

worldview of the Babylonian Judaism there is always present a viceroy or a divine co-ruler of the world represented in the figure of angel Enoch – Joel – Michael – Metatron – Akatoel, a special human being who ascends to heaven and is transformed into a little god, as described in chapter 4 („Rav Idit and the heretics: God and Metatron“). The figure of Metatron raised in some circles of the Bavli and in 3 Enoch, against whom the Rabbis of the Bavli (cf. b Sanhedrin 38b; b Chagiga 15a) and the final editor of 3 Enoch argue, becomes a Jewish saviour figure in response to the role attributed to Jesus in Christianity. Palestinian sources, however, are not so explicit.

The last chapter is dedicated to the vision of the suffering Messiah of Ephraim, developed in a few Jewish sources and finding its climax in the redeeming death of the Messiah in the NT. Rabbinic Judaism, for its part, reacted restrained. A special case are the homilies in Pesikta Rabbathi 34.36.37 according to which the Messiah of Ephraim will redeem Israel through voluntary redemptive suffering (cf. Psalm 22), but he does not die. Probably, the authors of these sermons were aware of the application of this Psalm to Jesus. The correspondences between these three homilies and the NT indicate a late (seventh century) Jewish reception or the reutilization of images that have been usurped by Christians and for long been considered exclusively Christian.

The book shows clearly that the borderlines between heresy and faith were very blurred in late Judaism, as well as between Christianity and Judaism. Judaism is defined in confrontation to and exchange with Christianity: attraction and repulsion. The marginalization or elimination of Jewish elements, usurped by Christians, and the conscious and proud re-appropriation of these religious traditions affirm that Jewish theology was in the process of formation marked by its constant contact and dialectical debates with Christianity, which for itself was in the process of finding its own identity, and consequent separation. In this sense, we may speak not only about the birth of Christianity in the spirit of Judaism, but also about the birth of Judaism in the spirit of Christianity. In addition to inviting the reader to delve into the exegesis, not always easy, of the rabbinic discourse, Schäfer shows the different attitudes of Palestinian and Babylonian Judaism towards Christianity, determined by the political, cultural and religious circumstances. Another issue is to what extent these examples of scattered Judaism are in fact representative, since they cover such a long period of time and wide geographical extension.

Valladolid, 5. Juni 2011.

David Alvarez Cineira.

Daniel Boyarin, *Abgrenzungen. Die Aufspaltung des Judäo-Christentums* (ANTZ 10 = Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Umwelt 1), Berlin (Lehrhaus) 2009, XVIII u. 373 S., geb. EUR 22,80; ISBN 978-3-934943-31-5.

This book describes the outlines of the long and complex process of confrontation between Judaism and Christianity. Both traditions have a common origin; spoken originally in different dialects which, in the course of time, became national languages, with each claiming absolute validity for itself. As the first phase, we may speak of the consolidation of normative Christianity and the re-consolidation of Judaism after the destruction of the temple; this process is characterized on both sides by

demarcation and the exclusion of heresies. The different concepts of the divine logos, not Christology, marked the dividing line between. The Jews who continued to believe in the Logos, and Christians who rejected it, were no longer Jews or Christians, but heretics according to the decision of legislative bodies. It was not separation as such, but dialectics which facilitated the clustering of specific identity features under the tag of one or the other that gradually formed the groups which became Christianity and Judaism (28). In both movements, this process took place simultaneously but with different results.

On the Christian side, Justin, who was the originator of the discourse of heresiology (38), shaped the theological identity of Christianity in contrast to Judaism and thus invented orthodoxy as the formal structure of Christianity. Judaism was an entity that he was engaged in constructing in the textual process (38). The invention of heresy and Christian religion as distinct from ethnicity and Jewish religion constitutes the key point in the discursive construction of orthodoxy. For Justin, the centre of Christian faith is logos Christology. He builds and strengthens the separation: Judaism is conceived as a religion of those who believe in God but reject the Logos. Seen from this perspective, Jews and heretical Christians are alike.

During the second century, something similar happened on the Jewish side with the invention of the *minut* (72). Whereas during the Second Temple period, there had been no heresies, but merely different perspectives of Judaism, thereafter the situation changed. The different „types“ became heresies. According to Elisha ben Abuya, the doctrine of the two powers became a concept of Jewish heresy. The rabbis left the concept of Logos for the Christians; this, however, highlighted a feature of demarcation in the second century Judaism between those Jews who rejected the Logos and those who declared it as essential. Similarly, the borderlines between Christianity and Judaism were secured respectively thanks to the apostolic succession together with the line of succession ensuring the transmission of tradition in the opening chapters of the Mishna Avot (109–128). Logos was originally a common „doctrine“ which ultimately became a touchstone for confronted definitions (131). Before and even during the rabbinic times, most Jews who did not believe in Jesus were somehow „binitarians“ and defended the idea of a „second God“ (Logos, Memra, Metatron, etc.).

In the early period, therefore, the vertical axes – believers in Jesus versus non-believers in Jesus – did not constitute a dividing line between the defenders of a Logos theology and those who refused it (136), as evidenced by the prologue of John, a Jewish midrash. The Logos theology is understood as a general designation of various closely related binary theologies (186). The Rabbis, who crucified Memra (188), excluded the „second power-order“ or subjugated it. They remained with a kind of Jewish modalism: The one and only God can have different features or aspects. Christians who defended modalist views (cf. Sabellius) became heretics. Therewith arose a border: Trinitarian Christians and „Monarchian“ Jews.

By the time the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud was completed, the uniformity of Judaism had come to an end; canonization of dissension ensued (248). In late Antiquity, Christianity and Judaism are two asymmetric entities. Christianity became a religion, namely a „system of beliefs and practices to which one adheres voluntarily and defalcation from which results in one's becoming a heretic“ (319). Judaism

refused to become a religion in this sense; it remained a particular ethnic entity in which there was no possibility of not being Jewish, because the idea of heresy had been excluded (319). Judaism had been reconfigured as a grand coalition of differing theological and even halakhic views, in which agreement to disagree was raised to a first rate theological and hermeneutical principle. In late Judaism the meaning of „minut“ changed. It no longer referred to a difference within Judaism, but has come to mean Gentiles (315).

This book opens up the wide field of Jewish heritage that was left to the Christians. It was not the faith in Jesus, nor his relationship to God rooted in his resurrection, but the attitude towards the Logos and towards binitarian trends which became the turning point for the parting of the ways. Boyarin, however, left aside the texts of the NT (cf. Jn 9.22, 12.42, 16.2; Mt 22.2-7; Hebrews) in his reconstruction. He does not want to talk about the parting of the ways, but focusses on the construction of languages or constructions of religious identity by demarcation „against the others“. Justin, as well as many rabbinic and Patristic texts, serves as a good example for this. It is clear that this construction of identity becomes reality through the demarcation of borderlines. Were the ways already separated before Justin? What the book offers is rather a description of the many faces and colours of the formation of Christian and Jewish identities through demarcation; important aspects are highlighted, but the process was more complex as regards places and times. Scholars have criticized the moderate role Boyarin ascribes to Christology in the construction of identities. For many Jews, this was decisive: the Christian communities expressed their belief in the divinity of Jesus with the aid of the theology of the Logos. Faith in Christ was the starting point that led to a new presentation of latent binitarism of the doctrine of Logos. Although Christology was not always the central feature of identity, it was much more important than Boyarin supposes. Moreover, applying the concept of religion only to Christianity, not to Judaism, is untenable.

Boyarin's books are always thought provoking. We thank the publisher for the translation of this book which in its original English version has found wide echoes among the German scholars (cf. *J. Gühne*, Kreuz und quer verlaufende Linien der Geschichte [Pontes 31], Berlin 2006; *U. Luz*, Grenzziehungen, in: *EvTh* 68 [2008] 71-77). The translation enables the German readers to find an easier access to the new American research on „the Ways That Never Parted“, which was much more complex than usually presented. Judaism was not uniform, nor was Christianity; religious practice and belief in different places varied among the diverse Christian and Jewish groups which held ideas or practices close to those of other groups, so that convergence, cooperation or social contact between groups might have engendered a hybrid stage, confirming the wave theory sustained elsewhere by Boyarin as an argument for the emergence of Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity.

Valladolid, 13. Juni 2011.

David Alvarez Cineira.