

1

What's the Relationship between Christianity and Judaism?

It was the year 48. Almost twenty years had passed since Jesus had died and reportedly risen from the dead. While fasting and in prayer, the leaders of the fledgling Christian community in Antioch, the city where Christians first received their name, set aside and anointed two Jewish men to spread the message of Jesus Christ outside of the region. Their names were Barnabas and Saul. Their first destination was Cyprus, Barnabas's homeland. In what would become a standard practice, these two men initially preached their message to Jews before then "turning to the Gentiles" (Acts 13:46). According to the book of Acts, the missionary duo eventually traveled to the southwestern part of the island of Cyprus. There, in Paphos, they met with the Roman governor—a man named Sergius Paulus—explaining to him and his court how a Jewish criminal crucified by the Romans was the *Soter mundi*, or Savior of the world.

It was at this point in the story when two interrelated events occurred: the conversion of the Roman governor to Christianity and the change of Saul's name. The conversion of Sergius Paulus signaled a great change in the history of Christian mission, for this governor

was not only a Gentile but also the most powerful Christian man currently living in the Roman Empire. In fact, one New Testament scholar goes so far as to suggest that Saul departed Cyprus earlier than anticipated since conversion at “the highest level of society” all but guaranteed the conversion of the island without the apostle’s presence.¹ It was also at this time that Saul changed his Jewish name to Paul in the presence of the governor, Sergius Paulus. Given the venue of the name change and the larger cultural Roman practice of patronage, it’s possible that Saul formally adopted the *cognomen* or family name of his new patron, Paulus (or Paullus). Such a theory is bolstered by the fact that Paul and Barnabas, now under the patronage of the governor, immediately set sail from Cyprus for Pisidian Antioch, the hometown of Sergius Paulus. The governor likely sent Paul and Barnabas along with letters of introduction to individuals in that very important city in the Roman province of Galatia. In order to indicate this shift of wind in Christian mission, one of the greatest of the apostles, Saul, would henceforth be known not by his Jewish name but by one of his Roman ones, Paulus.

Figure 1.1. Understanding Roman Names

Many Roman citizens had three names (*tria nomina*). These are commonly referred to as the (1) *praenomen*, (2) *nomen*, and (3) *cognomen*:

1. *Praenomen* – Personal name chosen by the parents of the child
2. *Nomen* – Family name of Roman citizen (shared with other family or clan members, passed on generationally)
3. *Cognomen* – Additional name used to identify child’s relation to other family or clan members. It’s possible that the apostle Paul adopted the *cognomen* Paul (in Latin: Paulus or Paullus) after coming under the patronage of the Roman governor Sergius Paulus.²

1. Eckhard Schnabel, *Early Christian Mission*, vol. 2, *Paul and the Early Church* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 1088.

2. Naturally, scholars debate whether Saul had always had the name Paulus as one of his names since he was a Roman citizen or whether he later adopted it.

The Question of the Parting of Ways

It comes as no surprise that the so-called Jerusalem Council, convened to formulate a policy on how to address conversions of Christianity by non-Jews (called Gentiles), came at the heels of Saul's name change to Paulus and his conversion of a powerful Roman governor. Though emerging out of Judaism, it was now clear that Christianity was more than a Jewish sect. At the same time, it was not at all clear what requirements were expected of Gentiles who affirmed Jesus as their *Dominus et Deus*—their Lord and their God. As one early Christian historian wrote, “it is relatively easy to see that the movement Christ started was in conflict with Judaism from the beginning.”³

In this chapter, we will engage the first of our twenty questions that shaped world Christian history. Our focus will be the following question: What was the relationship between Christianity and Judaism? This question, amply discussed and alluded to in the New Testament documents, consumed the thinking and writing of the earliest Christians. It was, in fact, a question that loomed over the formation and development of Christian churches all across the Mediterranean world. From the Gospels, to Paul's letters, to the Council of Jerusalem, and to the destruction of the Jewish temple, we will sift through various Christian responses to this most fundamental of questions during the first century of the Christian era.

Jesus in the Gospels: A Foreshadowing of an International Ministry

Jesus was raised in Nazareth, a three-day journey from Jerusalem. In the first century CE, Nazareth was an insignificant Jewish village

3. James Leonard Papandrea, *Reading the Early Church Fathers: From the Didache to Nicea* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2012), 1.

of only a couple of hundred people. Nazareth was surrounded by Gentile populations and was located on the outskirts of a large Roman-influenced city known as Sepphoris. We know next to nothing of Jesus' early childhood. According to the gospel accounts, in his late twenties or early thirties Jesus abandoned his craft as a "woodworker" and spent the last years of his life preaching and healing in the Palestinian backwaters of Galilee, earning the reputation of a great wonderworker and teacher.

The climax of Jesus' ministry occurred in Jerusalem the last week of his life. According to each of the New Testament Gospels, Jesus made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem for Passover like many other pious Jews. There, in the city where all prophets were destined "to be killed" (Luke 13:33), Jesus openly rebuked Jewish authorities in the temple precincts, arousing their ire and jealousy. New Testament historian N. T. Wright suggests that Jesus was ultimately killed for redefining the people of God in a way that threatened and offended Jewish authorities as well as common Jewish people alike:

Jesus seems to have believed himself to be the focal point of the real returning-from-exile people, the true kingdom-people; but that kingdom, that people and this Messiah did not look like what the majority of Jews had expected. Jesus was summoning his hearer to a different way of being Israel. We now have to come to terms with the fact that he believed himself called to go that different way himself as Israel's anointed representative and to do for Israel—and hence also for the world—what Israel could not or would not do for herself.⁴

It is certainly significant that the "different way" Jesus went about as Israel's representative favored religious inclusivity. We get a glimpse of the different way of Jesus when he was almost stoned to death by the villagers of Nazareth one day as a result of lauding God's provision of Gentiles (and not Jews) during the days of Elijah and

4. N. T. Wright, *The Challenge of Jesus* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1999), 81.

Elisha (see Luke 4:16–30), two wonderworking prophets whom Jesus emulated. As New Testament scholar E. P. Sanders argues, “All the authors of the gospels favoured [Jesus’] mission to Gentiles.” Not surprisingly, therefore, these authors hunted for “all the pro-Gentile material that they could”⁵ find to include in their biographies of Jesus. And, according to many scholars, it was Jesus’ radical redefinition of who was included in the kingdom of God—Gentiles as well as Jews—that played a large part in his execution.

The belief that Jesus’ racially inclusive teaching contributed to his death need not conflict with select passages from the Gospel of Matthew, traditionally believed by early Christians to be written for a largely Jewish audience. Jesus’ saying in the Gospel of Matthew that he “was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (15:24; see also 10:5–6) should be tempered by other passages in that gospel indicating that Jesus was understood to be a light to the Gentiles whose birth was good news for non-Jews (e.g., 2:1; 4:15–16; 8:10; 12:18–21; 28:19). As best as we can reconstruct, Jesus regarded himself as the inaugurator of God’s reign, the one whose death would usher in a divine (and eschatological) kingdom encompassing Jews *and* Gentiles. Such a calling gives us the context for Jesus’ famous statement in the Sermon on the Mount, “Do not think that I have come to abolish the law or the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfill” (5:17). Rather than abolish the Torah or condemn the Jewish people God had called, safeguarded, and “entrusted with the oracles of God” (Rom. 3:2), Jesus fulfilled the Torah in his own person. In this way, Matthew’s community regarded Jesus not merely as the most authoritative interpreter of Torah in relation to the scribes or other Jewish leaders but as the personification of the Torah, as Matthew’s many formula citations indicate (1:22; 2:5, 15, 17, 23;

5. E. P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), 192.

4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:14, 35; 21:4; 27:9). In short, Jesus came to fulfill the mission for which Israel had always existed but had not always recognized—to be the collective channel of God’s salvation to the entire world.

The Ministry of the Apostle Paul (40s to 60s CE)

The apostle Paul based his ministry on the conviction that Jesus brought to an appropriate fulfillment the story of God’s dealing with humankind. “Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle,” words Paul dictated to his scribe Tertius in his most famous of letters, believed that he had been “set apart for the gospel of God, which he promised beforehand” (Rom. 1:1–2). The gospel or “good news” that Paul proclaimed centered on the offer of salvation made available to people of all ethnic backgrounds and religious persuasions due to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Though God’s covenant was previously restricted to the nation of Israel, God was bringing to completion this covenant in order to invite all other nations into the covenant as well. As historian Peter Brown succinctly writes, Paul’s “mission had been to bring pagans into the kingdom.”⁶ Israel was meant to bless the world and become the means by which the rest of the world gained salvation. Paul, as the self-styled “apostle to the Gentiles” (Rom. 11:13), worked tirelessly to establish and shepherd Gentile and Gentile-Jewish Christian communities.

As we survey the journeys of the apostle Paul in the book of Acts, we surmise that he did not regard Christian identity as in any way tied to the land of Judea. Nor do any of the New Testament authors appear to do so. On the contrary, after his encounter with the risen Christ, Paul rarely spent time in Judea or in the holy city of Jerusalem. Instead, the majority of his ministry was devoted to establishing and

6. Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 45.

nurturing Christian communities across the Mediterranean world, oftentimes in Gentile-dominated regions in modern Turkey and Greece. According to the so-called three missionary journeys of Paul narrated in the book of Acts, Paul always preached to Jews and Gentiles, but it was his preaching to Gentiles that caused the greatest controversies. Paul minced no words with Jewish Christians in Galatia who attempted to strong-arm Gentile and Jewish Christians into fully observing the Law of Moses while professing belief in Christ: “Listen! I, Paul, am telling you that if you let yourselves be circumcised, Christ will be of no benefit to you” (Gal. 5:2).

Although Paul was, of course, a Jew—and a rather proud one that at that (see Phil. 3:4–6)—he confounded many Jews by the ease with which he moved from the Jewish and Gentile worlds. In the matter of a few hours, it seems, Paul would preach in a synagogue, be stoned, shake the dust off his sandals, and proceed to spend the night with Gentiles. The next day he would do it all over again. In many ways, Paul was a conundrum. He refused to circumcise Titus by matter of principle, but forced his companion Timothy to undergo circumcision. He boldly asserted that Jesus was the end of the law, but was persuaded to undergo a Jewish ritual at the temple in Jerusalem. He argued that Jesus broke down the barrier dividing free people from slaves, but ordered slaves to be obedient to their masters. He commanded Christians to be good citizens and obey the authorities, but had a prison record longer than any two-bit criminal in the Roman Empire. And yet, through all these apparent contradictions, Paul was the one destined to move the Christian message forward into the Gentile world like no one else before him. For him, at any rate, Gentiles were full partners with Jews in the plan of salvation. Although he struggled greatly with how to implement this conviction from context to context, he

went to the grave believing that Jesus' death destroyed the centuries-long division between Jews and Gentiles. Through baptism into the community of faith, all ethnic, gender, and social distinctions that formerly caused division were stripped away. The individual's baptism into the church was a symbolic death to racism, exclusivism, and social bigotry.

The Jerusalem Council (49 or 50)

Paul's work among Gentiles precipitated concerned questions from many Jews, a people long accustomed to stark division existing (in diet, clothing, religion, and lifestyle) between Jews and *goyim*, that is, Gentiles. Were Gentiles able to become full participants in what God was doing through Christ? If so, what was expected of them? Although the book of Acts reported that Peter had received a revelation that effectively abrogated the continuation of dietary restrictions between Jews and Gentiles in the 30s CE, the issue was anything but settled. Indeed, as Paul crowed in his Letter to the Galatians, possibly written just months before the Jerusalem Council convened, he condemned Peter to his face for backing off table fellowship with Gentile Christians.

Each of the major players of Jewish Christianity was present at the Jerusalem Council: James, Peter, Paul, and Barnabas. Although they did not know this at the time, the council members were establishing a precedent of epic proportions, as each generation of Christian leaders since this time has held councils to settle church disputes on the basis of this one in the first century. The first words of the council were, not surprisingly, spoken by the impetuous Peter, while the last words came from James, who, true to form as one who is "quick to listen, slow to speak" (James 1:19), wisely spoke only after weighing

everyone else's testimony. Barnabas and Peter shared personal stories emerging from their work as missionaries.

The ruling of the council was settled on the basis of a novel Christ-centered interpretation of the Hebrew Bible as well as on the experiences of Christian leaders. In short, the experiences of Peter, Paul, and Barnabas confirmed—in light of Jesus' ministry and teaching—that Gentiles were to be included in the work that God was doing in the world among the Jewish people. The council determined that circumcision and the keeping of the law was unnecessary for Gentile converts. Gentiles were only required to refrain from blood, fornication, sacrificing food to idols, and from things strangled—basic requirements of Gentiles who converted to Judaism based on passages in Leviticus 17 and 18.

Although the Jerusalem Council is the basis for all subsequent councils in the history of Christianity, its rulings were surprisingly short-lived. It's true that Paul delivered the ruling to the church in Syrian Antioch, but it does not appear that he really took the rulings to heart. If it's true that Paul wrote his Letter to the Galatians before the council convened, the deliberations would have been anti-climactic. He had already decided how to handle the issue of contention. What need was there to receive the approval of mortals when Jesus Christ had personally appeared to him, commissioning him to the great task of Gentile missions? As Paul poignantly wrote to the Galatian Christians, "I died to the law" (2:19). For Paul, this was no figure of speech; he was fully persuaded that Jesus had ended observance of the law. He even went so far as to egg on those Jewish Christians adamant about demanding badges of Jewish identity such as circumcision: "I wish those who unsettle you would castrate themselves!" (5:12).

When viewed from hindsight, it's apparent that the Jerusalem Council was anything but definitive. It did not resolve how Jewish

Christians were to relate to the Law of Moses. If anything, it seemed to presuppose that Jewish Christians continued observing the law—but to what extent, it is not exactly clear. At the same time, the council did extend the door that Paul and others had opened in their evangelization of the Gentiles. Although Gentiles did not have to become Jews to become Christians, they were not on equal footing with Jewish Christians. Such were the conclusions of Jewish Christians living in the heart of Judaism amidst a fully operational temple—but this would not always be the case.

The First Jewish War (66–70)

The First Jewish War and the destruction of the Jewish temple were watershed events in the history of Christianity. Before the temple's destruction in 70 CE, even the apostle Paul, the very man who so strongly avowed that those who clung to observance of Jewish rituals were making null and void the work of Christ, fulfilled a Nazarite vow in deference to James decades after becoming a Christ-follower. Of course, Paul's presence in the Jewish temple caused a riot—demonstrating not only Paul's penchant for provoking controversy but also his apparent urging for Jews to “forsake Moses, and . . . [other Jewish] customs” (Acts 21:21). According to the early church historian Eusebius, relations between Jews and Jewish Christians had deteriorated to such an extent that the threat of the temple's destruction, the holiest site on earth and the throne of God in the eyes of the Jews, did not compel them to remain at home and fight with their fellow Jews against the pagan Romans. Nor did the Christians feel obliged to pay the temple tax now that they were no longer bound to the sacrificial system. It appears that there was already a growing division between Jews and Jewish Christians.

Figure 1.2. Timeline of the First Jewish War

- Begins in Caesarea when Roman soldiers stand by as Jews are killed (66)
- Gains force as Jewish priests cease to make (required) offerings for Roman emperor (66)
- Escalates as General Vespasian enters Palestine and attacks Jewish forces (67)
- Halts as Emperor Nero commits suicide and Rome is in an uproar (68)
- Continues as Vespasian leaves Israel to become emperor—the fourth in a year (69)
- Culminates when Vespasian's son, Titus, takes over as general and utterly destroys Jewish rebels, their land, and, finally, the temple (69–70)
- Comes to finale as a hardened band of Jewish rebels commits suicide at Masada rather than die at the hands of Romans (73)

The First Jewish War, which lasted roughly from 66 to 70 CE, was an inevitable battle that had been brewing in the in the minds and hearts of Jews since the Romans annexed Judea in the year 6 CE. The mounting animosity between Jews and Romans serves as the backdrop to some of the stories in the Gospels, though New Testament scholars disagree to what extent Jesus was influenced by this Jewish–Roman hostility. According to the first-century Jewish general Josephus, who later became a spy for the Romans and who retired to a life of leisure and writing in Rome after the war ended, the culmination of the war came when General Titus, the son of the newly proclaimed Roman Emperor Vespasian, entered Jerusalem in the year 70, set up Roman standards, made pagan sacrifices, and proceeded to destroy the temple.

While those Jews who escaped death watched their holy furnishings cavalierly handled by Roman soldiers and their temple's walls burned to the ground, the Jewish Christians of the Jerusalem church were safely in a city called Pella in the region of Perea, about sixty miles northeast. According to Eusebius, the Christians in

Jerusalem had been directed to flee “the judgment of God [which] at last overtook [the Jews] for their abominable crimes against Christ and His apostles.”⁷ For Eusebius, whose thinking was drawn in part from Paul’s First Letter to the Thessalonians (2:14–16), God used the Romans to condemn the Jewish people and their most prized possession, the temple, in accordance with Jesus’ prophecy in the Gospels. In the eyes of Eusebius, the destruction of the temple did several things simultaneously: it confirmed the prophecies of Christ; illustrated Christianity’s final break with Judaism; and demonstrated the patience of God, who “for forty years after [the Jews’] crime against Christ delayed their destruction” in order to provoke the Jewish people toward repentance so that “they might obtain pardon and salvation.”⁸

Eusebius of Caesarea is an important figure in early Christianity. Eusebius was bishop of Caesarea (capital of the Roman province of Judea, where the governors formally lived—now an ancient site in Israel) from the year 314 until his death in c. 340. He wrote the first major history of the church (as well as several other books) and was a client of the first Christian emperor of the Roman Empire, Constantine, under the so-called patronage system. Eusebius later wrote a book that lauded Constantine as a man of faith who protected Christianity.

However the early Christians interpreted this event, the destruction of the Jewish temple was clearly a turning point for Jews and Gentiles. As one early historian wrote, “the period after the destruction of the Temple certainly saw a worsening of relations between Christians and non-Christian Jews.”⁹ For Jews, the absence of a temple obviously made full observance of the Jewish law impossible since so many laws were dependent on the continuation of the sacrificial system. The war had also decimated the populace

7. Eusebius, *The History of the Church* 3.5 (London: Penguin, 1989), 68.

8. *Ibid.*, 75.

9. Jonathan Hill, *Christianity: How a Tiny Sect from a Despised Religion Came to Dominate the Roman Empire* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011), 70.

and destroyed many Jewish groups. Such groups included the Sicari, a radical Jewish sect that committed suicide at the citadel of Masada in 73 CE; the Sadducees, who were the Jewish elite connected to the temple and part of the Sanhedrin; and the Essenes, who had retreated to the Dead Sea and were responsible for the Dead Sea Scrolls. For Jewish Christians in Palestine, the church became increasingly Gentile in orientation since Jews in Judea were unable to enter the area, especially after the Second Jewish War ended in 135.

The Thought and Practice of the Ebionites

Although virtually none of their writings have outlived their own time period, there was a fringe group of Jewish Christians from the first century who would have responded to the question of the relationship between Judaism and Christianity differently than many other Christians such as the apostle Paul and what we may call the proto-orthodox group of Christians—those whose views would become the majority. They were called Ebionites. Like the apostle Paul, the Ebionites believed that Jesus was the Jewish Messiah and that he fulfilled prophecies in the Hebrew Bible. In contrast to Paul, however, the Ebionites did not regard Jesus as God; nor did they believe that Jewish Christians had to observe the Law of Moses in order to be in relationship with God. As a result, the Ebionites—though Christians—followed the law of the Hebrew Bible in full, even though they understood the Law very differently than non-Christian Jews did.

Like the pious child of a Jewish mother and a Christian father, Ebionites observed the rituals of both parents. As Jews, they took daily ritual baths while, as Christians, they performed baptism; as Jews, they kept the Sabbath from Friday to Saturday afternoon while, as Christians, they observed the Lord's Day on Sunday. Unlike Gentile Christians, however, they revered the city of Jerusalem and

faced its direction while in prayer; and unlike Jews, they believed that Jesus' death had ended the sacrificial system. They were "in" the worlds of both Christianity and Judaism, but "of" neither.

From what we can gather, the Ebionites disagreed vigorously with the apostle Paul on many points of doctrine. Although in the first century there was no such thing as a "New Testament" as we conceive of it today, Paul's letters would never have been included in the Ebionite canon of Scriptures. Nor would Paul have tolerated their views of Christ had he known about them. Paul would have regarded their theology on par with the Judaizers of Galatia—and thus a gospel-free theology—while, on the other hand, the Ebionites would have considered Paul a heretic for urging Jews to cease observing the Law of Moses and instead urging faith in Jesus on the supposition that "Christ is the end of the law" (Rom. 10:4). The Ebionites also objected to Paul's teaching that Jesus was the ultimate sacrifice of God who was slaughtered like a lamb in order to save the world. On the contrary, we know from a third-century document called "The Letter of Peter to James" that the Ebionites considered Paul thoroughly mistaken. As the letter states, Paul is considered the "enemy" of Peter who distorted Peter's message. In clear contrast to Paul's teaching, the Ebionite letter indicates that only "a man who ... has been circumcised is a believing Christian."¹⁰

Although the Ebionites appeared to flourish for a season, the Ebionite movement died out in the centuries to come. As the Christian church in the Roman Empire become predominantly Gentile, Jewish Christians such as the Ebionites found themselves in the minority and out of favor. Yet not all of the theology of the Ebionites disappeared. Although the Ebionite church perished, one of their distinct beliefs—that Jesus was adopted by God at some point

10. "The Letter of Peter to James and Its Reception," in Bart Ehrman, *After the New Testament: A Reader in Early Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 137–38.

in his ministry—would strike a chord with various Christian groups in the years that followed. Such Christian “adoptionists,” though not part of what we may regard as mainstream Christianity, have always had a following in the history of Christianity, even to this day. Although movements come and go, ideas, especially controversial ones, are often recycled during some other period in history.

Conclusion: Christianity and Judaism as Separate Religions

Despite the presence of fringe groups such as the Ebionites, by the close of the first century there was a mounting consensus that Christianity and Judaism were quite distinct. Perhaps early church historian W. C. H. Frend summed it up best when he wrote, “After circa AD 100 there was . . . more of a tendency to contrast Christianity and Judaism as separate religions.”¹¹ Over time, this tendency has only accelerated. Likely written at the end of the first century, the *Didache* urged Christians to fast on different days of the week than did “the hypocrites,” that is, the Jews, in order to demonstrate the clear separations of these two religions. Likewise, we cannot overestimate how significant it was that early Christians moved their day of worship from the Sabbath (Friday to Saturday afternoon) to Sunday, the day when Jesus was reported to have risen from the tomb.

Writing in the second century, the Gentile Christian Justin Martyr captured the division between Jews and Christians by boldly declaring to his Jewish dialogue partner Trypho that the Law of Moses was “already obsolete.” Whereas circumcision was only given to “you Jews,” Justin asserted, the message of Christ was intended “for all men.”¹² Justin argued that Gentiles who adopted the Law of

11. W. C. H. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1986), 124.

12. Justin Martyr, “Dialogue with Trypho 11,” in *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 6, *A New Translation*, trans. Thomas Falls (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1977), 164.

Moses would not be saved, nor would any Jews who did not believe in Christ. Justin went on to declare to Trypho:

Aren't you acquainted with [the words of the prophets like David and Moses], Trypho? You should be, for they are contained in your Scriptures, *or rather not yours, but ours*. For we believe and obey them, whereas you, though you read them, do not grasp their spirit.¹³

Taking into consideration the argument of Justin Martyr in the second century, we see that the parting of ways between Judaism and Christianity was essentially complete by the second century, if not before.¹⁴ Although it is true, as historian Jaroslav Pelikan once wrote, that “Virtually every major Christian writer of the first five centuries either composed a treatise in opposition to Judaism or made this issue a dominant theme in a treatise devoted to some other subject,”¹⁵ such treatises were effectively intellectual exercises. Most early Christians understood themselves to be the inheritors of God’s promises in the Old Testament and thus the rightful possessors of the Hebrew Bible. While the Jews read the Hebrew Bible in a carnal way—their eyes covered as if by a veil, wrote the apostle Paul (2 Cor. 3:14)—the Christians read it spiritually and hence saw Christ everywhere. Though sharing a common heritage, Judaism and Christianity were really different religions whose beliefs and practices have only diverged over time.

13. Justin, “Dialogue with Trypho 19,” 191 (italics added).

14. As New Testament historian James Dunn writes in *The Parting of Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM Press, 2006), 318, “by the end of the second Jewish revolt, Christian and Jew were clearly distinct and separate.”

15. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 1, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 15.