as well as those that appear to be differences. These features need to be described and ranked in light of questions about the significance of each example in its larger scheme of things. Done well we shall have learned much about each example of a phenomenon, something about the situational factors that may have accounted for the distinctive variants of each, and we may even be able to detail the cluster of features both examples have in common that makes them instances of a general phenomenon. (Mack 1996, 256- 257)

To a greater or lesser degree, both steps have been followed in relation to ancient and modern representations of Marcion, and the academic discourse that surrounds the *Apocryphon of John.* In each instance, not only have the social reconstructions of both been examined, but also how this social history has been

assumed to be an indication of some form of latent anti-Jewishness by modern scholars. For example, while Marcion's ancient representations, while polemical, nonetheless consistently portray his version of Jesus as having some affinity with other ancient constructions of Divine Wisdom (Section 1, Chapter 3). But what has been a constant trope of modern academic discussion about Marcion has not included a comparison with other Wisdom expressions, but has instead been about how on a very basic level, Marcion must have been anti-Jewish, a claim that was given more traction with superficial comparisons to Nazis and the anti-Jewish theological projects of the *„Institut zur Erforschung und Beseitigung des jüdischen Einflusses auf das deutsche kirchliche Leben."* As noted, this concern with "anti-Jewishness" was not something that can be found either in the early descriptions of Marcion nor in older academic reconstructions of him. It has only been a scholarly focus post-Holocaust and post-1967; it is a byproduct of the "Ways that Never Parted" model.

Regarding the *Apocryphon of John,* similarities with a variety of ancient data—both "Jewish" and "non-Jewish"—have been explored, such as comparable demiurgical or binary models of the cosmos which also interpret "Jewish" sources, such as *Genesis*. But there has also been an examination of how scholars have gone though great pains to cast the *Apocryphon of John* as *a priori* anti-Jewish, despite the fact that many of its "anti-Jewish" ideas can be found in

what are now supposedly pro-Jewish Christianities, such as found in the New Testament. But since scholars have insisted that the *Apocryphon of John* misappropriates "Judaism" it can not be a product of those who are in some way "Jewish" (such as those who produced *Matthew*, *John* or *Revelation*) but must have been authored by groups antagonistic to "Judaism" or by those who left that religion and as such were "no longer Jews."

What is now required, if one is to move beyond the standard and problematic ways in which representations of Marcion and the the *Apocryphon of John* have been deployed, is a serious engagement with the last two goals of Mack's model for redescription:

> (3) Invariably, the process of comparison will give rise to a redescription of the objects under investigation. That is because the comparative enterprise, having to take note of situations, human interests, the investments of a people in a project, and the circumstances, skills, and effects of its production or cultivation, will put us in touch with an ever more complex and interesting set of details...
>
> (4) At the end of such a comparative study it might be possible to rename the phenomenon of which our case studies are examples. This, at least, is what we should strive for. Smith's term for this operation is the *rectification of categories*. By that he means that the terms we use to name and describe things are important, and that the traditional terms we use are not innocent with respect to parochial connotations. It is frequently the case that a term can be found that fits the new descriptions better than older designations. (Mack 1996, 258-259)

On some level the redescription of Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* has begun, with the dismantling of such classifications and categories as "gnostic / Gnosticism," "heretic" and "Christian." But because of the current scholarly climate of the "Ways that Never Parted," both sets of data inevitably became defined along the axis of their supposed pro- or anti-Jewish stance. However, considering how the terms "Jew," "Jewish" and "Judaism" have been used by scholars of Christian Origins, this classification is hardly neutral, pigeonholing Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* as exemplars of what is anti-Jewish and hence "heretical" Christianity. Beyond how the "pro-" or "anti-Jewishness" of "Christian" sources is used to quarantine those groups that do not conform to the "Ways that Never Parted" model as inauthentically "Christian," what is Jewish also acts as a cipher for a whole host of modern issues and scholarly concerns that have little or no bearing on antiquity. As has been detailed above, "Judaism" has become equally as problematic a designation as "Christian," "Heresy" or "Gnostic." They are all products of modern classification and preference that has little or no utility in helping describe and account for ancient discourses like the *Apocryphon of John* or how Marcion has been represented.[395] In other words, the relative "anti-Jewishness" of Marcion or the

[395] Or others groups that do not fit within "normative" cliches such as *1 Enoch*, Philo, the *Apocalypse of Adam*.

Apocryphon of John has very little do do with these objects in antiquity; it is simply a cipher for modern issues.

So much as the term "Christianity" actually hinders the description of those discourses that are anachronistically deemed "Christian" (such as the New Testament), so too the terms "Jew","Jewish" and "Judaism" become equally problematic in describing "Christian Origins"; even (or especially) in light of the "Ways that Never Parted."

Therefore, in light of points 3) and 4) of Mack's model of redescription—and in the interest of fleshing out 1) and 2)—a change in the how scholars describe or classify both the *Apocryphon of John* and Marcion's representations is in order. But simply debunking the "anti-Jewishness" of Marcion[396] or finding analogous "Judaisms" in which to compare the *Apocryphon of John*[397] is unfortunately not enough; a "re-Judification" of the *Apocryphon of John* or a recasting of Marcion as "pro-Jewish" (or at least not "anti-Jewish") will not account for either phenomenon. This is an issue we find regarding "rebranded" pro-Jewish Christian texts such as those of the New Testament. Even though the "Jewishness" of New Testament texts is a more methodologically accurate descriptor than the old "Parting of the Ways" model, because what is "Jewish" is a

---

[396] As per Tyson 2005 and Hoffmann 1984

[397] See Section 2

modern classification top-heavy with modern concerns, this simply re-inscribes limited and anachronistic notions of what were the "Judaisms" in antiquity, for "Christian" appropriative purposes. Hence this is why the reconstruction of early "Christianity" is more a reflection of modern worries and angst than a reconstruction of antiquity (Arnal 2005); at its best Christianity must be Jewish...just not THAT Jewish (Crossley 2008, 173-193).

In light of this, it seems that not only do we need to rethink how we classify these phenomena, but also need to continue the task of abandoning these anachronistic categories. And while terms like "Heresy", "Gnostic" and even "Christian" have lost descriptive utility for data of the first and second century CE, it seems that it is also time to abandon the term "Jewish" or "Judaism" as well, for the same reasons.[398] If this could be accomplished, then perhaps a redescription of both Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* can occur.

3.3.5: Donald Who?

While there are of course many scholars of Christian Origins and Religious Studies theorists who have been attempting this kind of work, one

---

[398] In other words, in Christian Origins scholarship, is time to abandon the uncritical use of the English terms "Jewish", "Judaism(s)" or "Jew". Not only are these terms products of the modern discourse of "religion" but they are also so pregnant with modern conceptions, issues and concerns that they simply do not map onto the ancient world

approach that *could* help in providing the conceptual frame work for this kind of redescription is not provided by a scholar of religion. Instead, perhaps it would be more fruitful to take a different approach. This is where the work of Donald X. Vaccarino could gain utility.

As noted, Donald X. Vaccarino is not a scholar of religion...or of anything for that matter. Instead he is the inventor and designer of a "European-style" deck building card game called *Dominion.*[399] Unlike traditional card games such as poker or bridge that use the standard 52 cards of 4 suits, *Dominion* is more akin to "hobbyist" or competitive Collectible Card Games (CCG's) such as *Magic: the Gathering*, and require a variety of specialist cards that can only be used for that specific game. But unlike *Magic: the Gathering*, *Dominion* does not come with or require a pre-assembled "deck"[400] that players then proceed to use to battle each other, but is instead based on a game mechanic known as "deck building."

> Deck / Pool Building is a mechanism in which players start the game with a pre-determined set of cards / player pieces and add

---

[399] While the base set of *Dominion* was released in 2008, along with promotional "decks," there have been 9 "expansion" sets to date.

[400] "This type of game uses a basic rule structure and a large assortment of cards [of] which each have characteristics that contradict or supplement the basic rules. Each player selects a number of cards that they own to create a deck which they use in the game. This allows players to predetermine their strategies. The game rules define how many cards must be used and how many copies of each single card are allowed. Cards are sold in "booster packs". Packs contain a fixed number of cards and usually include one "rare" card, some "uncommon" cards, and the bulk of the pack contains "common" cards. Rare cards are generally more powerful or efficient than uncommons or commons, which can lead to the problem that the person who has spent the most money on cards wins. The original collectible card game was Magic: The Gathering. Its incredible success spawned dozens of copycat games." <http://boardgamegeek.com/wiki/page/Glossary&redirectedfrom=collectible_card_game#toc33>

> and change those pieces over the course of the game. Many deck-building games provide the players with a currency that they use to "buy" new items that are integrated into the deck or pool. These new resources generally expand the capabilities of the player and allow the player to build an "engine" to drive their future plays in the course of the game. This mechanism describes something that happens in play during the game as a function of the game, not customization of the game from a body of cards[401]

So how does the "deck building" of *Dominion* work? As part of the central conceit of *Dominion*, each player takes the role of a minor "lord" or "lady" in a generic medieval setting.[402] During each turn, the players "draft" various cards into their deck as a way to represent their expanding holdings. So for instance, a player may draft "Action Cards"[403] that may be played later to help them acquire

---

[401] <http://boardgamegeek.com/boardgamemechanic/2664/deck-pool-building>

[402] "You are a monarch, like your parents before you, a ruler of a small pleasant kingdom of rivers and evergreens. Unlike your parents, however, you have hopes and dreams! You want a bigger and more pleasant kingdom, with more rivers and a wider variety of trees. You want a Dominion! In all directions lie fiefs, freeholds, and feodums. All are small bits of land, controlled by petty lords and verging on anarchy. You will bring civilization to these people, uniting them under your banner. But wait! It must be something in the air; several other monarchs have had the exact same idea. You must race to get as much of the unclaimed land as possible, fending them off along the way. To do this you will hire minions, construct buildings, spruce up your castle, and fill your treasury. Your parents wouldn't be proud, but your grandparents, on your mother's side, would be delighted.This is a game of building a deck of cards. The deck is your Dominion. It contains your resources, victory points, and the things you can do. It starts out a small sad collection of Estates and Coppers, but you hope by the end of the game it will be brimming with Gold, Provinces, and the inhabitants and structures of your castle and kingdom" (Rio Grande Games 2008).

[403] For instance the action card "Festival" costs 5 "coins" to initially purchase, but it gains the player 2 extra actions, 1 extra "buy" in which other cards can be purchased and 2 coins for income when played. "Militia" costs 4, gains the player 2 coins, and each other player discards down to 3 cards in his hand. "Spy" costs 4, gains the player 1 extra card draw and 1 action. In addition, each player reveals the top card of his deck and either discards it or puts it back, your choice.

"coins"[404] in which they may "buy" victory cards[405] that contribute to final scoring and determining who wins the game.

As noted, the goal of *Dominion* (as with other deck building games) is to develop an "engine" in which players draft a limited number of pre-determined cards from a common pool, in the hopes that this will give them the best chance of earning the most victory points. But the cards that are drafted for each "engine" are not the same for each player, but will be a reflection of a player's preferences and play style. Now what is intriguing about *Dominion* and may provide some re-descriptive utility for Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* is that while *Dominion* consists of a total of 206 draftable "kingdom"decks (of 8-12 cards each) only 10 are used in any one game, based upon the choice of the players. This creates a game that not only is different every time, but is also one that can suit the play style and interests of each participant. So for instance, in the same game, one player may be very interactive with those with whom she is playing, directly "attacking" the engine of her opponents. But on the other hand, during the same game, another player can create an "engine" that avoids these attacks and allows the player to essentially

---

[404] For instance "Copper" provides "1" to the available coin pool, "Silver" provides "2" each time it is played, but initially costs "3" coins. "Gold" initially costs "6" but provides "3" coins each time it is played.

[405] These include "Estate" which is worth 1 Victory point and costs 2 coins, a "Duchy" is worth 3 Victory points with a cost of 5 and "Province" which is worth 5 victory points but costs 8 coins.

play a "multi-player solitaire" game, with little or no interaction beyond building the ideal Victory point deck. So each player—while playing the same game at the same time—can use the mechanism of deck building to strategically create an engine that will earn victory points, but is also based upon their own preferences and needs. In other words, while all players start with the same start "deck,"[406] *Dominion* can accommodate very different play styles from a variety of players. But most importantly, *Dominion* can be won with very different deck combinations based upon the choices of the players, in the *same single game*, with the *same draftable card pool* available to all players.

Now what *Dominion* offers—besides a good deal of fun—is the bare bones of a conceptual model in which to examine how both Marcion has been represented and the *Apocryphon of John* has been deployed, but in a way that—by avoiding the tools and models provided by Religious Studies and Christian Origins—avoids some of the problems; that the "religion" of "Judaism" was the cultural matrix in which "Christianity" developed and—under the "Ways that Never Parted"—the "heretics" are "anti-Jewish." But by appropriating some of the mechanisms of Vaccarino's *Dominion* we can perhaps examine elements of the *Apocryphon of John* and Marcion's representations without assuming their relative "pro-" or "anti-Jewishness" and the rhetorical minefield this is for modern

---

[406] Or in more Lightstoneian terms, "homological structures" (Lightstone 2006 [1984], 5).

scholarship. Instead, with the "deck building" model of *Dominion,* both can be compared with other contemporary discourses in the interests of seeing how each can construct, affiliate with (or against)[407] and reinterpret the huge variety of mythic, historical and ideological *bricolage* that represents the broad spectrum of cultural elements that have been understood on some level to be "Jewish."[408]

So let us assume then that the game being played is no longer *Dominion*, but one called *Nostalgic Israel*.[409] As per Smith's polyvalent mode of classification, ten selected points of comparison are assembled[410] into the *bricolage* "decks" of *Nostalgic Israel* (as opposed to *Dominion*'s "Kingdom Decks"). In the same manner as *Dominion,* in *Nostalgic Israel* no singular "card"

---

[407] Or in *Dominion* terms "Attack" other players who may perhaps "fight" back or simply defend and continue with their own engine construction.

[408] Of course this could and should include—but is not necessarily limited to— those elements noted by Mason such as *ethnoi*, National Cult, Philosophy, Familiar Traditions, Voluntary Association and Magic. But along with this *bricolage* one can also include "political and military cultures, educational and athletic institutions, and large-scale public entertainments, including tragic performances based on ancient myths, all of which included sacrifice and attention to the deity. What we would recognize as 'religious' activities were everywhere, but there was no phenomenon understood as 'religion'" (Mason 2007, 488).

[409] As opposed to the *ethnoi*, National Cult, Philosophy, Familiar Traditions, Voluntary Association and Magical practices that resonate with Nostalgic Rome, Nostalgic Egypt or Nostalgic Greece.

[410] As per another Smith notion "there is no data for religion. Religion is solely the creation of the scholars study. It is created for the scholar's analytic purposes by acts of comparison and generalization. Religion has no independent existence apart from the academy....For the self conscious student of religion, no datum possesses intrinsic interest. It is of value only insofar as it can serve as *exempli gratia* of some fundamental issue in the imagination of religion" (Smith xi 1982). Now while scholars do by their own choices select what their data will be, there is nonetheless an element of "Common Sense" regarding the data that is more "obviously" religious (Arnal 2013, 17-30); such as the common sense that Gandalf the Grey is not "religious" where the Pope is. Despite the use of similar tropes between the two, the Pope has more "mythic" authority (Lincoln 1989, 24-26).

or piece of *bricolage* has a unique or differential quality,[411] or is intrinsically more relevant to how the game is played (or how *Nostalgic Israel* is constructed). So depending on the decks used and the questions of comparison one wishes to answer, the 10 *bricolage* decks of *Nostalgic Israel* can be set up to "serve as *exempli gratia* of some fundamental issue in the imagination of religion" that is the concern of the scholar, the one organizing the game.

3.3.6: Lets Play Nostalgic Israel!

Let us then assume a 2-player "game" of *Nostalgic Israel* in which the *Apocryphon of John* and Marcion's representation are the "players." The 10 *bricolage* decks for this round of *Nostalgic Israel* are "Divine Wisdom," "Temple in Jerusalem," "Messiah," "Hebrew Bible," "Allegory," "Literal," "Land of Judea," "Jesus," "Demiurge" and "Hebrew."

What kind of result could we expect?

Marcion's cards or the deck engine he would create would focus on the *bricolage* of *Nostalgic Israel* that was most relevant to him or to his representation. And while the cards "drafted" will change depending on the initial *bricolage* decks selected and the players involved with the game in which he is

[411] Smith 1982, 5.

playing as set out above, it would be expected that Marcion's representation would draft:

Jesus: Due to his centrality to Marcion's representation as the revelation of the previously unknown God of Love,[412] Jesus would not only be an important card, but one that would be linked (played along with) Divine wisdom.

Divine Wisdom: The Jesus in Marcion's representation is a "*decentus Christi*" figure[413] who reveals the presence of a God of Love and as such clearly is analogous to how Divine Wisdom was portrayed in not just "Judaism" or "Christianity" but also within the context of the Ancient Near and Middle East (Fairen 2008, 132-139).

Hebrew Bible: While Marcion represented does not use the Hebrew Bible as "canonical," it is nonetheless understood to have been for Marcion "historically" correct.[414] However, because Jesus' revelation was from a new god, there would be no link or play synergy in Marcion's deck between "Jesus" and "Hebrew Bible" (as opposed to Justin Martyr for instance).

Literal: this lack of synergy between "Jesus" and "Hebrew Bible" would be emphasized via the *bricolage* card "Literal." Because of Marcion's apparent literalistic rendering of the Hebrew Bible—one that is understood to be part of his

---

[412] "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, Jesus descended [out of heaven] into Capernaum, a city in Galilee, and was teaching [in the synagogue] on the Sabbath days." (Euan. 3:1a / Marc. 4:7. See Head 1993 for the "suddenness" of Marcion's Jesus.) Ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τετρااαρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρῴδου,

[413] Marc. IV.7.1: Hoffman 1984, 226-28.

[414] Tyson 2006, 33; Moll 2010, 78

"Judizing" [415]—Jesus could not have been predicted by the text.[416] So while the Hebrew Bible is a central and an accurate portrayal of reality, it can have no connection with Jesus and the God of Love. In other words, the Hebrew Bible is an accurate revelation, just of a lesser god.

Demiurge. As a natural consequence of the representation of Marcion's[417] need to preserve the authority of the Hebrew Bible yet distance it from Jesus (the Divine Wisdom of a God of Love), a demiurge figure is required to account for the incongruence. In Marcion's representation this is the creator god of the Hebrew Bible.

Now what would be the shape of the deck constructed with the *Apocryphon of John*? And how would it compared to Marcion's*?*

Divine Wisdom: Like Marcion, the *Apocryphon of John* is indebted to the idea of "Divine Wisdom", both in the figure of Jesus but also the figure of Sophia. And while Jesus' "revelatory" nature is somewhat minor—considering Jesus[418] appears to be an addition to a "pre-Christian" version of the text—and Sophia is a

---

[415] Moll 2010, 78; Tyson 2006, 48; Knox 1942, 1-18. According to Tertullian this literalistic reading is "Jewish" in which Marcion "borrow[ed] poison from the Jew—the asp, as the adage runs, from the viper." (Marc. 3.8:1).

[416] In Marcion's representations, Jesus is distinct from the Creator's Christ who was still to come (Marc. 3.23:6), a Messiah who would re-gather the Jews from dispersion, re-establish Israel (Marc 4.6:3) and "with the recovery of their country; and after this life's course is over, [facilitate the Jews] repose in Hades in Abraham's bosom" (Marc 3.24:1). Marcion's second ["Jewish"] Christology is represented as historical. "The Christ of the Jews will be known as Emmanuel" (Marc 3.12:1; Isa 7:14); he will be a warrior (Marc 3.13:1), "born of a young woman" (Marc 3.13:5); he will take up the strength of Damascus and the spoils of Samara against the king of Assyrians (Isa 8:4; Marc 3.13:1). The Jewish Messiah by his very nature will be shown to be "the son and the spirit and the substance of the Creator" (Marc 3.6:8), but it is not prophesied in Scripture that he will suffer and die on a cross (Hoffmann 1984, 228).

[417] This could very well be not even close to how Marcion actually constructed his theology. As a product of apologetics of the Church Fathers, Marcion's beliefs, ideas and text are essentially lost. However, that being said because the image of Marcion figured so large in the theological fears of writers like Tertullian, his image is perhaps more important to ancient reconstructions—or the game—than what he may have really been. In other words, seeing how he is "played" gives an indication of the worries and goals of the people like Tertullian and Irenaeus who played his hand.

[418] Of course the lack of a Jesus figure is assumed by some to be an indication of non-Christian origin.

"fallen" wisdom, both conform to the general pattern of Divine Wisdom as it was understood in the Ancient World as figures of divine revelation; of both greater and lesser gods.

Hebrew Bible: Like Marcion, the *Apocryphon of John* assumes the "accuracy" of the Hebrew Scriptures. And while it uses other prestigious sources from antiquity, such as *Timaeus* (King, 2006) the Hebrew Bible is the primary mythic superstructure of the text's cosmology.

Allegory: Of course, one of the major differences between Marcion's representations and the *Apocryphon of John* is how the "accuracy" of the Hebrew Scriptures is interpreted. So while Marcion is understood to see the Hebrew Bible as literally "true," the *Apocryphon of John* seems to instead find allegorical "truth" within the text; particularly *Genesis.* This allegorical use of *Genesis* is done both by Jesus[419] and the supposed pre-Christian version of the text.

Demiurge: Again, much like Marcion's deployment, the *Apocryphon of John* seems to require a demiurgical figure. But unlike the ditheism of Marcion that at least grants divinity to YHWH (if of a secondary nature) the *Apocryphon of John*'s allegorical interoperation of the Hebrew Scriptures requires a corrupted and imperfect Demiurge to not only account for the corrupted state of the world,[420] but to also preserve the Hebrew mythical narrative's authority, if not its accuracy.

---

[419] "But [Jesus] smiled and said, 'Do not think it is, as Moses said, 'above the waters.' No, but when she had seen the wickedness which had happened, and the theft which her son had committed, she repented. And she was overcome by forgetfulness in the darkness of ignorance and she began to be ashamed. And she did not dare to return, but she was moving about. And the moving is the going to and fro.'" (ApocJohn 14:10-14)

[420] "And the Rulers took him and they placed him in paradise. And they said to him, 'Eat that is in idleness. For indeed their delight is bitter and their beauty is licentious. For their delight is deception and their trees are impiety. And their fruit is an incurable poison and their promise is death. And in the midst of paradise, they planted the tree of their life...Its root is bitter and its branches are deaths. Its shade is hate and deception dwells in its leaves. And its blossom is the anointment of evil. And its fruit is death, and desire is its seed, and it blossoms from the darkness. The dwelling place of those who taste from it is Hades, and the dark is their resting place" (ApocJohn 20:1-17).

Jesus: While Jesus is a figure in the *Apocryphon of John*—both as Wisdom and a resurrected "Christ"—he presence in the narrative is secondary. Indeed, the *Apocryphon of John*'s overall critique does not require the presence of Jesus.[421]

So in comparing these two, what does this game of *Nostalgic Israel* tell us?

While both Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* have very similar constructions of *Nostalgic Israel,* the inclusion of "Literal" and "Allegory" within their specific engines, and the different emphasis of Jesus in each, changes how they interpret their other *bricolage*. In other words, despite the similarities between the these traditionally understood "demiurgical," "heretical," "anti-Jewish," "Gnostics" expressions, their emphases on "Literal," "Allegory" and "Jesus" act as the overarching interpretive lenses in which the other bits of *bricolage* can be examined. And at least from this first step, there appears to be no "anti-Jewishness" within their *Nostalgic Israel*s .

But this comparison of such a small pool of *bricolage*[422] does not give a large enough sampling of "a similar construct in some other cultural context...In setting up a comparison for the purpose of humanistic learning one must constantly keep an eye on the features that commend themselves as similarities as

---

[421] For many scholars, Haer 1.29 is a "pre-christianised" version of the *Apocryphon of John.* (Logan 1996; King 2006)

[422] Or as Jonathan Z. Smith would have it the "*exempli gratia* of some fundamental issue in the imagination of religion" (Smith 1982, xi).

well as those that appear to be differences" (Mack 1996, 256).[423] A wider sample is required: both in "players" and the "decks" used. To accommodate this, "Demiurge," "Divine Wisdom" and "Land of Judea" are replaced with "Cosmological Concern," "Critique of the World" and "Greek." Also, as a way to expand the comparative samples, two more "players" will be invited; the *Gospel of John* and the representation of "Normative" Judaisms as has been part of the Christian origins imagining; a straw man or "Straw Rabbi" to be sure, but one whose representation—like Marcion's—is more about the "image" required for Christian Origins, than the "reality" of how "rabbis" may have thought and acted in the ancient world (Lieu 1996).

So how would this 4-player game of *Nostalgic Israel* proceed?

Marcion: As before, his focus would be "Jesus," "Hebrew Bible" and "Literal" for the same reasons as noted above. However, added to this would be;

Cosmological Concerns: considering how the place of the Creator God YHWH is part of Marcion's ditheism and is a point of contention and comparison between Marcion and the Straw Rabbi, "Cosmological Concerns" would also be drafted into Marcion's engine.

Messiah: Finally, of the choices available to him, "Messiah" would also be selected; not as a method of modifying "Jesus" (who is not in play) but as part of the "Literal" interpretation of the "Hebrew Bible" in which a future "messiah" will come from the Creator for the Creator's own people.

---

[423] Done well we shall have learned much about each example of a phenomenon, something about the situational factors that may have accounted for the distinctive variants of each, and we may even be able to detail the cluster of features both examples have in common that makes them instances of a general phenomenon. (Mack 1996, 256- 257)

Apocryphon of John: As before, "Hebrew Bible" and "Allegory" are central focuses for the *Apocryphon of* John, with "Jesus" acting in a minor revelatory role. But added from the new *bricolage* decks one could expect:

Greek: Not only does "Greek" emphasize the language in which the text was composed[424] but also the Greco-Roman intellectual underpinning of the *Apocryphon of John* (King 2006; Lewis 2013, 85-102).

Cosmological Concerns: With its extensive reinterpretation of the intellectual models of the time, most specifically *Genesis*, the *Apocryphon of John* constructs an elaborate two-tier cosmology in which the perfect realm of the "Monad" is poorly recreated by the imperfect and oppressive creator of the world. In other words, the *Apocryphon of John* goes through great effort to postulate a negative creation and ignorant creator within the confines of the narrative arch of *Genesis*.[425]

Now what can be said about the other players? Based upon how "Judaism" has been traditionally constructed by Christian Origins scholarship[426] the *bricolage* engine of the Straw Rabbi is predictable.

Hebrew Bible: While other sources of "religious" significance were available to ancient "Jews" (such as the Dead Sea Scrolls), most scholars privilege the Hebrew Bible as the primary "source" of "Judaism."

---

[424] Both the long and short version are preserved in Coptic.

[425] The *bricolage* card "Critique of the World" would have easily fit within the *Apocryphon of John*'s engine.

[426] For instance see Sanders 1993. For a critique see Arnal 2005, 58 and Crossley 2008, 173-193)

Literal: While a "literal" interpretation of the Hebrew Bible is of course not the only way ancient "Jews" thought about their texts,[427] this has nonetheless been understood by scholars as the most "Jewish" way to interpret them. Indeed, while a more allegorical interpretations of the Hebrew Bible is possible for "Jews" it usually reserved for those "rebranded" Christian groups who are "Jewish...Just not THAT Jewish" (Section 2, Chapter 2). Excessive allegory—as is found in the *Apocryphon of John*—is by default, un-Jewish.

Hebrew: Despite living in the Greco-Roman world (and despite translations of the Hebrew Bible like the LXX) scholars of Christian Origins seem insistent to place as central to "Judaism" a reliance on the Hebrew language. For instance, as a way to root Jesus as "Jewish" there is an assumption that he must have spoke "Hebrew" or a Semitic language despite the sources of Jesus' mythology all being composed in Greek (Arnal 2005, 56; Smith ed. 1995, 409-410).

Messiah: As opposed to the Messiah-ness of Jesus, which is seen as a "Pro-Jewish" yet problematically "Christian" trope[428] there is the assumption that the "Jewish" expectation of a future Messiah was also central to "Judaism."[429]

Land of Judea / Temple in Jerusalem: Both of these cards could or would be an "obvious" draft for the straw Rabbi. Despite being found throughout the Diaspora (Lightstone 2006, [1984]) the "religion" of the Rabbis was assumed to be focused on the Land of Judea and of course the Temple; pre- or post-70 CE (Neusner 2005, 56, 73-88)

---

[427] This of course does not include Lightstone's "Shamanistic" Judaisms of the Diaspora nor the "heretics" such as those who held to a "Two-Powers in Heaven" cosmology. This exclusion is intentional.

[428] *pace* Marshall 2001; Boyarin 2012.

[429] While "it is quite appropriate to search out and indeed to include illuminating parallels to New Testament messianic expectations in contemporary Jewish writing...[to] use the sorts of questions that one that one might ask in the course of that task, or the sort of criteria it might lead one to apply to the sources, in order to describe overall Jewish eschatological hopes the same period, may well be misleading. There is no particular reason to assume that the particular crystallization of Jewish messianism found in the New Testament was typical, normal or widespread in Judaism" (Stone 2011, 13; See also Green 1988).

Gospel of John: For *John*—much like the Straw Rabbi— some cards are obvious.

Jesus: the revelatory role of Jesus is the central element of *John*'s engine. Within *John* the idea of "knowing" Jesus equals "knowing" God (Meeks 1972, 68). "As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me" (John 17:21).[430] While this idea is not consistent throughout *John* there is a sense that those who are of God or chosen by him will be the only ones open to Jesus. "And he said, 'For this reason I have told you that no one can come to me unless it is granted by the Father'" (John 6:65; see also 12:37-40; 17:2). This function of Jesus is central to Johannine theology.

Messiah: While Jesus is perhaps more like the figure of "Divine Wisdom" in *John* as he is a "revealer" (and if such a card was in the *bricolage* pool it would have been drafted), he is cast in a modified role of messiah. "Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name" (John 20:30-31)[431] According Robert Kysar however, *John*'s messianism was

> suggestive of more than a political ruler. [It] connoted one who wold rescue the people from economic as well as political oppression; who would correct religious injustices and falsehoods; who would destroy the forces of evil in the world; who was variously thought of as a man, a superman, and an angelic type of divine creature" (Kysar 1993, 37)

Hebrew Bible: the "revelation" of *John*'s Jesus is portrayed as being in continuity with the "Hebrew Bible"; *John* is clearly indebted to the narrative of

---

[430] ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

[431] Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτου

the "Hebrew Bible" and casts itself as the continuation of it; particularly with its use of John the Baptist as a method of establishing continuity.[432]

Allegory: While *John* clearly requires an allegorical interpretations (in particular in comparison to the "Straw" Rabbis) this is of course not to the extent of the *Apocryphon of John* and the detailed reconfiguring of the cosmos. So while *John* does assume a very dualistic interpretation of *Nostalgic Israel* and casts "Jesus" into the role of a demiurge[433] this is not to the same extent as found in the the *Apocryphon of John.*

Critique of the World: As part of *John*'s narrative, the "world" is rendered as a place of darkness, one that is opposed to the Johanne community.[434] This kind

---

[432] Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν· Σὺ τίς εἶ; καὶ ὡμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὡμολόγησεν ὅτι Ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ οχριστός. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν· Τί οὖν; σὺ Ἠλίας εἶ; καὶ λέγει· Οὐκ εἰμί. Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη· Οὔ. εἶπαν οὖν αὐτῷ· Τίς εἶ; ἵνα ἀπόκρισιν δῶμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς· τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; ἔφη· Ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· Εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας ὁ προφήτης. Καὶἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἠλίας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης; ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων· Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι· ⌜μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε, ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος. ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ὅπου ἦν ⌜ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων. (John 1:19-28).

[433] As noted by Droge "In the Johannine imagination the world is under the control of the "Cosmic Archon" (12:31; 14:30; 16:11), the "Accuser" (8:44; 13:2, 27) whose tyranny of ignorance extends even to the sons of Light. How this predicament came about—that is, how it is that "Darkness" is still on the loose—is not addressed directly and stands in unresolved tension with the prologue's claim that "all things came about through the logos (1:3)" (Droge 2007 / 2008, 127) Clearly for John, Jesus functions as a demiurgical co-creator with God.

[434] "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. What has come into being in him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. He came as a witness to testify to the light, so that all might believe through him. He himself was not the light, but he came to testify to the light. The true light, which enlightens everyone, was coming into the world. He was in the world, and the world came into being through him; yet the world did not know him. He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him. But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God, who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God. And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth. (John testified to him and cried out, 'This was he of whom I said, "He who comes after me ranks ahead of me because he was before me." ') From his fullness we have all received, grace upon grace. The law indeed was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. No one has ever seen God. It is God the only Son, who is close to the Father's heart, who has made him known" (John 1:1-18).

of critique is part of *John*'s overall binary between the "Light" and "Dark," "above" and "below" (John 8:23, 2:31) "life" and "death" (John 3:36), "truth" and "lies" (John 8:44) and between the "Johannine Community" and the "Jews / world" (John 17:14).

So now what does this illustrate? First, what is obvious is that, unlike how he has been traditionally rendered, neither Marcion nor the Straw Rabbi seem to be "antagonistic" toward each other, nor contesting for any space. This seems quite different than the claim made by Daniel Boyarin who states

> I tend to think of Judaism and Christianity in late Antiquity as points on a continuum. On one end were the Marcionites,[435] the followers of the 2nd century Marcion, who believed that the Hebrew Bible had been written by an inferior God and had no standing for Christians and who completely denied the "Jewishness" of Christianity. On the other were the many Jews for whom Jesus meant nothing. (Boyarin 1999, 8).

But if one looks at the "Jews" of Boyarin, which the "Straw" Rabbi could represent, and Marcion in light of *Nostalgic Israel,* the argument could be made that they are not opposite ends of a spectrum, but should be placed right beside each other; simply because there is little disagreement between them on any contested space. As noted before, unlike some Christians like Tertullian who saw the Hebrew Bible as that which anticipates and is fulfilled by Jesus and Christianity; this is NOT the case for either Marcion or the Straw Rabbi. Of course the Hebrew Bible does not predict Jesus: for Marcion he was a "new

---

[435] See Willing 2002 on later reception of "Marcion" from the perspective of "Marcionites."

thing" who does not appear in any previous discourse—let alone the Hebrew Scriptures—and for Straw Rabbi he does not figure at all. Indeed both agree that the Jewish messiah was not Jesus, but is still to come. And of course YHWH was not the father of Jesus: that goes without saying. While the place of YHWH / the Creator might be considered an issue, when taken under consideration with all the points that the two agree upon, the assumed stance that Marcion "hates Jews and everything Jewish" and the implied links made with the Nazis is nothing more than hyperbole.

Indeed we have a similar lack of entanglement between the *Apocryphon of John* and the Straw Rabbi. While the Hebrew Bible is shared as a homological source, again because of the allegorical nature of its interpretation by the *Apocryphon of John*, the way that it is interpreted really has no overlaps with the Straw Rabbi. And while of course the Straw Rabbi would see the *Apocryphon of John* as part of the two powers heresy and as such blasphemous, considering the cosmological focus of the *Apocryphon of John,* this simply does not seem to be a critique of "Judaism" (*pace* King 2006). While YHWH and the population of the divine realm is certainly different than the Straw Rabbi's, its differences are still comparable to other "Judaisms" such as "shamanistic" and diaspora Judaisms (Section 3, Chapter 1). Indeed the cosmological reconfiguring of the text is more

about negative creation and the darkness of the world than about a critique of the "Jews."

The emphasis on the "Critique of the World" is something that is also shared by the *Gospel of John*. Like the *Apocryphon of John,* the *Gospel of John* is concerned with the state of the "world" and the Darkness that rules it. (Droge 2007 / 2008 127). Indeed—and problematically—the darkness of the world is equaled to the "Jews" (Fairen 2008, 119). While of course this is a major concern for more modern appropriations of the *Gospel of John* in how it has been interpreted and used, within the context of the text itself, and considering the "Ways that Never Parted" model, *John*'s use of the Hebrew Bible and other elements of the *bricolage* of *Nostalgic Israel* including the vilification of the "Jews" (or Judaens) could be easily construed as an intra group dispute (Brown 1979); especially since *John* is considered "Jewish."

3.3.7: Its All Just a Game.

While both the terms used, and tone of, the "Game of Nostalgic Israel" model are not part of the academic idiom, this is intentional, both as a means of destabilizing categories like "Judaism(s)", "Jew" or "Jewish", "Christian" or "Gnostic" but also as a strategy to destabilize the overt seriousness and, at times vitriol, of scholarly discourse as well. As detailed above (in particular Section 3,

Chapter 2) the hand-waving and polemical broadsides fired amongst various scholars over the (mis)use of the modern English term "Jew" as applied to antiquity—ranging from accusations of a non-Jewish Jesus (Pearson 1996) reminiscent of the "Aryan Christ" of the Nazis, to trying to make the "Jews" disappear (Reinhartz 2014), to *Judenrein* New Testaments (Levine 2007)—is, if not for the seriousness of the accusations, almost funny. Almost. So in light of this, instead of using traditional academic models to attempt to understand how the ancient peoples we moderns have retroactively classified as "Jewish" and "Christian" thought about their worlds—such as Smith's polyvalent Judaisms or even Lévi-Strauss' *bricolage*—the different idiom and tone employed with the "Game of Nostalgic Israel" was used to not just avoid some of the pitfalls that have become embedded with our academic models such as the "Ways that Never Parted," but also to avoid the rhetorical hysterics that seem inevitable with any discussion of the "Jewishness" of early "Christianity."

3.3.8: Marcion, the Apocryphon of John *and Salvaging Nostalgic Israel*

So what does this show us? First, it is possible to compare both Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* in relation to comparable and nominally "Jewish" data from the period without using the anachronistic categories "Jews" or "Judaism(s)" (with either "pro-" or "anti-" assumptions) as

the axis of comparison. In fact, by avoiding these classifications and terms that are consistently used to set out the terms of the discourse such as "(anti- / pro-) Jewish," "Christian," "heresy" etc., then "it might be possible to rename the phenomenon of which our case studies are examples of...the *rectification of categories*" (Mack 1996, 258). And by renaming our phenomena as examples of *Nostalgic Israel* this perhaps gives us a clearer idea of the goals and agendas of each.[436] But regardless, from this perspective neither Marcion's representation nor the *Apocryphon of John* appear anti-Jewish in any way; even by the standard of the Straw Rabbi. Considering that all four data sets, while perhaps having differing agendas, goals, authors and audiences that could be "against" each other (if not explicitly, then implicitly) they nonetheless share a concern with constructing, maintaining or appropriating the "mythic" status of the prestigious pedigree of *Nostalgic Israel*, however it is imagined.

So how does this "*rectification of categories*" help in relation to the topic of the Demiurge? By looking at these examples of Demiurgic speculation beyond being the *sine qua non* of "anti-Jewishness"—and as the variety of data explored certainly can not provide any justification for claiming such—what does the game of *Nostalgic Israel* tell us?

---

[436] Mack continues. "By that he means that the terms we use to name and describe things are important, and that the traditional terms we use are not innocent with respect to parochial connotations. It is frequently the case that a term can be found that fits the new descriptions better than older designations" (Mack 1996, 258).

Marcion's Demiurge: Throughout the examination, a major concern of Marcion according to his representation was one of incongruence. As all of our representations of him indicate, Marcion is thought to have understood the mythic narrative of Hebrew Bible and the "history" recorded within as reliable. Because of its "reliability" Marcion was understood to have no interest in "allegorical" interpretations of this narrative (Harnack 1924, 22 n.5; Moll 2012). Indeed, he is cast as wanting to preserve its integrity; particularly from Christian (mis) appropriation of it. This is perhaps a better accounting for why Marcion seems to have "purged" references of the Hebrew Bible from the Pauline letters; not out of any anti-Jewish animus but as a means of preservation of both the mythic narrative of Nostalgic Israel AND the integrity and novelty of Jesus (Tyson 2006, 79-123). Because the Jesus of Marcion's representation is the revelation of something unique and unprecedented,[437] it makes sense to insist that Jesus (and his representative Paul) can not rely on the old sources such as the Hebrew Bible. And it should be clear: this is not because these "old sources" were wrong or as traditionally rendered misunderstood by the "Jews" and in need of only "Christian" revelation to clarify them. According to his representation, Marcion

[437] In what is perhaps the opening of Marcion's Antithesis there seems to be an emphasis on the novelty of Jesus' revelation. "O Wonder Beyond Wonders, Rapture, Power, and Amazement is it, That one can say nothing at all [About the Gospel] Nor even conceive of it, Nor even compare it to anything." However, it should be noted that this come from the fourth-century *An Exposition of the Gospel* written by Ephren so its authenticity as being a first-hand writing of Marcion is questionable.

held to the notion that because Jesus and his God are utterly unprecedented, that they can have no bearing on this revelation, beyond being the stage in which Jesus preforms. But while Marcion is represented as claiming a unique status for Jesus and his god, he nonetheless casts them both as part of the intellectual currency of the time, with a Divine Wisdom, a material "Creator" who is distinct and utterly separate from a perfect god of love as can be found in other "demiurgical" authors like Plato and Philo. Marcion's representation requires a demiurge—a God of Law vs a God of Love—not out of any anti-Jewish animus but as a way to keep *Nostalgic Israel* stable and account for the new revelation of Jesus.[438]

With the *Apocryphon of John* again there is also an issue of incongruence. But considering its focus on *Genesis* and its allegorical interpretation that reconfigures the cosmology of *Nostalgic Israel*, the demiurge that emerges is radically different than that of Marcion's. For the *Apocryphon of John,* the demiurge is a reflection of a "gnostic pattern" (Smith 1982, 94); the literary and scribal[439] expression of the situational incongruence of the cessation of native kingship under foreign rule (Smith 2004). Hence, the *Apocryphon of John* is an

---

[438] Not only does this fit the data as it has been presented to us, but also dovetails into the agenda of the presenters of Marcion; the heresologists. For Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian, Marcion's "anti-Jewishness" wouldn't be a concern. It was his "Christianity" that was the issue. By avoiding appropriating the Hebrew Bible, Marcion would have avoided the issues of trying to invent a solution to the incongruence of the "Old Testament" and the "New."

[439] See Fairen, 2012.

> analogous expression [to] Ancient Near and Middle Eastern apocalypticism where, under the domination of a hegemonic foreign power, there is a belief in the inability, or lack of desire, of the titular national god to instigate an apocalyptic resolution. Hence, gnosticism —as an expression of the inherent tension within an ontological system that postulates a good deity with a corrupt world—recasts notions of "as above, so below" so that where once the wrong king would be replaced by the right god, it now is reconfigured so that the wrong king must reflect the wrong or illegitimate god in heaven. (Fairen 2008, 153-54; see also Smith 2004, 332)

From this political standpoint, texts such as the *Apocryphon of John* can be read very differently than their supposed "anti-Jewish" focus:

> And when she saw (the consequences of) her desire, it changed into a form of a lion-faced serpent . . . She cast it away from her . . . and *surrounded it with a luminous cloud and she placed a throne* in the middle of the cloud so no one of the immortal ones might see it, for she created it in ignorance . . . And she called his name Yaltabaoth. *This is the First Ruler*[440] *who took power from his mother* [divine wisdom] . . . *He became strong and created for himself other aeons with a flame of luminous fire which (still) exists now.* And he joined with his arrogance which is in him and *begot authorities for himself . . . And he placed seven kings—each corresponding to the firmaments of heaven—over the seven heavens, and five over the depths of the abyss, that they might reign. And he shared his fire with them"* (ApocJohn 10:7-11:8, emphasis mine).

Instead of being simply nihilistic and "mythical—crude, something of a freak" (Jonas, 2001 [1958], 320) or academically quarantined as a syncretistic

---

[440] The choice of translating **ⲡϣⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̀ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ** as "First Ruler" as opposed to " chief ruler" is not intended to cast the *Apocryphon of John* in a "gnostic" light, but to emphasis the "political" nature of Imperial Roman and how it might be understood within a scribal "as below, so above" situation.

"mixture of mysticism, asceticism, pantheism and polytheism" (Meier 1987, 126), through playing a game of *Nostalgic Israel*, how could this description of "above" be accounted by the authors of "below"?

As noted, this demiurgical "first Archon" as detailed in the *Apocryphon of John* seems to be a rationalisation of the "gnostic situation" of a foreign ruler or interloper king equalling a counterfeit god in heaven. In particular, Yaltabaoth's usurpation of his mother's power is not simply the usurpation of the national throne, but also a usurpation of the legitimating power of Divine Wisdom. For if the figure of Divine Wisdom functioned as the one "who revealed the beginning and the end of the universe as mediated by a god who held court in heaven and created by the use of divine law and according to a divine, written plan" (Smith 1983 [1975], 103), the Yaltabaoth's seizure of "power from his mother" could be read as a critique of a foreign king who not only takes a national throne, but also tries to legitimate such a claim via the "theft" of Wisdom's power. It seems that in the inverse of those scribes who, through ritual words of rectification (Smith 2004, 328), offer a way to legitimate a foreign king's position of power,[441] this section of the *Apocryphon of John* appears to be an analogous attempt to actively undermine the position of a foreign king who nonetheless claims *legitimacy* for

[441] For example, the Babylonian *Atiku* ritual in the Seleucid era changed from an archaic omen procedure concerning native kingship to a scribally reconfigured "*ritual for the rectification for a foreign king"* (Smith 1982, 94; emphasis original).

his position (Fairen 2012). Much like the king's heavenly counterpart who is "impious in his arrogance" (ApocJohn, 11:18), the foreign ruler has *not* received the "blessing" of the construction of Divine Wisdom, but has illegitimately taken it and as such is simply a corrupt pretender. This illegitimate king-god who is presented as attended by a whole variety of subordinate and secondary semi-divinities, such as Archons, Watchers, principalities, and "aeons with a flame of luminous fire which (still) exist now" is analogous to an imperial power structure in which a distant emperor holds the throne with the appearance of law and "shared his fire" by delegating power to various satraps, governors and vassal kings who rule with imperial authority (Fairen 2008, 164-166).

From this perspective, the *Apocryphon of John*'s reconfiguration of *Genesis* seems less like an "anti-Jewish" critique from "outside" but more like a critique from the position of someone invested in the narrative of *Nostalgic Israel* as authoritative and wishes to preserve it. Indeed, reconfiguring the mythic narrative of *Nostalgic Israel* to reflect this "gnostic situation" not only keeps Nostalgic Israel relevant, but is also a means of critiquing a foreign—in this case, Roman—ruler who claims to rule by divine right:

> The Secret Revelation of John's insistence that the rulers of the lower world are arrogant, unjust and malicious was a bold and subversive position to take in a world whose rulers styled themselves as servants of the gods and purveyors of justice. The Romans justified their right to rule a vast empire by asserting that the gods had favoured them due to their exemplary virtue; those

> who opposed them stood against divine providence and justice. Widely honoured as chosen agent of the gods on earth, the emperor was worshipped in cities and provinces throughout the Empire (King 2006, 157).

From this perspective, there is simply nothing "anti-Jewish" within the *Apocryphon of John*.

Conclusion

Naming, Classifying and Taxonomy

Names matter. What we call something, is not simply a neutral endeavor. How we classify, and how we sort our data—what in fact gets to be our "data'—is centrally important to the scholarship, even if we know it or not. According to Bruce Lincoln:

> all the epistemological functions of taxonomy are undeniable, placing primary emphasis on them obscures the fact that all knowers are themselves *objects* of knowledge as well as subjects insofar as they cannot and do not stand apart from the world that they seek to know. One consequence of this (and far from the least important) is that catagorizers come to be categorized according to their own categories. Taxonomy is thus not only a means for organizing information, but also—as it comes to organize the organizers—an instrument for the classification and manipulation of society, something that is particularly facilitated by the fashion in which taxonomic trees and binary oppositions can conveniently recode social hierarchies...(Lincoln 1989, 137)

In other words, not only is the act of naming and classification an attempt to say something about the things being categorized, but also (and perhaps more importantly) it says volumes about the interests, agendas and the context of the catagorizer as well.

For instance, the term "heretic." As it was applied in antiquity to Marcion, "heretic" implied not only that the heresologists understood Marcion's version of "Christianity" as "different" in some way from their own, but it also carried with

it a whole series of contextual assumptions of the organizers; the "taxonomic trees and binary oppositions [that] conveniently recod[ed] social hierarchies." In other words, "heretic" encoded the idea of difference, but also was a cipher that indicated that Marcion—who most likely "eats human flesh" (1 Apol. 26), "mutilates the Gospel [of *Luke*]" (Haer. I.27.2), "morbidly brood[s] over the question of the origin of evil" (Marc. I.2.1) and is *the* worse part of *the* worse part of the Pontus (Marc. I.1,1)—must have been "deviant" in some way from "orthodoxy."

In other words, the naming of Marcion a "heretic" says very little specifically about Marcion *per se*, but it does reflect his place as the "proximate other" (Smith 2004, 245-46) to the heresologists, and gives insight to the needs and agendas of writers who require such a "heretical" representation of him to help shore up their own nebulous constructions of "the Church" and of what is proper "Christianity."

Of course, the term "heretic" as it has been employed in antiquity has been deconstructed and essentially dismissed when it comes to modern academic practice, as being obviously too loaded with the theological agendas of writers

like Irenaeus and Tertullian.[442] So when Sebastian Moll insists that Marcion was not just a "heretic" but "the Arch-Heretic," beyond the anachronism of the term, this has some interesting implications for what is being assumed by Moll. Beyond granting a veneer of academic legitimacy to some of the less hyperbolic polemics of writers like Irenaeus and Tertullian (Moll 2010, 25-47) in Moll's use "Arch-heretic" tells us (un)surprisingly, very little about Marcion. What it does tell us however, is some of the conceptual tasks Moll wishes to accomplish with his invention of Marcion. And while of course there might be some theological commitment on the part of Moll that needs protecting,[443] what really seems to be at stake regarding Moll's insistence on the arch-heretical status of Marcion, is the "new picture" (Moll 2010, 10) that he wishes to paint that must be different from Harnack's portrayal that has dominated the field for close to a century (May 1987 / 1988, 129). In other words, as opposed to Harnack's proto-Protestant innovator (which has its own issues), Moll's "Arch-heretic" is deployed as a

---

[442] "Heresy was a particularly disturbing case of proximity in that the heretics claims to be Christian. To exclude them denies something of what it means to be a Christian, to become estranged from some part of one's own tradition. To exclude those who claim to belong means to divine the corporate self against itself in the interests of power and purity. Hence, the ambiguous rift of disturbing estrangements evident in the politics of exclusion" (King 2003, 24. see also 2–3).

[443] See note 18.

figure who cannot be any more than a footnote in history.[444] While having its antecedents in antiquity, Moll's use of the term heretic is obviously being used to encode more modern assumptions; both those that are in tune with some of the ancient claims about Marcion (Moll 2010, 43-45) but also about the need to place Marcion as the "other" to the dominant and all-but scholarly "orthodoxy" of Harnack's imagining.

And while not a concern of Moll (Moll 2010, 60) the "orthodoxy" of Harnack's representation of Marcion also carries with it modern concerns and worries. As noted above, for the majority of modern scholars—especially post-Harnack *and* post-Holocaust—Marcion is "heretical" not because there is a need to cast him as radically different than Harnack's representation, or because of some kind of theological preference, but because of the perceived similarities between Marcion and the intellectual environment that produced Harnack and the other antisemitic scholars of the late 19th and early 20th century. For example as noted in Section 1 Chapter 2, it seems that because Marcion and Harnack rejected the "Hebrew Bible," the assumption is that he, like Harnack, must have been anti-Jewish. Given the ubiquitousness of the "Ways that Never Parted" model, no

---

[444] "[Marcion] thus may have initiated the situation [canonization of the New Testament and the Christian appropriation of the Hebrew Bible as a means of supersessionism] but his complete inability to offer a real and lasting solution to it labels his contribution, while crucial, as purely negative and indirect. Among other things, it is this failure on Marcion's part which makes him ineligible for a comparison with such great men as Martin Luther. It is no accident that Marcion's movement remained an episode in the history of the Church, whereas Luther's became an era." (Moll 2010, 162)

other reason for his supposed "rejection" is needed or required. And with this first link, other antisemitism tropes, lamprey-like, can be easily attached to Marcion until even though almost 1800 years separated them, Marcion can be thought of as the 2nd century progenitor of the Nazis and other antisemitic expressions of the early 20th century. The western "heresy" of Nazis are now safely quarantined with the other "heretical" Christians.

A similar kind of phenomena surrounds the scholarly "naming" of the *Apocryphon of John* and how this has dictated the ways in which scholars have examined it. For example, because it was found in the Nag Hammadi Library, scholars initially determined that the *Apocryphon of John* must by default be "Gnostic."[445] And while what gets to be "Gnostic" has shifted over time (Fairen 2008; King 2003; Williams 1999) and the use of the term as a means of classification has become less and less tenable in scholarship,[446] the position of that which has been in the past classified as "Gnostic" still, as noted in Section 2 Chapter 2, need to maintained. So while the *Apocryphon of John* is for some an outlier simply by virtue of not being part of the New Testament (Tuckett 1986;

---

[445] "Once [the Apocryphon of John was] found, however, the work was classified as "Gnostic heresy" and largely relegated to the scholarly interests of a few specialists" (King 2006, vii)

[446] As noted, while content to dispense with "Gnosticism," David Brakke nonetheless argues that the identification "Gnostic" is still useful (as it applies to Sethians and as such the *Apocryphon of John*), with this term actually being used as a self-designation (Brakke 2010, 112-140)

Meier 1987) what makes it fundamentally "heretical" for more serious scholarship is harder to justify, since as argued in Section 2 Chapter 2, many of the "heresies" of antiquity are irrelevant for modern scholarly classification. Nonetheless, the *Apocryphon of John* still occupies the conceptual space of "heretic" for modern scholarly reconstructions. And considering the impact of the "Ways that Never Parted" model (both the mental gymnastics of those who use it and the vehemence against those who apparently do not), the supposed "un-" or "anti-Jewish" portrayal of God in the *Apocryphon of John*, not only makes it "heretical" theologically, but provides the means for scholars to act the part of the heresologists as well. So, as noted by King but worth repeating

> Pharisees play the role of antagonists of Jesus in both [the *Gospel* and *Apocryphon of John*] and the anti-Judaism in the [*Apocryphon*] *of John* would certainly fit a reading of passages in the *Gospel of John* such as 8:42-44: "Jesus said to them, 'If God were your Father, you would love me, for I came from God and now I am here. I did not come on my own, but he sent me. Why do you not understand what I say? It is because you cannot accept my word. You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks according to his own nature, for he is a liar and the father of lies." (King 2006, 236)

It seems that, like Moll's use of "Arch-Heretic," King's claim that the the *Apocryphon of John* is anti-Jewish does not say anything about the text by virtue of the simple fact that, as noted above, the supposed "anti-Jewishness" of *Gospel*

of John can not in any way be found in the *Apocryphon of John*. This does however, say quite a bit about King's construction of what must have been the "Judaisms" of the time, and considering the lack of criticism leveled against such a claim, is telling in how scholars in general agree with such a view of the *Apocryphon of John*. In other words, despite the fact that "Judaisms" encompass a wide variety of polyvalent and contradictory discourses in antiquity that overlap with the *Apocryphon of John*'s cosmology (see Section 3, Chapter 1) it must nonetheless be *a priori* anti-Jewish. Again this is more about the motivations of the classifier as opposed to social position of the classified. [447]

Taking the above into consideration, it can be illustrated that while scholars have dismissed the terms "heresy and gnostic" as descriptors loaded with old theological assumptions, a similar jettisoning of "key terms" of Christian Origins scholarship must continue.[448] In particular, since under the model of the "Ways that Never Parted" for something to be seen as properly "Christian" (and worthy of robust academic consideration) it must on some level be "Jewish," as both a way of accounting for the historical situation of the first "Christians," but

---

[447] "What one holds dear and wants to preserve is normative, intramurally and extramurally, in a given socio-religious formations...[and] may be authorized by means of inscribing current interests on the past as what has always been the case, thus a given" (Braun 2006, x).

[448] According to Jonathan Z. Smith "Religion has no independent existence apart from the academy. For this reason, the student of religion, and most particularly the historian of religion, must be relentlessly self-conscious. Indeed, this self-consciousness constitutes [her] primary expertise, [her] foremost object of study" (Smith 1982, xi)

more importantly, as a way of recitificying the supersessionalism and anti-Jewish agendas, of the old "Parting of the Ways" models. The problem with this however, is that even though the discursive boundary of "heresy" and "gnostic" has been torn down along the academic frontier, under the regime of the "Ways that Never Parted" a new discursive fence has simply been erected in its place. While the names of the principals have changed to "pro-" and "anti-Jewish," the boundary between what is "legitimate" and "deviate" Christianity has not changed. In other words, "anti-Jewishness" (and on the flip side "pro-Jewish") is about defining and placing the various Christianities along the spectrum of what is and is not, authentically Christian for the modern scholarly palate.

As stated at the beginning of this project, as a means of offering a corrective to these issues, three steps were required. First, a deconstruction of how scholars have used both Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* as exemplars of "anti-Jewish" Christianity was required in order to bring to light some of the implied and explicit scholarly agendas inherent within these claims, despite evidence to the contrary. Second, a new taxonomic idiom would be required in order to look at both Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* that avoids the issues of past scholarship that has simply pigeonholed each as *a priori* "anti-Jewish heretics." And third, a critical reconstruction of Marcion's representation and the *Apocryphon of John* would be required that avoided

interpreting them as heretical deviations or anti-Jewish polemic, and instead allow them to be compared in parity with other contemporary groups who shared similar interests in preserving the "mythic" authority of Nostalgic Israel.

Whether or not this attempt was successful remains to be seen. But what does seem certain by the above examination is that many of the concepts used to classify Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* are not just problematic or anachronistic, but are ideological specters with no real substance. As stated by Willi Braun

> As is the case with many other common words in the large domain of cultural studies—think of "culture" itself, or of "society," "ideology," "experience," "history," "tradition"...—the term "religion" is as familiar as it is difficult to contain within a cogent, agreed-upon, manageable frame of reference. Like the apparition of ghosts which often are a feature of religious talk and behavior, "religion" is a phantom-like category, a specter,...a free floating Something. As a specter, "religion" presents us with the dual problem of being flamboyantly real, meeting us in all forms of speech and in material representations, on the one hand, and frustrating apt to turn coy or disintegrate altogether when put under inquisition, on the other. (Braun 2000, 3-4)

While the coyness of the categories of "heresy" and "Gnosticism" have been noted, what is clearly needed as illustrated by the above, is a more serious engagement with the use and invention of "Christianities" and "Judaisms" especially in light of the "Ways that Never Parted" model. Under this current regime, both may seem flamboyantly real; especially Judaisms, if "true" Christianity—and the culture that upholds it—can be saved from the

antisemitism. But the specter that scholars have invented is just a ghost. A tame ghost, but a ghost nonetheless, and when put under investigation, disintegrates into ideological quantum foam.

So naming really does matter. How we name something not only dictates the questions we ask but also the answers we must receive. So the answer to the question posed in the title of this project is no. Marcion and the *Apocryphon of John* are not anti-Jewish, proto-Nazi expressions from antiquity, despite the modern requirements of the "Ways that Never Parted."

They are only revelations of lesser gods.

Bibliography

Ancient Sources

The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,3; andIV,1 with BG8502.2. NHMS 33. Edited by M. Waldstein and F. Wisse. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations. Edited by Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.

The Coptic Gnostic Library Vol II, II & V. Edited by James M. Robinson. Lieden: Brill, 2002.

The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation and Commentary. Edited by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr. and Edward Cook. San Francisco: HarperSan-Francisco, 1996.

Fragmenta philosophorum graecorum (Vol 1-3). Edited by Friedrich Wilhelm August Mullach. Paris: Editore Ambrosis Firmin Didot, 1883

The Greek New Testament. Edited by Aland, Aland, Karavidopoulos, Martini and Metzger. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, D-Stuttgart, 2005.

Irénée de Lyon: *Contre Les Hérésies*, Sources Chrétiennes 100, 153, 211, 264, and 294, Edited by A. Rousseau. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1965-1982,

The Nag Hammadi Library. Edited by James M. Robinson. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1988

The New Oxford Annotated Bible: NRSV with the Apocrypha. Edited by Michael D. Coogan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol. 1& 2. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983

Proclus: Commentary on Plato's Timaeus: Vol 1-5. Edited by Harold Tarrant. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

The Works of Philo: Greek Text with Morphology. Edited by Fudlseth, Skarsten and Borgen, Logos Research Systems, Inc, 2005.

Platonos Timaios: The Timaeus. Edited by Archer-Hind. London: Macmillan, 1888

Tertullian. *Adversus Marcionem*, Books I-V. Edited by Ernest Evans. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972

Modern Sources

Aland, Barbara. *Marcion: Versuch Einer Neuen Interpretation*. J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973.

—. "Sünde und Erlösung bei Marcion und die Konsequenz für die gog. Beiden Götter Marcions." Pages 147-157 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Vortage der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15.-18 August 2001 in Mainz.* Editied by May and Greschat. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter 2002.

Albertz, Rainer, and Jakob Wöhrle. *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Alexander, P. H. *The SBL Handbook of Style : For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.

Asad, Talal. "The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category." Pages 114-32 in *A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion*. Edited by M. Lambek, London: Blackwell. 2001 [1993]

Arnal, William. *The Symbolic Jesus : Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity*. London; Oakville, CT: Equinox, 2005.

—. “The Q Document.” Pages 119-154 in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered : Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Edited by Matt Jackson-McCabe. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Arnal, William and McCutcheon, Russell. *The Sacred is the Profane: The Political Nature of “Religion.”* Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2013

Balas, D. L. "Marcion Revisited. A ‘Post-Harnack’ Perspective.” Pages 95-108 in *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and the Early Church Fathers.* Edited by W.E. March. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1980.

Barton, John. "Marcion Revisited." Pages 341-354 in *The Old Testament: Canon, Literature and Theology: Collected Essays of John Barton.* Ashgate, 2002.

Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971 [1934].

Beck, Edmund. "Die Hyle bei Markion nach Ephräm." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* XLIV (1978): 5-30.

Becker, H. *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance.* New York: Free Press, 1963.

BeDuhn, Jason D. *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2013.

Bergen, Doris L. *Nazism and Christianity: Partners and Rivals? A Response to Richard Steigmann-Gall, the Holy Reich. Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919-1945*. Sage Publications, 2007.

—. *Twisted Cross : The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich*. Chapel Hill : University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Black, Matthew. “The New Creation in 1 Enoch.” In *Creation, Christ and Culture.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976

Blackman, Edwin Cyril. *Marcion and His Influence*. London, S. P. C. K., 1948.

Bloch, Maurice. “Why Religion is Nothing Special but Central.” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363 (2008): 2055-2061.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Richard Nice, Trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Bowersock, G.W. “Polytheism and monotheism in Arabia and the Three Palestines.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 51 (1997):1-10.

Bowker, John Westerdale. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature : An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture*. London ; Cambridge U.P., 1969.

Boyarin, Daniel. *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ*. New York: New Press, 2012.

—.“Beyond Judaisms: Meṭaṭron and the Divine Polymorphy of Ancient Judaism,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 41 (2010): 1-43.

—. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia, Pa.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

—. “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John.” Faculty of Divinity, Harvard University, 2001.

—. *Dying for God: Martyrdom and the Making of Christianity and Judaism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

—. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1994.

Brakke, David. *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Braun, Willi. “The First Shall be Last: The Gospel of Mark after the first century.” Pages 41-57 in *Chasing Down Religion: In the Sights of History and the Cognitive Sciences Essays in Honour of Luther H. Martin.* Edited by Panavotis Pachis and Donald Wiebe. Thessaloniki: Barbounakis, 2010.

—. “Foreword.” vii-xiv In Lightstone, Jack N., *The Commerce of the Sacred : Mediation of the Divine among Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.

—. “Religion.” Pages 3-18. In *Guide to the Study of Religion.* Edited by Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon. New York: Continuum, 2000.

Broek, R. *Gnostic Religion in Antiquity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Brown, Raymond Edward. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

Buell, Denise Kimber. *Why this New Race : Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Bultmann, Rudolph. *Theology of the New Testament: Vol. 2.* New York: Charles Scriber’s Sons, 1955.

—. *The Gospel of John*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971.

Carter, Warren. “Matthew’s Gospel: Jewish Christianity, Christian Judaism, or Neither?” Pages 155-180 in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered : Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*. Edited by Matt Jackson-McCabe. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Chamberlain, Anna Horst. *Meine Erinnerungen an Houston Stewart Chamberlain.* München: Beck, 1923.

Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. München: F. Buckmann, 1932.

Charron, Régine. “The ‘Apocryphon of John’ (NHC II, 1) and the Graeco-Egyptian Alchemical Literature.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 59 (2005): 438-56.

Cochrane, Arthur C. *The Church's Confession Under Hitler*. Philadelphia, Westminster Press, 1962.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness : Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Couchoud, P. L. "Is Marcion's Gospel One of the Synoptics?" *Hibbert Journal* XXXIV (1936): 265-77.

Crossley, James G. *Jesus in an Age of Terror : Scholarly Projects for a New American Century*. London: Equinox, 2008.

Dahl, Nils A. "The Arrogant Archon and the Lewd Sophia." Pages 689-712 in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28-31, 1978.* 2 Vols. Bently Layton, ed. Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen), 41. 2:Leiden: Brill 1980-81.

Davies, Alan T. "Aryan Christ : A Motif in Christian Anti-Semitism." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 12.4 (1975): 569-79.

Davies, Stevan L. *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom*. New York: Seabury, 1983.

Dawkins, Richard. *The God Delusion*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin Co., 2006.

Dever, William G. *Did God have a Wife?: Archaeology and Folk Religion in Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.

Dillon, J. *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. London: Duckworth, 1977.

Drijvers, H. J. W. "Marcionism in Syria : Principles, Problems, Polemics." *Second Century* 6.3 (1987): 153-72.

Dijkstra, Meindert. "I Have Blessed You by YHWH of Samaria and his Asherah." Pages 17-45 in *Only One God?: Monotheism in Ancient Israel and the Veneration of the Goddess Asherah*. Edited by Becking, Dijkstra, Korpel and Vriezen. London, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Droge Arthur J. "Sabbath Work/Sabbath Rest: Genesis, Thomas, John." *History of Religions* 47 /14 (2007): 112-141

Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus, Paul, and the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2011.

Dunderberg, Ismo. *Beyond Gnosticism: Myth, Lifestyle, and Society in the School of Valentinus.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2008

Edwards, M. J. *Catholicity and Heresy in the Early Church*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.

Efroymson, David P. "The Patristic Connection." in *Antisemitism and the Foundation of Christianity*. Alan T. Davis ed. New York: Paulist Press, 1979. 98-117.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Lost Christianities: The Battle for Scripture and the Faiths we Never Knew*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Elliott, J. K. "The Coptic Gnostic Library, v 2." *Novum Testamentum* 43.2 (2001): 201-210.

Emerton J. A. “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1958): 225–242

Enslin, Morton Scott. “The Pontic Mouse.” *Anglican Theological Review* 27.1 (1945): 1-16.

Evans, R.J. *In Defence of History.* London: Granta, 2000.

Evans, Richard J. *Nazism, Christianity and Political Religion: A Debate*. Sage Publications, 2007.

Fairen, Glen J. *As Below, So Above : Apocalypticism, Gnosticism and the Scribes of Qumran and Nag Hammadi*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008.

—. “Scribes.” in *Dictionary of the Bible and Western Culture.* Edited by Mary Ann Beavis and Michael J. Gilmour. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012.

Field, Geoffrey G. *Evangelist of Race: The Germanic Vision of Houston Stewart Chamberlain*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.

Filoramo Giovanni. *A History of Gnosticism*. Oxford and Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Fossum, J. E. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord. Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1985.

—. "Gen 1:26 and 2:7 in Judaism, Samaritianism and Gnosticism." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 16 (1985): 201-239.

Frankfurter, David. "Beyond 'Jewish Christianity': Continuing Religious Subcultures of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents." Pages 131-144 in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. Minneapolis : Fortress Press, 2007.

Fredriksen, Paula. "What 'Parting of the Ways'? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City." Pages 35-64 in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. Minneapolis : Fortress Press, 2007.

—. "Mandatory Retirement : Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time has Come to Go." *Studies in religion / Sciences religieuses* 35 (2006): 231-46.

—. "The Birth of Christianity and the Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism," in *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism : Reading the NewTestament After the Holocaust*. Edited by P. Fredriksen and A. Reinhartz. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.

Frevel, Christian, and Christophe Nihan. *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Freyne, Seán. *Jesus, A Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus Story*. Edinburg: T&T Clark, 2005.

—. "Galilean Questions to Crossan's Mediterranean Jesus." Pages 61-91 in *Whose Historical Jesus*? Edited by William Arnal and Michel Desjardins. Warterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997.

Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. New York : Oxford University Press 2000

—. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism. Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

—. "Marcion and Philosophy." *Vigiliae Christianae* XXVI (1972): 53-9.

Gailus, Manfred. *A Strange Obsession with Nazi Christianity: A Critical Comment on Steigmann-Gall's the Holy Reich*. Sage Publications, 2007.

Gerdmar, Anders. *Roots of Theological Anti-Semitism : German Biblical Interpretation and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Goodman, Martin. "Modelling the 'Parting of the Ways.'" Pages 119-130. In *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Grant, Robert M. *Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

— "Marcion and the Critical Method" Pages 207-215 in *From Jesus to Paul. Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare.* Edited by Peter Richardson & John Collidge Hurd. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press 1984.

—. *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Green, Bernard. *Christianity in Ancient Rome: The First Three Centuries*. London: T & T Clark, 2010.

Green, William. "Introduction: The Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question." Pages 1-13 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era.* Edited by Jacob Neusner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Gruen, Erich Stephen. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Grundmann, Walter. *Totale Kirche im totalen Staate: Kirche im Dritten Reich*. Dresden: O. Günther, 1934.

—*Jesus Der Galiläer und das Judentum*. Leipzig : Verlag Georg Wigand, 1940.

Hakola, Raimo. *Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness.* Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005

Hagner, Donald. "Matthew: Apostate, Reformer, Revolutionary?" *New Testament Studies.* 49 (2003): 193-209

Harland, Phil. "Imperial Cults within Local Cultural Life: Associations in Roman Asia." Ancient History Bulletin / Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte 17 (2003) 85-107.

Harnack, Adolf von. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*: Leipzig: Buchhandlung, 1888.

—. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott.* Leipzig: Buchhandlung, 1924.

—. *What is Christianity*? Translated by. Thomas Bailey Saunders. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1957.

—. *History of Dogma Vol. 1-5*. New York: Dover Publications, 1961.

Hartin, Patrick. *James (Sacra Pagina).* Collegeville, MN*:* Michael Glazier Inc, 1993.

Haynes, Stephen R. *Jews and the Christian Imagination: Reluctant Witnesses*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.

Hays, Christopher M. "Marcion Vs. Luke: A Response to the 'Plädoyer' of Matthias Klinghardt." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 99 (2008): 213-32.

Head, Peter M. "The Foreign God and the Sudden Christ : Theology and Christology in Marcion's Gospel Redaction." *Tyndale Bulletin* 44.2 (1993): 307-321.

Heschel, Susannah. "Nazifying Christian theology; Walter Grundmann and the Institute for the Study and Eradication of Jewish Influence on Church Life." *Church History* 63 (1994): 587-605.

—.*"When Jesus was an Aryan : The Protestant Church and Antisemitic Propaganda"* in *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust*.

Ericksen, Robert P., and Susannah Heschel eds. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

—. *The Aryan Jesus : Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Hexham, Irving. “Inventing 'Paganists': A Close Reading of Richard Steigmann-Gall's the Holy Reich.” *Sage Publications*, 2007.

Hoffmann, R. J. *Marcion. on the Restitution of Christianity. an Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984.

—. "How then Know this Troublous Teacher? further Reflections on Marcion and His Church." *Second Century* 6.3 (1987): 173-91.

Jacobson, Arland Dean. "The Literary Unity of Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101.3 (1982): 365-89.

Johnson, M. D. "Power Politics and New Testament Scholarship in the National Socialist Period." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 23.1 (1986): 1-24.

Jonas, Hans. *The Gnostic Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2001 [1958].

—. “Response to G. Quispel’s ‘Gnosticism and the New Testament.’” Pages 279-293 In *The Bible in Modern Scholarship.* Edited by J. Phillip Hyatt. Nashville, Tenn: Abingdon Press, 1965.

—. “Delimitation of the Gnostic Phenomena—Typological and Historical.” Pages 90-108 in *The Origins of Gnosticism: Colloquium of Messina 13-18 April, 1966*. Edited by Ugo Bianchi. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London, SCM, 1964.

Kinzig, Wolfram. *Harnack, Marcion und das Judentum: Nebst einer kommentierten Edition des Briefwechsels Adolf von Harnacks mit Houston Stewart Chamberlain.* Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004.

Kenney, John Peter. *Mystical Monotheism: A Study in Ancient Platonic Theology*. London: Brown University Press, 1991.

King, Karen L. "Reading Sex and Gender in the 'Secret Revelation of John'." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19 (2011): 519-38.

—. *The Secret Revelation of John*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

—. *What is Gnosticism?*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Klinghardt, Matthias. "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion." *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008): 1-27.

Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. *Excavating Q : The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Kloppenborg, John S., Meyer W. Marvin, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael Steinhauser, eds. *Q-Thomas Reader.* Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press 1990.

Knox, John. *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Kraemer, Ross S. "On the Meaning of the Term 'Jew' in Greco-Roman Inscriptions." *The Harvard Theological Review* 82.1 (1989): 35-53

Kraft, Robert A. "The Weighing of the Parts: Pivots and Pitfalls in the Study of Early Judaisms and their Early Christian Offspring." Pages 87-94 in *The Ways that Never Parted : Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Adam H. Becker, and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "Wisdom Passages in 1 Corinthians 2:6–16: Between Qumran and Proto-Gnosticism." In *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran, 241–53*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez and Eileen M. Schuller. New York: Brill, 1998.

Kysar, Robert. *John, the Maverick Gospel*. Louisville : Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.

Law, Timothy M. and Halton, Charles eds. *Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts.* The Marginalia Review of Books, 2014. http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean forum/

Levine, Amy-Jill. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus.* HarperOne, 2007.

Levine, Amy-Jill, and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds. *The Jewish Annotated New Testament: New Revised Standard Version Bible Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lewis, Nicola Denzy. *Cosmology and Fate in Gnosticism and Graeco-Roman Antiquity, Under Pitiless Skies*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Lieu, Judith M. "The Battle for Paul in the Second Century." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 75 (2010) 3-14.

— *Image and Reality : The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Lightstone, Jack N., *The Commerce of the Sacred: Mediation of the Divine among Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006 [1984].

—. "Whence the Rabbis? From Coherent Description to Fragmented Reconstruction." *Studies in Religion / Sciences Religieuses* 26 (1997): 275-295.

Lincoln, Bruce. *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*. Oxford University Press, 1989.

—. "Theses on Religion and Violence." *ISIM (Institute for the Study of Islam in the Modern World) Newsletter* 15 (2005): 12.

Logan, A. H. B. "The 'Apocryphon of John' and the Development of the 'Classic' Gnostic Myth." *Adamantius* 18 (2012): 136-50.

—. *The Gnostics : Identifying an Early Christian Cult*. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

—. *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1996.

—. "John and the Gnostics : The Significance of the Apocryphon of John for the Debate about the Origins of the Johannine Literature." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 43 (1991): 41-69.

Löhr, Winrich A."Did Marcion Distinguish between a Just God and Good God?" Pages 131-146 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Vortage der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15.-18 August 2001 in Mainz.* Editied by May and Greschat. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter 2002.

—. "Die Auslegung des Gesetzes bei Markion, den Gnostikern und den Manichäern." Pages 77-95 in *Stimili: Ecegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann.* Edited by Georg Schöllgen and Charles Scholten. Munster: Aschendorff, 1996

Lüdemann, Gerd. *Heretics : The Other Side of Early Christianity*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Lukas, Volker. *Rhetorik und literarischer 'Kampf': Tertullians Streitschrift gegen Marcion als Paradigma der Selbstvergewisserung der Orthodoxie gegenüber der Häresie*. Bern; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2008.

Luttikhuizen, Gerard P. *Gnostic Revisions of Genesis Stories and Early Jesus Traditions*. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2006.

McCutcheon, Russell T. *Religion and the Domestication of Dissent: Or How to Live in a Less than Perfect Nation*. London: Equinox, 2005.

—. *Manufacturing Religion : The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the Politics of Nostalgia*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2003.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *Christianity: The First Three Thousand Years.* Penguin Books, 2009.

Mack, Burton L. *The Christian Myth : Origins, Logic, and Legacy*. New York : Continuum, 2001.

—"On Redescribing Christian Origins." *Method and Theory for the Study of Religon* 8 (1996): 247.

—. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins*: Harper Collins, 1993

—. *Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia : Fortress Press, 1988.

MacRae, George W. "Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth." *Novum Testamentum* 12.2 (1970): 86-101.

Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology.* Rev. ed. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.

—.*The Social Gospel of Jesus*. Augsburg: Fortress Publishers, 2000.

—*Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*. Augsburg: Fortress Publishers, 2006.

Malina, Bruce J. and Pilch, John J. *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998

Markschies, Christoph. "Die Valentinianische Gnosis und Marcion — Einige neue Perpektiven." Pages 159-175 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Vorträge der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15. - 18. August 2001 in Mainz / Marcion and his impact of church history.* Edited by Gerhard May, Katharina Greschat, Martin Meiser. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Marshall, John W. *Parables of War : Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse*. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 2001.

Martens, John W. *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Masuzawa, Tomoko. *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism.* Chicago*:* University Of Chicago Press, 2005.

Matheson, Peter. *Third Reich and the Christian Churches.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Publishers, 1981.

Mason, Steve. “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism 38.* (2007): 457-512.

May, G. "Marcion in Contemporary Views : Results and Open Questions." *Second Century* 6.3 (1987/1988): 129-51.

—. “Markions Genesisauslegung und die Antihesen.” Pages 189-198 in *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche.* Edited by Wyrwa, Arland and Schaublin. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1997.

Meeks, Wayne A. "Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91.1 (1972): 44-72.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus: The Roots of the Problem and the Person, Vol. 1*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

— . *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus: Companions and Competitors, Vol 3*. New York; London: Doubleday, 2001.

Moll, Sebastian. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Mühlenberg, Ekkehard. "Marcion's Jealous God." Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979. 93-113.

Murphy, Tim. “Discourse.” Pages 396-408. In *Guide to the Study of Religion.* Edited by Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon. New York: Continuum, 2000.

Neusner, Jacob. *Theology of Normative Judaism: A Source Book*. Lanham: University Press of America, 2005.

Osborn, Eric. *Tertullian : First Theologian of the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Overbeck, Franz. *Christentum und Kultur.* Basel: Schwabe & Co., 1919

Pearson, Birger A. *Ancient Gnosticism : Traditions and Literature*. Minneapolis: Fortress Pr, 2007.

—. *The Emergence of the Christian Religion : Essays on Early Christianity*. Harrisburg, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1997.

—"The Gospel According to the Jesus Seminar." *Occasional Papers of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity* 35. The Claremont Graduate School, April 1996

—. *Gnosticism, Judaism and Egyptian Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

—. "The Problem of 'Jewish Gnostic' Literature." Pages 15-35 in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by C. W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson. Peabody MA: Hendrickson 1986.

Perdue, Leo G. "Cosmology and the Social Order in the Wisdom Tradition." Pages 457-478 in *The Sage of Israel and the Ancient Near East* Edited by Gammie and Perdue. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Perkins, P. *The Gnostic Dialogue. the Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.

Pétrement Simone. *A Separate God : The Christian Origins of Gnosticism*. San Francisco, Calif.: Harper, 1990.

Pfuhl, Edwin H. *The Deviance Process.* New York: Van Nostrand, 1980.

Plese, Zlatko. "Intertextuality and Conceptual Blending in the 'Apocryphon of John'." *Adamantius* 18 (2012): 118-35.

Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. "The Right and the Left Penis: Remarks on Textual Problems in the 'Apocryphon of John'." *Adamantius* 18 (2012): 65-70.

Quispel, Giles. *Gnostic Studies Vol. 1*. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1974.

Räisänen, Heikki. "Marcion and the Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism: A Reappraisal." Pages 191-205 in *Challenges to Biblical Interpretations: Collected Essays 1991-2000*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

—. *Marcion, Muhammad and the Mahatma : Exegetical Perspectives on the Encounter of Cultures and Faiths*. London England : SCM Press, 1997.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko and Becker, Adam H. "Introduction: Traditional Models and New Directions." Pages 1-34. In *The Ways that Never Parted : Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Law, Timothy M. and Halton, Charles eds. *Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts.* The Marginalia Review of Books, 2014. http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean forum/

Robinson, James M. "History of Q Research." Pages xix-lxxi in *The Critical Edition of Q*. Edited by James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann & John S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

—. "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: On the *Gattung* of Q." Pages 37-74 In *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays by James M. Robinson.* Edited by Christopher Heil and Joseph Verheyden. Dudley, MA: Leuven University Press, 2005 [1964].

—."Jesus as Logos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels." Pages 119-130 in *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays by James M. Robinson.* Edited by Christopher Heil and Joseph Verheyden. Dudley, MA: Leuven University Press, 2005 [1975].

Rosenberg, Alfred. *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts.* Munich: Hoheneichen, 1934.

Roth, Dieter T. "Marcion's Gospel and Luke : The History of Research in Current Debate." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127 (2008): 513-27.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*. New York: Seabury Press, 1974.

Rudolph, Kurt. *Gnosis*. Translated by Robert McLachlan Wilson. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1987 [1977].

Runia, David T. *Philo of Alexandria and The "Timaeus" of Plato.* Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1977.

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Augsburg: Fortress Publishers, 1983.

—. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia : Fortress Press, 1985.

—. *Judaism : Practice and Belief*. London; Philadelphia: Trinity Pr, 1992.

—. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Allen Lane Penguin Press, 1993.

—. "Jesus in Historical Context." *Theology Today*. 3 (1993): 429.

—. "Jesus, Ancient Judaism, and Modern Christianity." Pages 31-55 In *Jesus, Judaism and Christian Anti-Judaism: Reading the New Testament after the Holocaust.* Edited by Paula Fredriksen and Adele Reinharz. Louisville, KY and London: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

Sanders, Jack T. *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations*. Valley Forge, PA : Trinity Press International, 1993.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls : The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Philadelphia : Jewish Publication Society, 1994.

Schmid, Ulrich. *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995.

Schwartz, Seth R. *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society?: Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. London: A. and C. Black, 1954.

Scott, Joan W. "Experience." Pages 22-40 in *Feminists Theorize the Political.* Edited by Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Segal, Alan F. *The Other Judaisms of Late Antiquity*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987.

—. *Two Powers in Heaven : Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*. Leiden : Brill, 1977.

Smith, Carl B. *No Longer Jews : The Search for Gnostic Origins*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2004.

Smith, Jonathan Z. *Relating Religion : Essays in the Study of Religion*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 2004

—. *Drudgery Divine : On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1994.

—. *Map is Not Territory : Studies in the History of Religions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

—. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

—. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Smith, Jonathan Z. ed. "Hebrew Language." Pages 411-412 in *The HarperCollins Dictionary of Religion.* General Editor J.Z. Smith. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995.

Snyder, Graydon F. *Ante Pacem: Archaeological Evidence of Church Life before Constantine*. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 2003.

Somos, Róbert. "Strategy of Argumentation in Origen's 'Contra Celsum'." *Adamantius* 18 (2012): 200-17.

Start, Rodney and Bainbridge, William. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1985.

Steigmann-Gall, Richard. *The Holy Reich : Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919-1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Stone, M. E. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 2011.

Stowers, Stanley. “The Concepts of 'Religion', 'Political Religion' and the Study of Nazism.” Sage Publications, 2007.

Stroumsa, G. A. G. *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology*. Leiden: Brill, 1984.

Tröeger, Karl-Wolfgang. "The Attitude of the Gnostic Religion Towards Judaism as Viewed in a Variety of Perspectives." Pages 86-98 in *Colloque international sur les texts de Nag Hammadi.* Edited by Benard Barc. Quebec City: Les Press de Universite Laval, 1981.

Tsutsui, K. “Das Evangelium Marcions : Ein Neuer Versuch Der Textrekonstruktion.” *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 18 (1992): 67-132.

Tuckett, C. M. *Nag Hammadi and the Gospel Tradition: Synoptic Tradtion in the Nag Hammadi*. Edinburgh: T&T., 1986.

Tyson, Joseph B. *Marcion and Luke-Acts : A Defining Struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.

—.“Anti-Judaism in Marcion and His Opponents.” *Studies in Christian-Jewish Relations* 1.1, 2005.

—. *Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts : Reading as a Godfearer*., 1995.

Vaage, Leif E. *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus’ First Followers According to Q.* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Vaccarino, Donald X. “Dominion.” Rio Grande Games, 2008.

VanderKam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for all Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

Willing, Meike. “Die neue Ftage ded Marcionschülers Apelles - zur Rezeption marcionitischen Gedankenguts.” Pages 221-231 in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung: Vortage der Internationalen Fachkonferenz zu Marcion, gehalten vom 15.-18 August 2001 in Mainz.* Edited by May and Greschat. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Williams, D. S. "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108.3 (1989): 477-96.

Williams, Michael Allen. *Rethinking "Gnosticism" : An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press, 1999.

Wilson, Stephen G. " Jew' and Related Terms in the Ancient World." *Studies in religion* 33 (2004): 157-71.

—. "Marcion and the Jews." Pages 45-58 in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity : Volume 2: Separation and Polemic*. Edited by Stephen Wilson. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986.

—. *Related Strangers : Jews and Christians, 70-170 C.E*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Wright, N. T. *Christian Origins and the Question of God: The New Testament and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

—. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1996.

Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism. A Survey of the Proposed Evidences*. London: Tyndale Press, 1973.