

THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN SCHISM (PART II)

by DAVID FLUSSER

VI. Jewish Hatred of Christians

Let us now return to the period before the destruction of the Temple. We have seen that there is, with one exception, no relevant evidence of tension between the early Jewish Christians and the Synagogue. There existed at that time a feeling of tension and even of hatred on the part of non-Christian Jewry, but our knowledge of the development, intensity and ideological motifs of this tension from the Jewish side is more fragmentary than is commonly supposed. Then the prophecy of Jesus was fulfilled (Mt. 10:17–18): “And be on your guard, for men will hand you over to their courts, they will flog you in the synagogues, and you will be brought before governors and kings, for my sake, to testify before them and the heathen” (Cf. I Thess. 2:14). Nothing about such persecutions is known from Rabbinic literature, but the tension itself against Christians is attested there, as is also the close connection between the rabbis and the Jewish Christians.²⁵ The strangest thing is that in the early Rabbinic sources, until the end of the second century, nothing is said against the person of Jesus or against the faith he had elicited. Even the argument that he was a sorcerer only appears later (Mt. 12:24

David Flusser, a frequent contributor to and member of the Editorial Board of *Immanuel*, is Professor of Judaism of the Second Temple Period and Early Christianity in the Department of Religion at the Hebrew University.

Part I of this article, an original contribution to *Immanuel*, in which Prof. Flusser detailed the Christian side of the “Jewish-Christian schism,” appeared in *Immanuel* 16 (1983), pp. 32–49.

25. See, e.g., R.T. Herford, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London, 1903).

and parallel passages do not seem to be decisive). Earlier we hear only that some rabbis opposed exorcisms in his name. According to a legend in the Babylonian Talmud (Gittin 56b–57a), the spirit of Jesus said to Aquila, before he became a proselyte, that Israel is beloved by God; he said that he had been condemned because he had spoken against the words of the Jewish sages. This is, as far as I know, the only possibly-authentic instance in which Jesus' position in Judaism is defined — but even there his solidarity with Israel is stressed, but it is not altogether clear that this passage really is old. The lack of any criticism of the faith of Jesus and of the principles of Christian religion in rabbinic literature prior to the end of the second century cannot be easily explained. Christians are as strongly rejected as other heretics, but no specific arguments are adduced against them in that period, while at the same time other, unknown groups are designated heretical on the ground of false doctrines of theirs which are specifically mentioned. Does this mean that the rabbis rejected Jewish Christians, not because of the special content of their faith, but because of their opposition to the synagogue?²⁶ If so, these Jewish Christian heretics did not profess the developed Christology of the Gentile Church. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that, from the end of the second century, we read in Rabbinic literature polemics against such Christian articles of faith as the idea that God had a son. These new polemics were evidently not directed against Jewish Christian heretics but against the Christian Church, and it is interesting to see that these objections were, as far as we can see, never directed against any specific group, but only against such articles of faith as are opposed. All this shows that neither Jesus nor Jewish Christians were attacked because of their faith. Later, when Rabbinic Judaism came into contact with the Gentile Christian Church, Gentile Christianity was perceived, not as a Jewish problem, but as an expression of a false theological attitude of foreigners.

It seems that the opposition against Jewish Christians arose mainly on a social and national level; but even so, I do not think that the departure of Christians to Pella in the year 68 was a decisive factor which heightened the tension, for others also opposed the Jewish war. The situation was probably different in the Bar-Kokhba War, not only because the entire Jewish nation was then mobilized, but also because of the strongly messianic character of that war, and the inability of Christians to accept Bar Kokhba as the Messiah. This explains the persecution of Christians by Bar Kokhba. Justin Martyr writes (*I Apology* 131) that the Jews

26. This is also the opinion of G. Alon, *Toldot ha-Yehudim be-Erez Yisrael bi-tekufat ha-Mishnah veka-Talmud* (Tel Aviv, 1952), I: 191–192. [English: *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age* (Jerusalem, 1980), pp. 306–307]. On the Jewish side, the tension arose, not on the religious, but on the national level: Jewish Christians were seen by the Jews as separatists, who did not share the national concepts and hopes of other Jews.

“count us (Christians) foes and enemies; and, like yourselves (pagans) they kill and punish us whenever they have the power... For in the Jewish war which raged lately, Barchochebas, the teacher of the revolt of the Jews, gave orders that the Christians alone should be led to cruel punishments, unless they would deny Jesus the Messiah and utter blasphemies.” Justin’s evident exaggeration is caused by his equation of the pagan persecutions (“like yourselves”) of the Christians with those carried on by Jews. The notion that Christians were compelled by Bar Kokhba to blaspheme Jesus is almost certainly taken from the Roman practice of investigating Christians. Already Pliny the Younger (*Epistles* X 96:5) asserts that those who were suspected of being Christians were asked to blaspheme Christ, in order to prove whether the accusation against them was true or not. The same method was applied by the Romans during the Jewish war against the Essenes (Josephus, *Wars* II:152, cf. II:145): they were tortured “in order to induce them to blaspheme against the lawgiver.”²⁷ Thus, the historical kernel of Justin’s comment is that Jewish Christians had to deny that Jesus is the Messiah, but not to blaspheme Jesus. As is well known, Bar Kokhba himself was believed to be the Messiah, but even so it seems to be improbable that he forced others to accept this belief. We know from Eusebius’ *Chronicles* that Bar Kokhba punished Christians because they refused to fight together with him against the Romans. They evidently refused to do so because of their belief that the Messiah had already come and that he had not now returned in Bar Kokhba. It seems to me that in this way the punishment of the Christians by Bar Kokhba and their belief that Jesus was the Messiah were connected. But even here, the political and not the religious aspect was decisive.

VII. Birkath ha-Minim

In discussing Jewish opposition to Christianity during the first century of its existence, we ought to mention one of the eighteen benedictions of the *Shemonah Esrey*, namely, the benediction against heretics (*Birkath ha-Minim*).²⁸ The

27. W.H.C. Frend, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford, 1965), p. 221, is right when he connects Pliny’s action against the Christians with the “resort to the sacrifice-test, which... was used in the Greek cities for the purpose of establishing beyond doubt Jews and their sympathisers.” Pliny also applied the sacrifice-test against the accused, and, “in addition, he ordered the accused ‘to curse Christ’ — ‘none of which acts, it is said, those who are really Christians could be forced into performing.’” (*Ibid.*, p. 219). Frend (pp. 135–7) sees a similarity between Pliny’s sacrifice-test against supposed Christians and the horrible anti-Jewish riots in Antioch in A.D. 67 (Josephus, *Wars* VII: 43–62), when the sacrifice-test was applied against the Jews. For our purposes, it is interesting to note that Essenes were induced by Romans to blaspheme the lawgiver and, later on, those who were suspected to be Christians were induced by Pliny to blaspheme Christ. The same is said by Justin — probably wrongly — about Bar Kokhba’s treatment of the Christians. I hope to return to the consequences of this fact elsewhere.

See also, about the martyrs from Lyons, in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* V: 1, 16, 20, 25.

28. See Alon, *op. cit.* (note 26), pp. 179–192 | English: pp. 288–307; H. Graetz, *Geschichte der*

Church Fathers, beginning with Justin Martyr, asserted that the Jews curse the Christians in their synagogues, but the common opinion that *Birkath ha-Minim* was added after the Destruction of the Temple and directed against Christians is incorrect. The original benediction was evidently the second in a series of three sections which were inserted in the *Shemonah Esrey* in the later Maccabean period: the first of the three was probably a malediction of the Sadducees, and the third, which is still in use, invoked blessing upon the “Pharisaic” community: upon the righteous, the pious (*Hassidim*), the elders of the people and the scribes.²⁹ The second of these three is known as *Birkath ha-Minim*, the benediction against the heretics. If the Essenes were once seen as dissenters, then the three sections correspond to the three Jewish sects mentioned by Josephus: the Sadducees, the Essenes and the Pharisees.³⁰ It is essential to realize that Christians are explicitly mentioned in only two texts of *Birkath ha-Minim*, which were found in the Cairo Genizah and are remnants of the old Palestinian rite. These two texts speak about “the Christians (*nozrim*, i.e., Nazoraeans) and the heretics (*minim*).” Thus, it is evident that the term for “Christians” was added to an older text, which spoke only about heretics. This was probably done in order to stress that the term “heretics” (*minim*) refers mainly to Christians. This addition was made before the year 400, as both Jerome and Epiphanius expressly state that the Jews curse “the Nazoraeans” in their synagogues. When Justin earlier asserts that the Jews curse those who believe in Christ, this may also mean that both the Jews and the Christians in his days understood *Birkath ha-Minim* as being directed against the Christians, even if the word itself did not then appear in the benediction: in the second century Christians were the strongest and most numerous group among those considered as heretics by the Synagogue.

That the reference to Christians in *Birkath ha-Minim* is secondary is confirmed by its appearance in only the two fragments of the Palestinian rite mentioned. In all other rites, both those from Christian lands and from non-Christian, oriental

*Juden*³ (Leipzig, 1893), IV: 401–3; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (Leipzig, 1907), II: 543–4 and its new revised English version, *A History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 2 v. (Edinburgh, 1973–79), II: 462–3; E. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst* (Frankfurt, 1931 [Reprint, Olms, 1962]), pp. 36–39, and especially the important addition in the Hebrew translation of the book (Tel-Aviv, 1972), pp. 31–32; D. Flusser, “Jerusalem in the Literature of the Second Temple Period” (Heb.), in *Ve-im be-gevuroth* [Rubin and Hanna Mass Festschrift] (Jerusalem, 1974), pp. 263–294, esp. 269–273; W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 275–9.

29. So according to the normal text. In all extant texts of the benediction, the proselytes are also mentioned, but those who, following the option in Tosefta Berakhoth 3:25, once said a special benediction for the proselytes, did not automatically include the proselytes in the benediction for the elders.

30. See my article, quoted above, note 28; the same threefold division appears also in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

countries, where no Christian censorship was at work, only the term *Minim* (heretics) appears, but never *nozrim* (Christians).³¹ This indicates that the word “Christians” was not added to the blessing by an authoritative decision, because if it were, it would not be absent in most rites.

Birkath ha-Minim is thus older than Christianity. It was originally coined against dissidents, apostates and traitors — including those who delivered Jews to the Gentile government — and similar wicked men who separated themselves from the Jewish collectivity,³² a group which at one time probably also included the Essenes.³³ Two listings of categories of sinners, similar to those appearing in the various textual forms of *Birkath ha-Minim*, are preserved in Rabbinic literature: the first is a somewhat longer list³⁴ while the second³⁵ contains only three categories. In both lists, as in our benediction, the heretics and traitors are named. A similar list of dissidents, apostates and traitors was evidently the *vorlage* of *Birkath ha-Minim*, which list already included the heretics. We know from rabbinic sources that Shmuel ha-Katan composed *Birkath ha-Minim* at the request of Rabban Gamaliel of Jamnia. From what we have seen above, the fact that he included an explicit mention of the *minim* was no innovation: they appear in both lists of sinners, independent of the blessing. He also did not explicitly mention the Christians there — we have already seen that the term “Nazoraeans” only appears in two fragments of the old Palestinian rite.

The first, longer list of sinners, according to the best text,³⁶ begins as follows: “Those who separated themselves (*parshu*) from the ways of the community, such as the heretics and the traitors³⁷ and the apostates...” These three categories also form the short list in *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*³⁸ and appear in some variants

31. I have found only one exception: the “Christians and the heretics” appear in one manuscript from the year 1426 of *Seder Rav Amram Ga'on*, ed., D. Goldschmidt (Jerusalem, 1972), p. 25. As the word *minim* (heretics) can be understood as “Christians,” this word is eliminated from *Birkath ha-Minim* in most prayerbooks printed in Christian countries, due to Christian censorship.

32. Flusser. *op. cit.* (note 28), pp. 270–271.

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 271–273.

34. Tosefta Sanhedrin 13:5, and especially *Midrash Seder 'Olam*, ed. Ber Ratner (reprinted, New York, 1966), Ch. 13, pp. 16–17; see also BT Rosh ha-Shana 17a and D. Zlotnick, ed., *The Tractate Mourning*” (*Šēmaḥoḥ*) (Yale Judaica Series, 17. |New Haven, London, 1966|), p. 103.

35. *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, ed. S. Schechter (New York, 1945), Version A, p. 64.

36. The text of *Seder Olam* (*op. cit.*, note 34), pp. 16–18 (beginning) is better than that of Tosefta Sanhedrin 13:4–6 and the other parallels, and is independent of them. There, those “who separate themselves from the ways of the community” are one of the categories of sinners, while in *Seder Olam* they head the list.

37. Literally: those who deliver Jews to the Gentile government.

38. See above, note 35.

of *Birkath ha-Minim*.³⁹ Heretics, traitors and apostates are apt to be subsumed under the heading of “those who separated themselves from the ways of the community” — in other words, those who severed all ties with their people. The heading can be summarized in one Hebrew word — *parushin*, “those who separated themselves.” This is the Hebrew word for the Pharisees, and they were evidently once so designated by their enemies. The negative force of the word also remained later, the Pharisees themselves practically never referring to themselves in Hebrew or Aramaic by this name.⁴⁰ The word itself was once even included in *Birkath ha-Minim*, which the Pharisees themselves recited. According to Tosefta Berakhoth 3:25,⁴¹ there are three consecutive benedictions of the *Shemonah 'Esrey*, each one of which contains two distinct elements which may be separated if one wishes. Thus, one may combine the benediction against the heretics (*minim*) with that against the “separatists” (*parushin*), the benediction for the proselytes with that for the elders, the benediction of David with that for Jerusalem, or, in each case, one may recite two separate blessings. From this, we see that the “separatists” (*parushin*) were once included in *Birkath ha-Minim*, it being clear that these *parushin* are identical with “those who separated themselves from the ways of the community.” The “Benediction against the heretics” was directed against this kind of danger, and against the heretics (*minim*), traitors and apostates. Thus, when Shmuel ha-Katan⁴² composed *Birkath ha-Minim*, it was not his purpose to introduce the heretics into the benediction in order to direct it against them; they were already included in this group before the time of Jamnia. What then really was the purpose of Rabban Gamaliel when he asked Samuel ha-Katan to compose this prayer, and what changes were introduced by him?

The extant manuscripts and the first printed edition of Tosefta Berakhoth 3:25 mention the “separatists” (*parushin*) and the heretics (*minim*). We have tried to show that the first designation is definitely correct. This term disappeared from all the variants of *Birkath ha-Minim*, and other terms were substituted for it both in the Talmudic parallels⁴³ and in two quotations from the Tosefta,⁴⁴ because the term *parushin* was no longer understood in the older, pejorative sense, having

39. See also my article (*op. cit.*, n. 28), p. 270, n. 16. See especially the version of the blessing in the Yemenite rite, in which all three categories occur.

40. I hope to show this elsewhere. See L. Finkelstein, *ha-Perushim ve-Anshey Keneset ha-Gedolah* [*The Pharisees and the Men of the Great Synagogue*] (Heb.) (J.T.S. Texts and Studies. 15. [New York, 1950]), p. 33, n. 19.

41. See also the important notes of S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-feshutah* (New York, 1977), Zera'im, I:53–55.

42. See W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten* (Strassburg, 1903), I: 370.

43. See Finkelstein (*op. cit.*, n. 40).

44. See Lieberman (*op. cit.*, n. 41), p. 53. In the citation of the second quotation there the correct page number is 47, not 15.

become the term used for the Pharisees. At that time, the term *minim* became the designation, or one of the designations, of the first group, the “separatists,” both in the Talmudic variants and in the two quotations, while the second group, the heretics, appear in all the parallels and in the two quotations from the Tosefta as “the arrogant ones” (*zedim*). In this case, I would venture to say that this was the original term,⁴⁵ not only because, as we tried to show, the “separatists” and the heretics are almost the same thing, but also for other reasons.

There are many variants of *Birkath ha-Minim*,⁴⁶ but the essential similarity among them is astonishing.⁴⁷ For the readers’ convenience, I shall suggest the following hypothetical reconstruction of the original text:

For the “separatists” (*parushin*) and for the apostates and for the traitors let there be no hope, and the heretics (*minim*) shall perish as in a moment, and the dominion of arrogance (*zadon*) do Thou speedily uproot. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant.

There are two central themes in *Birkath ha-Minim*: those Jews who severed all ties with the Jewish people; and the Gentile empire, the “dominion of arrogance” — the “arrogant” being a common designation for Gentile imperialism. Already in Jeremiah 50:31–32, “arrogance” (*zadon*) is a surname for Babylon. Later, Ben Sira 32:22–23 expresses the same hope in words similar to those of the benediction: “Yea, the Lord will not tarry, and the Mighty One not refrain Himself, till he smite the loins of the merciless, and require vengeance to the nations, till He disposes the scepter of arrogance (*zadon*), and the staff of wickedness utterly cut down.” The similarity in the wording of Ben Sira and of the benediction may possibly be explained through the indirect influence of the passage in Ben Sira upon the benediction, or by a common tradition. In the benediction, the “dominion of arrogance” doubtless designates the Roman Empire.⁴⁸

We supposed that there were once two benedictions, one directed against those who severed all ties with the Jewish nation, such as the “separatists” (*parushin*)

45. I hope to treat this question elsewhere. According to the second quotation the text was כולל זדים בשל פרושין; I suggest that the original text was כולל זדים בשל פרושין, or in the reversed order.

46. For the various texts of *Birkath ha-Minim* see L. Finkelstein, “The Development of the Amidah,” *JQR* 16 (1925–26), pp. 156–157; reprinted in his *Pharisaism in the Making* (New York, 1972), pp. 318–319. The second fragment of the Palestinian rite, which is quoted *i.a.* in Alon (*op. cit.*, n. 26), is not quoted there; this text is an exception, because it does not mention the “dominion of arrogance.” The non-censored text of the European rite is quoted in *Ozar ha-Tefilloth* (Wilna, 1915), pp. 336–337.

47. About one exception see the previous note.

48. About the use of *zadon* and *zedim* in synagogal poetry with the same meaning, see the lists in L. Zunz, *Die synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters* (Frankfurt, 1920), pp. 454, 460.

and the heretics (*minim*), and another directed against the “arrogant” Gentile empire. We based our assumption upon the various readings of Tosefta Berakhoth 3:25 and upon the Talmudic parallels. It seems that the benediction against the dissidents and the apostates originated in the later Maccabean period.⁴⁹ If so, it is quite probable that the later benediction, against the “arrogant dominion,” was inspired by the former benediction, against the inner enemies, and added to it when Roman imperialism became a menace to the existence of Jews in their own land. We have learned from the Tosefta that the two polemical benedictions could either be combined in one benediction or recited separately and that, with the exception of the two manuscripts of the Tosefta, in all other sources including the two old quotations from the Tosefta, the second benediction was directed against the “arrogant.” That this is so is confirmed by its extant variants, which all deal with two different classes of enemies: the inner enemies, those who severed all ties with their people, and the external enemy, the “arrogant” Roman Empire.

The results of our research make it even more difficult than before to understand what Shmuel ha-Katan did in the period after the Destruction, and the intent of Rabban Gamaliel in inviting the rabbi to compose a benediction against the heretics. Was it only then that the wish for the speedy destruction of the arrogant kingdom of Rome, which had destroyed the Temple, was introduced? This seems to me highly improbable. I do not see why Rabban Gamaliel should have wanted, by such a change, to augment the anti-Roman feeling of the people.⁵⁰ This hatred existed before and was the main cause of the unhappy war. It is more probable that, by composing *Birkath ha-Minim*, Shmuel ha-Katan united the two benedictions, that against the heretics and that against the “arrogant,” thereby creating the archetype of the extant blessing. It is never said in our sources that Gamaliel’s primary aim was to stress the malediction against heretics; this blessing had been directed against them prior to his time. But it is true that, by their equation with the enemy from without, the wicked Roman empire, through their inclusion in the same blessing, they, the heretics — of whom the outstanding group was the Jewish Christians — stood condemned to the same degree. In any event, Gamaliel’s act was not so decisive a step in the departure of Christianity

49. See my article (*op. cit.*, n. 28).

50. The man who composed *Birkath ha-Minim*, Shmuel ha-Katan (Samuel the Small), was surely not a supporter of the war against Rome. At the time of his death he spoke in Aramaic: “Simeon and Ishmael for the sword. The rest of the nation for plunder. After this, great disasters will follow.” (Semahoth 8:7; for parallels see W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten* (Strassburg, 1903), I:234, n. 2; 270, n. 4.) These words do not refer to the Bar Kokhba war, but to the “War of Quietus” under Trajan; this was shown by G. Alon (*op. cit.*, n. 26), pp. 262–3 [not available in English]. Thus, Shmuel ha-Katan died before the year 115, so that *Birkath ha-Minim* was composed before that date.

from Judaism as is commonly suggested. Even without any special change in the benediction on the part of the Synagogue in the period after the Destruction of the Temple, Jews understood the word “heretics” as directed mainly against Jewish Christians, and the Christians themselves could assume that the benediction was directed against them.⁵¹

VIII. Conclusions

Our task has been to show the centrifugal forces which caused the estrangement of Christianity from Judaism, and not the origin of Christian anti-Judaism as such, although we cannot avoid the conclusion that all that happened later was linked with the beginning. The saying that “each tree is known by its own fruit” (Luke 6:43) is not utterly wrong, and it is not too exaggerated, as we find that Christianity is the religion which did the greatest injury to the Jews. When we read Christian sources from the apostolic and subapostolic age with open eyes, we find there almost all the later major anti-Jewish motifs, at least *in nuce*, which indicates that the later development was not only an unhappy deviation. One of the surprising findings of my research is that those texts in the Gospels expressing opposition to the Synagogue or to Jews, or accusing the Jews of having caused Jesus’ death, or even those passages which express enmity towards “normative” Judaism, cannot be retranslated literally into Hebrew or Aramaic: they are styled in Greek. This means that enmity of Palestinian Jewish Christians against other Jews, while it may have existed, cannot be proven, and that those passages were written by Gentiles or, so to speak, by Jewish “Gentile” (i.e., Hellenistic) Christians. We must conclude that the opposition to Jews and to Judaism is primarily, or even exclusively, a function of the emergence of Gentile Christianity, and that this tension, or even abhorrence, was a factor which fostered the birth of Christianity as an independent Gentile religion. At the

51. I have written this chapter concerning *Birkath ha-Minim* in close collaboration with S. Safrai. After I had finished writing this section, I read the article by Peter Schäfer, “Die sogenannte Synode von Jabne. I. Zur Trennung von Juden u. Christen im 1/2 Jh. n. Chr.,” *Judaica* 31 (1975), pp. 54–64. Schäfer’s results are similar to my own, although there are some differences in our evaluations of their historical significance and implications.

Additional Note: I recently received the latest book of the prominent Christian scholar and theologian Markus Barth, in which he addresses himself to the general problem under discussion here. In the summary of his final chapter, on “The Church and the Jewish People Today,” he says:

Even by taking offence at Jesus Christ and by rejecting the gospel, the Jews render the church a service for which she owes it gratitude, love and respect. Without the Jewish people there is no church. Conversely, the church is a detour for the salvation of Israel. Where men meant to do evil. God meant to do good. ... With the complete physical extinction of all Jews from the face of the earth the demonstration and proof of God’s existence would collapse and the church would lose its *raison d’être*: the church would fall. The future of the church lies in the salvation of all Israel. [See Romans 11:26–D.F.] (M. Barth, *The People of God*. [JSNT. Supplement Series. 5. (Sheffield, Eng., 1983)] p. 72.)

Many Christian friends would agree.

beginning of our article, we tried to show why it was almost impossible for all of Jewry to have become Christian. On the other hand, the origin of Christianity is Jewish, and many of the first Gentile Christians were close to Judaism; Jesus and his disciples were observant Jews: therefore Christianity had to solve the problem of why the Jewish people did not embrace Christianity. The separation of Christianity from Judaism was brought about by heightening the centrifugal tendency, which produced opposition to and even hatred of Jews in Gentile Christians. The Jewish origin of Christianity and the failure of Christianity to convert the Jewish people to the new message was precisely the reason for the strong anti-Jewish trend in Christianity; this explains the disharmony between the old and new community, which is probably unique in the history of religions. All this is obviously only one side of the relationship between the two. However, my task here has not been to describe the common heritage of Judaism and Christianity, but to explain the separation of the two. Tension towards Judaism was an historical necessity for Christianity, in order to become a world religion for former pagans — a need which no longer exists. Today, Christianity can renew itself out of Judaism and with the help of Judaism. Then it will become a humane religion.

Immanuel 17 (Winter 1983/84)