

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor  
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors  
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)  
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)  
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

394





# Perceiving the Other in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity

Edited by  
Michal Bar-Asher Siegal, Wolfgang Grünstäudl,  
and Matthew Thiessen

Mohr Siebeck

MICHAL BAR-ASHER SIEGAL, born 1979; 2010 PhD in Judaic Studies from Yale University; currently the Rosen Family Career Development Chair in Judaic Studies at The Goldstein-Goren Department of Jewish Thought, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.

WOLFGANG GRÜNSTÄUDL, born 1977; 2013 PhD in New Testament Studies from University of Regensburg; currently assistant professor of Biblical and Historical Theology at the University of Wuppertal.

MATTHEW THIESSEN, born 1977; 2010 PhD in Religion from Duke University; currently associate professor of Religious Studies at McMaster University.

ISBN 978-3-16-154962-5

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

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

© 2017 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

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

The book was typeset and printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

## Acknowledgements

In May 2014, the editors of this volume met for the first time in the beautiful city of Heidelberg. We had been invited there as recipients of the Manfred Lautenschläger Award for Theological Promise, which we had been awarded for our first books. Over a weekend filled with Schlösser, Kaffeetrinken, Bier, and Spargelessen (and paper presentations, too), it became apparent that our various research interests overlapped. Each of us in our own way was tackling issues related to outsiders in antiquity, as well as interrogating the way in which modern scholarship narrates interactions between these different groups. We met a number of times during our visit to Heidelberg in order to plot out a way in which we could collaborate together. The current volume is the fruit of such plotting.

We are deeply grateful to the Forschungszentrum Internationale und Interdisziplinäre Theologie (FIIT) at the University of Heidelberg, especially its director, Professor Michael Welker, who is a tireless advocate for international and interdisciplinary collaboration on numerous topics related to the academic study of religion. We are also grateful to Bettina Höhnen for her unflagging and cheerful support for the winners of the Lautenschläger Award.

We would also like to thank Ben-Gurion University of the Negev and the faculty of the Goldstein-Goren Department of Jewish Thought for their hospitality in hosting the colloquium out of which the following papers grew. We are grateful for the financial generosity of the Goldstein-Goren Department of Jewish Thought and its head, Professor Haim Kreisel, as well as for the funds provided by the office of the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Ben-Gurion University.

Asher Benjamin, the administrator at Goldstein-Goren International Center for Jewish Thought, deserves untold thanks. He took care of most of the logistical issues surrounding the conference and enabled participants not only to learn from one another, but also to experience both the hidden delights of Beer Sheva, as well as better-known wonders such as Qumran, the Israel Museum, and the Shrine of the Book.

Most of all we are grateful to Manfred Lautenschläger for his support of the critical study of religion. Since 2013 he has generously funded the preeminent award granted to junior scholars of Religious Studies. The recognition and prestige that come with the Lautenschläger Award have done much to advance the careers of numerous recipients, including the careers of the editors. Further, his willingness to fund a conference dedicated to the study of religion enabled the current collaborative work to proceed. With him, we share both the desire and the conviction that the academic study of religion can contribute to the development of a world where difference, religious and otherwise, leads not to strife, but to harmony.

Michal Bar-Asher Siegal, Wolfgang Grünstäudl, Matthew Thiessen



## Table of Contents

<i>Albert I. Baumgarten</i>	
1. An Ancient Debate of Disciples .....	1
<i>Matthew Thiessen</i>	
2. Gentiles as Impure Animals in the Writings of Early Christ Followers	19
<i>Nathan Eubank</i>	
3. Damned Disciples: The Permeability of the Boundary between Insiders and Outsiders in Matthew and Paul .....	33
<i>Tobias Nicklas</i>	
4. Creating the Other: The “Jews” in the Gospel of John: Past and Future Lines of Scholarship .....	49
<i>Wolfgang Grünstäudl</i>	
5. Instant Polemics: Use and Reuse of Charges against Others in Early Christianity .....	67
<i>Patricia A. Duncan</i>	
6. The Case for Tolerance in the Early Christian (Pseudo-Clementine) Novel .....	83
<i>Katell Berthelot</i>	
7. The Paradoxical Similarities between the Jews and the Roman Other ..	95
<i>Isaiah M. Gafni</i>	
8. Various “Others” in Rabbinic Literature: Between Babylonia and the Land of Israel .....	111
<i>Haim Weiss</i>	
9. The Bodily Images of Shimon Bar Kosibah in Rabbinic Literature .....	121
<i>Michal Bar-Asher Siegal</i>	
10. “The Best of Them Is like a Brier”: On <i>b. ’Eruvin</i> 101a and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue in the Babylonian Talmud .....	131
<i>Christine Hayes</i>	
11. The Complicated Goy in Classical Rabbinic Sources .....	147

Contributors .....	169
Index of Sources .....	171
Index of Authors .....	185
Index of Subjects .....	191



## An Ancient Debate of Disciples

*Albert I. Baumgarten*  
Bar Ilan University

“Do Unto Others as They Do Unto You.”  
With Apologies to Leviticus, Hillel, Jesus,  
Rabbi Akiba, and Immanuel Kant

“We should forgive our enemies, but not  
before they are hanged.”  
Attributed to Heinrich Heine

”The historian knows ... that his witnesses  
can lie or be mistaken. But he is primarily  
interested in making them speak, so that  
he can understand them.”  
Marc Bloch, *The Historian's Craft*, 90.

### Was There an Ancient Debate of Disciples?

In writing a historical account of John the Baptist, or – if that is too difficult due to the nature of the sources – at a minimum the way he was portrayed and perceived, a fundamental choice must be made at the outset. The gospels and Acts remain the principal sources on which a study of this sort must be based. Yet virtually all scholars have recognized that these texts have an explicit bias to lower the status of John at almost every possible opportunity in order to enhance the stature of Jesus. John was not only portrayed as second best, but he explicitly and repeatedly announced his inferiority to Jesus. These circumstances found their visual expression in medieval Christian art, in which one of the standard scenes had John present at the crucifixion declaring the superiority of Jesus (against all chronological logic, since, according to the gospels, John had been executed long before). One example of this theme is the Grünewald Isenheim altarpiece, now in the Unterlinden Museum in Colmar. In this masterpiece, John is pointing to Jesus on the cross, with an open book in his other hand and the lamb of God at his feet, not merely insisting that he is the forerunner of the Messiah (John 3:28), but also foretelling both his own future and that of Jesus by quoting in Latin, John 3:30: “*illum oportet crescere me autem minui*,” “As he grows greater I must

grow less.”<sup>1</sup> In another famous painting, this one by El Greco (again, against all chronological logic), John is portrayed holding a cross and pointing to the lamb of God.

If one follows this path, the critical question as Walter Wink posed it becomes, “What is the role of John the Baptist in God’s redemptive purpose? That is to say, what is the role of John the Baptist in the Gospels and Acts?”<sup>2</sup> Not surprisingly, if this is the leading question, John’s proclamations of subordination to Jesus will be taken at face value and the significance of any passage that might suggest tension between John’s disciples and those of Jesus will be diminished.<sup>3</sup> Wink therefore summarized his conclusions as follows: polemic against the Baptist and his disciples played a secondary role at best in the gospels. John did not intend to form a movement. Most of those he baptized returned home to their ordinary lives. Only a few stayed with him, were his inner circle, and followed the lifestyle of fasting and prayer that he fostered. Jesus may have been a member of one of these two circles.

In their early experience, the disciples of John and Jesus fraternized freely with each other, since both groups endorsed the ministry of John. In the end, for the most part, the Baptist movement was absorbed into the *ekklesia* of Jesus. A few holdouts remained, whose voice can be heard in the Pseudo-Clementines. At the same time, many sects that had a central role for purifications in their practice flourished in the desert, and some may have claimed John the Baptist as their paradigm, but these groups quickly faded. They were not a real challenge to followers of Jesus. Therefore, the main goal of the evangelists was not to polemicize against these holdouts or schismatics, but to preserve John the Baptist for the Jesus movement, which was the one great survivor and heir of John the Baptist.<sup>4</sup>

In light of the way that Wink stated the question that guided his research, this conclusion is not surprising, but I beg to differ. At the very least, the fact that John taught his disciples a distinct prayer, Luke 11:1–4, perhaps what we call the Lord’s Prayer,<sup>5</sup> indicates that there was a significant independent group of disciples of John, who should have posed a problem for the disciples of Jesus. This justifies a search for a meaningful debate of disciples.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Grünwald Isenheim altarpiece can be viewed at <http://www.musee-unterlinden.com/en/collections/the-isenheim-altarpiece/>, El Greco’s “San Juan Bautista” can be viewed at [http://www.xn-espaaecultura-tnb.es/es/obras\\_de\\_excelencia/museo\\_de\\_bellas\\_arts\\_de\\_valencia/san\\_juan\\_bautista.html](http://www.xn-espaaecultura-tnb.es/es/obras_de_excelencia/museo_de_bellas_arts_de_valencia/san_juan_bautista.html), and Caravaggio’s “The Beheading of Saint John the Baptist,” which will be discussed below, can be viewed at <https://www.stjohnscocathedral.com/caravaggio/>.

<sup>2</sup> Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, SNTSMS 7 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), xii.

<sup>3</sup> Wink, *John the Baptist*, 11.

<sup>4</sup> Wink, *John the Baptist*, 107–15.

<sup>5</sup> Much depends on how one understands both the *kathōs* in Luke 11:1 and the absence of any connection between the Lord’s Prayer and John in Matt 6:9–13. I plan to devote a paper to analysis of the Lord’s Prayer against the background of Jewish belief in the Second Temple period, in particular to compare that prayer to the maxim of Antigonus of Socho, as analyzed by Elias J. Bickerman, “The Maxim of Antigonus of Socho,” *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, 3 vols., AGJU 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 2:270–89.

<sup>6</sup> Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Urchristentum 1. Buch, Johannes der Täufer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932), 116. Other scholars attach this same significance to Luke 11:1–4. See, e.g., Mau-

From another vantage point, what if one suspects that the gospels protest too much in making John subservient to Jesus? What if one follows the advice of Jonathan Z. Smith, who insisted:

While the “other” may be perceived as being LIKE-US or NOT-LIKE-US, he is in fact most problematic when he is TOO-MUCH-LIKE-US, or when he claims to BE-US. It is here that the real urgency of a “theory of the other” emerges. This urgency is called forth not by the requirement to place the “other” but rather to situate ourselves ... This is not a matter of the “far” but, preeminently, of the “near.” The problem is not alterity but similarity ... at times even identity.<sup>7</sup>

What if John, Jesus, and their groups of disciples were too close to each other and the problem of “similarity ... at times even identity,” engendered a debate of disciples, which, in turn, was behind the insistence on subordinating John to Jesus in the gospels?

However, if there really was a debate between the followers of John and Jesus, which continued until after their deaths, how can one reconstruct it with any degree of certainty? The gospels tell us only one side of the story and that is an inadequate basis for constructing the tenor of a debate. How can we learn what was said by the other side? More than one hundred years ago, at the end of the nineteenth century, Wilhelm Baldensperger attempted just that, focusing his attention on the Gospel of John and particularly on the prologue to that gospel as a basis for reconstructing what John’s disciples thought or said in defense of their belief in John’s place in the scenario of the end of days.<sup>8</sup> Not surprisingly, one contemporary reviewer of Baldensperger’s book, Rush Rhees, remarked:

This discussion has all the charm of great ingenuity, backed by wide learning; its lack is the failure of any adequate evidence of the existence of so well-defined a Baptist party as this argument requires. The chief evidence for our author is this gospel; for those who find his thesis over-ingenuous such evidence is inconclusive.<sup>9</sup>

In this light, Jean Daniélou is notable for accepting the gospel accounts as true testimony to the Catholic Christian heritage and its interpretation of these texts, insisting that John’s greatness allowed him “to be set aside, as he entered upon the mystery of self-abasement ... despite the fact that precursors usually want to live on”<sup>10</sup> and refuse to step aside, just as the Jews refused when the truth of Christianity was

---

rice Goguel, *Au Seuil de l’Évangile: Jean-Baptiste* (Paris: Payot, 1928), 75. See also Carl H. Kraeling (*John the Baptist* [New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1951], 172–75), who argued that John’s disciples were an important component of the early Jesus movement. There was close fraternization at the outset; the split and polemics came later, but the polemic did certainly come.

<sup>7</sup> Jonathan Z. Smith, “What a Difference a Difference Makes,” in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, “Others” in Late Antiquity*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 47.

<sup>8</sup> Wilhelm Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums: Sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1898). Along the same lines as Baldensperger, see Goguel, *Seuil*, 75–85.

<sup>9</sup> Rush Rhees, “Review of Baldensperger, *Prolog*,” *AmJT* 3 (1899): 370.

<sup>10</sup> Jean Daniélou, *The Work of John the Baptist*, trans. J.A. Horn (Baltimore: Helicon, 1966), 109.

revealed, “wanting to keep to the past when the future was already present.”<sup>11</sup> John, according to Daniélou, willingly fell into obscurity, but for John “the fact of falling into obscurity was nothing compared to the joy in his soul as he beheld the fulfillment of the mystery.”<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, and despite the warnings sounded by Rhee, even Daniélou conceded that at least during the period when John the Baptist and Jesus were both baptizing (as described in John 3–4) there was

some kind of conflict between John’s disciples and those of Jesus – and the impression certainly is given that the evangelist sought to cover it up as much as possible ... There was, then, an entire history of relations between the Johannine community and the Christian community. We have only one version of the situation, that of Jesus’ disciples. It is certainly unfortunate that we do not have any documents to give us the point of view of John’s disciples. Nevertheless, we can be sure that it was quite a dramatic situation at that time.<sup>13</sup>

In sum, according to Daniélou, unlike John himself, his “disciples never completely understood what it meant to be the disciples of a precursor,”<sup>14</sup> and echoes of this lack of understanding and of the conflict with the disciples of Jesus it engendered can still be heard in the gospels. This line of interpretation forced Daniélou to work hard and heavy to explain why John continued to baptize while Jesus was also baptizing, despite the fact that, according to Daniélou, John gladly accepted both his role as precursor and the fact that he was destined to diminish while Jesus would flourish. But then, when John himself was baptizing (John 3:22–24, with great success; see also John 4:1) and the disciples of Jesus were also baptizing (John 4:1–2; observe that the text specifies that Jesus was not baptizing, only his disciples), why did people see Jesus and John as competitors (John 4:1)?<sup>15</sup> Daniélou continued to put the blame on John’s disciples and not on John himself (even though the texts are explicit that it was John himself who was baptizing; blaming disciples or successors for later sectarian separation and polemic debates has a long history in many religious traditions),<sup>16</sup> conceding, nevertheless, that at least during the period when both John and Jesus were baptizing there was “some kind of conflict between John’s disciples and those of Jesus – and the impression certainly is given that the evangelist sought to cover it up as much as possible.”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. Daniélou (*Work of John*, 113) went so far in following the gospels and arguing for John’s self-abasement that he maintained that John 3:30 (“He must increase but I must decrease”), a saying that was at the center of the portrayal of John in later Christian art as noted above, was a genuine logion of John.

<sup>12</sup> Daniélou, *Work of John*, 113.

<sup>13</sup> Daniélou, *Work of John*, 108–9.

<sup>14</sup> Daniélou, *Work of John*, 111.

<sup>15</sup> Daniélou, *Work of John*, 95–108.

<sup>16</sup> For ancient Jewish and Christian examples, viewed against the background of classical parallels, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, “A Virgin Defiled: Some Rabbinic and Christian Views on the Origins of Heresy,” *USQR* 36 (1980): 1–11; now reprinted in idem, *The Significance of Yavneh and Other Essays on Jewish Hellenism*, TSAJ 136 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 535–47.

<sup>17</sup> Daniélou, *Work of John*, 108. Cf. Goguel (*Seuil*, 92), who understood these verses as evidence of competition and a rupture between Jesus and John themselves.

It is therefore not surprising that in the many years since Baldensperger wrote there have been numerous attempts to reconstruct the debate between the disciples of Jesus and John, and to overcome the difficulty that almost all our evidence comes from one side, with the position of the other side determined by reading the sources of their opponents against the grain. I have found special merit in the studies by Martin Dibelius,<sup>18</sup> Maurice Goguel,<sup>19</sup> Ernst Lohmeyer,<sup>20</sup> and Carl Kraeling.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Martin Dibelius, *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*, FRLANT 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911).

<sup>19</sup> Goguel, *Seuil*. See his summary of the issues that guided his work on p. 12.

<sup>20</sup> Lohmeyer, *Urchristentum*. Lohmeyer (1890–1946) was notable among German Protestant scholars of his time for his friendship with contemporary Jewish scholars, and for his conviction, expressed in a letter to Martin Buber, that “the Christian faith is only Christian as long as it retains in its heart the Jewish faith.” See Andreas Köhn, *Der Neutestamentler Ernst Lohmeyer: Studien zu Biographie und Theologie*, WUNT 2/180 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 298. Lohmeyer opposed the Nazis but served as an officer in the Wehrmacht. After the Soviet occupation of East Germany, he was arrested and executed in September of 1946. Nevertheless, despite his consistent attempt to draw a portrait of John that was both historically accurate and sympathetic, and from which I have learned a great deal, Lohmeyer’s Christian (Protestant) convictions were expressed most explicitly in his concluding chapter. There he insisted that John (*Urchristentum*, 174), despite his protest against conventional Jewish beliefs of his time, never uttered a statement of strong personal belief of the sort made by Luther, “Here I stand, I can do no other.” In addition, according to Lohmeyer (*Urchristentum*, 179–80), John demanded faith in his baptism, but never defined the nature of that faith. As far as John was concerned, his baptism was effective, *ex opera operato*, as in the Judaism of the time, as exemplified by sacrifice. Inevitably, this is more than somewhat demeaning of Judaism and of John from a Protestant perspective. Or, again (*Urchristentum*, 185), John’s baptism was a “magical” rite. Alternately, John’s baptism could lead to all sorts of strange and stranger consequences, foreign to Judaism, which ultimately found expression in “syncretistic Gnosticism.” Last of all, according to Lohmeyer (*Urchristentum*, 182–84), John’s baptism was limited. At most it could create a sect, but not become the basis for a world religion. That possibility only entered the picture with Christianity, where the wide-ranging implications of John’s work were effectively expressed in the gospels. John was a prophet of redemption, at best a witness (as seen clearly and correctly in the Fourth Gospel), pointing to a greater one to come. That is all John was. It is therefore not surprising that Lohmeyer (*Urchristentum*, 183, 185) concluded that John only had a small group of followers, lost in the greater mass of the Jewish people. Their belief in baptism was insufficient to prescribe a way of life for them; it was too abstract. Only a few could bear this burden. Because his baptism was ultimately so incomprehensible, a miracle of forgiveness and a divine gift, according to Lohmeyer (*Urchristentum*, 103), it did not have the power to mandate a lived life in history, in which people would remain pure and holy. Not surprisingly, therefore, John’s baptism made its ultimate and everlasting impact only when it became Christian baptism (*Urchristentum*, 188–89).

<sup>21</sup> Kraeling, *John the Baptist*. This list shows my clear preference for the older scholarship on the topic, as opposed to more recent scholarship, which tends to grasp at any opportunity, real, imagined, or invented, to minimize tensions between the Jesus movement and other varieties of Judaism at the time, whether the Baptist and his disciples or the later Rabbis, all suspiciously in service of contemporary agendas, which laudable as they may be may also do a disservice to history. See the note of caution sounded by Robert Kraft (“The Weighing of the Parts: Pivots and Pitfalls in the Study of Early Judaism and their Early Christian Offspring,” in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, TSAJ 95 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 87–94 [92]) that scholars must pay attention to the issues that were important to the historical participants and the way these issues affect our historical understandings. This means that there should be a limit to “redemptive criticism” in the name of current theological or political loyalties, or to attempts to achieve some sort of contemporary rapprochement by setting the clock back to a more favorable time and situation.

Among contemporary scholars, the forthcoming study by Joel Marcus, of which he has kindly sent me a copy in advance of its publication, clearly analyzes the pertinent issues from the perspective of what Marcus calls the “competition hypothesis.”<sup>22</sup>

### Christian Supersessionism and The “Johannine” Response

In order to achieve greater clarity, let me state the premise on which this article is based from another perspective. John and his baptism had a foundational role in the career of Jesus. This was a fact that the gospel authors could not deny.<sup>23</sup> At the same time, the gospels went to great lengths to subordinate John to Jesus and to insist that John was a forerunner of a greater truth yet to come, at the very best, as John himself asserted over and over again in the gospels. This strikes me as a rough analogy to what will later be known as Christian supersessionism, or replacement theology, vis-à-vis Judaism. The foundations of Christian belief in the Hebrew Bible were never denied, however the Hebrew Bible was understood as pointing in every place possible to Jesus as Christ and as the absolute fulfillment of the promises of the Hebrew Bible, eternally intended for that role. Despite this goal of Christian interpretation, the Jews were not convinced. In Daniélou’s succinct formulation (cited above at n. 11), the Jews wanted “to keep to the past when the future was already present.” At least some of the ways Jews pushed back against Christian supersessionism can be found in Jewish texts, so that Jews can speak in their own voice on this matter.<sup>24</sup>

I take Christian supersessionism as a paradigm for the way the gospels dealt with the John/Jesus relationship. I see the John/Jesus connection, as set forth in the gospels, as an early example or anticipation (in the context of the discussion in this article, dare I write forerunner?) of the Christian supersessionist strategy in dealing with predecessors. Therefore, if Jews refused to be demoted and replaced, then I would also expect the disciples of John to deny the attempt to make their master a mere herald proclaiming the truth, whose task was only to prepare the way for a greater one to come, specifically, Jesus. This expectation encourages me to look for this “Johannine” response, even if it involves the difficulties and uncertainties of reconstructing a missing voice based almost only on the sources written by their opponents, as already noted by Rhees more than a century ago.

<sup>22</sup> Joel Marcus, *John the Baptist in History and Theology*, The Personalities of the New Testament (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, forthcoming). In contrast, despite the claim that the book offers a new approach in light of recent (i. e., Qumran) evidence, by setting John firmly in a Second Temple Jewish context, I have found less merit and too much theologizing in Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

<sup>23</sup> See Goguel, *Seuil*, 141: “Peu de traits de la vie de Jésus ... nous paraissent d’une historicité aussi incontestable.” This conclusion is shared by numerous other scholars.

<sup>24</sup> For recent examples from the extensive literature on the topic see Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); idem, *The Jewish Jesus: How Judaism and Christianity Shaped Each Other* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

## Awkward Landings

In favor of this attempt to get behind the John/Jesus story and to tell the John story the gospel authors did not want to tell is appreciation of the diverse, fractious, and contentious world of the Second Temple period. Individuals were moving in and out of different groups (e.g., Josephus and Paul), creating longer and shorter term “awkward landings” in which elements of past and present loyalties did not always come together in ways that look coherent or consistent to us, especially when we view them from the perspective of the systems in which these different beliefs and practices were later organized into “orthodoxies.” Put otherwise, it would take some time for those later orthodoxies to work through all the diverse and sometimes contradictory elements that they inherited and put some order into the way of life observed and package of beliefs expected to be held by the members of the various movements.<sup>25</sup> It may be that Daniélou, more than any other scholar whose work I have read on John the Baptist, took advantage of the idea that movements do not move forward in full steps in assessing the gospel accounts concerning Jesus and John the Baptist, arguing that the stages of salvation overlap rather than succeed one another by replacement.<sup>26</sup>

In Acts 18–19 we read about two strands of “Johannine Christians”<sup>27</sup> in Ephesus, two similar but somewhat different “immature” forms of Christianity from the perspective of Luke-Acts, two “awkward landings” in the terms I have proposed. Each strand required a different sort of correction – Apollos, who only knew the baptism of John (Acts 18:25), needed a doctrinal lesson in the “New Way,” as taught by Priscilla and Aquila. The twelve disciples needed a ritual correction – baptism.<sup>28</sup> I begin

<sup>25</sup> This is my way of restating the larger point made by numerous colleagues concerning “the ways that never parted,” although, as I have argued elsewhere, this valid perspective has sometimes been taken too far in the enthusiasm engendered by a powerful notion that has potential implications for contemporary relations between Jews and Christians. See Albert Baumgarten, “The ‘Rule of the Martians’ in the Ancient Diaspora: Celsus and his Jew,” in *Jews and Christians in the First and Second Centuries: How to Write Their History*, ed. Peter J. Tomson and Joshua Schwartz, CRINT 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 398–430.

<sup>26</sup> Daniélou, *Work of John*, 106. Although, I must note that Daniélou made this point in service of his explicitly Christian perspective in reading the gospels. Note his comment on the Jews, who wanted “to keep to the past when the future was already present.”

<sup>27</sup> This term, adopted by Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 [New York: Doubleday, 1998], 639), goes back to Hans Conzelmann. Robert L. Webb (“John the Baptist and his Relationship to Jesus,” in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans, NTTS 19 [Leiden: Brill, 1994], 179–229 [213]) attempted to reduce the anomalies posed by these Johannine Christians in Ephesus by arguing that since Jesus began as a baptizer in the name of John even those who had only received the baptism of John could be considered in some sense disciples of Jesus.

<sup>28</sup> Hans Conzelmann (*Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. J. Limburg, T. Kraabel, and D. H. Juel, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987], 158) suggested that in light of these differences the two stories were originally independent. Cf. Goguel (*Seuil*, 100), who proposed that despite their differences the fact that both these episodes took place at Ephesus indicated that they were connected to each other. Goguel (*Seuil*, 104) added the observation that the fact that the Fourth Gospel, whose final form has some connection to Ephesus, polemicized against the disciples of John strengthened the historicity of the account of the presence in Ephesus of disciples who only knew the baptism of John according to Acts 18–19.

with Apollos. He was preaching in synagogues, had full knowledge of Jesus,<sup>29</sup> but only knew the baptism of John. How and why did Apollos put these pieces together as he did – beginning by teaching accurately in synagogues the facts about Jesus but knowing only the baptism of John – and then (perhaps after having been instructed in the “New Way” by Priscilla and Aquila) offering in Corinth strong proof from scriptures that Jesus was the Messiah based on the Scriptures? Although it is not mentioned explicitly, perhaps after learning and accepting the “New Way,” Apollos was then baptized into the baptism of Jesus, but that may only be an inference to be drawn from the continuation of the story – would the community in Ephesus have written letters recommending him to the community in Achaia had he not received the baptism of Jesus?<sup>30</sup> In any case, Apollos appears to us as a strange hybrid. Just what he was missing and what he needed to learn from Priscilla and Aquila in order to bring him fully into line with the outlook and practice of the disciples of Jesus, whose perspective was represented in Acts, remains unclear.<sup>31</sup> However, just to complicate the picture, that

<sup>29</sup> This is inherently paradoxical from the perspective of later belief of the followers of Jesus. How could one know *ta peri tou Iêsou*, “everything about Jesus” but not know baptism? To solve this problem, Baldensperger (*Prolog*, 94) suggested that *ta peri tou Iêsou* meant “messianic stuff” in general, without any special connection to belief in Jesus as the Messiah. However, Baldensperger’s suggestion falters in favor of the usual view. As Dibelius (*Überlieferung*, 93–94) pointed out, at least according to some sources, Paul’s knowledge of Jesus came from direct revelation but did not include baptism. See 1 Cor 1:14–17 (whose relevance to the story in Acts 18–19 was pointed out by Benjamin W. Bacon, “New and Old in Jesus’ Relation to John,” *JBL* 48 [1929]: 40–81 [81]), where Paul asserted that he preached the gospel, and had only baptized Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanus, insisting “that Christ did not send me to baptize.” Thus, even Paul, who practiced minimal baptism, knew that faith in Jesus included widespread baptism as performed by others. In light of these circumstances, it is therefore ironic that it was Paul who supposedly offered Christian baptism that brought the gift of the Holy Spirit in Ephesus. Underlying Baldensperger’s understanding of these passages in Acts was his insistence that later Christian sources positioned John’s disciples among Jewish sects and as such separated them completely from believers in Jesus. According to Baldensperger, this was anachronistic. It represented taking as accurate and historical the retrospective perspective of the later winners; the separation of Church and synagogue had not yet taken place in earlier centuries, such as at the time of the events described in Acts. One needed to reconstruct the earlier situation, without being misled by sources that portrayed it from a later perspective. In this, Baldensperger (*Prolog*, 100–1, 153) anticipated contemporary scholars on the “ways that never parted.”

<sup>30</sup> See B. T. D. Smith, “Apollos and the Twelve Disciples at Ephesus,” *JTS* 16 (1915): 241–46 (245–46). Another possibility, however, is suggested by the end of the story. Whatever Apollos’s accurate knowledge about Jesus might have been at the beginning, perhaps it only consisted of the simple details of his life and death. The end of the story suggests that Priscilla and Aquila taught him that Jesus was the Messiah, based on scripture, the point concerning which Apollos then strenuously confuted the Jews (Acts 18:28). This explanation of the account keeps the focus on doctrine from beginning to end.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Dibelius (*Überlieferung*, 95), who argued that Apollos was not a follower of John who then saw the light with the help of Priscilla and Aquila and then was baptized into the baptism of Jesus. Apollos, according to Dibelius, already “lived in the spirit” (Acts 18:25). He did not need the baptism of Jesus to acquire the Holy Spirit. In that case, however, one may wonder just what Apollos learned about the “new way” from Priscilla and Aquila. Continuing his dissent from the usual understanding of Apollos’s “conversion,” Dibelius (*Überlieferung*, 97–98) suggested that prior to meeting Priscilla and Aquila Apollos was unaware that Jesus began his career when he was baptized by John. I find this explanation unlikely, as Jesus’s baptism by John was one of the best known



same Apollos had a following in Corinth (1 Cor 1:12) and the community there was divided between followers of different apostles. Paul viewed Apollos as a friendly figure, a collaborator, and not as a rival, although one is entitled to wonder whether Paul was trying to put a good face on a potentially tense relationship (1 Cor 3:4–5; 4:6).

Something analogous took place when Paul arrived in Ephesus, as narrated in Acts 19. There Paul met converts who only knew the baptism of John and therefore had not received the Holy Spirit. From the perspective of Acts, these hybrids were stuck at an earlier intersection along the road to salvation. They needed ritual correction, and when Paul baptized these folks in the name of Jesus they began to speak in tongues and prophesy. The Holy Spirit became active in them and this was proof that they had reached the final destination as believers in Jesus.

The events narrated in Acts 18–19 were told from the perspective of believers in Jesus. For that reason it was easy for Wink to assert that Luke ignored the apologetic/polemical possibilities of these incidents. This supposedly showed that the circumstances described were of little consequence to Luke or possibly no longer existed.<sup>32</sup> However, this understanding of the passage is typical of Wink's overarching interest/objective in reading sources about John from the perspective of the gospels, as discussed above, in a way that loaded the dice in favor of the portrait drawn in the gospels and Acts. Obviously they related the success of apostles of Jesus, Paul in particular. For that reason, the gospels and Acts need to be read with more than one grain of salt. We must ask, "What do these sources want to hide? To what reality are they testifying despite themselves?" Therefore, even if the gospels and Acts told stories from the triumphalist perspective of believers in Jesus they reflected the diverse, fractious, and contentious world of Second Temple Jewish experience and its aftermath, with two strands of "Johannine Christians" as evidence of the diverse "awkward landings" and hybrid combinations of religious identity, in which John's disciples continued to offer and practice "his" baptism, in some form or other, well after his death and in the diaspora.<sup>33</sup>

Returning to Acts 18–19, debates about the status of Jesus were central to the critique of Celsus's Jew, effectively the only topic on which he wrote.<sup>34</sup> According to Acts 18 lively discussions about the messianic status of Jesus were taking place in diaspora synagogues, with Apollos confuting the Jews (who should have known

---

and most widely attested facts of his life. See n. 23 above. Accordingly, if Apollos knew *ta peri tou Iēsou* accurately (*akribōs*), how could he not have known this?

<sup>32</sup> Wink, *John the Baptist*, 84. In Wink's favor, however, it should be noted (as pointed out by Ernst Bammel, "The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition," *NTS* [1971–1972]: 95–128 [122]) that Q shows no signs of conflict between disciples. Matthew 14:12 (if Q) emphasizes strict continuity between the two movements.

<sup>33</sup> I expand here a point well made by Lohmeyer, *Urchristentum*, 26. See also Hermann Lichtenberger, "Täufergemeinden und frühchristlicher Täuferpolemik im letzten Drittel des 1. Jahrhunderts," *ZTK* 84 (1987): 36–57 (50–51). That John's disciples formed a movement that continued after his death, whose traces were found in the Ephesus incidents related in Acts 18–19, was acknowledged by Daniélou (*Work of John*, 140), although he hastened to add "that the history of this movement cannot be traced very far."

<sup>34</sup> On Celsus and his Jew see Baumgarten, "Rule of the Martian."

something about scripture, as opposed to the gentiles who were Paul's primary audience according to his letters!) that Jesus was the Messiah, according to scripture. However successful or not Apollos was in these debates,<sup>35</sup> the account in Acts, when combined with that of Celsus's Jew, is credible testimony to the existence of such debates in diaspora synagogues.

It is therefore significant that the other contentious issue in diaspora synagogues, according to Acts, was the baptism of John versus that of Jesus, as discussed above. The disciples of John and Jesus were apparently in the same diaspora synagogues, but the disciples of Jesus felt the need to encourage disciples of John to complete their spiritual journey either by experiencing the baptism of Jesus or through full belief in Jesus as Messiah. In other words, these were allied but somewhat competitive movements, as has been recognized by many scholars, such as Robert L. Webb, who noted that John's disciples were the closest analogy for the disciples of Jesus.<sup>36</sup> This seems like a situation tailor made for the narcissism of small differences to be a dominant force, for the circumstances indicated by J. Z. Smith, cited above, to come into play. These groups were not "far" but preeminently "near." Their problem was not alterity but similarity ... at times even identity. I suggest that this was the context in which the vehement and persistent demotion of John to Jesus was located. It is here that we should devote attempts to read the texts against the grain and attempt to reconstruct how the disciples of John saw the John/Jesus relationship.<sup>37</sup>

### Jesus as the Resurrected John

Despite all these considerations from differing points of view, the warning sounded by Rhee concerning the speculative nature of the effort to retrieve the perspective of the disciples of John noted at the outset of this paper remains real. At best, such speculation cannot be avoided but only minimized. In order to reduce that risk this article focuses on one of the few sets of passages in the gospels in which John's subordination to Jesus was understated, expressed tacitly rather than explicitly. Here we may find traditions about John and his followers that have been less reworked in service to the superiority of Jesus and the inferiority of John. I therefore will take up the traditions reported by Mark, Matthew, and Luke that Jesus was perceived as a reincarnation or resurrection of John the Baptist (Mark 6:14–16; Matt 14:1–2; Luke 9:7–9).<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> A dialogue between Apollos and Celsus's Jew is an interesting event to imagine. Celsus's Jew claimed that he knew the "true" account of the life of Jesus (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.13), an anti-gospel, as opposed to that told by Jesus's disciples, but we have little or no information about the contents of that account. Perhaps the only hint we have is the charge made by Celsus's Jew that Jesus's biological father was a Roman soldier named Panthera (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.32).

<sup>36</sup> Webb, "John the Baptist," 228.

<sup>37</sup> For an extended analysis of the passages in Acts 18–19 see Dibelius, *Überlieferung*, 87–98, and Goguel, *Seuil*, 98–105.

<sup>38</sup> My impetus for pursuing the analysis proposed below comes from the discussion in Lohmeyer (*Urchristentum*, 16–17), whose conclusions I want to take a step further.

John was known to be dead, as he had been executed at the order of Herod Antipas (according to Mark 6:29, the gory work was done by a “professional” and experienced executioner, a *spekoulatōr*,<sup>39</sup> as in the painting by Caravaggio in Malta: the bloody sword was already on the floor, and the executioner held a large knife behind his back, ready to sever the last tendons holding the head). At least as far as the gospel authors were concerned, John’s disciples also knew that he was dead since they had buried him themselves; they even informed Jesus of John’s death (Mark 6:29// Matt 14:12). From the perspective of the disciples of Jesus the curtain had come down on the final act in the drama of the life and career of John. He was no longer a factor in the scenario of salvation.<sup>40</sup>

One may wonder how the information in Mark 6:14–16; Matt 14:1–2; Luke 9:7–9, which I want to suggest was more favorable to John and reflected the incidents from the perspective of his disciples, managed to make it through the chain of transmission in the gospels without their being reworked to reflect the lower standing of John vis-à-vis Jesus. The first part of the answer is in Mark 6:29// Matt 14:12. For the gospel authors, Jesus and his disciples knew that John was dead and buried. His career on earth was over and his role in salvation was complete. Furthermore, both the gospel authors and their audiences knew that the popular identification of Jesus with John, Elijah, or one of the prophets was mistaken. The correct explanation of why Jesus was able to perform his miraculous deeds was because he was Jesus. For these reasons, even if Mark 6:14–16; Matt 14:1–2; Luke 9:7–9 can be understood as favorable to John and deprecatory to Jesus, this possibility did not apparently disturb the gospel authors. Any possible difficulty raised by these verses for the authors or readers of the gospels was thus effectively refuted in advance.

However, not everyone saw things that way. Jesus was performing all sorts of miracles, which showed that he had some sort of super-human power. He was a holy man far and above the usual sort (Mark 4:35–5:43), whose actions even reached Herod Antipas. These circumstances required an explanation. According to Mark 6:14–16:

King<sup>41</sup> Herod heard of it, for the fame of Jesus had spread; and people were saying, “John the Baptist has been raised to life, and that is why these miraculous powers are at work in him.” Others again, “He is a prophet like one of the old prophets.” But Herod, when he heard of it said, “This is John, whom I beheaded, raised from the dead.”

<sup>39</sup> A loanword from Latin, Dibelius, *Überlieferung*, 80 n. 1. The *spekoulatōr* was one of the principal “attendants” of Antipas, whose responsibility included executions, as noted by Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 314.

<sup>40</sup> Jean Steinmann, *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition*, trans. M. Boyes (New York: Harper, 1958), 103.

<sup>41</sup> This is famously the place where Antipas was called a king, even though he was only a tetrarch. His lack of full royal status was an increasing irritant, which culminated in conflicts that resulted in his deposition and exile according to Josephus. Joel Marcus (*Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 27 [New York: Doubleday, 2000], 398) suggested that the title “King” is not accidental but was meant to be ironic. See also n. 45.

At least two possibilities for explaining the deeds of Jesus were abroad: he was either the resurrected John or one of the ancient prophets come back to life. Faced with these choices, Herod, who had ordered John beheaded and therefore should have been well informed, endorsed the notion that Jesus was the resurrected John, and this despite the fact that Jesus had become known for his miracles while no source reports that John performed such deeds of power; in fact, for whatever it is worth as historical evidence, according to John 10:41, "John gave us no miraculous sign."<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, John, in his new incarnation as Jesus, was the beneficiary of powers that John may not have possessed when alive. In returning to life, John had been transformed and empowered; this was no mere encore. As Joel Marcus has summarized: "There is no other evidence that John the Baptist had a reputation as a wonder worker and indeed John 10:41 seems to imply that he was not ... The emphasis here is on the transformation wrought by his supposed resurrection."<sup>43</sup>

Matthew was more direct: "It was about that time that reports about Jesus reached the ears of Prince Herod. 'This is John the Baptist,' he said to his attendants; 'John has been raised to life, and that is why these miraculous powers are at work in him'" (Matt 14:1–2). There was one and only one way to explain the deeds of Jesus, and Herod voiced that understanding by identifying Jesus as John the Baptist raised to life.<sup>44</sup> Luke, a careful historian, treated this information differently and more circumspectly:

Now Prince Herod heard of all that was happening, and did not know what to make of it; for some were saying that John had been raised from the dead, others that Elijah had appeared, others again that one of the ancient prophets had come back to life. Herod said, "As for John, I beheaded him myself; but who is this I hear such talk about?" And he was anxious to see him. (Luke 9:7–9)

Several possibilities were circulating for identifying Jesus as a figure from the past come back to life: John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the ancient prophets. Herod was skeptical, "utterly at a loss,"<sup>45</sup> whether this was John, as he had beheaded John him-

---

<sup>42</sup> W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr. (*An Exegetical and Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 3 vols., ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991], 2:468, n. 19) suggested that this verse in John may not be historical but polemical, insisting that John the Baptist performed no miracles when in fact he did.

<sup>43</sup> Marcus, *Mark 1–8*, 393. In agreement with Marcus in stressing the supernatural powers that operated through the risen Baptist, see Willoughby C. Allen, *An Exegetical and Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, 3d ed., ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922 [1993 repr.]), 157. See also Ezra P. Gould (*An Exegetical and Critical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Mark*, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896], 109).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Ulrich Luz (*Matthew 8–20: A Commentary*, trans. J.E. Crouch, Hermenia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 306), who argued that Herod Antipas had a bad conscience because he had executed John and was afraid that John had been raised by some miracle worker. Luz dismissed the possibility that Matthew and his Jewish-Christian readers would have attributed to the "evil" Herod Antipas any pious ideas such as, for instance, the resurrection of martyrs or even expectations of an eschatological prophet.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. François Bovon (*Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, trans. C.M. Thomas, Hermenia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002], 350), who explained that Luke described

self (not quite literally, see above), but wondered nevertheless who this unusually god-gifted man might be and therefore was anxious to meet him.

Behind all these explanations stands one basic belief of ancient Jews. Against all the doubts that might be raised concerning the possibility that a dead person could be resurrected,<sup>46</sup> the ability of God to resurrect was the ultimate proof of his power. As Celsus's Jew put it (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 2.77): "We hope, it is true, to be resurrected in the body and have everlasting life, and that he who is sent to us (i. e., the messiah?) will be a pattern and leader of this by showing that it is not impossible for God to raise someone up again with his body." Along the same lines, Paul had to argue in 1 Cor 15:12–19 against those who insisted that there was no resurrection of the dead. Paul proclaimed that Jesus was resurrected as the "first fruits of the harvest of the dead" (1 Cor 15:20). However, if and when that "pattern and leader" appeared, and whoever would be the "first fruits of the harvest," a resurrection was also a sure sign that the scenario for the end of days was in full force and nearing its triumphant magnificent climax. God's will and power were now being displayed on earth as in heaven. It would therefore be appropriate for the person resurrected, as the beneficiary of the exercise of the supreme divine power, to have the ability to perform the extraordinary miracles associated with Jesus. In light of these beliefs, it was perfectly comprehensible that John on his first round on earth may have performed no miracles, but now, returned as Jesus, became notorious for his superhuman deeds. The only question troubling some was whether Jesus was John, Elijah, Antipas, the very ruler who had ordered John put to death, endorsed identifying Jesus with John.<sup>47</sup>

---

Herod as a greedy and novelty-hungry personality, who was from the outset certain of only one thing: John was not Jesus, because Herod Antipas knew that he had ordered the execution of John. Bovon further noted the impudence and nonchalance with which the "tyrant" expressed himself. Against Bovon, I prefer to follow the philological insight offered by Alfred Plummer (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary According to the Gospel of St. Luke*, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914], 241), who indicated that the Greek verb employed in Luke 9:7 to express Herod's response to Jesus=John was a classical word, unknown in the Septuagint and in the New Testament outside of Luke-Acts: *diēporei*, which should be translated as "utterly at a loss."

<sup>46</sup> "The hope of worms," according to Celsus, writing in his own name. Celsus added that some Jews and Christians did not accept this belief, which showed its utter repulsiveness (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 5.14). According to Claudia Setzer (*Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self Definition* [Boston: Brill, 2004], 1–20), belief in bodily resurrection became a major test or marker of orthodoxy in both Judaism and Christianity.

<sup>47</sup> In light of the argument in this paragraph, I cannot agree with the conclusion proposed by Collins (*Mark*, 304) that the return of John as Jesus was not "a release of the powers of the Age to come," and should be understood in less eschatological terms as the result of "a popular religious idea that an especially good or especially evil person could come back from the dead by some mysterious process." According to Collins (*Mark*, 304), "the closest analogy (to the belief attested to in Mark 6:14–16 that Jesus was John returned to life) is the notion of Nero *redivivus*." Collins made this suggestion despite the fact that she recognized the significance of the fact that "John the Baptizer did not work miracles (cf. John 10:41), it belongs to the logic of this popular idea that Jesus, as John *redivivus*, had extraordinary powers." Nor can I accept the conclusion of Goguel (*Seuil*, 48–49): "il faut se rappeler que l'idée de la resurrection d'un mort n'était pas alors la chose

However, if Jesus was nothing other than John resurrected, *then* Jesus was subordinated to John, as was recognized by Lohmeyer,<sup>48</sup> who pointed to the potential significance of this identification: Jesus was now subservient to John the Baptist, not the other way around as was usual in the New Testament. Moreover, Jesus was not the only one who was executed and then subsequently proclaimed to be resurrected: so was John, well before Jesus! John's career did not end with his execution and burial, as told by Mark and Matthew. Perhaps for the gospels John's story was over with his execution,<sup>49</sup> but not for Herod, in some ways the most unexpected and unusual but therefore also a reliable witness to John's resurrection, which then indicated that the grand finale of end-times was soon to come and pointed to John's exalted place in that glorious event.

### cui bono

At this point one must ask the most basic of all historiographic questions: *cui bono*.<sup>50</sup> Who would have had an interest in promoting John at the expense of Jesus, arguing that John was resurrected first and was therefore the "pattern and leader" in proving the power of God to raise the dead, and that Jesus was nothing more than John returned to life, as even Herod Antipas recognized? Who would have wanted to turn Jesus himself into an unwilling witness to the ultimate status of John?

When put this way, the obvious suspects (not merely the speculative/default or "usual" ones) must be the disciples of John. They would have had a ready explana-

---

extraordinaire, paradoxale et, pour tout dire en un mot, impossible qu'elle est pour nous." The fact that Jesus raised the dead showed that he was much more than the lower sorts of wonder workers, thoroughly despicable, with whom Celsus's Jew argued that Jesus belonged. These charlatans learned from the Egyptians how to put on a show in the market place, charging only a few obols, in which they displayed expensive banquets and dining tables filled with non-existent cakes, and dishes that moved as though they were alive. At the same time, they drove demons out of men, blew away diseases, and invoked the souls of heroes (Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1.68). Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 2:468) dismissed the notion that Jesus was John resurrected as "a very ill-informed piece of popular superstition."

<sup>48</sup> Lohmeyer, *Urchristentum*, 16–17. Marcus (*Mark* 1–8, 398–99) treated this incident as an example of Herod's inadequacy as a ruler whose pretensions to royal authority seem "almost farcical." Cf. Taylor (*The Immerser*, 294), who waffles on the significance of this tradition, explaining it away as caused by the fact that people did not necessarily know just when John had been executed and therefore they confused Jesus and John. But our sources clearly indicate otherwise. People were fully aware that John was dead. It was central to the popular belief that he had been dead, then resurrected and therefore had the power to perform the miracles attributed to Jesus. Compare the clear conclusion articulated by Bammel ("The Baptist," 125): "John's followers believed that he was taken away by God while being put to death – like Elijah and Enoch, and returned to earth as Jesus."

<sup>49</sup> Dibelius, *Überlieferung*, 85; Steinmann, *Saint John*, 103. However, as expected, and in accord with his general approach, Wink (*John the Baptist*, 11) insisted that no polemic against the disciples of John was intended here.

<sup>50</sup> As Marc Bloch (*The Historian's Craft*, trans. J.R. Strayer [New York: Vintage Books, 1964], 93) put it, "in its effort to achieve knowledge as deep as possible, criticism seeks out the impostor behind the imposture, in order to reveal and then comprehend the motives of the imposture."

tion for why John was the beneficiary of this special grace. At the very least, they might have argued that John died as a martyr to his faith and message.<sup>51</sup> As indicated at least twice in the passages discussing the martyrdom of the mother and seven sons in 2 Macc 7:9 and 7:23 martyrs announced their willingness to die in the context of their belief in resurrection.

Fiend though you are, you are setting us free from this present life, and, since we die for his laws, the King of the universe will raise us up to a life everlastingly made new. (7:9)

It is the creator of the universe who molds man at his birth and plans the origin of all things. Therefore, he, in his mercy, will give you back life and breath again, since now you put his laws above all thought of self. (7:23)

In 2 Maccabees the moment when martyrdom would be rewarded by eternal new life was put in the indefinite future. What made John the Baptist even more special, when Jesus was identified as the resurrected John, was that the Baptist had earned a new life so soon after his death. He did not have to wait, and this proved both that the eschaton was very near and that the Baptist played a central role in the scenario of the end of days.<sup>52</sup> All this would have served the disciples of John extremely well in their encounter with the disciples of Jesus. From this perspective, Baldensperger's argument concerning John 3:13 ("no one has ever ascended to heaven") is most attractive: this verse was intended to counteract the belief among John's later followers that John the Baptist was executed, resurrected, ascended to heaven, and then returned to earth with special powers as Jesus.<sup>53</sup>

Once this step is taken other admittedly sparse pieces of evidence can fall into place. The Ps.-Clem. *Recognitions* contain brief statements about disciples of John. They "separated themselves off from the community" – i. e., they were an identifiable community, denounced as is usual in literature of this sort as schismatics – who believed that John was the Messiah:

*Sec ed discipulis Iohannis, qui videbantur esse magni, segregarunt se a populo et magistrum suum velut Christum praedicarunt.*

Yes, some even of the disciples of John, who seemed to be great ones, have separated themselves from the people, and proclaimed their own master as the Messiah. (Ps.-Clem. *Recog.* 1.54 [GCS 51, 42])

---

<sup>51</sup> The different accounts of why Antipas put John to death are a topic I hope to treat elsewhere. For John's death understood as martyrdom see Lohmeyer, *Urchristentum*, 119–22. Bacon ("New and Old" 78–80) raised the interesting possibility that the belief in John the Baptist's martyrdom and resurrection was among the factors which convinced Jesus to go to Jerusalem and suffer death in imitation of the pattern of John the Baptist. The latter set the pattern for the former, from baptism through martyrdom.

<sup>52</sup> Compare Jesus's prediction that he would be resurrected on the third day, which then came true according to the testimony of the two Marys (Luke 24:7–9). Jesus was restored to life almost immediately, which was both proof of his special stature as the Son of Man and an indication of a critical moment in the scenario of the end of days.

<sup>53</sup> Baldensperger, *Prolog*, 84–85. Cf. Goguel (*Seuil*, 48), who argued that the fact that the Fourth Gospel does not dispute John's resurrection proves that John's disciples did not believe that he had been resurrected and that Jesus's identification as the resurrected John is not to be understood in the context of the debate of disciples, as I have suggested.

## Index of Sources

### Old Testament

#### *Genesis*

1:1	65
1:31	105
10	31
12:1–3	106
15:1	126
17:12	29
17:14	29
19	78
21:21	98
24	152
26:34	152
28:12	65, 108
32:3	98
33:14	98
33:16	98
34	154
34:13–24	154
36:2	152
36:8–9	98
38	160
41:45	152

#### *Exodus*

2:21	152
14:31	88–9
18	160
19	158
19:3b–6a	158
19:9	89
22:32	31
32:6	42

#### *Leviticus*

11	159
11:41–45	159
12:3	29
18	154
21:4	27

#### *Numbers*

12:1	152
21	42
24:17	123, 127
24:17–19	97
24:18	97–8
24:19	97
25	42

#### *Deuteronomy*

	151–2
2:4	98
7	158
7:1–6	159
7:2b–4	151
7:6–8	158
14	159
14:21	31
20	151
20:10–18 NRSV	151
21:10–14	151
23	153, 160
23:3–8	151
23:4	155
32:30	124
33:2	98

#### *Judges*

14–16	152
-------	-----

#### *Ruth*

4:17	160
------	-----

#### *1 Samuel*

17:43	26
24:14	26

#### *2 Samuel*

3:8	26
9:8	26
16:9	26



<i>1 Kings</i>		50:9	137
18:28	27	51:8	137
		54:1	136, 143
<i>2 Kings</i>		60	106
8:13	26		
		<i>Jeremiah</i>	
<i>Ezra</i>		30:3	155
	152–155, 157, 161–2	49:6	155
9:1	153		
9:1–2	153, 159	<i>Lamentations</i>	
		1:17	117
<i>Nehemiah</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>	
	152, 155, 161		99
<i>Tobit</i>		<i>Daniel</i>	
4:8–9	140	7	106
<i>Judith</i>		11:35	44
8:27	45	<i>Hosea</i>	
<i>1 Maccabees</i>		7:14	27
	100	<i>Joel</i>	
8:14	100	1	137
<i>2 Maccabees</i>		<i>Amos</i>	
	15	4:13	136, 143
6:12–16	45	<i>Obadiah</i>	
7:23	15		96
7:9	15	<i>Micah</i>	
12:39–45	45		143, 145
<i>Jubilees</i>		4	145
	99, 154–5, 157, 161	4:13	134–5, 144
<i>Psalms</i>		7:4	134–136, 143, 145–6
8:3 LXX	91	<i>Zechariah</i>	
50:16	113	3:1–5	76
60	123, 126	11:17	124
<i>Wisdom</i>		<i>Malachi</i>	
12:22	45	2:11–12	159
<i>Isaiah</i>		3	44
	106		
10:13	155	<i>Early Jewish Writings</i>	
11:1–10	106	<i>1 Enoch</i>	
11:2	102		68, 73, 75–6, 80
15:2	27		
33:6	102		
45:12	105		

85–90	31	Qumran	
89:10–12	31	<i>IQS</i>	34
89:42–49	31		
90:4	31	<i>4Q246</i>	
90:37–38	32	frag. 1, col. ii, 1–9	106
<i>2 Baruch</i>		<i>4QMMT</i>	154, 161
	95		
<i>Apocalypse of Zephaniah</i>		<i>Sirach</i>	
10–11	45	29:8–13	142
Josephus		<i>Testament of Abraham</i>	
	96, 103	13	44
<i>Against Apion</i>		14	45
1.60	103	<i>Testament of Zebulun</i>	
1.212	103	6.4–7	142
2.146	103		
2.170–171	103	New Testament	
2.181	103		
2.291	103	<i>Mark</i>	
<i>Jewish War</i>			14, 19–26, 33, 71, 76, 139
	96	1:23–27	20
4.17–20	126	1:39	20
4.224	96	1:41	22
4.229	96	3:5	22
4.566–576	96	3:15	20
5.248–249	96	3:22	20
6.288–315	103	4:34–5:43	11
6.378–383	96	5:1–20	20
7.218	107	5:41	23
Philo		6:7	20
<i>De Praemiis et Poeniis</i>		6:13	20
163–171	106	6:14–16	10–1, 13
<i>Rewards</i>		6:29	11
104	140	6:47–8:27a	24
<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>		7:3	23
	104	7:24–30	20
146–147	104	7:27	20
<i>Quaestiones in Exodum</i>		7:34	23
2.76	106	8:22–26	22
<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>		8:27–30	92
	138	10:14	22
13:6–11	45	10:23–24	90
		13:10	21
		14:36	23
		15:34	23
		15:39	164

<i>Matthew</i>		22:1–14	35
	12, 14, 19, 22–26,	22:2	35
	33, 40, 46–7, 71, 86,	22:10	35
	138–9, 143	22:13	35
1:21	38, 47	22:14	86, 88
3:7–10	34, 38	23:3	34
3:8	35	24:14–30	37
3:11–12	34	24:36–40	37
4:1–11	53	24:36–25:46	37
5:43–48	47	24:45–51	37
6	140, 142	24:45–25:13	37
6:9–13	2	25:1–12	37
6:16–18	138	25:31–46	37–8
6:19–21	138	25:40	37
7:6	19	26:28	37
7:13–14	36	28:16–17	37
7:13–27	36	28:19	22
7:15–20	36		
7:21	88	<i>Luke</i>	
7:21–23	36		12, 19, 23–26, 33, 71,
7:24–27	36		76, 139, 143
8:3	22	3:7–9	34
8:11	86	4:1–13	53
9:37–38	87	6:46	88, 90
11:2–6	16	7:18–28	16
11:11	16	7:28	16
11:25	89–91	7:29–30	34
12:13	22	9:7	13
13:21	37	9:7–9	10–12
13:24–30	37	10:2	87
13:36–43	37	10:21	89–91
13:52	90	11:1	2
14:1–2	10–12	11:1–4	2
14:12	9–10	12	140, 142
15:8	34	12:32–34	139
15:21–28	22	13:28–29	86
15:22	23	13:29	86
15:24	23	16:19–21	90
16:18	35	16:22	86
16:27	37	18:23	90
19:14	22	18:24–25	90
19:23–24	90	24:7–9	15
20:16	86		
21:16	91	<i>John</i>	
21:23	34		3, 47, 49–66, 71
21:28–32	34	1:1	65
21:28–46	34	1:3	65
21:32	34	1:7	64
21:33–44	35	1:8	64
21:45	34	1:10	51

1:12	63	5:16	56
1:14a	65	5:16–18	51
1:17a	65	5:18	56
1:18	64	5:45	65
1:19	50, 56	5:46	65
1:21	64	6:4	51, 54–56
1:26	64	6:25	51
1:27	64	6:41	56
1:29	65	6:42	51
1:30	64	6:52	56
1:35	64	7:1	54, 56
1:37	64	7:2	51, 56
1:38	51	7:11	56
1:44	51	7:13	51, 56
1:45	65	7:15	56
1:45–46	55	7:35	56
1:46	51, 64	7:52	55, 59
1:51	65	8:22	56
2:6	55–6	8:30–31	55
2:13	51, 54, 56	8:31	51, 56, 62
2:16	65	8:44	49, 51, 53, 63
2:17	65	8:48	56
2:18	56	8:52	56
2:18–22	55–6	8:57	56
2:21	65	8:58	64
2:22	56	9	50, 58
3:1	52, 56	9:2	51
3:2	51–2, 59	9:7	57
3:10	52	9:13–34	51
3:13	15	9:18	56
3:18–19	44	9:22	51, 56, 58
3:22–24	4	9:28	65
3:25	56	9:29	55
3:27–36	64	9:34	58
3:28	1	10:19	56
3:30	1, 4	10:24	56
3–4	4	10:31	56
4:1	4	10:33	56
4:1–2	4	10:41	12–3
4:7–9	64	11:8	51, 56
4:9	51, 55–6	11:18	56
4:19	64	11:19	56
4:20	64	11:31	56
4:21–23	64	11:33	56
4:22	51, 55–6	11:36	56
4:31	51	11:45	56
5:1	51, 54, 56	11:47	51
5:2	57	11:49	51
5:10	56	11:54	56
5:15	56	11:55	51, 54, 56

12:9	56	18:15-17	36
12:11	56	18:25	7-8
12:14	56	18:28	8
12:20	55	18:33	51
12:31	56	18:35	51
12:36	56	18:39	51
12:38	56	19	9
12:42	51, 58	19:2	51
13:33	56	19:19	51
16:2	51, 58	21:25	24
18:1	57	24:2-3 NRSV	105
18:13	51	24:9-14	36
18:14	51	24:13	36
18:20	56		
18:24	51	<i>Romans</i>	
18:28	51	44, 71	
18:31	56	2:28-29	29
18:33	54, 56	3:1	28
18:35	56	4:12	28
18:38	56	5	44
18:39	54, 56	5:8-9	44
19:3	54, 56	6:23	39
19:7	56	8:1	44
19:12	56	8:29-30	44
19:14	56	9:1-5	46, 66
19:19	54	9-11	66
19:20	56	11	30, 39, 46
19:21	54, 56	11:16-24	39
19:31	56	11:20	39
19:36	53, 65	11:21-22	39
19:38	51-2, 56	11:26	46
19:40	56	11:32	46
19:42	56	14:10	39
20:19	51, 56		
20:31	65	<i>I Corinthians</i>	
21:2	51		41, 45, 71
21:24	64	1:12	9
		1:14-17	8
<i>Acts</i>		1:23	17
	7-10, 13, 23-25, 71,	3:4-5	9
	104	3:8	44
10	24-5	3:10-15	39
10:11-16	24	3:12-15	44
10:14	24	3:14	44
10:28	25	4:6	9
10:44-47	25	5	44
15:20	24	5:1-13	42
15:29	24	6:9-11	39
18	9	6:10	40
18-19	7-10	6:12-20	42

6:15-19	41	<i>Ephesians</i>	
7:2-5	42		71
7:14	46	2:8-9	89
7:16	46	2:11	29
7:18	28		
7:19	29, 43	<i>Philippians</i>	
8:1-4	42		71
8:6	42		26
8:7-13	42	1:1	28
9:27	39	1:2	28
10	42	3	27, 30
10:1-4	42	3:2	26-7
10:5	42	3:3	28-9
10:6	42	3:4-8	29
10:7-10	42	3:5	28-30
11:19	39	3:17	28
11:27	45	3:20	28
11:27-31	45	3:21	28
11:32	45	4:20	28
12	42		
15:1-2	39	<i>Colossians</i>	
15:12-19	13		69, 71-2
15:20	13	2:18	69, 71
15:29	45		
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
	71		41, 71
5:10	39	1:4	44
6:1	39	2:14-16	66
9:13	41	3:5	39
11:1-4	39	3:13	47
13:5	39	4	43
<i>Galatians</i>		4:1	41
	42-3, 71	4:3-8	41
1:6-9	39	4:4-6	41
2:7	29	4:6	41
3:28	156, 164	4:8	46
4:8-11	39	5:9	42, 44
5:2-4	39	<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	
5:4	46		71
5:5-6	43	1:5-10	39
5:6	29	1:7-9	41
5:13-6:10	42-3		
5:21	42	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
5:22-23	43		71
6:7	43	1:20	45
6:7-10	43	2:4	47
6:8	39, 42		
6:8-9	43	<i>2 Timothy</i>	
6:15	29, 43		71

<i>Titus</i>		19	76-7
	71	19-23	73, 76, 80
		20	67
<i>Philemon</i>		20-23	76
	71	20-25	68
		22	76
<i>Hebrews</i>		22-23	76, 78
	71	24	76
6:4-6	33	24-25	67
12:5-6	45	25	76
<i>James</i>		<i>1 Peter</i>	
	71-2		71, 77
1:1	63		
1:25	63	<i>2 Peter</i>	
2:8	63		71-73, 75-78, 80, 82
2:12	63	1:1-2	73
2:20-26	71	1:2	76
		1:3-4	76
<i>Jude</i>		1:5	76
	67-69, 71-73, 75-81	1:6-11	76
1	73	1:12	76
1-2	67	1:13-21	76
2	76	1:19-21	75
1-4	68	2	76
3	67, 76	2:1	73, 76
4	68	2:4	73
5	67, 72, 76, 78	2:5	76
5-7	68	2:6	78
5-8	68	2:7-9	76
6-7	73	2:12	76
7	78	2:14	76
8	77, 79	2:17	76
8-10	69	2:19-3:1	76
8-11	71	2:22	19, 76
8-16	79	3:1	77
9	68, 76	3:2-3	76-7
9-10	68	3:3	76
10	77	3:4	75-6
11	68, 78	3:4-13	76
11-13	68	3:13-16	77
12	77, 80	3:14	76
14	68	3:14-16	75
14-15	68, 73	3:15-17	
14-16	68	3:18	76
16	77, 79		
17	67	<i>1 John</i>	
17-18	68, 76-7		71
17-19	68	2:18-19	33
18	76	2:19	40

<i>2 John</i>	71	<i>De paenitentia</i>	37
<i>3 John</i>	71	Clement of Alexandria	
<i>Revelation</i>		<i>Excerpta ex Theodoto</i>	
	69	1.3,6	79
3:19	45	<i>Paedagogus</i>	
19:8	35		78
22:15	19	3.43–45	78
		3.44:1–3	78
		3.44:4	78
		3.45:1	78
Early Christian Literature		<i>Stromateis</i>	
<i>2 Clement</i>			79
4.1–2	36	I 85, 1–2	53
<i>4 Ezra</i>		3.5–11	78
	95, 98	3.11:2	79
6:7–10	98	25.5	78
<i>Acts of John</i>		54.1–2	78
	60	Cyrill of Jerusalem	
<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>		<i>Oration II</i>	
	73, 75, 77	58	137
<i>Apocryphon of John</i>		<i>Didache</i>	
	60	16,5	44
<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>		Ephrem	
	63	<i>Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron</i>	
3.23–27	63		16
Augustine		Eusebius	
<i>De doctrina christiana</i>		<i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>	
3.32	36	2:23:24–5	71
<i>Sermones</i>		4:6	128
40.3–4	35	<i>Gospel of Peter</i>	
Ambrose			53
<i>Selected Works and Letters</i>		14	53
VII, 52	137	<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>	
<i>The Prayer of Job and David</i>		76	139
2.5.18	137	Ignatius	
Chrysostom		<i>Magnesians</i>	
<i>Homilies on Philipians</i>		8	62
10	26, 30	10	62–3



Irenaeus		<i>Homilies/Klementia</i>	
<i>Adversus haereses</i>			83–93
4.36.5	35	1.9.1	88
5.22.2	53	2.6.4	90
5.23.2	53	3.32.1	90
		3.50.2	90
Jerome		4.7.2	84
<i>De viris illustribus</i>		7.4.3–5	90
1	77	8–11	84
		8.1.1	86
Justin		8.1.2	85
<i>Apologia i</i>		8.2.1	84
16.9	36	8.4–7	88
		8.4.1–4	86
<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i>		8.5–7	85
	63, 72, 76	8.5.1	88–9
82.1	73, 76	8.5.2	89
		8.5.3	88–9
<i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i>		8.5.4	90
	63	8.6	90
		8.6.1	90
Origen		8.6.2	90
<i>Commentarii in Romanos</i>		8.6.4	90
8.11	39	8.6.5	90
8.12.8	47	8.7	91
		8.7.1–2	92
<i>Contra Celsum</i>		8.7.5	92
1.68	14	8.22	86
5.14	13	10.26.3	88
		11.35.4	88
<i>Epistula ad Africanum</i>		13.7.3	84
20 (14)	107	13.7.4	84
		17.18	92
<i>Homiliae in Genesim</i>		18.4.3–4	88
3.4	28	20.22.2	84
<i>Homiliae in Jeremiam</i>		<i>Recognitions/Recognition</i>	
1	137		15, 83–93
15.3.2	137	1.54	15
		1.60	16
Polycarp		4–6	84
<i>Philippians</i>		4.2.1	85
7.1	53	4.4.1–6	87
		4.4.3	87
<i>Pseudo-Clementines</i>		4.4.6	88–9
	2, 83–4	4.5	85
		4.5.1–2	88
<i>Epistula Clementis</i>		4.5.2	88–9
1.1	88	4.5.3–4	89–90
		4.5.4	88

4.5.5.–6	89	Livy	
4.5.7–8	90	<i>Ab Urbe Condita Libri/History of Rome</i>	
4.5.9	90	5.7.8	108
4.35	86	21.62.9	101
<i>Shepherd of Hermas Visions</i>		Ovid	
4.3.4	44	<i>Fasti</i>	
Tertullian		2.684	99
<i>Adversus Praxean</i>		3.71–72	108
1.3	53	Polybius	
<i>De cultu feminarum</i>		<i>Histories</i>	
1.3	80	6.56	102
Ancient Greek and Roman Literature		Tibullus	
Aelius Aristides		<i>Elegies</i>	
<i>Roman Oration</i>		2.5.23	108
28–29	108	2.5.39–2.5.62	102
108	108	Virgil	
Appian		<i>Aeneid</i>	104, 108
<i>Historia Romana</i>		1.278–279	102, 108
8	108	6.847–853	104
Augustus		6.851–853	102
<i>Res Gestae divi Augusti</i>			
	100	Rabbinic Literature	
26.1	100	Mishnah	
26.4	100	<i>m. Avodah Zarah</i>	
Cassius Dio		163	
<i>Historia Romana</i>		<i>m. Avot</i>	
65.7.2	107	1.3	2
69.12.1–2	107	3.2	105
69.14.1–2	125	<i>m. Bekhorot</i>	
Cicero		5:6	31
<i>De haruspicum responsis</i>		<i>m. Ketubbot</i>	
19	103	13.11	115
Dionysius of Halicarnassus		<i>m. Nedarim</i>	
<i>Roman Antiquities</i>		4.3	31
1.2.1	108	<i>m. Qiddushin</i>	
1.3.3–5	108	4.1	156
Horace		4.3	155
<i>Odes</i>		4.6–7	156
3.6.5–6	102		

<i>m. Sanhedrin</i>		<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>	
10.1	46	9.13	97
		46.4	105
<i>m. Yadayim</i>			126
4.4	155–157	<i>Leviticus Rabbah</i>	
Tosefta		29.2	108
<i>t. Avodah Zarah</i>		<i>Canticles Rabbah</i>	
3.9	117	8.10	118
<i>t. Hagigah</i>		<i>Lamentations Rabbah</i>	
2.3	112	1.17	117
<i>t. Hullin</i>		2.2	122, 127–8
1.1	166	<i>Sifre Deuteronomy</i>	
<i>t. Pe'ah</i>		54	159
4.15	114	343	98–9
4.18	141	Babylonian Talmud	
<i>t. Qiddushin</i>		<i>b. Avodah Zarah</i>	
5.1	155		163–4
<i>t. Sanhedrin</i>		2a–3b	164
12.10	22	10b	165
13.3	44–5	16b–18b	164
<i>Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Be-Shalah</i>		17a	165
4	126	23b–24a	165
<i>Pisha (Bo) 14</i>	98	<i>b. Bava Batra</i>	
Jerusalem Talmud		8b	114
<i>y. Hagigah</i>		121a	155
2.1 77b	111–113	<i>b. Bava Metz'ia</i>	
<i>y. Megillah</i>		85a	115
3.2 74a	114	<i>b. Berakhot</i>	
<i>y. Mo'ed Qatan</i>		10a	136, 143
3.1 81c.	115	18b	139
<i>y. Qiddushin</i>		28b–29a	59
4.6	156	33b	141
66a	156	<i>b. Eruvin</i>	
<i>y. Ta'anit</i>		101a	131, 143–4, 146
4.5	122	<i>b. Gittin</i>	
4.8	97	57a	118, 144
68d	97	<i>b. Hagigah</i>	
		5b	134
		13a	19

14b–15b	111–2	<i>b. Qiddusin</i>	
15a–15b	113	64b	156
16b	114	70b	116
		71a	118
<i>b. Horayot</i>		72b	117
12a	116	74a	155
13b–14a.	112		
		<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>	
<i>b. Hullin</i>		36b	155
2a–4b	166	93b	128
7a	113		
87a	133, 136, 143	<i>b. Sukkah</i>	
127a	116	20a	118
<i>b. Yoma</i>		<i>b. Ta'anit</i>	
19b	116	26a	116
57a	115		
		<i>b. Yevamot</i>	
<i>b. Ketubbot</i>		16b	117
54a	116	76b	155
65a	116		
75a	115	<i>b. Zevahim</i>	
110b	115	60b.	115
111a	115–6, 118		
<i>b. Megillah</i>		Other Sources	
21a	114		
27b	114	<i>Secret Gospel of Mark</i>	
			79
<i>b. Niddah</i>			
49b	155	<i>Ginza</i>	
		II, 1.151–152	18
<i>b. Pesahim</i>			
34b	115	Corpus Papyrorum Judaicorum	
49a–49b	117	2:204–208 no. 421	107
49b	114, 117		



## Index of Authors

- Abramski, S. 121, 129  
Adams, E. 75  
Adamson, G. 91  
Aichele, G. 69, 77, 81  
Allen, W.C. 12  
Allison Jr., D.C. 12, 14, 17, 21, 34  
Alon, G. 106, 128–9  
Altmann, A. 98  
Ameling, W. 73  
Aminoff, I. 96  
Amir, Y. 106  
Amsler, F. 83  
Ando, C. 100, 105  
Appel, K. 65  
Appelbaum, A. 96  
Ashton, J. 54  
Augustin, P. 53  
Austen, J. 149  
Ave Marie, F. 96  
Avramsky, S. 129
- Backhaus, K. 40  
Bacon, B.W. 8, 15  
Baden, J. 72  
Baker, C.A. 95  
Bakhos, C. 96  
Baldensperger, W. 3, 5, 8, 15  
Bammel, E. 9, 14  
Bar-Asher Siegal, E. 136, 144  
Bar-Asher Siegal, M. 121, 133, 136, 140, 143–4, 146  
Baras, Z. 127  
Baratte, F. 101  
Barclay, J.M.G. 27, 39–40, 43, 47, 103  
Barraclough, R. 106  
Barth, F. 25  
Baruch, E. 107  
Bateman, H.W. 26  
Bauckham, R. 67, 73, 76  
Baumgarten, A.I. 7, 9, 64, 93, 162  
Baur, F.C. 19, 26, 29  
Be'eri, N. 111–114  
Becker, A.H. 5, 91
- Bedenbender, A. 32  
Beer, M. 113  
Belayche, N. 107  
Belle, G. van 58  
Bennema, C. 51  
Béranger, J. 100  
Berthelot, K. 104  
Betz, H.D. 138–140  
Betz, O. 71  
Bickerman, E.J. 2  
Bieringer, R. 50, 52  
Billerbeck, P. 61  
Black, M. 61  
Bloch, M. 1, 14  
Blumenthal, C. 68  
Bock, D.L. 23  
Bockmuehl, M. 26–28  
Boer, M.C. de 43  
Bonnard, P. 28  
Borgen, P. 106  
Bornkamm, G. 36  
Bottini, G.C. 107  
Bovon, F. 12–3, 23–4, 138–9  
Boyancé, P. 102  
Boyarin, D. 62, 128  
Bremmer, J.N. 63  
Brennecke, H.C. 79  
Brodie, I. 131  
Brodie, T.L. 55  
Brosend, W. 67  
Brown, R.E. 23, 59  
Brown, S. 22  
Bryan, D. 31  
Buber, M. 5, 117  
Buchholz, D.D. 75  
Büchler, A. 131  
Buell, D.K. 19  
Bultmann, R. 54  
Burkill, T.A. 20
- Caird, G.B. 23  
Callan, T. 73, 78  
Campbell, D.A. 40

- Cappelletti, S. 107  
 Carleton Paget, J. 83  
 Carroll, J. T. 24  
 Carter, W. 34, 95  
 Charlesworth, J. H. 106  
 Chibici-Revneanu, N. 55  
 Chilton, B. 7  
 Chrupcała, L. D. 107  
 Clark, E. 91  
 Clark, K. 23  
 Clements, R. A. 106  
 Coblenz Bautch, K. 91  
 Cohen, G. D. 96–7, 101–2, 109  
 Cohen, S. J. D. 4, 98, 103, 118  
 Conzelmann, H. 7  
 Crawford, M. H. 101  
 Crossan, J. D. 21  
 Crouch, J. E. 12, 35  
 Cullmann, O. 38  
 Culpepper, R. A. 52, 66
- Dainese, D. 78  
 Daniélou, J. 3–4, 6–7, 9  
 Davids, P. H. 68  
 Davies, M. 21  
 Davies, W. D. 12, 14, 17, 34  
 DeConick, A. D. 91  
 Dennert, B. C. 64  
 Dettwiler, A. 53–4  
 Devillers, L. 58  
 Dibelius, M. 5, 8, 10–1, 14  
 Dirscherl, E. 65  
 Dobbeler, A. von 22  
 Dodd, B. 27  
 Donaldson, T. L. 32  
 Dragutinovic, P. 63  
 Ducrey, P. 100  
 Dunn, J. D. G. 19, 30
- Eastman, S. G. 43  
 Eck, W. 121  
 Eckhardt, B. 109  
 Eckstein, H.-J. 40  
 Edmondson, J. 107  
 Efron, J. 129  
 Ehrman, B. 22  
 Elliott, M. W. 40  
 Engberg-Pedersen, T. 43  
 Eph'al, I. 99  
 Erskine, A. 100
- Eubank, N. 37, 43, 139–142  
 Evans, C. A. 7, 23  
 Evans, S. 128
- Fander, M. 21  
 Faust, A. 107  
 Favazza, A. R. 125  
 Fears, J. R. 101  
 Fee, G. D. 28  
 Feldmeier, R. 21, 96  
 Feliks, Y. 135  
 Fenske, W. 49  
 Filson, F. V. 21, 44  
 Finkelstein, L. 98–9  
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 7  
 Flusser, D. 17  
 Fogel, S. 127  
 Fonrobert, C. E. 111  
 Fornet-Ponse, T. 49  
 Först, J. 50  
 Fortna, R. T. 55  
 Fossum, J. 72  
 France, R. T. 23, 38  
 Frayer-Griggs, D. 44  
 Frerichs, E. S. 3  
 Frey, J. 52, 55, 57, 60, 62, 64–5, 68–9,  
 72–3, 76, 79  
 Frisch, A. 34  
 Funk, R. W. 21  
 Furstenberg, Y. 166
- Gafni, I. M. 114, 116, 119  
 Gardner, G. E. 113  
 Garnsey, P. 96  
 Gathercole, S. J. 40  
 Gebauer, R. 40  
 Gebhardt, J. 16  
 Gil-White, F. J. 25  
 Ginzberg, L. 96  
 Givens, T. 35  
 Glenny, W. E. 137  
 Gluckler, Y. 148, 156  
 Goguel, M. 3–7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 38  
 Goodenough, E. R. 106  
 Goodman, M. 107, 118  
 Gordon, B. D. 39  
 Goshen-Gottstein, A. 111–2  
 Gould, E. P. 12  
 Grasmück, E. 79  
 Grayston, K. 26

- Green, J. 38  
 Greenhut, Z. 107  
 Gregory, B. C. 140, 142  
 Gridheim, S. 38  
 Gruen, E. S. 99  
 Grünstäudl, W. 67, 71–73, 75–77, 121  
 Gundry, R. H. 19, 35–37  
 Gundry Volf, J. M. 39–40, 42  
  
 Hadas-Lebel, M. 96  
 Hakola, R. 63  
 Harnisch, W. 58  
 Hartom, E. S. 135  
 Hasan-Rokem, G. 122, 129  
 Hassler, I. 21  
 Hawthorne, G. F. 28–9, 71  
 Hayes, C. E. 32, 41, 98, 111, 117–8, 132, 136,  
     154, 157, 163  
 Hays, R. B. 42  
 Heckel, U. 21, 69  
 Heemstra, M. 107  
 Heiligenthal, R. 67, 69  
 Hengel, M. 71  
 Henning, M. 63  
 Herman, G. 133  
 Herr, M. D. 106  
 Heschel, S. 49  
 Hoek, A. van den 77–8  
 Holmes, M. E. 62  
 Hoover, R. W. 21  
 Horovitz-Rabin 98  
 Houtman, A. 69  
 Hubbard, B. J. 22  
 Hunt, S. A. 50–1, 52, 64  
 Hvalvik, R. 83  
  
 Inglebert, H. 104  
  
 Jackson-McCabe, M. 83  
 Jaffee, M. S. 111  
 Janowski, B. 65  
 Jeremias, J. 38  
 Jervell, J. 31  
 Johnson Hodge, C. 29–30  
 Jones, B. C. 80  
 Jones, F. S. 83, 85, 90  
 Jones, K. R. 95  
  
 Kaden, D. 166  
 Kalmin, R. 114, 119, 132, 143  
  
 Karakolis, C. 66  
 Karmann, T. 63  
 Kasher, A. 96  
 Kassuto, M. D. 135  
 Katz, S. T. 131  
 Keith, C. 21  
 Kelley, N. 87  
 Kierspel, L. 50  
 Klausner, J. 20  
 Kline, L. L. 86  
 Kloner, A. 107  
 Kohler, K. 66  
 Köhn, A. 5  
 Konradt, M. 22  
 Kraeling, C. H. 4–5  
 Kraft, R. 5  
 Kraus, T. J. 53, 76  
 Kraus, W. 69  
 Krause, M. 69  
 Kümmel, W. G. 23  
 Kunckel, H. 101  
  
 Labahn, M. 30, 57–8, 92  
 Lake, K. 72  
 Lang, M. 57  
 Lang, T. J. 46  
 Lange, N. de 96  
 Lapin, H. 132  
 Le Donne, A. 21  
 Levi, G. 106, 128  
 Levine, L. I. 93, 99, 119  
 Lévi-Strauss, C. 25  
 Lichtenberger, H. 9  
 Lieb, M. 49  
 Liebes, Y. 111–2  
 Löhr, W. H. 79  
 Lohmeyer, E. 2, 5, 9–10, 14–5, 26  
 Lovering, J. H. 106  
 Lowe, M. F. 54–5  
 Lüdemann, G. 92  
 Luomanen, P. 36–7  
 Luz, U. 12, 35  
 Lyons, W. J. 52  
  
 Marcus, J. 6, 11–2, 14, 23, 29, 60  
 Marguerat, D. 35, 38  
 Marks, R. G. 127–129  
 Marksches, C. 79  
 Maritz, P. 58  
 Marmorstein, A. 140



- Marshall, H. 26  
 Marshall, M. 34  
 Martin, R. P. 28–9  
 Martin, T. W. 68  
 Martyr, J. L. 43, 58–61  
 Mason, E. 49  
 Mason, E. F. 68  
 Mason, S. 54, 107  
 Masuzawa, T. 19  
 Mattingly, H. 108  
 McCarthy, C. 17  
 McGlothlin, T. 47  
 Meier, J. P. 22  
 Meinertz, M. 28  
 Meiser, M. 40  
 Mell, U. 26, 67, 72  
 Menoud, P. 38  
 Metzger, B. M. 72  
 Michel, O. 19  
 Millar, F. 61, 99  
 Miller, C. D. 40  
 Miller, G. D. 20  
 Miller, S. S. 131  
 Milne, H. J. M. 67  
 Mitford, T. B. 108  
 Moore, G. F. 61, 97  
 Mor, M. 121  
 Moser, M. 65  
 Moses, R. E. 45  
 Müller, K. 32  
 Müller, P. 67–69  
 Müller, U. B. 26  
 Munck, J. 27  
 Murray, M. 26–27  
  
 Nahon, G. 140  
 Nanos, M. D. 26, 31, 33  
 Nasrallah, L. 41  
 Nepper-Christensen, P. 23  
 Netzer, A. 116  
 Neubert, L. 75  
 Neusner, J. 3, 97–8, 106  
 New, S. 72  
 Newman, H. 107  
 Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 32  
 Nicklas, T. 49–50, 52–61, 63, 65, 73, 75, 80  
 Niebuhr, K.-W. 63, 69  
 Niehoff, M. 104  
 Nienhuis, D. 71  
 Noam, V. 113, 162  
  
 Notley, R. S. 17  
 Novick, T. 136  
  
 Oliver, I. W. 24, 31, 35  
 Olson, D. C. 32  
 Ophir, A. 147–157, 160–163, 165–167  
 Oppenheimer, A. 61, 116, 121, 127–129  
 Oropeza, B. J. 40, 42  
 Overman, J. A. 23  
 Oyen, G. van 69, 80–1  
  
 Paschoud, F. 100  
 Patrich, J. 107  
 Pavry, J. S. 141  
 Perdue, L. G. 95  
 Pettem, M. 24  
 Plummer, A. 13, 23  
 Pokorný, P. 69  
 Pollefeyt, D. 50, 52  
 Popkes, E. E. 65  
 Poplutz, U. 50, 53, 65, 75  
 Pouderon, B. 84  
 Preuss, J. 22  
 Price, J. J. 166  
 Propp, W. H. 29  
  
 Rabbinowitz, J. 131  
 Rabens, V. 40  
 Rappaport, U. 129  
 Rau, E. 79  
 Reed, A. Y. 5, 91  
 Reese, G. 32  
 Reese, R. A. 68  
 Rehm, B. 86–7  
 Reicke, B. 38  
 Reinhartz, A. 51  
 Reumann, J. 28  
 Rhees, R. 3–4, 6, 10  
 Richardson, J. S. 100  
 Richardson, P. 27  
 Rissi, M. 55  
 Rives, J. 107  
 Roberts, J. 49  
 Robinson, D. W. B. 28–9  
 Rodríguez, R. 21, 26–7  
 Ronen, I. 96  
 Rosenberg, A. 49  
 Rosen-Zvi, I. 147–157, 160–167  
 Rubenstein, J. L. 112, 114, 133, 164  
 Ruf, M. G. 73, 77  
 Runesson, A. 32–3, 35

- Safrai, S. 129  
 Saldarini, A. J. 23  
 Sanders, E. P. 21, 26, 40  
 Sasson, J. M. 29  
 Savignac, J. de 106  
 Schäfer, P. 6, 121, 128  
 Scheid, J. 100, 102  
 Schiffman, L. H. 34  
 Schlosser, J. 73  
 Schlund, C. 53, 65  
 Schmidt, K. M. 77  
 Schmithals, W. 23  
 Schmitz, B. 50  
 Schnackenburg, R. 56  
 Schnelle, U. 40, 57, 66, 76  
 Scholtissek, K. 54  
 Schrage, W. 45  
 Schreiber, S. 20  
 Schremer, A. 97, 106, 131  
 Schröter, J. 79  
 Schürer, E. 61  
 Schwartz, D. R. 99, 106, 119  
 Schwartz, J. 7  
 Schwartz, S. 98, 106  
 Scornaienchi, L. 67  
 Scott, J. M. 106  
 Secunda, S. 132  
 Segal, A. F. 29, 131  
 Sellin, G. 67, 69  
 Setzer, C. 13  
 Shaked, S. 116  
 Shanks, H. 118  
 Shanor, J. 44  
 Sharvit, S. 135  
 Shatzman, I. 126  
 Siikavirta, S. 40  
 Sim, D. C. 19, 21, 23  
 Skarsaune, O. 83  
 Skeat, T. C. 67  
 Smallwood, E. M. 107  
 Smith, B. T. D. 8  
 Smith, D. R. 45  
 Smith, J. Z. 3, 10  
 Snodgrass, K. R. 36  
 Snowden, J. 85  
 Sorensen, E. 20  
 Sperber, D. 131  
 Stanton, G. N. 35, 83  
 Stein, H. J. 69  
 Steinmann, J. 11, 14  
 Stemberger, G. 61  
 Stone, M. 98  
 Strack, H. L. 61  
 Strecker, G. 86–88, 92  
 Taylor, J. E. 6, 14  
 Thiessen, M. 25–27, 29–30, 32, 39, 121, 161, 162  
 Thomas, C. M. 12, 41  
 Thorsteinsson, R. M. 27  
 Thurén, L. 73  
 Tiller, P. A. 32  
 Tillmann, F. 28  
 Tilly, M. 67, 72, 75  
 Tolmie, D. F. 50–52, 64  
 Tomson, P. J. 7  
 Touati, C. 140  
 Trobisch, D. 71  
 Urbach, E. E. 61, 128–9, 140–142  
 Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, F. 50, 52  
 Vargon, S. 135  
 Verheyden, J. 58  
 Vermes, G. 61  
 Vielhauer, P. 26  
 Viviano, B. T. 23  
 Vögtle, A. 67  
 Wahlde, U. C. von 50, 56–7  
 Wahlen, C. 20, 24  
 Wald, S. G. 117–8  
 Wallace, J. B. 63  
 Wasserman, M. B. 163–166  
 Wasserman, T. 73  
 Watt, J. G. van der 64, 66  
 Webb, R. L. 7, 10  
 Weder, H. 38  
 Wehnert, J. 92  
 Weidemann, H.-U. 52  
 Weinfeld, M. 99, 102  
 Weiss, H. 121, 130, 133  
 Weiss, Z. 106  
 Wengst, K. 59  
 Werman, C. 155  
 Westenholz, J. G. 99  
 White, B. L. 22  
 Whittaker, C. R. 96  
 Wilker, J. 109

- Williams, C.H. 64  
Wink, W. 2, 9, 14  
Wischmeyer, O. 67  
Wisse, F. 69
- Yarbro Collins, A. 11, 45  
Yevin, S. 121  
Yinger, K. 40  
Yuval, I.J. 97
- Zamfir, K. 52  
Zangenberg, J. 92  
Zanker, P. 103  
Zeichmann, C.B. 107  
Zerubavel, Y. 130  
Zetterholm, M. 33  
Zimmermann, R. 50–52, 57, 64  
Zoccali, C. 46  
Zumstein, J. 54

## Index of Subjects

- Abraham 34, 64, 85, 87, 102, 105, 126, 158  
Aeneas 102, 104, 108  
allegorical 35  
alterity (cf. identity) 3, 10, 93, 147, 157, 160  
am ha-aretz 57  
Amalek 96  
anachronism 58, 60, 150  
angel 65, 69, 71, 108, 126  
– angelomorphic Christology 72  
– Michael 76  
animal  
– animal imagery 31  
– animal language 20, 26  
– bull 31–2  
– dog (cf. gentile) 19, 20, 22–8, 30–1, 112  
– doggish identity (cf. identity) 30  
– donkey 113, 117  
– horse 112–3  
– impure animals 19, 25, 31  
– impure animal imagery 19, 31–2  
– lamb of God 1–2  
– paschal lamb (cf. Passover) 53, 65  
– sheep 22–3, 25, 27, 30–2, 36  
– violent animal behavior 117  
– wolf 31, 36  
Annas 50  
apostasy 41, 46, 112  
apostate 114  
apostle (cf. disciple)  
authority 14, 56, 80–1, 92, 118, 127, 132, 166  
  
Babylon/Babylonia 95, 111–2, 114–9, 132, 143  
– Babylonian Empire 100  
– Babylonian Exile 153  
– Babylonian other 112, 114, 116–7, 119  
– Babylonian Talmud (cf. Talmud)  
Baptism 5–10, 15, 18, 34, 45  
Bar Kokhba 97, 106, 112, 121  
belief 2–3, 5–8, 10, 13–5, 17, 40, 42, 51, 66, 75, 88–90, 103, 111, 113, 142  
– unbelief 39  
  
binary opposition 158  
blood 24, 44–5  
– bloodshet 163  
– bloody 11, 112  
– pureblood (Ammonite) 156  
body 13, 21, 36, 41, 45, 55, 65, 124, 127  
border crossing 153–5, 157–8, 164, 167  
borderline 62–4  
boundary 33, 38, 48, 84, 99, 113, 153, 156, 158, 160–2, 164  
– boundary crossing 156–7, 160, 162  
brier 131, 134–7, 144–5  
  
Caiaphas 51  
canon  
– canon awareness 73  
– canonical gospels (cf. gospel)  
– canonical reading of the New Testament 82  
– canonical rearrangement 69  
– Christian canon 66, 75, 80  
Carpocratians 78–9  
Catholic Epistles 71  
characterization (derogatory) 116  
charity 114, 142  
chastity 79  
– chastisement 44–5  
child/children 18, 20, 22–3, 25–6, 34, 46, 83, 89–90, 97, 103, 113, 136, 138, 143–4, 151–2, 158–9  
– children of God 63, 66  
– children of the devil 53, 63, 66  
Christian art 1, 4  
– Caravaggio 11  
– Grünewald Isenheim altarpiece 1  
– El Greco 2  
Christianity (cf. Judaism) 3, 5, 7, 13, 19, 26, 27, 47, 62–3, 67, 77, 80, 90, 97–8, 133, 146  
– Christian community 4  
– Christianization 97, 99  
– Christian Jews 63, 83  
– Johannine Christianity 4, 7  
– Krypto-Christians 59

- circumcision 27–30, 43, 121, 125, 154, 165  
 – symbolic circumcision 125  
 citation 86–91  
 coin 101–2, 108  
 collaborator 9  
 commands of God 35  
 condemnation 42, 44–5, 164–5  
 conflict 4, 9, 11, 35, 58, 60, 63, 69, 72–3,  
   80–2, 106, 131, 135, 144  
 – conflict between disciples 4, 9  
 – conflict between rabbi and min 143  
 – conflict between the Johannine commu-  
   nity and “the Jews” 58  
 – Galilean-Judean conflict 55  
 Constantine 97  
 context 6, 10, 15, 17, 19, 24, 26, 39, 43, 53–5,  
   57–8, 68, 78–81, 86, 95, 98, 101, 103–5,  
   111–2, 118, 121, 132–3, 135–6, 144–5,  
   155, 158  
 – Christian context 69, 132  
 – historical context 78, 95, 109  
 – literary context 112, 131  
 conversion 8, 24, 27, 40, 86, 97, 148, 153,  
   155–6, 162  
 Corpus Paulinum 71  
 Council of Jabne/Jamnia 61  
 crisis 63, 80  
  
 damnation 35, 40  
 Day of the Lord (cf. Eschatology) 44–45  
 death 3, 8–9, 11, 13–5, 17, 38, 43–5, 107–8,  
   116, 124–5, 134, 154, 164–5  
 debate 1–5, 9–10, 15, 40, 55, 67, 72, 98, 121,  
   132–3, 139, 143, 145, 163  
 deity 158, 161, 164  
 demon (cf. spirit) 14, 20, 22, 84  
 demotion 10  
 determinism 113  
 devil 51, 53  
 – Children of devil 53, 63, 66  
 – liar 51, 53  
 – Satan 39, 45, 80  
 – sons of the devil 51, 66  
 diaspora 9–10, 61  
 – diaspora synagogue 9–10  
 dichotomy 38, 40, 42, 117–8, 148–9  
 diet 24  
 – dietary laws 159, 164  
 – dietary restriction 24  
 – kosher vs. non-kosher 166  
  
 difference 7, 10, 32–3, 46–7, 63, 77, 81, 84,  
   88–91, 112, 114, 139, 149–51, 156–7,  
   162, 164, 166–7  
 disciple 1–11, 15–8, 22, 33, 36–9, 58, 62,  
   64–5, 85, 90, 112, 115–6  
 – apostle 9, 29, 46, 85, 86, 92  
 – Apostle Peter 84–5  
 – beloved disciple 64  
 – disciples of Jesus 2, 4–5, 7–8, 10–1,  
   15–6, 52, 64  
 – disciples of John the Baptist 2–11,  
   14–8, 64  
 – disciples of Moses 65  
 – twelve disciples 7, 85  
 disobedience 46–7  
  
 Edom (cf. Esau) 95–9, 105, 108  
 – Edomite 95–6, 152–3  
 – identification of Rome with Edom  
   95–9  
 ekklesia 2, 33, 35–7, 39–40, 45–7  
 elder 34, 91, 105  
 election 86, 100–1, 103, 159  
 Elijah 11–4, 64, 116  
 embarrassment 21–3  
 – criterion of embarrassment 21  
 empire 95, 97, 99–104, 108  
 – Macedonian Empire 100  
 – Persian Empire 131–2, 146  
 – Roman Empire (cf. Rome) 95, 97–9,  
   105, 108–9, 131  
 enemy 57, 95, 126, 142  
 Esau (cf. Edom) 95–9, 109, 158  
 – identification of Rome with Esau 95–9,  
   109  
 eschatology 64  
 – coming wrath 34, 44  
 – Day of Judgement 38, 44  
 – eschatological concepts 75  
 – final judgement 33, 39, 44, 81  
 – imminent judgement 80  
 – parousia 37, 47, 75, 90  
 eternal life 37, 42–4, 47, 165  
 ethnocentrism/ethnocentricity 19–21,  
   23–4  
 exclusion (cf. inclusion) 33, 45–6, 152, 157,  
   164  
 exclusivism 19, 32  
 exile 11, 98, 118, 129, 153  
 expulsion 45

- faith 5, 8, 15, 18, 28, 39, 43, 88–90, 157  
 – faithful 26, 36, 46, 85–6, 93, 125, 158  
 – faithfulness 37, 89  
 – faithlessness 153  
 feast/feasting 51, 54–5, 69, 86  
 Fiscus Judaicus 62, 106–7  
 flesh (cf. spirit) 18, 28, 43, 45, 65–6, 84
- Galilee (cf. Judea) 51, 54–5  
 Gamaliel II 59  
 – Rabban Shimon ben Gamaliel II 112  
 gentile 10, 19, 21, 23–33, 39, 45–6, 84–5,  
 87–92, 111, 113–4, 117–9, 131, 135, 145,  
 154, 162–6  
 – circumcised gentile 30, 43  
 – genealogical gentile 28  
 – gentile Christians 39, 90  
 – gentile followers of Christ 23–4, 29  
 – gentile identity 25, 27, 29–30  
 – gentile inclusion (cf. exclusion, inclu-  
 sion) 32  
 – gentile mission 19, 21–2, 26  
 – gentile woman 20–4  
 – Judaizing gentiles 27, 29  
 – the nations/τὰ ἔθνη 21–2, 31, 37–8,  
 41, 99, 102, 104–5, 118, 134–6, 144–5,  
 147–8, 151, 153, 155, 158–60, 163–5  
 ger 148, 156, 160, 162  
 gift 5, 8, 39, 44, 87–90, 140  
 gnostic 78–9, 131  
 God's people 45, 49  
 good deed 34–8, 86, 88–9, 140–2  
 gospel (cf. index of sources) 1–11, 14, 17,  
 20–2, 24–6, 29, 36, 39, 41, 44, 46–7, 49–  
 58, 60–2, 64–6, 72, 81–3, 86–8, 92, 139  
 – canonical gospels 71, 82  
 – gospel message 39–41, 81  
 – Paul's gospel 41, 46  
 – Peter's gospel 25, 53  
 – Synoptic Gospels 33, 50, 55, 57–8, 83  
 – Synoptic Gospel writers 25  
 goy/goyim 147–55, 156–7, 160–2, 164–7  
 – Jew/Goy binary 149, 165–6  
 greed 13, 26, 40, 69
- Hadrian 108, 121–4  
 heaven 13, 15, 24, 35, 65, 89, 102–5, 113,  
 124, 128–9, 138–43, 145  
 – heavenly treasures (cf. wealth) 138–43  
 – heavenly voice 24, 124, 164–5
- Hebrew (cf. gentile, Jew) 29, 84, 88–92, 98,  
 102, 125, 130, 134–5, 137, 143–4  
 – Hebrew Bible 6, 20, 160  
 – non-Hebrews 158  
 hell 38–9  
 – gehenna 134–5, 144–5  
 – Jesus in gehenna 144  
 heretic 53, 59, 111, 131, 134, 137  
 – Birkat ha Minim 59–61  
 – Elisha ben Avuyah 111  
 – min/minim 59, 60–1, 118, 131–6, 143–6  
 – minim stories 131–3, 145–6  
 Herod  
 – Herod Antipas 11–4  
 – Herodian 50  
 – Herod the Great 96  
 historicity 7, 133  
 holiness 41, 63, 158–60  
 – covenantal holiness 158, 160  
 – designated holiness 158–60  
 – holy nation 158  
 – Holy One 98, 124, 141, 164, 166  
 – Holy Spirit (cf. spirit)  
 – non-holy seed (cf. seed) 153  
 hostility/hostile 27, 36, 51, 56–57, 66, 133,  
 143–4  
 hybrid 1, 8–9, 154, 156, 160, 162  
 – hybrid status 155, 156, 160, 166–7
- identity (cf. alterity) 3, 10, 27, 63, 65–6, 84,  
 92, 113, 125, 127, 147, 156–63, 165–7  
 – doggish identity (cf. animal) 30  
 – gentile identity (cf. gentile) 25, 27, 29–30  
 – hybrid identity 143, 147–8, 153–4, 157,  
 161–2, 166–7  
 – identification 11, 14–5, 23, 95–7, 99,  
 105, 150, 165  
 – identification formula 68  
 – Israelite identity 157, 159–60  
 – Jewish identity 29, 147, 150, 160–1  
 – Messianic identity 127–8  
 – religious identity 9, 113  
 idol 42  
 – idolater 19, 42, 103, 159–60  
 – idolatry 42–3, 113, 151, 159, 162–3  
 illness (cf. death) 45  
 image 49, 52, 57–8, 60–3, 77, 87, 111,  
 114–5, 121–2, 127–30, 137, 144–5  
 – bodily image 121  
 – guided imagery 133

- imagery 19, 66, 76, 136, 143–4
- moth imagery 143, 145
- paschal imagery 53
- impurity (cf. purity) 25, 41, 46, 162–3
- inclusion (cf. exclusion) 32–3, 37, 44–6, 61, 71, 81, 157
- in-group (cf. out-group) 39, 153
- insider (cf. outsider) 33, 35–6, 38–9, 44, 46
- instruction 36, 45, 138
- insult 21, 135, 138, 144
- interpretation 3–4, 32, 38, 45, 50, 53, 55, 57, 97–9, 103, 134, 136, 143–6, 157
  - Biblical exegesis 84
  - Biblical interpretation 36, 49, 58, 65, 131–3, 146
- intruder 68
- irony 66, 146
- Israelite/non-Israelite binary 157, 160
- Jerusalem 15, 18, 51, 54–5, 57, 59, 64–5, 88, 96, 99, 106, 108, 121, 137, 144
  - Aelia Capitolina 107, 121
  - Jerusalem Talmud (cf. Talmud)
  - Jerusalem Temple 55, 59, 96, 107
  - Jerusalem Temple Mount 64, 107–8
- Jesus 1–5
  - Jesus' disciples (cf. disciples)
  - Jesus in gehenna 135
  - Jesus tradition 68
  - saying of Jesus 21, 89–91
  - stature/status of Jesus 1, 9, 16–7
- Jew 2–8
  - anti-Jewish authors 49
  - Jewish-Christian Dialogue (cf. Christianity) 131
  - Jewish Christianity (cf. Christianity) 63, 83
  - Jewish followers of Christ 23
  - Jewish identity 29
  - Jewish self-definition 119
  - Judaism (cf. Judaism)
  - non-Jews 19, 132
  - non-rabbinic Jews 114
- John the Baptist 1–2, 4, 7, 10–2, 14–6, 34, 38, 64
- Joseph of Arimathea 52, 62
- Judaism 6, 62
  - diaspora Judaism 61
  - Judaizer 63
  - tribe of Judah 54
- Judea/Judean (cf. Galilee/Galilean) 34, 54–6, 96, 103, 121, 130, 153
- Justin Martyr 36, 60, 63, 73, 76
- juxtaposition 71, 86, 90, 138
- land of Israel 95, 111–2, 115, 118, 125, 131
- law
  - Jewish law 25, 27, 29, 30, 63, 164
  - Torah 19, 63, 68, 98, 102, 114, 118–9, 151–2, 157, 159, 164, 166
  - works of the law 27–8, 42
- leader 34–7, 46, 56, 122, 124–5, 127, 129–30, 135, 145, 153
  - church leadership 137
  - communal leadership 114
  - Israel's leadership, 135–6
  - pattern and leader 13–4, 17
- Levites 50, 153
- libertinism 69
- macro-level vs. micro-level (concepts of the goy) 147–67
  - macro-level and micro-level dialectic 157
  - macro-level binaries 154, 160
  - macro-level concepts/constructions 147, 150–1, 155, 157, 160–1
- magic 5, 22, 128
- marriage 79, 115–7, 151–6, 159–60
  - intermarriage 151–5
  - Levirate marriage 115
  - mixed marriage 46
- martyr 12, 15, 164–5
- martyrdom 15, 63, 164
- Masoretic Text 137, 143
- mercy 15, 22, 37, 38, 46–7
- message 15–6, 27, 39, 41, 81–2, 87, 108, 164
- Messiah 1, 8, 10, 13, 15–7, 64–6, 97, 116, 122–5, 127–30
  - false Messiah 127–8
  - self-appointed Messiah 127–8
- miracle 5, 11, 13–4, 17, 36
- mirror reading 27
- mission 19, 95, 103–4, 113
  - mission to the gentiles (cf. gentile) 21–2, 26
  - missionary 26, 44–5
- money (cf. wealth) 107, 139–42
- Moses 16, 42, 55, 65, 84, 88–93, 158

- movement 2–3, 5, 7, 9–10, 24, 33–4, 36, 46,  
   61–2, 98, 156, 158  
 – Jesus movement 2–3, 5, 24, 36  
 – John’s movement 34  
 – Zealot Movement 61  
 mutilation 27–8, 30, 125
- National Socialism 49  
 Nazareth 49, 51–2, 55, 63–4, 66  
 New Way 7–8, 43, 62  
 Nicodemus 51–2, 62  
 notzrim 59, 61
- opponent 5–6, 26–9, 35, 43, 53, 58, 68, 79, 81  
 orthodoxy 7, 13  
 – Christian orthodoxy 81  
 – Jewish orthodoxy 59, 116  
 other 3  
 – generalized other 155  
 – otherness 111  
 – particular other 155  
 – Roman other (cf. Rome) 95, 99, 109  
 out-group (cf. in-group) 153  
 outsider (cf. insider) 33, 36, 38, 45–7, 112,  
   114–5, 118
- parable 34–5, 37–8, 86, 125  
 parted ways 93  
 particularism 19, 26  
 – particularistic language 26  
 passion 41, 50, 53, 165  
 Passover 51, 55  
 – paschal lamb (cf. animal) 53, 65  
 Pentateuch 152, 154, 156, 158  
 perfection 40, 90  
 – perfect Christian 78  
 perfidiousness 69  
 permeability (of boundaries) 33, 157  
 persecution 36–7, 112  
 Pharisees 34–5, 50, 58, 65  
 – Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism (cf. Juda-  
   ism) 59, 61  
 piety 34, 84, 102–3, 165  
 Pilate 51, 56  
 pneuma (cf. spirit) 20, 22, 25, 144  
 polemic 2–4, 14, 34, 67–9, 71–3, 76, 78–80,  
   132–3  
 – polemical tract 69  
 possession 97, 138–40, 145, 158  
 prayer 2, 59, 126
- priest 50, 103, 153, 158  
 – chief priest 34  
 – high priest 50–1, 104–5, 164  
 priority of Israel 23  
 prophet 5, 11–3, 16–7, 53, 62, 64–5, 91,  
   103, 118, 135, 137  
 – false prophet 36, 53, 63  
 prophecy 76–7, 88, 97, 103, 155  
 providence 103, 140  
 purity (cf. impurity) 55, 63, 117  
 – purification 2
- rabbi/rabbinic (cf. sages) 1, 5, 51, 96–8,  
   111, 113–8, 122, 127, 130–3, 141, 143,  
   148, 156–7, 160–1, 165  
 – Babylonian rabbi 114–5  
 – non-rabbi 111, 114–5, 132  
 – non-rabbinic Jew 111, 113–4, 117  
 – Palestinian rabbi 105, 114, 118–9, 131  
 – Rabbi Akiva 117  
 – rabbi-min dialogue 133  
 – rabbinic community 111, 114–6, 118–9,  
   146  
 – rabbinic Jews 61, 93, 113, 132  
 – rabbinic literature 31, 60–1, 95–8, 105,  
   111, 117, 121–2, 126–8, 131–2, 139, 141,  
   146, 148–51, 155, 157, 160–3, 166–7  
 – rabbinic source 97, 141, 146, 150–1,  
   155–7, 162, 164  
 reception history 49, 53, 57, 75  
 relation 4, 7, 19, 25, 32, 56–7, 61, 63–5, 77,  
   103, 114, 122, 139, 161  
 relationship 9, 24, 38, 42, 73, 84, 117–8,  
   139, 157, 164  
 – John/Jesus relationship 6, 10  
 – relationship between author and  
   addressees 75  
 – relationship of gentiles to the gospel 24  
 – relationship with non-rabbis 114  
 religious tradition 4, 81  
 repentance 34, 40  
 resurrection 10, 12–5, 17, 47, 53, 65  
 revelation 8, 46, 91–2, 98  
 rhetorical strategy 81  
 rival 9, 17, 26, 46, 99, 106  
 rivalry 43, 63, 99, 101, 103  
 Rome/Roman 18, 27–8, 39, 46, 54, 71, 84,  
   95–109, 121, 125–8, 131–2, 134, 164–6  
 – Christian Rome 95, 97  
 – Genius Populi Romani 101



- pagan Rome 95
- Pax Romana 105
- Roman Empire (cf. Empire)
- Roman Palestine 132
- Roman people 100–2
  
- Sadducees 34, 50, 131
- sages (cf. rabbi/rabbinic) 113–4, 116–9, 122, 124–5, 127–8, 134
- salvation 7, 9, 11, 32, 38–42, 44–6, 51, 55, 64, 71, 85–90, 138, 144
- Samaritan 54–5, 64, 131, 166
  - Samaritan woman 51, 56, 64
- sanctity 39, 41, 46
- satire 146
- schism 81
  - schismatic (cf. heretic) 2, 15
- scribe 50, 71–2, 90
- scripture 8, 10, 26, 65, 68, 75–6, 82, 88, 95, 103, 117, 132, 135
  - intra-Christian discussions of scripture 132
- Second Temple period 2, 7, 95, 99, 148, 159
- seed 43, 154, 158
  - holy seed 153–5, 159–60
  - holy seed ideology 159
  - non-holy seed 159
  - profane seed 153–5
- self-mutilation 125
- separation 4, 8, 37, 93, 149, 154, 158–60
- Septuagint 13, 136–7, 143–6
- sexual behavior 79
- similarity (cf. alterity, identity) 3, 10, 77, 99, 164, 167
- sin 36–8, 40–2, 45, 47, 76, 78, 114, 151, 154, 165
  - sinful 39, 76, 79
  - sinner 34, 44, 112, 116, 165
- Son of David 22, 123, 127
- Son of God 65, 164
- source 1, 5–6, 8–9, 12, 14, 22, 54, 57–8, 76–8, 84–6, 92–3, 97–8, 102, 104, 108, 111–4, 116–7, 121, 125–8, 131, 133, 136, 138, 141–2, 145–7, 150–2, 155–8, 162–4, 166, 177
- spirit 8, 17, 28, 39, 41, 43, 45, 64, 66
  - God's spirit 41, 43, 45
  - Holy Spirit 8–9, 66
  - sacred Spirit 41
  - spirit vs. flesh 43
- subordination 2, 10
- substitution 87, 106, 108–9
- superiority 1, 10, 101, 103–4, 115
- supersessionism (Christian) 6
- synagogue 8, 51, 58–61, 113–4
  - diaspora synagogue (cf. diaspora)
  
- Tabernacles 51, 55
- Talmud 112, 114, 116, 125, 131, 133, 145–6, 163–4
  - Babylonian Talmud 118, 127, 131, 134, 143, 145–6, 163
  - Jerusalem/Palestinian Talmud 97, 116, 122, 126–7
  - Palestinian Midrashic-Talmudic Literature 96
  - Talmudic min narratives 133, 136, 143
  - Talmudic narrative 131–2, 146
  - Talmudic rabbi-min dialogues 133, 143
- tannaim 117, 131, 134
  - Tannaitic literature 97, 117, 148
- teacher 16, 20, 51–2, 64, 76, 79, 88–93
- teaching 8, 36–7, 42, 77, 79, 84, 87–9, 91–3, 112, 115, 164
- temple 34, 41, 55, 59, 65–6, 68, 95, 106–7, 118, 140
  - First Temple 96
  - Second Temple 2, 6, 9, 61, 96, 140, 151, 154, 166
- terminology 42, 62, 83–4, 128, 149–51
- theological apologetics 19
- tolerance 83–4, 92–3
- Torah (cf. law)
- Tripolis Discourses 84–6, 93
  
- universalism 99
- use of force 122
  
- vocation 99, 101, 103
  
- wealth (cf. money) 85, 113, 134, 138, 140, 144, 146
  - earthly treasure 139, 142, 145
  - heavenly treasure 138–43
  
- Zionist discourse 129