

Published in 2002 by
Routledge
29 West 35th Street
New York, NY 10001
www.routledge-ny.com

Published in Great Britain by
Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane
London EC4P 4EE
www.routledge.co.uk

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group.

Copyright © 2002 by Routledge

Printed in the United States of America on acid free paper.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Excerpt from the poem "Zoon Politikon" used, with permission, from *Marie Luise Kaschnitz: Überallnie Ausgewählte Gedichte 1928–1965* ©Claassen Verlag.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A shadow of glory: reading the New Testament after the Holocaust / Tod Linafelt, editor.
p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-415-93793-0 (hardback)—ISBN 0-415-93794-9 (pbk.)

1. Bible. N.T.—Criticism, interpretation, etc.

2. Holocaust

(Christian theology)

I. Linafelt, Tod, 1965–

BS2370 .S53 2002

225.6'09'045—dc21

2002004904

A SHADOW OF GLORY

*Reading the New Testament
after the Holocaust*

Tod Linafelt, Editor

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Contents

Acknowledgments	vii
Introduction	ix
<i>Tod Linafelt</i>	
PART I: THE HOLOCAUST IN THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION	
1. The Christian Canon and the Problem of Antisemitism	3
<i>Pamela Eisenbaum</i>	
2. Higher Critics on Late Texts: Reading Biblical Scholarship after the Holocaust	18
<i>Deborah Krause and Timothy K. Beal</i>	
3. Reading Jesus as a Nazi	27
<i>Susannah Heschel</i>	
4. Shoah Consciousness and the Silence of American Christian Biblical Scholarship	42
<i>Mark K. George</i>	
PART II: READING AS JEWS	
5. Blood on Our Heads: A Jewish Response to Saint Matthew	57
<i>Steven L. Jacobs</i>	
6. The Apostle and the Seed of Abraham	68
<i>Richard L. Rubenstein</i>	
7. Double Bind: Sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews	89
<i>Jennifer L. Koosed</i>	

VI CONTENTS

PART III: READING AS CHRISTIANS	
8. Reading from the Day "In Between"	105
<i>Walter Brueggemann</i>	
9. Woman as Witness in a Post-Holocaust Perspective	117
<i>Margie Tolstoy</i>	
10. New Testament Theology after the Holocaust: Exegetical Responsibilities and Canonical Possibilities	128
<i>Lloyd Gaston</i>	
11. Reading the Cross at Auschwitz: Holocaust Memories and Passion Narratives	140
<i>Tania Oldenhage</i>	
12. Did Christianity Die in Auschwitz?	155
<i>Rolf Rendtorff</i>	
PART IV: JEWS AND GENTILES, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND TODAY	
13. The Passion after the Holocaust	171
<i>John Dominic Crossan</i>	
14. Restoring the Kingdom to Israel: Luke-Acts and Christian Supersessionism	185
<i>Craig C. Hill</i>	
15. The Jew Paul and His Meaning for Israel	201
<i>James D. G. Dunn</i>	
16. Reading after the Holocaust: A New Testament Scholar Responds to Emil Fackenheim	216
<i>Luke Timothy Johnson</i>	
17. The Killing Fields of Matthew's Gospel	232
<i>Gary A. Phillips</i>	
Contributors	249
Index	251

CHAPTER I

The Christian Canon and the Problem of Antisemitism

PAMELA EISENBAUM

Many Christians and Jews today are genuinely interested in promoting positive relations between the two faith communities.¹ Often an explicit awareness of living in a post-Shoah world is articulated by the various organizations devoted to Jewish-Christian relations. But even when such awareness is not explicitly articulated, most of these individuals and organizations have been at least implicitly motivated by the Shoah and the long history of Christian brutality toward Jews.² This desire for better relations between Christians and Jews often inspires statements stressing our common heritage. The place where this common heritage is most plainly evident is in the sharing of some scriptures, what Christians commonly call the Old Testament and Jews call the Tanakh or Hebrew Bible.³ The sharing of scriptures thus constitutes the starting point for Christians and Jews as they enter into dialogue with one another; this seems especially true for Christians.⁴

Although the sharing of scriptures evokes the sentiment that we have a common heritage, it also disguises the profound differences in the meaning of the Bible for Jews and Christians. When American Jews are speaking in their own circles (that is, not in interfaith gatherings), they commonly use the term "Bible" to refer to their scripture. But "Bible" means something different for Christians. Not only are the contents different (a Christian Bible contains a New Testament as well as the Old Testament), but, by the fourth century C.E., the two Testaments together were thought of holistically as *Christian* scripture. The earliest extant Christian Bibles contain both the Old and New Testament, with all of the texts

written in Greek.⁵ The Greek Old Testament was based on the Septuagint, a translation made by Jews during the third and second centuries B.C.E. The process of canonization therefore caused a vast rereading of the scriptures of ancient Israel, a Christianizing of those scriptures that differed tremendously from the way the rabbis came to understand those same texts.⁶

One common assumption embedded in the notion that Jews and Christians share a common scriptural heritage in the Old Testament/Tanakh is that the New Testament (and its call to belief in Jesus) is the only thing that divides Judaism and Christianity. For Jews, much of the New Testament sounds violently anti-Jewish. Many Christians themselves have recognized this problem and been troubled by it. The origins of Christian supersessionism, it is often assumed by Christians and Jews, can be found in the New Testament. I intend to refute this assumption by proposing that the *texts* of the New Testament themselves are less of a problem in Jewish-Christian relations than the *process of canonization* among Christians in antiquity.⁷

Modern Jews and Christians often do not realize that for most of the past 2000 years, our "common heritage" in the scriptures of Israel has produced more antipathy than comradery.⁸ That Christians canonized many of the same scriptures as Jews did not create common ground; rather, it created a battleground that drove a deeper wedge between the two groups. As Christians came to see the Holy Bible as made of two parts, the Old Testament and the New Testament, they came to redefine Jews, Judaism, and Jewish scripture as having been superseded by Christianity. In this essay I will highlight some events that led to the canonization of the Christian Bible from the first to the fourth centuries while emphasizing the rhetoric that made up the debates about canonization. Historically, there were some Christians who had different ideas about what writings should constitute the Christian canon. Thus the biblical canon modern Christians take for granted was hardly a historical inevitability. I will then demonstrate how the debates of antiquity were eerily replayed by Christian theologians during the Third Reich. I hope not only to show the dangers inherent in too facile an understanding of our "sharing of scriptures," but also to offer some insights about deepening our understanding of this common textual heritage.

The First Century

In the beginning, the only sacred texts known to believers in Jesus were those texts deemed sacred by Jews. The New Testament (hereafter, NT) is full of references to "scripture" by which NT authors always mean the writings generally considered sacred by Jews of the first century.⁹ With one or two possible exceptions, NT authors never quote other early Christian writings as authorities.¹⁰ Paul certainly would not have envisioned his letters having the status of scripture. With the possible exception of the Apocalypse of John, which presents it-

self literally as a revelation of the heavenly realm, none of the writers who produced the documents that now comprise the NT believed their writings had the same scriptural authority of, say, the Torah and the Hebrew Prophets. Thus, during the first century there was no debate about the canon: Christian scripture was identical to Jewish scripture. To be sure, there were debates among Jews of different sects about the interpretation of the Bible, but not about the contents of the Bible.¹¹

Although Christians have traditionally credited Paul with the notion that the covenant with Christ has supplanted the covenant with Moses—thus setting up the Old Testament/New Testament paradigm—a wave of scholarship has been building in Pauline studies (often referred to as the "new perspective on Paul")¹² that argues that Paul never had any such supersessionist ideas. There is no doubt that many negative statements about Torah can be found in Paul's letters. But many scholars have convincingly argued that these statements are not intended as a wholesale rejection of Jewish law. There are far too many positive statements Paul makes about Jewish law for such a view to be tenable. The more convincing explanation of Paul's negative statements about Jewish law is that he opposes Jews or Judaizing Christians who wish to impose Jewish law on Gentiles as a prerequisite for being in Christ; he is not rejecting the Mosaic covenant *per se*.¹³

Rather, building on the vision found in the Prophets, Paul wants to include all the "nations" (the Greek word is *ethne*, which can be translated either "gentiles" or "nations") in the same covenant Israel already enjoys. In other words, gentiles—at least gentile believers in Jesus—can now be included in the heritage of the Jews as made known in the scriptures, but they do not need to become Jews (thus do not need to be circumcised) to partake of that heritage. In Romans 4, Paul makes sophisticated use of the Abraham saga to argue that Abraham is not just the patriarchal ancestor of the Jews, but of the gentiles, too; in other words, of *all* the nations. The linchpin of Paul's argument is Genesis 17:5 in which God promises that Abraham will be the "ancestor of a multitude of nations (*ethne*)."¹⁴ As Paul says, "according to grace, the promise is guaranteed to all [Abraham's] descendants, not to those who belong to Torah only, but rather to those who belong to the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all! As it is written, 'I have made you the ancestor of many nations (*ethne*)'" (Romans 4:16b–17a; translation mine).

Paul's vision of Judaism had been expanded to a greater point of inclusivity than many other Jews (including other followers of Jesus) were willing to accept. But Paul's sense of continuity between first-century Judaism and Israel's history as related in scripture remains firmly in place. There can be no supersessionism for Paul, because Judaism has not been replaced by anything. What will later become the Old Testament for Christians is still very much the sum total of Holy Writ for Paul.

The Second and Third Centuries

The unquestioning authority of Jewish scripture that prevailed in the first century began to change in the second century. The *Epistle of Barnabas*, a document usually dated somewhere within the first half of the second century, is an excellent example of how thinking for some Christians had begun to change, moving far beyond anything seen among NT documents.¹⁵ The primary focus of the writer of *Barnabas* (whom I will hereafter call Barnabas) is to argue that the scriptures of Israel have been completely misunderstood by the Jews, both because the Jews have consistently been disobedient and because they have taken the scriptures literally and thus have not been able to see how they point to Christ. Interestingly, Barnabas takes some texts literally, usually those that recount the disobedience of the people.

Barnabas provides a good example of how a few generations after Paul some Christians began to develop a different scriptural hermeneutic. Barnabas writes: "What then does [God] say to Abraham, when he alone was faithful, and it was counted him for righteousness? 'Behold I have made thee, Abraham, the father of the Gentiles (*ethne*), who believe in God in uncircumcision.'" ¹⁶ Here Barnabas both mimics Paul's use of Genesis 17:5 in Romans 4:16–17, and yet he turns it upside down. Barnabas replaces Paul's inclusive vision with an exclusivist one. No longer is Abraham father of *all* the *ethne* as Paul says in Romans 4:16, or even a *multitude* of *ethne*, as the text of Genesis 17:5 itself says, but only the *ethne* who specifically reject circumcision, namely non-Jews. In Barnabas's understanding of salvation history, gentiles have *replaced* Jews as the children of Abraham (see also *Barnabas* 14.1–4). Barnabas thereby creates discontinuity between the people spoken of in scripture and his contemporary Jews.

As Hans von Campenhausen put it, *Barnabas* represents "the most thoroughgoing attempt to wrest the Bible absolutely from the Jews, and to stamp it from the very first word as exclusively a Christian book."¹⁷ But von Campenhausen also points out that Barnabas does not deal adequately with questions about circumcision, the Sabbath, and food laws as they apply to a gentile context. Although Barnabas used symbolic exegesis to dismiss peculiarly Jewish commandments, his interpretations jeopardized the continuity of the two Testaments (von Campenhausen, 70–71).

It is no surprise, then, to discover that some Christians of the second century began to doubt the validity of the scriptures. They began to question how these scriptures, which contained so much about Jewish history and practices, bore relevance for Christians. By the second century, writings by Christians were beginning to circulate more widely. There is strong evidence that Paul's letters, for example, originally written to individual churches, were copied and gathered together into collections. In addition, by the beginning of the second century, there are at least four gospels in circulation.¹⁸ Although none of these early

Christian writings hold scriptural status in the second century, they are gaining in importance and availability. Furthermore, as more gentiles came to dominate Christian communities, they understandably lacked the sentimental attachment to the history and tradition of Israel that Paul and many of the gospel writers had. Thus, Christians began to see the negative statements about the Torah made by Paul as applicable to Jews and Judaism.

The first and most devastating argument for a full-scale rejection of the scriptures of Israel came from a radical Paulinist named Marcion (c. 84–160). He was excommunicated by Rome because of his radical ideas and subsequently founded his own church (which survived until the fifth century). Marcion believed that the God who plays such an important role in the scriptures of Israel is not the same God who is represented by Jesus Christ.¹⁹ They are literally different Gods. He identified the Jewish God as a creator-god, who meted out justice to human beings as they deserved. The God of Jesus Christ was a Savior-God from another transcendent realm who was far superior to the creator-god.

Marcion's hermeneutics and theology meant that he could no longer regard the scriptures of Israel as divinely authoritative. Thus he identified a small selection of more recent Christian writings as having scriptural status. He included only an edited collection of Paul's letters and an abridged version of the Gospel of Luke. Aside from his dogmatic allegiance to Paul, the reason for such a slim canon was that he was forced by his theological convictions to expunge everything that referred to the scriptures of Israel. Many if not most of the writings that now make up the NT include citations of, paraphrases of, and references and allusions to these texts. Put simply, Marcion's position was that these few Christian writings should replace the texts of ancient Israel as scripture for Christians.

Although Marcion is not necessarily thought of as a "gnostic" Christian, gnostic Christians of the second and third centuries also typically believed that the God of Israelite scripture was a lower god. There is no one consistent hermeneutical orientation to scripture in the writings deemed "gnostic" by scholars—some gnostic writers ridiculed it and some revered it as holding secret knowledge if interpreted correctly. Many if not most gnostic Christians seemed to have studied it earnestly and used it to justify their arguments. In most cases, like Marcion, gnostic exegesis stressed the discontinuity between the revelation of scripture and the revelation that had occurred in Jesus Christ (and their own revelatory writings).

These attitudes prompted a fierce debate about what constituted scripture for Christians that continued throughout the second and third centuries. Eventually, the writings of Marcion and the gnostics were deemed heretical by the "orthodox" church. But the arguments of these "heretics" must have been a severe

threat and perhaps compelling to a number of Christians, precisely because the church fathers began to construct a much more self-conscious and sophisticated hermeneutic regarding the role of scripture within the context of Christian belief. Justin Martyr, whose dates are roughly contemporary with Marcion's, converted to Christianity because he was transformed by the teachings of the Hebrew Prophets, taught to him by an old Christian. Von Campenhausen credits Justin with being the first Christian to develop "a doctrine of holy scripture" (von Campenhausen, 88). Although most Christian authors before Justin use scripture as evidence that Jesus is the Christ, in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, he reverses the argument. Because everything foretold about Christ in scripture came true, the scriptures must be the essential witness to the divine plan. In other words, Justin makes an argument for the validity of Israelite scripture for Christians, rather than simply assuming it. But Justin, like those before him, must explain those peculiarly Jewish parts of the Bible—circumcision, the food laws, the Sabbath, i.e., the ceremonial law—in this new Christian context. Whereas Barnabas engaged in symbolic and allegorical exegesis, Justin opts for a more literalistic, historical approach. The law was a kind of ad hoc necessity because of the disobedience of the Jews. "Thus, 'circumcision, which derives from Abraham,' was ordained simply in order that, even in the dispersion, the Jews might remain identifiable, and not escape their merited punishments."²⁰ Justin appeals to the prophets to demonstrate what he sees as the obduracy of the Jews. Elsewhere in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, Justin refers to Israelite scripture as "your scriptures, or rather not yours, but ours." In other words, the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, and the rest of what made up scripture at that point properly belonged to Christians. At the close of the second century there still was no NT. Thus, there was not yet a textual concept of the Old Testament, just the "scriptures" (that is, the scriptures of Israel), for which some Christians had no use. Against the influence of Marcion and gnostic Christians, the church fathers followed Justin in constructing arguments for the continuing validity of scripture in order to create a sense of unity between those sacred writings, to which Jews also laid claim, and Christian faith. Meanwhile, Christian writings, particularly those that had the status of apostolic authority—in other words, writings having a close chronological connection to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus—were becoming more revered. Perhaps the first person to express textual unity between the scriptures of Israel and these Christian writings comes from Tertullian (c. 155–220), who says,

[The Church] knows one Lord God, Creator of the universe, and Christ Jesus, born of the Virgin Mary, Son of God the Creator, and the resurrection of the flesh; she unites the Law and the Prophets with the writings of the evangelists and the apostles; from that source she drinks her faith and

that faith she seals with water, clothes with the Holy Spirit, feeds with the Eucharist, encourages to martyrdom; and against that teaching she receives no one.²¹

Although Tertullian writes before there is an official Christian canon, he clearly stresses the unity of "the Law and the Prophets" and "the evangelists and the apostles," thus setting the stage for the concept of the unified Christian canon, one made up of the Old Testament and the NT. Moreover, Tertullian clearly defines a boundary between those who hold the correct view of scripture and those who do not.

Many of the arguments of the church fathers of the second and third centuries were directed mainly at other Christians, but these arguments were made at the expense of the Jews and Jewish claims to the same scriptures. The more Christians argued for continuity between the scriptures of Israel and the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, the more they worked to sever the connection between those same scriptures and their contemporary Jews.

The Fourth Century

It is surely no coincidence that in the same century that Christianity moves from being a marginalized, often persecuted religion to being the official state religion under Constantine, it finally produces its official scriptural canon, made up of Old Testament (hereafter, OT) and NT.²² State sponsorship of Christianity led to the mass production of Christian Bibles, which is the primary reason our earliest biblical codices derive from the fourth century. Although the word "canon" is not used to refer to Christian scripture until Athanasius of Alexandria in 367, it was Eusebius of Caesarea in the early fourth century who, by virtue of his research interests as a historian and having access to the works of Origen (c. 185–253), made available to Constantine Origen's revision of the Septuagint, which Origen had referred to as the "Old Testament." More importantly, Eusebius constructed a comprehensive understanding of history that made seamless the material contained in the Old and New Testaments.

In his *Preparation for the Gospel*, Eusebius explains why Christianity is founded upon the "oracles of the Hebrews" (as opposed to the sacred writings of other cultures). First on his agenda is the distinction between "Hebrews" and "Jews."

And you may know the difference between Hebrews and Jews thus: the latter assumed their name from Judah, from whose tribe the kingdom of Judah was long ages afterward established, but the former from Eber, who was the forefather of Abraham. And that the Hebrews were earlier than the Jews, we are taught by the sacred writings.²³

He goes on to explain the Jews' "manner of religion," which is dependent on the laws of Moses. The reader learns that the Mosaic legislation and the establishment of the Jewish nation was caused by the people's "moral weakness" at the time, making them unable to "emulate the virtue of their fathers, inasmuch as they were enslaved by passions and sick in soul . . ." (*Preparation*, 7.9d).

Eusebius builds on Justin's arguments, in which there is a pristine early period, followed by disobedience and the giving of the law at Sinai out of necessity. Christians are of course descended from Hebrews. The patriarchs, Moses, and the prophets become the ancestors of the Christians; the biblical heroes are seen as pre-Christ Christians. The Jews, on the other hand, are seen as illegitimate offspring, a people rightfully deprived of their heritage because of their depravity. By making this neat distinction between Hebrews and Jews, Eusebius is able to maintain continuity between the OT writings and Christianity, while at the same time denying the continuity between the people of God spoken of in the OT and Jews.²⁴

Eusebius's writings are not polemically directed against Jews; he writes for Christian Rome. One of the strongest motivations for retaining the scriptures of Israel as the Christian OT was to demonstrate to Rome that Christianity was not a new-fangled cult. For Christians to gain stature in the eyes of Rome they had to demonstrate they had deep roots in antiquity. Rome's tolerance for Judaism and peculiar Jewish practice was largely predicated on Judaism's claims to a long-standing tradition extending far back in time. The need to prove to Rome that Christianity represented a long tradition exacerbated the need to push Jews out of the historical picture and claim the scriptures of Israel as exclusively Christian.

Robert Wilken has made the point that Christians probably suffered from a kind of inferiority complex as they tried to define themselves over against Judaism. "That Christians only had copies of the Jewish books, that few Christians knew Hebrew, and that Christians read and studied the Bible only in translations put them on the defensive. Possession of the original books was no small matter, for the rightful possession implied that one understood their contents."²⁵ Precisely because Christians had to make a case for the OT in the second through the fourth centuries, had to argue for its validity as *Christian Holy Writ*, they were led to dispossess the Jews of their scripture. For if "scripture" was equivalent to the sacred writings of Jews, then how could it truly belong to Christians? For Jews of the rabbinic period, they understood their sacred writings to be the story of God's covenantal relationship with them in particular. Jews understood themselves as constituting the exact same people as spoken of in the Bible. They saw no historical break between ancient Israel and themselves, much as Paul had. There is nothing comparable in rabbinic writings to the sense of newness reflected in the OT/NT schema constructed by Christians.²⁶ For Christians of the second through the fourth centuries, the essence of the OT was

that it constituted a harbinger of Christ; everything in scripture pointed toward Christ. The OT by itself was, at best, incomplete.²⁷

Thus, the OT was retained as scripture but it was, well, old. It was scripture in so far as it related to the NT. But because Jews did not read it this way, and because Jews had traditionally been the caretakers of scripture, Christians had to undermine the rival Jewish understanding of the Bible to establish their interpretation as legitimate. Interestingly, Marcion's rejection of Israelite scripture was largely due to his rather "Jewish" understanding of it.²⁸ He saw the OT as too particularistic. What was prophesied was a kingly messiah who would restore the Jews to the land. Marcion agreed with the Jews that a suffering messiah was never envisioned by the Hebrew Prophets. For Marcion, all of this was proof that Jesus and the message he brought was unprecedented, having nothing to do with the Jews or their Bible. Thus, those Christian writers who wanted to defend the Christian OT had to debunk completely the Jewish understanding of the Bible, and thoroughly Christianize the texts of the OT. Of course, this hermeneutical move saved the OT as scripture in a Christian context. The irony is that the rhetoric of the church fathers that preserved the scriptures of Israel and provides a common textual tradition for Jews and Christians today is the same rhetoric that constructed a view of Judaism and Christianity as mutually exclusive.

Nazi Theologians Revive the Debates of Antiquity

Strikingly, Christian theologians of the Third Reich reflect the same ironic tension regarding debates about the canon as had occurred in antiquity. Many *Deutsche Christen* theologians who were loyal to Nazi ideology rejected the OT, precisely because they thought of it as a Jewish book.²⁹ But even before the rise of Nazism, the famous Christian historian and theologian Adolf von Harnack argued that the OT should be published separately from "Christian scripture" because it is contradictory to the New Testament—a suggestion resembling the thought of Marcion, about whom Harnack had written the definitive study.³⁰

Of course, others argued against those theologians who wanted to reject the OT. These Christians—who include both Protestants and Catholics, those who were Nazi party members and those who were not—employed the same kind of rhetoric used by orthodox Christians during the second through the fourth centuries. In their attempt to maintain the traditional Christian canon comprised of OT and NT, they completely disassociated the OT from contemporary Jews, Judaism, and Jewish culture. Cardinal Faulhaber, the relatively moderate archbishop of Munich, preached passionately against any rejection of the OT. In defense of the OT he says:

By accepting these books Christianity does not become a Jewish religion. These books were not composed by Jews; they are inspired by the Holy Ghost, and therefore they are the word of God, they are God's books. The

writers of them were God's pencils, the Psalm-singers were harps in the hand of God, the prophets were announcers of God's revelation. It is for this reason that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are worthy of credence and veneration for all time. Antagonism to the Jews of today must not be extended to the books of pre-Christian Judaism.³¹

The cardinal makes three distinctions or disassociations: that between ancient Israel and postbiblical Judaism, that between the OT scripture and other Jewish writings like the Talmud, which are not divinely inspired, and that between what is of permanent value in the OT and what is of transitory value. Of the first distinction he says:

We must first distinguish between the people of Israel before and after the death of Christ. Before the death of Christ during the period between the calling of Abraham and the fullness of time, the people of Israel were enlightened men who by the law, the Mosaic Torah, regulated their religious and civil life, by the Psalms provided them with a prayer book for family devotion and a hymn book for the public liturgy, by the Sapiential books taught them how to conduct their lives, and as prophets awakened the conscience of the nation with the living word. . . . After the death of Christ, Israel was dismissed from the service of Revelation. She had not known the time of her visitation. She had repudiated and rejected the Lord's Anointed, had driven Him out of the city and nailed Him to the Cross. Then the veil of the Temple was rent, and with it the covenant between the Lord and His people. The daughters of Sion received the bill of divorce. . . . (Faulhaber, 257–258).

Like his predecessors in antiquity, Cardinal Faulhaber's defense of the OT is made at the expense of the Jews, not because he felt any "common heritage" with the Jewish people.

One particularly interesting Christian thinker who allied himself with the Nazis but also argued against the *Deutsche Christen* rejection of the OT was Gerhard Kittel.³² Kittel was a New Testament scholar and one of the foremost authorities on ancient Judaism. Kittel took pains at his trial in 1946 in Nuremberg to defend his views, because they were based on his historical expertise, not on vulgar antisemitism. He, too, made a distinction between the good Jews of ancient times and contemporary Jews who were corrupt, only he did not make the cut-off the death of Christ, but the Babylonian exile. Prior to the exile, Israel was a state with its own laws and boundaries and land. But after the exile, some Jews chose not to return home. Thus, the diaspora led to a wholly new form of Judaism; "Jewry became a religion and a race without a

homeland."³³ Furthermore, because they had no actual political power, they became parasitic on other nations. The "Jewish Question" in Kittel's view could therefore be intellectually and historically substantiated within OT scripture itself. Although Kittel's interpretation of biblical history reveals his own perspective—obviously informed by the concept of nationalism that so dominated postenlightenment thought—making the point of disconnection between Israel and Judaism the Babylonian exile, rather than the death of Christ, offered one more argument in favor of seeing the OT as an exclusively Christian book. His interpretive context may have been different than that of Tertullian or Eusebius, but like them, Kittel defended the OT as a Christian book by seeing it as the history of the Jews' failure and God's eventual rejection of the Jewish people. Christians were therefore the true Israel, whereas the Jews were God's outcasts, or, worse yet, God's enemies.

Concluding Thoughts

It took nearly 300 years to establish the Christian canon. Not only did Christians have different views on the matter, but the Jewish connection to the Hebrew scriptures, through language, culture, and observances, made claims to continuity seemingly easier. That is why Christians of the past worked so hard to construct a rhetoric of exclusion toward Judaism; that was the only way to be persuasive in retaining the OT. Since part of the meaningfulness of the study of the past is to see that historical events are not inevitabilities, but develop through a series of choices people make, I cannot help but wonder what would have happened if Christians had settled on a canon that did not overlap with the Hebrew Bible? Would there have been the same hostility?

At the same time, I recognize that there were good reasons for the Christian canon to turn out as it did. For at least the first 200 years of Christian history, the only sacred authority to which Christians could appeal was Israelite scripture, and many Christians, whether of Jewish or gentile origin, revered those texts as much as any rabbinic Jew. Justin was converted by studying the Prophets, not by reading the gospels. Furthermore, many of the texts that would eventually make up the NT are so full of quotations, allusions, and paraphrases of the Septuagint, that some of these writings would barely be comprehensible if the OT had not been included in the Christian Bible.

The resemblance of ancient debates about the Christian canon to debates during the Third Reich provides not only one more connection between ancient Christian anti-Judaism and modern antisemitism (and thus, at least implicitly, the Shoah itself), but should force Jews and Christians to ask whether their "common" heritage is really something we hold in common. Indeed in most recent scholarship, there is widespread acknowledgment that both Judaism and Christianity represent radical transformations of the religion of Israel, and that

the meaningfulness of Israel's sacred writings was dependent on reinterpreting them so as to make them vital in a world profoundly transformed during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.³⁴ It may sound outrageous initially, but the premise upon which Kittel based his antisemitic view of Jewish history was not totally unfounded. There is no doubt that modern Judaism differs immensely from the religion of Israel. The question is whether the difference reflects degeneration, as Kittel, like Eusebius and so many other Christians, had argued. Christianity, too, differs radically from Israelite religion. Kittel's primary criterion for seeing Judaism as degenerate was that it no longer had the status of nationhood. Ironically, Christianity was from the start supranational—"no longer Jew or Greek," as Paul had said—much as diaspora Judaism was and still is.

For most of history, having a set of sacred texts in common has led to a rhetoric of hostility, not a sentiment of kinship. The reason is obvious: the interpretation of those scriptures within the respective faith communities of Judaism and Christianity mattered more than the texts themselves, and that interpretation was one of the keys to self-definition between the two religions. Jews and Christians must both recognize that they each constructed their understanding of scripture within the contexts of their separate faith communities after the biblical period. The rabbis of the Mishnaic and Talmudic period *made* the writings of Israel into the Tanakh. The church fathers *made* those same writings, together with the NT, into the Christian Bible. Both were born out of a creative need to retain the past and yet make it vital to the present. Historically, the most important difference between the two is that Christianity grew much larger in number and stature once it allied with Rome and, from then on, its rhetoric was backed by political power and force. Ultimately, Jews suffered horrendously. Christians today, therefore, should not simply assume a common textual heritage with Jews and Judaism as a starting point for Jewish-Christian dialogue. As a Jew, I encourage Christians to acknowledge the historical relationship that exists between the making of the Christian Bible and the anti-Jewish attitudes that resulted from the rhetoric of canonization. That would be the first step toward recognizing the otherness of the Jewish understanding of scripture and the otherness of Judaism. If that were the starting point, I think we could work toward a genuine sense of what we share in scripture, but that sense of commonality would come at the end of a dialogical process, not at the beginning.

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Fiftieth Annual Conference of the American Theological Library Association, held at the Iliff School of Theology, June 1996.
2. Perhaps the best place to go for information on organizations devoted to Jewish-Christian relations is the Jewish-Christian Relations Net (www.jcrelations.net).

3. "Tanakh" is an acronym composed of the first letter of the Hebrew word for each of the three parts of the Hebrew Bible: Torah, Nevi'im (Prophets), Kethuvim (Writings).
4. See, for example, the founding statement by the International Council of Christians and Jews (www.jcrelations.net/stmnts/iccj_theol_statement.htm).
5. Our earliest extant codices of the Christian Bible are all dated to the fourth and fifth centuries. They include Codex Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae.
6. For a concise explanation of the differences between the Jewish and Christian canons, see the entry on "Canon" in the *HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*, ed. P. J. Achtemeier et al., rev. ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 1996).
7. For the purposes of this essay, my focus will be almost exclusively on the Christian canonization process; I will say little about the process among Jews of the same period. Although I occasionally use the word "canon" when speaking of the scriptures of Israel in the first and second centuries C.E., to emphasize that they were widely regarded as having divine authority, the term oversimplifies the matter. Whether there was a well-defined Jewish biblical canon by the first century is highly debatable. In my own view, Israelite scripture was constructed into the official Jewish canon by the rabbis at about the same time that Christians were establishing their canon, during the second to the fourth centuries C.E. (although for Jews it may have been more firmly fixed by the end of the second century). Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, for example, indicates a freer and more fluid understanding of sacred texts during the first century C.E. For an excellent discussion of the development of the Hebrew canon using evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, see E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999).
8. I will use the phrase "scriptures of Israel" in this essay as a neutral (and historically more appropriate) way of describing the texts that become the Tanakh for Jews and the Old Testament for Christians.
9. The scriptures of Israel are referred to in a variety of ways in the New Testament. Even the same author can refer to it in different ways. See, for example, Romans, where in 3:2 Paul calls them "the oracles of God;" in 3:21 "the law and the prophets;" and in 4:3 "scripture." The point, however, is that there is no ambiguity about the scriptural authority of the texts cited.
10. See 2 Peter 3:15–16, which mentions the writings of Paul. Although some writings of the New Testament use the writings of other New Testament authors, e.g., Matthew and Luke use the Gospel of Mark as a source, there is no evidence that such sources have any kind of scriptural status.
11. See J. Blenkinsopp, "Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Vol. 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 1–26.
12. The new perspective on Paul is represented in the works of K. Stendahl, L. Gaston, J. Gager, D. Boyarin, N. T. Wright, and J. D. G. Dunn, to name just a few. They themselves hardly comprise a perfect unity of perspective, but they all read Paul as standing well within the context of first-century Judaism.
13. For a good discussion of the problem of negative and positive statements about Jewish law, see J. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1–15.
14. All biblical quotations come from the NRSV unless otherwise indicated and will be cited in text.
15. Some scholars have argued that an attitude of supersessionism is already present in Hebrews or Luke-Acts, if not in Paul or other NT writings. Although I do think Hebrews represents a significant hermeneutical shift from Paul—to be sure, Hebrews speaks of the new covenant in Christ as having replaced the old, which is even called "obsolete" by the author—Hebrews

- treats the scriptural texts reverently and sees the old covenant as having established certain paradigms that are continued in the new covenant; they have just been perfected.
16. *Epistle of Barnabas* 13:7; hereafter cited in text as *Barnabas*. Translations for *Barnabas* are taken from *The Apostolic Fathers* (LCL; London: Heinemann, 1919). For a more detailed discussion of the role of Abraham in *Barnabas*, see J. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 148–151.
 17. H. von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972), 70; hereafter cited in text as von Campenhausen.
 18. It is likely there were more than four. Some scholars argue that the Gospel of Thomas can be dated to the first century. See also Luke 1:1–4, in which the gospel writer reports that “many have undertaken to set down an orderly account” of the story of Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection.
 19. The classic study of Marcion was done by A. von Harnack in 1921. A later English translation was made entitled *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1990). More recent is the study by R. J. Hoffman, *Marcion: On the Reinstitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century* (AAR Academy Series 46; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1984).
 20. See Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho* 16.2; 19.2; 19.5; 23.5; 92.3.
 21. *Prescriptions Against Heretics*, 36. Translation taken from S. L. Greenslade, *Early Latin Theology* (Library of Christian Classics; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956).
 22. See the discussion by J. Carroll in *Constantine’s Sword: The Church and the Jews, A History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), 178–207. Carroll argues that Constantine was driven by the need to unify the empire (which was divided at the time) and virtually all his political, religious, and military undertakings, including his attempts to unify Christians, were designed to establish a singular, common understanding of what it meant to be part of Rome.
 23. *Preparation for the Gospel*, 7.6c; hereafter cited in text as *Preparation*. Translations for Eusebius are taken from *Preparation for the Gospel*, Part I (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981).
 24. For a fuller discussion, see P. Eisenbaum, *The Jewish Heroes of Christian History: Hebrews 11 in Literary Context* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 218–225.
 25. R. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983), 81.
 26. S. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 21, 230–231.
 27. See E. E. Ellis, “Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church,” *Mikra: The Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M. J. Mulder (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 691–725.
 28. See S. G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 215–216.
 29. See E. C. Helmreich, *The German Churches Under Hitler* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979), 150.
 30. See H. J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Neukirchen Kries Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1956), 351; and R. Ericksen, *Theologians Under Hitler* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 50, 209. See also n. 19.
 31. English quotations for Cardinal Faulhaber are taken from *Nazi Culture: Intellectual, Cultural and Social Life in the Third Reich*, ed. George L. Mosse (New York: Schocken, 1981), 258–259; hereafter cited in text as Faulhaber.
 32. Kittel was a Nazi party member but he was often critical of the *Deutsche Christen* theologians, because they argued for historically untenable views such as that Jesus was not Jewish, which Kittel knew to be ridiculous. The best discussion I have found of Kittel is in Ericksen, *Theologians Under Hitler*, 28–78.
 33. Ericksen, *Theologians Under Hitler*, 61. Ericksen refers to an article by Kittel entitled “Die Entstehung des Judentums und die Entstehung der Judenfrage,” *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* 1 (1936): 47–48.
 34. See, for example, A. Segal, *Rebecca’s Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).