Supersessionism and Early Christian Self-Definition[1]

Terence L. Donaldson
Wycliffe College | terry.donaldson@utoronto.ca

From Anti-Judaism to Supersessionism

In the years following the Second World War, when the gates to Auschwitz and the drawers of Nazi archives had been thrown open and the grim horrors of Hitler's "final solution" came more fully into view, the painful question presented itself of how such an industry of genocide could have been conceived and carried out at the heart of Christian Europe. It quickly became apparent that, while Nazi anti-Semitism may not have been Christian,[2] it was rooted in soil that had been fertilized by centuries of anti-Jewish teaching and preaching by the church as a whole. Given the negative depiction of some Jews and some aspects of Judaism in parts of the New Testament, it was inevitable that the scholarly reassessment of Christian attitudes to Jews and Judaism would deal not only with later theology and exegesis, but with the origins of the Christian movement and the foundational New Testament documents.

From the beginning of this scholarly reassessment,[3] and indeed until relatively recently, the dominant categories for this discussion have been "anti-Judaism" and "anti-Semitism." "Is the New Testament anti-Semitic?" or "Do we find anti-Judaism in the New Testament?" are the terms in which the question has been posed. The "anti-Judaism" seminar within the Canadian Society of

————————————

[1] I presented an earlier version of this paper as my Presidential Address to the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies at its 2009 meetings in Ottawa, fully aware of the luster added to the office by Alan Segal's presidency in 1990–91. I am pleased to offer this version as a token of my appreciation for Alan, who was for me a teacher, mentor, colleague, and friend, from whom I have learned a great deal and whose untimely death I continue to lament.

[2] On the Nazi program to de-Judaize German Christianity, see especially Doris L. Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996); Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

[3] For a concise survey of the first stage, see John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

Biblical Studies serves as one example.[4] The central theme of Ruether's landmark book *Faith and Fratricide* provides another: she speaks of Christianity's "anti-Judaism, which constantly takes social expression in anti-Semitism," and which she sees as rooted in the "christological hermeneutic" of the New Testament itself.[5] In recent years, however, these "isms" have been joined by another. "Supersessionism," a term denoting traditional Christian claims that the church has replaced Israel in the divine purposes and has inherited all that was positive in Israel's tradition, appears with increasingly frequency in this discussion.

Of course, related words have long been used in Christian tradition with a positive (even triumphalistic) valence. As early as 1790, William Paley could speak of the "supersession" of the Jewish law that had occurred with Christ.[6] Thelwall's 1870 translation of Tertullian's *An Answer to the Jews*, published as part of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* and thus for a long time the standard English version, is another early example. The title for Chapter III, a title provided by Thelwall himself, is "Of Circumcision and the Supercession [*sic*] of the Old Law."[7] In the 1873 translation of F. C. Baur's *Paulus*, we read this statement concerning Stephen and the Hellenists: "That the essence of true

---

[4] The CSBS seminar produced two volumes of papers: Peter Richardson, ed., with David M. Granskou, *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol 1: Paul and the Gospels* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986); Stephen G. Wilson, ed., *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol 2: Separation and Polemic* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986).

[5] Note also her subtitle: Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism* (Minneapolis: Seabury, 1974), 116. Also, for example: Gregory Baum, *Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic? A Re-Examination of the New Testament* (Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965), originally published as *The Jews and the Gospel: A Re-Examination of the New Testament* (Westminster: Newman Press, 1961); George M. Smiga, *Pain and Polemic: Anti-Judaism in the Gospels* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992); William Reuben Farmer, ed., *Anti-Judaism and the Gospels* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999); R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, eds., *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001); Jules Isaac, *The Teaching of Contempt: Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964); Samuel Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*.

[6] William Paley, *Horae Paulinae* (London: Printed by J. Davis, for R. Faulder, 1790), 167. This is the earliest appearance of the word recorded in the *Oxford English Dictionary*.

[7] Vol. 4 in Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325* (Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885–96).

religion did not consist in outward ceremonials, connected with a temple service confined to an appointed spot, was the one great idea, through which, at that time, Judaism saw itself superseded by Christianity."[8]

In more recent years, however, the tenor of these terms has undergone a shift, as they increasingly have been drawn into the unfolding discussion concerning anti-Judaism, anti-Semitism, and the NT, where they have come to function as a negative designation for traditional Christian teaching about the Jews and Judaism. While I do not claim to have done an exhaustive search, the earliest instance I have come across is the 1971 English translation of Jules Isaac's *Jésus et Israël*, where we read that the Gospels were written in a period of increasing hostility, a period when the church was separating from the synagogue and Christians were declaring the Jewish law to be "superseded."[9] Several years later, in his introduction to Rosemary Ruether's *Faith and Fratricide*, Gregory Baum spoke of the "unmistakably negative" character of "the entire Christian tradition," which has taught that "the religion of Israel is now superseded, the Torah abrogated, the promises fulfilled in the Christian church," and so on.[10] In works published during the next few years, we encounter scattered instances of a similar use of "supersede"[11] and also of "supersession."[12]

_____

[8] F. C. Baur, *Paul: The Apostle of Jesus Christ* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1876), 1.59. The German word was "aufgehoben" (abolished, repealed, revoked). See also the English version of William Wrede, *Paul* (London: Green, 1907), 181.

[9] *Jesus and Israel* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 294. Isaac's original was "périmée" (lapsed, no longer valid, out-dated): *Jésus et Israël* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1948), 427–28.

[10] *Faith and Fratricide*, 6, 21. In his earlier publication *The Jews and the Gospel* (later re-issued in a slightly revised form as *Is the New Testament Anti-Semitic?*), written as a response to Isaac's work, Baum had attempted to defend the New Testament against any charge of anti-Judaism or anti-Semitism. The introduction to *Faith and Fratricide* offered him an opportunity to declare that these works no longer represented his position on the issue.

[11] In his discussion of "Justin Martyr's Argument with Judaism," Lloyd Gaston said that Justin believes that "his group and its social and cultural worlds . . . supersede" those of Trypho and the Jews (*Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol 2*, 77). Franklin H. Littell described "the superseding or displacement myth" as the "cornerstone of Christian anti-Semitism" (*The Crucifixion of the Jews* [New York: Harper & Row, 1975], 2, 30).

[12] According to Martin B. Shukster and Peter Richardson, Barnabas wrote out of a concern about a change in Roman policy (whether having to do with plans to rebuild the temple or with the *fiscus Judaicus*) because it would be "obscuring the political signs of Christian supersession" ("Temple and *Bet ha-Midrash* in the Epistle of Barnabas," in

The terms also appear in several church pronouncements and formal documents during this period.[13] Such occurrences, however, are relatively infrequent. John Pawlikowski's 1980 work *What Are They Saying About Christian-Jewish Relations?* can be taken as typical of the period. While he refers on two occasions to "Christian supersessionist approaches to Judaism,"[14] his survey of "what they have been saying about" Christian approaches to Judaism is generally carried out under the heading of other categories (e.g., "replacement theology").

During the past thirty years, however, not only have these descriptive terms appeared with increasing frequency, but the frequency has evidently reached the level at which the phenomenon so described can qualify as an "ism." A 1987 paper produced by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (USA) and commended to its church members for study and reflection provides an early example. In a section expanding on the affirmation that "Christians have not replaced Jews," the document stated: "Sometime during the second century of the Common Era, a view called 'supersessionism,' based on the reading of some biblical texts and nurtured in controversy, began to take shape." The document went on to observe that while this view quickly became the orthodox position, it can now be seen as "harmful and in need of reconsideration."[15] Another example is found on the first page of Kendall Soulen's 1996 work *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*: "For most of the past two millennia, the church's posture toward the Jewish people has come to expression in the teaching known as supersessionism, also known as the

_____

Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol 2, 24). Also Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 95; Littell, *The Crucifixion of the Jews*, 31; Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), 114.

[13] A working group convened by the Commission on Faith and Order of the National Council of Churches, in collaboration with the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and chaired by Franklin Littell, produced "A Statement to Our Fellow Christians" that includes the declaration: "in Christ the Church shares in Israel's election without superseding it" (paragraph 3; included as an appendix in Littell, *The Crucifixion of the Jews*, 135). For other examples, see Michael J. Vlach, "The Church as a Replacement of Israel: An Analysis of Supersessionism" (PhD diss., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004), 73–74.

[14] *What Are They Saying About Christian-Jewish Relations?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), 39, 54.

[15] "A Theological Understanding of the Relationship between Christians and Jews" (Louisville: Office of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church [USA], 1987), 8–9.

theology of displacement."[16] Initially the term seems to have appeared most frequently in theological discourse,[17] but increasingly it has been picked up by biblical scholars[18] and has passed into popular usage.[19]

––––––––––––––––––

[16] R. Kendall Soulen, *The God of Israel and Christian Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 1.

[17] Donald G. Bloesch, "'All Israel Will be Saved': Supersessionism and the Biblical Witness," *Interpretation* 43 (1989): 130–42; Robert R. Hann, "Supersessionism, Engraftment, and Jewish-Christian Dialogue: Reflections on the Presbyterian Statement on Jewish-Christian Relations," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 27 (1990): 327–42; Clark M. Williamson, *A Guest in the House of Israel: Post-Holocaust Church Theology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 268, n. 9; Ronald E. Diprose, *Israel in the Development of Christian Thought* (Rome: Istituto Biblico Evangelico Italiano, 2000), 31; John Howard Yoder, *The Jewish-Christian Schism Revisited*, ed. Michael G. Cartwright and Peter Ochs (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 213–14, 278; Douglas Harink, *Paul Among the Postliberals: Pauline Theology beyond Christendom and Modernity* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2003), 23 and passim; Eugene B. Korn and John T. Pawlikowski, eds., *Two Faiths, One Covenant? Jewish and Christian Identity in the Presence of the Other* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005), 3 and passim; Vlach, "The Church as a Replacement of Israel: An Analysis of Supersessionism."

[18] "Is John supersessionist?" is one of five key questions taken up in R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, eds., *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 5. See also the short article by Helmut Koester, "Historical Mistakes Haunt the Relationship of Christianity and Judaism," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 21/2 (1995): 26–27, with the heading (provided by the editor) "Strugnell and Supersessionism"; Krister Stendahl, "Qumran and Supersessionism—and the Road Not Taken," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 19, no. 2 (1998): 134–42; Jonathan Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); Lloyd Kim, *Polemic in the Book of Hebrews: Anti-Semitism, Anti-Judaism, Supersessionism?* Princeton Theological Monograph Series (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2006); Bruce W. Longenecker, "On Israel's God and God's Israel: Assessing Supersessionism in Paul," *Journal of Theological Studies* 58 (2007): 26–44; Jesper Svartvik, "Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews without Presupposing Supersessionism," in *Christ Jesus and the Jewish People Today: New Explorations of Theological Interrelationships*, ed. Philip A. Cunningham et al (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 77–91; John W. Marshall, "Misunderstanding the New Paul: Marcion's Transformation of the *Sonderzeit* Paul," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 20 (2012): 1–29.

[19] As an Internet word search will readily demonstrate. See also James Carroll, *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews: A History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), 587.

Advantages and Limitations of the Term

Yet while "supersessionism" has taken its place in the discussion alongside "anti-Judaism" and "anti-Semitism," it does not function simply as a synonym for either of these terms. To be sure, there is a considerable measure of overlap among all three. But each of the terms tends to highlight different aspects of the larger phenomenon. Just as it has proved useful to recognize and articulate distinctions between "anti-Judaism" and "anti-Semitism,"[20] so it is readily apparent that "supersessionism" brings a distinct aspect of the phenomenon into focus. If anti-Semitism refers to hateful attitudes and actions directed toward Jewish people per se—that is, an ethnic, social, and often political phenomenon—and if anti-Judaism refers to statements and formulations designed to defend and bolster Christian claims about themselves by denouncing what were perceived as Jewish counter-claims—that is, a theological and socio-religious phenomenon—then supersessionism refers to the kind of Christian self-understanding that might be seen to undergird such anti-Judaic rhetoric and anti-Semitic activity.

For this reason, the introduction of "supersessionism" as an analytical category makes a positive contribution to the discussion and helps to move it forward. Supersessionism focuses attention on the issue of self-definition, which in many ways is antecedent to any attitudes, speech or actions directed against (anti-) the other. Since Christian treatment of Jews and Judaism—whether expressed in verbal, social, or political terms—was rooted in the church's own self-conception with respect to the tradition and heritage of Israel, our understanding of the former will be enhanced by a clearer perception of the latter. Thus by encouraging a shift from the external domain (Christian

----

[20] Because of its origin in discredited late-nineteenth-century racial theories, some have argued that "anti-Semitism" should not be used at all (e.g., Smiga, *Pain and Polemic*, 11), while others have followed James Parkes's lead in using only the unhyphenated "antisemitism" in an attempt to distance the term from such theories (Alan T. Davies, ed., *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity* [New York; Toronto: Paulist Press, 1979], viii). For attempts to differentiate anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism, see, e.g., William Klassen, "Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity: The State of the Question," in *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol 1*, 5–12; Edward H. Flannery, *The Anguish of the Jews: Twenty-Three Centuries of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), 60; idem, "Anti-Judaism and Anti-Semitism: A Necessary Distinction," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies 10* (1973): 581–88; Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 8. See also the distinction implicit in Ruether's statement that Christianity's "anti-Judaism . . . constantly takes social expression in anti-Semitism" (*Faith and Fratricide*, 116).

opinions, speech, and action directed toward another group) to the internal (Christian self-definition and self-understanding), the concept of supersessionism helps to bring important questions into focus.

At the same time, however, the concept carries with it some limitations, especially for those of us who study the development of the Christian movement in its formative stages. Supersession describes a situation where one entity, by virtue of its supposed superiority, comes to occupy a position that previously belonged to another, the displaced group becoming outmoded or obsolete in the process. The term thus properly applies to a completed process of (perceived) replacement. For this reason, it is most immediately applicable in a situation where "Christianity" and "Judaism" are—or are perceived to be—more or less separate entities and the church is recognizably non-Jewish. Take, for example, Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. Justin argues that the church is a largely Gentile entity (117–23), existing separately from "you Jews" (11.2); that the old law and covenant have become "obsolete," and have been "abrogated" and replaced by a new law and covenant (11.2–4); that the church has now become "the true spiritual Israel" (11.5); that the Scriptures are no longer "yours, but ours" (29.2); and so on.[21] For such a version of Christian self-definition, supersessionism is clearly an appropriate category.

Even so, it is worth noting in passing that this is not the only way in which Justin construes the relationship between the church and Israel. Sensitive both to Roman respect for tradition and to Greek notions of immutability, he is nervously aware that to speak of a *new* Israel, a *new* covenant, a *new* law, and so on, is to concede a certain priority to the Jews and suggests a certain caprice or mutability on the part of God (*Dial.* 23, 30). Why should God establish one covenant and people and then replace them with another? And so Justin also speaks about the old Israel and its institutions in such a way as to suggest that they never had any positive, divinely authorized role to play at all. As he says to Trypho: "We too would observe your circumcision of the flesh, your Sabbath days, and, in a word, all your festivals, if we were not aware of the reason why they were imposed upon you, namely, because of your sins and your hardness of heart" (*Dial.* 18.2). Further, he argues that, in their attachment to the prima facie sense of Scripture, the Jews simply demonstrated their blindness to the deeper, spiritual reality that should have been apparent all along. Or at least most of

---

[21] All quotations from *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, ed. Michael Slusser, trans. Thomas B. Falls, revised and with a new introduction by Thomas P. Halton (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2003).

them. Justin believes that the writers of Scripture, the prophets and the saints of old—"Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the prophets, and quite simply every Jew who is pleasing to God" (*Dial.* 130.2)—were well aware of a spiritual and christological reality that represented the real meaning of Scripture. Thus, Israel itself comprised two different types of people from the very beginning: "So, we must here conclude that there were two seeds of Judah, and two races, as there are two houses of Jacob: the one born of flesh and blood, the other of faith and the Spirit" (*Dial.* 135.6).

How are we to characterize this second line of argument? Is supersessionism an appropriate category here? After all, supersession by definition ascribes a certain provisional legitimacy or validity to the superseded entity in the period prior to the point of supersession. If no legitimacy or validity were recognized at all, would we have passed beyond supersessionism to something else? The point could be debated, though since for Justin the old covenant was established by the same God, supersessionism is probably still applicable in this case, even if it represents a more negative strain than one in which Jewish ordinances and traditions are seen to have had a proper and legitimate role to play in the past. Nevertheless, the observation demonstrates the need for a typology of supersessionism,[22] a matter to which I will return.

Justin represents a movement that, by the middle of the second century, is predominantly Gentile, is settling down for the long haul in the Roman world, and is beginning to make extensive and creative use of Greek thought-forms to express and proclaim its message. To be sure, we should be cautious about assuming that even in Justin's day "Christianity" and "Judaism" represented two separate and distinct entities. Recent study has led us to recognize that it is too simplistic to talk of a "parting of the ways" that was complete and definitive by the time of Justin. Instead, the evidence suggests "a rich and variegated continuum of Jewish, Christian, and 'Jewish-Christian' identities in dynamic

_____

[22] That is, even in a situation where the church and Judaism are separate entities, supersessionism is not a single conception but can appear in several forms. Soulen has made a helpful beginning in differentiating three forms of supersessionism: economic (where an old economy of salvation is replaced by a better one, for which it served as a necessary first step); punitive (where the old covenant with Israel is abrogated because of Israel's disobedience); and structural (where the Christian economy of salvation is structured in such a way as to move from "fall" to "redemption," skipping over the story of Israel entirely). See *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*, esp. pp. 29–31.

competition, contact, and conflict,"[23] a situation that continued to play itself out for several centuries beyond the time of Justin. To the extent that this is true, it suggests that Justin's supersessionism needs to be seen less as an interpretation of an actual completed process of separation and more as an attempt to hasten the process and establish it as normative. Of course, Justin represented a portion of the movement that perceived itself as fully separated from Judaism[24] and he constructed his supersessionist argument on the basis of this perception. He also represented the portion of the movement that became dominant. But even so, as with all forms of self-definition, supersessionism has to do as much with social construction as with objective realities.

When we move behind Justin, however, into the earlier transitional period and back toward the first generation of the movement, we encounter a situation where it is progressively less realistic for anyone to speak of two separated entities and thus where the limitations of supersessionism as a category become even more apparent. The movement begins with a Jewish messianic prophet of the end-times, who gathered a band of disciples around him in preparation for the imminent arrival of the reign of God. Or, if you prefer to start a little later, the church begins as an eschatological renewal movement completely within a variegated Judaism, a community of Jews who believed that God had identified the coming Messiah by raising Jesus from the dead, and who set out to proclaim this Messiah to Israel. For the next few generations of the movement, what eventually comes to be known as Christianity comprises a variety of groups sprinkled throughout the Mediterranean basin—some primarily Jewish, some largely Gentile, and many of them ethnically diverse, and all of them together representing a variety of relationships, actual and perceived, with the traditions of Israel and the world of contemporary Judaism. Throughout this formative and transitional period, as these various groups worked to find living space for themselves and to create the social structures necessary for survival, they were necessarily engaged in processes of self-definition. While elements of these processes were inevitably taken up into the supersessionism of the second century, they originated in a social context where

---

[23] Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), xi. Also Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

[24] Though he was more tolerant of Jewish Christ-believers who continued to observe the Torah (*Dial.* 47.1–3) than were most of his contemporaries and successors.

supersessionism is less applicable as a descriptive category and they stood alongside other factors that were at play in a social context where membership was ethnically mixed and group boundaries were fluid.

Used as a broad category, then, supersessionism occludes variations and issues that were important in the formative period. What might loosely be described as supersessionism at a lower resolution displays significant differentiation at a higher. Moreover, this is just part of a larger set of self-definitional options where, at either end of the spectrum, "supersessionism" is not really applicable. The purpose of this paper is to provide a more finely-drawn typology of the various ways in which groups of Christ-believers in the first formative century and a half conceived of their relationship to the phenomenon of "Israel" in its various dimensions.

Early Christian Self-definition: A Typology

Supersessionism—the belief that the church has replaced the Jewish people as the people of God—is a construal of the relationship among three more-or-less fixed elements: (1) the Christian church, essentially Gentile and completely separated from Judaism and the Jewish people; (2) scriptural Israel, the people at the center of the collection of writings considered as Scripture by both church and synagogue; and (3) the Jewish people, considered by Christians as superseded by the church. In the formative period, however, what we are dealing with is not three relatively fixed elements but three sets of more fluid variables: (1) a range of conceptions concerning the place and status of Jewish and Gentile believers within groups of Christ-believers of varying ethnic composition; (2) a range of conceptions concerning the nature and purpose of scriptural Israel and its religion, as understood in relation with new beliefs about Christ and his significance; and (3) a range of conceptions concerning the place and status of the continuing Jewish people and their religion.

In each case, the range of conceptions was determined by different answers to the following sets of questions. (1) With respect to groups of Christ-believers and their ethnic composition: On what terms were Gentiles included? Did an identifiably Jewish entity have any distinct, ongoing status within the group? What was the relative status of individual Jewish and Gentile members? In more general terms, did Jew and Gentile continue to be significant categories, or were these identities thought to have been dissolved and transcended? (2) With respect to scriptural Israel: Did scriptural Israel have positive validity as the people of God in the past? If so, were the basic elements of Israel's self-understanding (covenant, Torah, temple, land, etc.) considered valid as these were understood by Jews themselves? Or were they considered valid only as they

were reinterpreted in light of Christ belief? (3) With respect to the continuing Jewish people and their religion: Had Israel as a distinct entity been totally absorbed into the church, so that continuing Judaism was devoid of theological significance? Or was Judaism seen as a continuation of scriptural Israel in some way, but only in negative terms? Or was Judaism seen in some way as a more positive ongoing embodiment of scriptural Israel?

If I were able to carry out a longer study here, I would want first to look at these three sets of questions in turn, in order to identify the range of answers that seem to have been in existence in the formative period, before attempting to provide anything like an overall typology. In the interest of economy, however, I will have to be content with this simple identification of the analytical questions, and allow the various options to emerge in the context of the typology itself.

Before I turn to the typology, I need to make three additional comments about my procedure. First, it is readily apparent that in many cases the evidence that I appeal to for any given position is subject to different interpretations. Since my interest here has to do with viable options rather than historical description, it is enough for my purposes that a given interpretation has been suggested and plausibly defended. The validity of the typology does not depend on a demonstration that it is the only or the most preferable interpretation of any particular text. In fact, for the most part I will refrain from indicating my own interpretations. Second, and partly for this reason, there is no compelling reason to multiply the number of examples cited for each type, nor is this the place to attempt any detailed mapping of scholarly opinion with respect to the set of types. What is important here is the identification of specific types, illustrated by a number of examples (proposed and plausible interpretations of primary texts) that are sufficient to establish the type. Third, in most cases there is no clean and simple correlation between individual authors or writings and discrete types. Justin is certainly not the only author who presents us with a more complex interweaving of strands that can be separated out into different types.

The typology contains five major types, most of which have two or more sub-types.

1. A Relationship of Binary Opposites

In this type, Israel in whole or in part is seen as the binary opposite of the true people of God. Two sub-types can be identified.

1.1 *Israel* in Toto *as the Binary Opposite of the True People of God*
Marcion represents the primary exemplar of this type, though similar dualistic patterns are found in some texts and teachings that have been traditionally

classified as Gnostic,[25] and Marcion himself was famously able to appeal to some aspects of Paul in support of his views. In this type, Israel as an undifferentiated ethnic-religious entity is considered *in toto* as categorically distinct from and inferior to the group of Christ believers. There is no continuity at all between the religious institutions and people of Israel in the past and the Christ-believing group in the present. The two groups are not simply distinct, but in their defining characteristics they are to a certain extent binary opposites of each other—or, to use the category that Marcion chose for the title of his major work (*Antitheses*), they are antithetical.

Of course, any attempt to describe Marcion's views has to reckon with the fact that we are totally dependent on secondary—and decidedly antagonistic—reports.[26] Nevertheless, as long as one takes the biases of the reporters sufficiently into account, one can have a reasonable degree of confidence in the picture that emerges.[27]

The antithetical structures of Marcion's thought are rooted in a duality of gods. The God of Israel—the God who created the material world, the God who gave the law, a God of harsh justice and judgment—is distinct from the "other and greater" God (Justin, *1 Apol.* 26.5) proclaimed and revealed by Christ. Marcion did not deny the existence of the God worshipped by the Jews; the created order itself served as evidence for this God's existence. Indeed, he believed that this God had promised a future Messiah for the Jews in the

_____

[25] As with categories such as "Christianity" and" Judaism," the usefulness of "Gnosticism" is increasingly being questioned. In this reassessment, "Gnosticism" is seen as an essentializing concept that obscures ancient realities, imposes artificial boundaries on complex socio-religious terrain, and conceals contemporary interests under a guise of historical objectivity. See, e.g., Karen L. King, *What is Gnosticism?* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).

[26] The earliest are found in Justin's *First Apology*; the most thorough and sustained is that of Tertullian (*Against Marcion*); also Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Epiphanius, and others.

[27] Thus Judith Lieu suggests that we need to proceed in two stages: first, by describing the various "Marcions" that emerge from the accounts of his opponents (beginning with Justin, Irenaeus and Tertullian, and then moving on to later sources); and then by reconstructing a historical Marcion on the basis of a critical analysis of these accounts (Judith M. Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015], here pp. 10–11). Of course, these reconstructions result in further Marcions, some of which have had a dominating influence on those to follow (especially that of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* [Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1921]).

Scriptures, and expected the "Creator's Christ" to appear in the future (Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.18.1; 3.24.1–2). But true salvation necessarily involved a liberation from the created order and its God, something that was effected by the Christ who was sent by the supreme God and who knew this God as his Father (Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.2). For Marcion, then, Christ was not the Messiah expected by Israel, nor was he predicted or anticipated in Israel's Scriptures. Indeed, for this reason, most Jews "rejected him as a stranger" (Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.6.2) and were not able to perceive the higher deity who had sent him. As a result, the people brought into being through Christ's revelation and redemption were not only a distinct people but were also drawn primarily from the Gentiles: "Marcion lays it down that there is one Christ who in the time of Tiberius was revealed by a god formerly unknown, for the salvation of all the nations (*omnium gentium*)." That Tertullian here has non-Jewish nations in view becomes clear in the rest of the sentence: "and another Christ who is destined by God the Creator to come at some time still future for the reestablishment of the Jewish kingdom (*Iudaici status*)."[28]

As Wilson has observed, Marcion's expectation of an earthly fulfillment of Israel's messianic prophecies—"restitution of the land and rest in the bosom of Abraham" (echoing Tertullian, *Marc.* 3.24.1)—is "remarkable."[29] On issues disputed between Jews and proto-orthodox Christians (the messiahship of Jesus, the christological meaning of Israel's Scriptures, the nature of salvation, etc.), Marcion is closer to Trypho than to Justin. Indeed, Marshall has observed that, the matter of two Gods aside, Marcion has affinities to the kind of two-covenant readings that have been proposed for Paul[30] (and that will be taken up in the final sub-type of this typology).

For present purposes, however, the salient point is that, for Marcion, the people of Israel and the community brought into being by Christ are categorical opposites—brought into being by different Gods and defined by different Christs.[31] Although the people of Israel are not simply negated, their defining characteristics are denigrated and set over against those of the Christians at every point.

---

[28] Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.6.2–3; see also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.27.3 (*omnes gentes*).

[29] Stephen G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians, 70–170 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 216.

[30] Marshall, "Misunderstanding the New Paul."

[31] Marcion "sets up a great and absolute opposition, such as that between justice and kindness, between law and gospel, between Judaism and Christianity" (Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.6.3).

Gnostic cosmologies were much more complex than Marcion's, just as Gnostic heavens were more heavily populated. But the resulting pattern of relationship between Christ believers and the people of Israel is functionally similar in many respects.[32] Typically, the created order is seen as the misguided work of the Demiurge, a lesser deity who in many cases is identified with the God who gave the law through Moses and who led Israel to believe that he was the only God. Christ, by contrast, was the emissary of the supreme deity, who descended into the created world for the sake of those human beings within whom an element of the divine spirit could be found, in order to provide them with the knowledge they needed to extricate themselves from the material world and to make their way back to the supreme deity.

While Valentinus and other Gnostic teachers were more prepared than was Marcion to appropriate Israel's Scriptures for their own purposes, they seem to have been less interested in Jews and Judaism, the Jewishness of Jesus, and their own relationship to things Jewish. Nevertheless, in the basic structures of Gnostic teaching the people of Israel and the people of Christ were identified with different Gods and thus are set over against each other across a cosmological divide.

Straddling the boundary between this sub-type and the next one are approaches that, although they remain monotheistic and make no distinction between the God revealed in Israel's Scriptures and the God who sent Christ, nevertheless align Israel in its distinctive covenantal characteristics with the devil or the demonic. One instance is found in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, which shares with Justin (and the *adversus Judaeos* tradition more generally) the pattern of discourse that makes a sharp distinction between the literal (fleshly) sense of Scripture and its deeper spiritual (christocentric) meaning (e.g., *Barn*. 10.9). In his discussion of circumcision, however, the author takes an additional step, as he explains Israel's attachment to the literal interpretation of the law as the result of demonic influence: "an evil angel instructed them" (*Barn*. 9.4).[33] While this is clearly distinguishable from Marcion's cosmological binary—the evil angel was not the creator; the God of Scripture and the God who sent Christ were one and

---

[32] For a helpful summary, with a focus on attitudes toward Jews and Judaism, see Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 196–207. See also Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 160–73.

[33] Wilson connects this verse with Barnabas's vehement denial that the covenant ever belonged to Israel at all: "watch yourselves now and do not become like some people by piling up your sins, saying that the covenant is both theirs and ours" (*Barn*. 4.6); see Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 137.

the same—a similar categorical binary appears at the level of people groups—one aligned with an evil angel, the other with the true God. Elsewhere, John's polemical description of the Jews as being descendants not of Abraham but of their father the devil (John 8:44) has been interpreted in a similar way. Rosemary Ruether, for example, cites John 8:43–47 in support of her contention that, in contrast to the followers of Jesus, "'[t]he Jews' . . . are the very incarnation of the false, apostate principle of the fallen world, alienated from its true being in God."[34] Likewise, we might mention Paul's statement in Gal 3:19 that the law was ordained "through angels by the hand of a mediator." Since the passage goes on to say that mediation is somehow set over against the oneness of God (v. 20), some have taken the statement to imply that the law originated with angels rather than with God, which in turn could imply a categorical duality of peoples.[35]

1.2 Israel as Containing Binary Opposites within Itself from the Beginning

This sub-type also consists of a pair of binary opposites, though in this case the opposites are contained within Israel itself. We have had occasion to notice one example of this type already, in Justin's argument that the true christological meaning of Scripture was readily apparent to the spiritually discerning within Israel all along, and that it was only because of their fleshly blindness that the rest of Israel could not see beyond a literal understanding of Israel's Scripture, laws, and institutions. In this line of reasoning the church is not so much a new entity that replaces Israel as it is a fuller manifestation of a portion of Israel that

_____

[34] Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 113.

[35] Since Paul speaks of the law being given *di' angelōn*, which can be rendered "through angels," the most common interpretation is that the angels are functioning as the means by which God gave the law (which then contrasts negatively with God's own direct giving of the promise [Gal 3:8, 18]); see, e.g., Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Waco: Word, 1990), 138–43. Others, however, have understood Paul to say that the law was given by angels rather than by God, thus setting the angels (and their law) over against God, with the result that "Paul took a step outside the Jewish world of thought and prepared the way to Gnosticism" (Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* [New York: Seabury, 1968], 71). On Gnosticizing interpretations of Gal 3:19–20, see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 168–70. For a more complex reading of the passage combining the assertion that "God played no part in genesis of the Sinaitic law" with a rejection of the conclusion that Paul then is "anti-Judaic," see J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 364–70.

was represented by the saints of old. Israel always contained within itself a "true" and a "false" Israel. It is important to note that in this construal, "true Israel" is understood not in the prophetic sense of a remnant that was faithful to the covenant, set over against the rest of Israel who were unfaithful or sinful. Rather, faithfulness to the covenant as most Jews would have defined it was itself false. Those who constituted "true Israel" were already in a real sense Christians (even if sometimes in a proto- or crypto- guise). While advocates of this approach might make use of such scriptural elements as prophetic denunciations, concepts of a remnant, and so on, these traditions are thoroughly Christianized, so that they have to do with Christian belief, not with covenantal faithfulness.

In addition to Justin, clear examples of this type can be found in Ignatius. For Ignatius, the reason that the prophets were persecuted was that they "lived according to Jesus Christ" (*Magn.* 8.2). Further, the prophets "hoped in him [Jesus] and awaited him. And they were saved by believing in him, because they stood in the unity of Jesus Christ" (*Phil.* 5.2).[36] A similar theme comes into view in *Barnabas*, where both Abraham and Moses are presented as fully cognizant of Christ and committed to him. Abraham, as he carried out the command to circumcise, "was looking ahead in the Spirit to Jesus" (*Barn.* 9.7);[37] Moses, stretching out his hands (as a sign of the cross) during Israel's battle against Amalek (Exod 17:8–13), did so in order to remind those engaged in battle "that if they refused to hope in him [Christ], they would be attacked forever" (*Barn.* 12.2–3). The theme comes to striking expression somewhat later in a tractate "against the Jews" attributed (falsely) to Cyprian, where scriptural figures are presented in contrasting pairs:

> Moses they cursed because he proclaimed Christ,
> Dathan they loved because he did not proclaim Him. . . .
> David they hated because he sang of Christ,
> Saul they magnified because he did not speak of Him. . . .
> Jeremiah they stoned while he was hymning Christ,
> Ananias they loved while he was opposing Him. . . .[38]

---

[36] On the explicitly Christian faith of the prophets of Israel, see Thomas A. Robinson, *Ignatius of Antioch and the Parting of the Ways: Early Jewish-Christian Relations* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 122.

[37] And thus, presumably, was immune to the baleful influence of the evil angel.

[38] Pseudo-Cyprian, *Adversus Judaeos* 3.3; cited by James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism* (London: The Soncino Press, 1934; reprinted by Hermon Press [New York] in 1974), 105–106.

As has already been noted in an earlier discussion of Justin, one of the factors driving this retrojection of explicitly Christian belief into the story of Israel was that it allowed Christians to lay claim to an ancient pedigree, an important commodity in the Roman world. More sophisticated forms of this strategy take advantage of the fact that in the scriptural story of Israel the giving of the law took place not at the outset but after a long period of patriarchal preparation. This enabled apologists such as Justin or Eusebius to make a distinction between an ideal kind of spiritual religiosity present from the beginning in the patriarchs and that which was brought into being with the Mosaic law. Justin can argue that the law was given simply because of Israel's weakness and sin, making much of the fact that the patriarchs were able to relate quite positively to God without it (e.g., *Dial.* 18–22). Eusebius, in a somewhat more polished way, sees the law as a divinely given remedy for polytheistic bad habits picked up by the Israelites in Egypt (e.g., *Praep. ev.* 7.8.37–38). This provided him with the grounds for a further distinction between the Hebrews (the patriarchs and those like them who perceived the true God clearly and worshiped him properly) and the Jews (the people shaped by the sojourn in Egypt and the remedial mode of religion found in the law of Moses).[39] The band of the Hebrews was not limited to the patriarchs but also included the faithful prophets and heroes of Scripture—and, eventually, the Christians, who represented the full flowering of the primordial Hebraic form of religiosity in the latter days.[40] While this approach does not simply (and crudely) retroject full-blown Christian beliefs into the pre-Christian period, it does nevertheless align the people of Christ with the positive side of a binary already existing within the scriptural story of Israel itself.

First-century writers were more inclined to work with themes of newness and fulfillment, which means that fewer interpreters are prepared to see full-blown examples of this type in the New Testament. Nevertheless, patterns of thought where Torah religion and Christ belief are presented as binary opposites—especially in Paul (law/grace; works/faith; Hagar/Sarah) and John (law/grace and truth; "the Jews"/believers; below/above)—leave themselves open

---

[39] On "Hebrews" and "Jews," see especially book 7 of Eusebius's *Preparation for the Gospel.*

[40] This was part of a more ambitious program on Eusebius's part of reworking the regnant demographic binaries (Greek/barbarian, Jew/Gentile, Rome/subject nations) in order to create an advantageous space for the Christians within the Roman world. See, e.g., Aaron P. Johnson, *Ethnicity and Argument in Eusebius'* Praeparatio Evangelica (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); and Jeremy M. Schott, *Christianity, Empire, and the Making of Religion in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), especially chaps. 4 and 5.

to what Ruether calls a metaphysical "antithesis between the true and the apostate Israel."[41] However, the essential elements of this type—the beliefs that these antithetical groups were co-existent throughout Israel's history and that members of "true Israel" in the past were explicitly aware of Christ—are only hinted at.[42]

2. A Relationship of Discontinuity and Supersession

In this type, which represents supersession proper, Israel is seen as an old entity that has been displaced and rendered obsolete by the church, a new entity in which any distinction between Jew and Gentile no longer has any fundamental significance. Again, two sub-types can be identified.

2.1 Israel as a Failed Entity, Rejected by God and Replaced with a Church Drawn Primarily from the Gentiles

The distinguishing characteristic of this sub-type is the emphasis on Israel's sin and failure, which result in God's rejection of Israel and the creation of a new people as Israel's replacement.[43] This sub-type, then, is characterized by a sequence of sin, rejection, and replacement. The focal point of Israel's sinfulness, of course, is its rejection of the Messiah, though this is often seen as the culmination of a longer legacy of sin and rebellion. In this sub-type it is possible for the institutions of temple and Torah to be given some element of positive significance, even if the emphasis falls on Israel's lack of faithfulness to them. Still, the tendency more often is to think of these institutions, at least at the literal level, simply as part of an era of failure and to locate any positive significance in their symbolic christological meaning. Because of the negative view of Israel that is inherent in this sin-rejection-replacement pattern of thought, the tendency in this sub-type is to see the new people that replaces Israel (i.e., the church) as primarily or even categorically Gentile.

Much of the *adversus Judaeos* tradition as it develops in the second and third centuries corresponds with this sub-type.[44] The headings of Cyprian's

---

[41] Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 95.

[42] Perhaps the most explicit is the statement in Heb 12:26 that Moses "considered abuse suffered for Christ to be greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt."

[43] This sub-type corresponds more or less to Soulen's "punitive supersessionism"; see *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*, 30.

[44] For surveys, see Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, 95–106; Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 124–49; Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 117–73.

Three Books of Testimonies against the Jews (especially Book 1)[45] provide us with a convenient illustration; to cite a representative sample, Cyprian asserts:

> 1.1 That the Jews have fallen under the heavy wrath of God, because they have departed from the Lord and have followed idols.
>
> 1.2 Also because they did not believe the prophets, and put them to death.
>
> 1.3 That it was previously foretold that they would neither know the Lord, nor understand nor receive him.
>
> 1.6 That they would lose Jerusalem, and leave the land which they had received.
>
> 1.11 That another dispensation and a new covenant was to be given.
>
> 1.19 That two peoples were foretold, the elder and the younger, that is, the ancient people of the Jews, and the new one which should be of us.
>
> 1.21 That the Gentiles should rather believe in Christ.

As might be expected, a number of New Testament writings have been interpreted within a similar sin-rejection-replacement framework.[46] The Gospel of Matthew, which presents the reader with a striking contrast between its beginning and end, provides one example. The Gospel begins with the identification of Jesus as the one who will "save his people from their sins" (Matt 1:23) and who will fulfill the prophecy concerning a coming "ruler who is to shepherd [God's] people Israel" (2:6). The Gospel ends with a scene in which a different people is in view, as the risen Jesus commissions his disciples to "make disciples of all the *ethnē*" (28:19). This closing injunction can be rendered as a command to "make disciples of all the Gentiles," which has led to an interpretation in which it represents the final piece in a pattern of displacement that has been building throughout the Gospel: Gentile Magi seek out the newly

---

[45] The work consists of a collection of Old Testament proof-texts organized under these headings.

[46] For a more substantial discussion of NT material that has a bearing on the characterization of this sub-type and the types (and sub-types) to follow, see the pertinent sections of Terence L. Donaldson, *Jews and Anti-Judaism in the New Testament: Decision Points and Divergent Interpretations* (London: SPCK; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010).

born infant Jesus, while "all Jerusalem" (2:3) was troubled at news of his birth (2:1–12); seeing the faith of a Gentile centurion, Jesus declares that "many will come from east and west . . . while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness" (8:11–12); speaking to Jewish leaders, Jesus announces that "the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation that produces its fruit" (21:43), describing them a little later as "the descendants of those who murdered the prophets" (23:31); at Jesus' trial before Pilate, "all the people (*pas ho laos*) answered and said, 'His blood be on us and on our children'" (27:25).[47] In this reading, Matthew's story is one in which God sends Jesus as Israel's Messiah in fulfillment of the prophetic promises, the people as a whole reject him and accept responsibility for his death, God then rejects Israel, and finally the risen Christ commands his disciples to gather a new people (the *ekklēsia*) drawn from the non-Jewish nations. In the words of an early proponent of such a reading, the Gospel of Matthew, displaying a "Gentile bias," conveys "the message that Christianity, now predominantly Gentile, has displaced Judaism with God as the true Israel."[48]

The ending of Luke's two-volume account of Christian origins might likewise be read as the culmination of a similar pattern. Here, after using the words of Isa 6:9–10 to denounce his Jewish hearers for their lack of response to his message, Paul declares: "Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen" (Acts 28:25–28).[49] In John the pattern perhaps is declared at the outset: "He came to what was his own, and his

––––––––––––––––––

[47] Of course, the pattern can be readily buttressed by other narrative elements.

[48] Kenneth W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew," *JBL* 66 (1947): 165–72, here p. 166. Such an interpretation of Matthew is adopted by a number of scholars, including Wolfgang Trilling, *Das wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäusevangeliums* (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1959); Douglas R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, SNTSMS 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967); Rolf Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments 91 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967); Lloyd Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles: The Setting of Matthew's Christology," *Interpretation* 29 (1975): 24–40.

[49] See the literature cited in Donaldson, *Jews and Anti-Judaism*, 61, n. 11. For other interpretations of Luke-Acts, see type 3.2 and 3.3 below.

own people did not accept him. But to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God" (John 1:11–12).[50]

2.2 Israel as an Entity of the Past, Having Had a Certain Preparatory Role to Play but Now Superseded by a Church in which Ethnic Distinctions Have No Fundamental Significance

In this sub-type, a more positive role is ascribed to the institutions of Torah and temple, and thus to Israel as a people. This role, however, is understood in Christian terms to such an extent that it is fully subordinated to, and seen simply as preparation for, the new institutions of salvation brought into being by Christ, who has abrogated the old covenant by fulfilling it and has instituted a new covenant in its place.[51] An essential element of this abrogation is the eradication of any theological distinction between Jew and Gentile. Even if, in some versions of this sub-type, the people of the new covenant might be described as a new Israel, this new Israel is a universal community in which the defining marks of the old Israel have been rendered obsolete.

There is no shortage of New Testament material that might be read in accordance with this sub-type. Returning to Matthew, the closing injunction could just as easily be read as a command to "make disciples of all the nations" (28:19) rather than "all the Gentiles."[52] In this interpretation, the new *ekklēsia* brought into being by the mission of the disciples contains both Jews and Gentiles, though the distinction between Jews and Gentiles has been transcended and Israel now constitutes just one *ethnos* among many.[53] If we combine this with Matthew's strong emphasis on fulfillment—Jesus as the one come not to abolish the law but to fulfill it (5:17–20) by providing a new authoritative

---

[50] One of the few New Testament texts cited by Cyprian in his *Testimonies* (1.3). See also the discussion of John's Gospel in Donaldson, *Jews and Anti-Judaism*, 81–108, and the literature cited there.

[51] This corresponds to Soulen's "economic supersessionism"; see *The God of Israel and Christian Theology*, 29.

[52] For a classic debate about the translation of *ethnē* in Matt 28:19, see Douglas R. A. Hare and Daniel J. Harrington, "'Make Disciples of All the Gentiles' (Mt 28:19)," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 359–69; and John P. Meier, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *CBQ* 39 (1977): 94–102. For a more recent discussion from a different angle of perception, see Matthias Konradt, *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. Kathleen Ess, Baylor–Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 311–17.

[53] See, e.g., Smiga, *Pain and Polemic*, 52–96.

interpretation (e.g., 5:21–48); the era of the law and prophets as coming to an end with John the Baptist and with the inbreaking of the kingdom (11:11–13); Jesus as greater than the temple (12:6); and so on—the result is a new community of disciples, drawn from all nations without distinction and characterized by baptism and adherence to Jesus' new teaching (28:19–20).

Except for the absence of any explicit attention to Jewish and Gentile identities, the Epistle to the Hebrews has readily lent itself to a preparation-fulfillment-abrogation pattern of interpretation. A central theme of the writing concerns the coming of a new set of religious realities—a new Sabbath rest (4:1–11); a new high priest (4:14–5:10; 7:11–28); a new sanctuary (8:1–6); a new covenant (8:7–13); a new sacrifice (10:1–18); and so on. The relationship between these new realities and their counterparts within the old covenant is described—in language reminiscent of Platonic dualism as it was reworked by Philo and other Diaspora Jews—as a relationship between a preparatory sketch and the real thing (8:5; 9:23), between the shadow and the reality (8:5; 10:1), and between the earthly copy and its true heavenly counterpart (8:2, 5; 9:24). Now that the new covenant has come in all its dimensions, the old has become obsolete (8:13) and abrogated (7:18).[54]

In all of this, however, there is very little sense in Hebrews that the new state of affairs was necessitated by sinfulness of Israel, or that Israel has been replaced in God's purposes by a new and different people.[55] The recitation of Israel's history in chapter 11 focuses on the faith of Israel's exemplary saints, both great and small, rather than, say, on Israel's resistance to God and persecution of God's prophets (as in Acts 7). In addition, the faith that is exhibited is (shall we say) expressed in covenant-appropriate ways (e.g., keeping the Passover; 11:28) rather than reshaped in christological patterns. While

––––––––––––––––––

[54] This has readily led scholars to the conclusion that Hebrews is supersessionistic: "In summary, it is the ancient Judaism with which Hebrews deals, regarding it as the worthy but imperfect preparation for the perfection which is Christianity. The Christ has superseded the law; Christianity has superseded Judaism" (Samuel Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament?* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978], 122). See also Hays's comments on his own earlier reading of Hebrews (Richard B. Hays, "'Here We Have No Lasting City': New Covenantalism in Hebrews," in *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham et al. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 151–73, here 151–52).

[55] In this regard, compare Hebrews with Melito's *On Pascha*, which combines a similar contrast between the preliminary model and the finished work with a harsh denunciation of the Jews ("you killed him at the great feast"; 92).

Gentiles are not mentioned explicitly, both the cosmic role of Christ (1:1–4; 2:5–9) and the fact that he has "taste[d] death for everyone" (2:9) may well suggest that they were included within his new priestly order, though this is not certain.[56]

3. A Relationship of Continuity, Redefinition and Reconstitution

This type overlaps with the previous sub-type in that the institutions of Torah and temple are understood to have played an important preparatory role, though this role has also been significantly redefined on the basis of the fulfillment believed to have taken place through Christ. What differentiates this type, however, is that here an important place in the state of fulfillment is ascribed to an identifiably Jewish entity, which is seen as representing the continuation of Israel (e.g., the faithful remnant). In this type, then, the new people of God is a reconstitution of the old, constructed on the basis of a reduced Jewish entity (to which Gentiles are added) but thoroughly redefined around Christ.

3.1 Israel as Succeeded by Christ, Who Provides the Sole Point of Continuity Between Israel of the Past and the Church of the Present

In this sub-type, continuity is located solely in Christ, who is seen as summing up and embodying Israel in himself. In some versions of this sub-type, not only is the community of Christ-believers considered to be "Israel" by extension, but no categorical distinction is made between Jewish and Gentile believers. In such cases, this sub-type overlaps to a considerable extent with the previous one. Still, the concern to identify Christ in his Jewishness as a point of continuity between Israel and the community of those who believe in him suggests that it should be located within this third type.

----

[56] According to Heb 2:16, it is the "descendants of Abraham" (*sperma Abraam*) whom Jesus has come to help. In 7:5–6 the author uses similar language—"from the loins of Abraham" (*ek tēs osphuos Abraam*)—in a very ethnic-specific way. If *sperma Abraam* is to be understood as referring to genealogical descendants of Abraham (rather than in some sort of spiritualized way), then Hebrews may be an example of type 3.2 below. The issue of the supposed supersessionism of Hebrews has been increasingly revisited in recent times. See especially Kim, *Polemic in the Book of Hebrews*; Richard Bauckham et al., eds., *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), especially the chapters in the section "The Problem of Hebrews' Supersessionism," 149–225; and Svartvik, "Reading the Epistle to the Hebrews without Presupposing Supersessionism."

An early example of this sub-type might be found in Paul's epistle to the Galatians, where he argues that all who believe in Christ are ipso facto part of the family of Abraham, and this precisely because Christ himself is the "seed" of Abraham, the entity to whom the divine promises were given (Gal 3:16; cf. Gen 12:7; 22:17–18). Such a christocentric (or messiah-centric) construction of the point of continuity between Israel and the Christ-believing *ekklēsia* has been a central element in N. T. Wright's massive enterprise of Pauline interpretation.[57] Of course, the form of the argument in Galatians 3 might suggest that Paul is cutting Israel out of the story entirely; he uses the singular form of the collective noun "seed" (*sperma*) to set the individual person (Christ) and the collective group (Israel) in contrast rather than in continuity. In addition, he does not go so far as to identify Jesus explicitly as Israel, a step taken later by Justin.[58] Still, the idea is at least latent.

A more substantial—even if more subtle—example of the sub-type is present in Matthew. In the first four chapters of his Gospel, Matthew presents the beginnings of Jesus' ministry as a kind of recapitulation of the story of Israel—a sojourn in Egypt (2:13–15); an exodus (2:19–21); a period of testing in the wilderness (4:1–11), the citations from Deuteronomy all having to do with lessons that Israel was to have learned in the wilderness; and so on. Matthew makes the identification explicit by quoting the second half of Hos 11:1 ("When Israel was a child, I loved him, and out of Egypt have I called my son") in Matt 2:15. In this reading of Matthew, Jesus' identity as God's son is, at least in part, an Israel identity—Jesus as taking on the identity and role of Israel.[59] Then,

_____

[57] From *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) through to *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013). E.g.: "God has deliberately given the Torah to be the means of concentrating the sin of humankind in one place, namely, in his people, Israel—in order that it might then be concentrated yet further, drawn together onto Israel's representative, the Messiah—in order that it might there be dealt with once and for all" (*The Climax of the Covenant*, 196). "In passage after passage in Paul, the point being made is that *Jesus, as Messiah, has drawn together the identity and vocation of Israel upon himself*" [italics his] (*Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 825; see the whole of chap. 10, "The People of God, Freshly Reworked").

[58] "As Christ is called Israel and Jacob, so we, hewn out of the side of Christ, are the true people of Israel" (135.3). Justin bases the first part of his statement on the identification of the suffering servant with Jacob in LXX Isa 42:1–4.

[59] For such a reading, see Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), esp. 209–11; and William L. Kynes, *A*

whether the new community of disciples that comes into view in 28:19 is seen as drawn from "all the nations" (with Israel as one nation among many) or as drawn exclusively from the non-Jewish nations, Jesus becomes the primary element of continuity linking Israel and the *ekklēsia*.

3.2 Israel as Succeeded by a Jewish Remnant, Supplemented by Gentiles Who Come in to Replace Unbelieving Jews

In this sub-type and the next, the Jewish entity that provides a strand of connection between scriptural Israel and the new community is not simply Christ himself, but a group of Jewish Christ-believers who form a distinct core. What differentiates the two is a different conception of the means by which non-Jews are added to the core. In the first of these two sub-types, all but the believing remnant have been rejected by God because of their unbelief, and Gentile believers have been brought in to take their place. This sub-type, then, is another example of a rejection-replacement pattern, though with the rejection being only partial and the Jewish part that remains providing an essential strand of continuity between scriptural Israel and the *ekklēsia*.

Paul's olive tree analogy in Romans 11 provides one example. Here the olive tree represents Israel as a whole, the branches being seen as individual Israelites. Some of the natural branches are broken off "because of their unbelief" (11:20), and Gentile believers—"wild olive shoot[s]" (11:17)—are grafted in. In v. 19 Paul presents one possible interpretation of the situation: "You will say, 'Branches were broken off so that I might be grafted in.'" Some interpreters are of the opinion that Paul himself endorsed this view, understanding v. 17 as giving expression to a similar image of displacement: "But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, a wild olive shoot, were grafted in their place. . . ."[60] But even if this is not his view (on which more in a moment), he is aware that some of his Gentile readers were prepared to see themselves as replacing Jewish unbelievers.

————————

Christology of Solidarity: Jesus as the Representative of His People in Matthew (Lanham: University Press of America, 1991).

[60] A good example of the displacement-replacement reading of the verse is provided by Achtemeier: "There is almost a spatial analogy here. Only if some Israelites have been cleared out will there be room for gentiles" (Paul J. Achtemeier, *Romans*, Interpretation [Atlanta: John Knox, 1985], 180). Also Lucien Cerfaux, *The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1967), 70; Markus Barth, *The People of God*, JSNTSup 5 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 42.

Another example might be provided by Luke-Acts, a two-part narrative that, like the Gospel of Matthew, provides readers with a striking contrast between beginning and end. The narrative begins in Jerusalem, among pious Jews who, like Zechariah, were "righteous before God, living blamelessly according to all the commandments and regulations of the Lord" (1:6) and, like Anna, were waiting for "the redemption of Jerusalem" (2:28). The story ends in Rome, with the apostle Paul denouncing his Jewish hearers for their inability to see and hear (citing Isa 6:9–10), and then declaring: "Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen" (28:28).

As with Matthew, the contrast between beginning and end in Luke-Acts has been read in different ways.[61] While some have read it (as we have seen) as a story of rejection and replacement (i.e., type 2.1), others have argued that such a reading does not give due weight to the important place of an identifiably Jewish church in the Acts account.[62] In the early chapters the author emphasizes the great numbers of those who "became obedient to the faith" (6:7); toward the end we find a reference to the "many thousands of believers there are among the Jews" in Jerusalem (21:20); even in the Diaspora, Paul's mission meets with some success among his Jewish hearers (13:43; 17:4, 11–12; 18:8). This provides grounds for a modified version of a rejection-replacement reading of Luke-Acts, one in which the Jewish church represents the remnant of Israel while Gentile believers come in to replace those unbelieving Jews who have been "utterly rooted out of the people" (Acts 3:23, citing Lev 23:29 in conjunction with Deut 18:15–19).

3.3 Israel as Succeeded by a Jewish Remnant, Supplemented by Gentiles Who Are Added to the Jewish Core

This sub-type also assigns an important role to a Jewish remnant, but here the Gentile component of the church is perceived not as replacing Jewish unbelievers but as joining the company of Jewish believers and thus receiving a share in the blessings of Israel. Often the inclusion of Gentile believers is understood within the framework of one or other of what I have elsewhere termed the Jewish "patterns of universalism,"[63] though reinterpreted with

---

[61] Again, see my *Jews and Anti-Judaism*, chap. 3.

[62] This point was made in a compelling way by Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1972), 41–74, though his interpretation of it is more representative of the next sub-type (i.e., 3.3).

[63] *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism (to 135 CE)* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007).

respect to the new beliefs about Christ. That is, Gentile believers are perceived as becoming linked to an Israel reconstituted around Christ, to which they relate in a manner analogous to the situation of proselytes, God-fearers, or participants in the end-time blessings of Israel.

Returning to Romans 11, one can observe that Paul's assent to a replacement idea is tepid at best. The NRSV's "that is true" is an over-translation of the more ambiguous *kalōs*[64] (v. 20); the remainder of the verse seems to contradict the assertion that the natural branches were broken off to make way for the wild-olive implants; and Paul's own statement in v. 17 places the emphasis on inclusion rather than replacement: "you, a wild olive shoot, were grafted in *among them* (*en autois*)"—that is, among the natural branches that remain[65]—"and have become *partners* in the rich root of the olive tree."

Returning to Luke-Acts and the role of the community of Jewish Christ-believers in the narrative, Jacob Jervell has argued forcefully that, for Luke, the theological grounding for the inclusion of Gentiles is provided not by the rejection of unbelieving Israel but by the "acceptance of salvation by a significant portion of Israel"; the prophetic promises have "been fulfilled in that Gentiles have been joined to the Israel that has accepted salvation."[66]

Another example might be found in John's Gospel, where on two occasions the Evangelist speaks of a second entity being added to an identifiably Jewish core: the "other sheep that do not belong to this fold" whom Jesus will bring into the flock (10:16) and the "dispersed children of God" for whom Jesus will die in addition to the nation itself (11:51–52). The "other sheep" of 10:16 are commonly understood to be Gentiles;[67] with respect to 11:51–52, while "the dispersed people of God" could readily be taken as referring to the Jewish

––––––––––––––––––

[64] While *kalōs* can be used to signal agreement (e.g., Plato, *Respublica* 5.21 [477]), it can also be used as an ironic agreement (Lucianus, *Demonax* 38.4), a more non-committal introduction to the speaker's real response (Aristophanes, *Ecclesiazusae* 1092) or even a polite refusal (Aristophanes, *Ranae* 888).

[65] So, e.g., Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 308; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (Dallas: Word, 1988), 673.

[66] Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 53. Earlier, Gregory Baum had argued for a similar position in *The Jews and the Gospel*, 153–66.

[67] E.g., C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), 312; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (XIII–XXI)*, Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1970), 396; Ernst Haenchen, *John 2 (Chapters 7–21)*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 48–49; Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to St. John*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers., 2006), 298.

Diaspora, many commentators interpret the term in analogous fashion (i.e., as referring to Gentile believers).[68]

4. A Relationship of Solidarity and Mission

In this type, the group of Jewish Christ-believers exists as a remnant or renewal group within a larger Israel that continues to be recognized as God's covenant people. Israel's covenantal identity continues to be based on temple worship and Torah observance, which are understood in traditional terms and have not been re-defined by Christ-belief in any fundamental way, and on the expectation of God's promised deliverance. Jewish Christ-believers are differentiated from their Jewish compatriots by their belief that Jesus has been appointed to be the coming Messiah and by their determination to call on Israel as a whole to recognize Jesus as well. Any Gentiles who want to share in the recognition of Jesus are expected to come into a proper relationship with Israel as a whole, through proselytism or some other appropriate means.

Luke's portrait of the Jerusalem church as we find it in Acts can be taken as an example of this type.[69] He presents the message of the Jerusalem community in its early days as directed first to those who "are the descendants of the prophets and of the covenant that God gave to" Abraham (3:25), a message having to do with the "universal restoration" that God would effect by sending "the Messiah appointed for you, that is, Jesus" (3:20). Members of this community continued to anticipate "the time when [Christ] would restore the kingdom to Israel" (1:6), to worship at the temple (e.g., 2:46; 3:1; 21:23–26), and to hold fast to Moses, circumcise their male children, and observe the (Jewish) customs (to render 21:21 in positive terms). In Luke's final portrait of the Jerusalem community, he describes it as containing "many thousands" of Jewish believers, all of whom "are zealots (*zēlōtai*) for the law" (21:20). On the matter of the Gentiles, while there were differences between those who advocated circumcision and the "apostolic decree" promulgated by James, both positions corresponded to options that currently existed within the Jewish world.[70]

---

[68] So Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John (I–XII)*, Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1966), 440, 442–43; Haenchen, *John 2*, 75; Lincoln, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 330–31.

[69] See especially Richard Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Community," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 55–95.

[70] On this point, see Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Community," 72–73.

In addition to Luke's account, one could also point to historical studies of "Jewish Christianity" that understand its ethos and identity in similar ways.[71] Further, with respect to the Gospel of Matthew, David Sim has argued that it reflects a thoroughgoing Torah observant community (5:17–18), one that expected any Gentiles who might want to join them to be circumcised and observe the law of Moses.[72]

5. A Relationship of Co-existence in Anticipation of the Final Redemption

The defining characteristic of this type is the positive status that is ascribed to continuing Israel, the Jewish group identified simply by its adherence to the covenant of Moses and the traditions of the Torah. In this type Israel itself is perceived as possessing continuing theological validity as God's covenant people, a validity that exists alongside—and is not negated by—the theological status of the new community of Christ-believers. This type does not carry with it any necessary conception, however, of how this new community relates to scriptural Israel, or of what relative status is assigned to Jewish and Gentile believers, and so on. Consequently, this type might overlap with one of several sub-types surveyed already. Nevertheless, it needs to be separated out as a distinct type.

5.1 Israel Apart from the Church as Having Some Theological Validity, in that "All Israel Will Be Saved" through Christ

Central to this sub-type is Paul's statement that "all Israel will be saved" (Rom 11:26). While Rom 11:25–27 is subject to several interpretations, this sub-type is

---

[71] For example, Craig Hill defines "Jewish Christianity" in terms of three criteria: "belief in the election and hope for the restoration of Israel, obedience to the law of Moses, and reverence for the temple" (Craig C. Hill, "The Jerusalem Church," in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007], 46). On the issue of definition, see further Jackson-McCabe's introductory article in this volume, "What's in a Name? The Problem of 'Jewish Christianity,'" 7–38; and the introductory chapters (Oskar Skarsaune, "Jewish Believers in Antiquity—Problems of Definition, Method, and Sources," pp. 1–21; James Carleton Paget, "The Definition of the Terms *Jewish Christian* and *Jewish Christianity* in the History of Research," pp. 22–52) in *Jewish Believers in Jesus,* ed. Skarsaune and Hvalvik.

[72] David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism: The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998); see also David C. Sim, "The Attitude to Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew," in *Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. David C. Sim and James S. McLaren, LNTS 499 (London: T & T Clark, 2013), 173–90.

best represented by an interpretation which understands salvation as an end-time occurrence accomplished through Christ (in contrast either to an ongoing process or to an occurrence separate from Christ) and "all Israel" as a corporate, ethnic-religious entity (in contrast either to a mass number of individual Jews or to the church itself).[73] If Israel itself will experience divine redemption in the future, its identity as God's covenant people must have some continuing validity in the present ("for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable"; Rom 11:29).[74]

5.2 Israel and the Gentile Church as Co-existing Peoples, Relating to God through Parallel Covenants

The defining characteristic of this final sub-type is the belief that Israel continues to enjoy a valid and sufficient relationship with God through the covenant of Moses, while the Gentile church is a distinct people with its own valid and sufficient relationship with God through Christ. According to Lloyd Gaston, this was Paul's own view: "Had all Israel followed Paul's example, we could have had an Israel loyal to the righteousness of God expressed in the Torah alongside a gentile church loyal to the righteousness of God expressed in Jesus Christ and his fulfillment of the promises to Abraham."[75]

---

[73] While the position described above is widely held among contemporary scholars, the interpretive issues are complex and the interpretive positions have varied; for a very helpful survey, see Christopher Zoccali, "'And So All Israel Will Be Saved': Competing Interpretations of Romans 11.26 in Pauline Scholarship," *JSNT* 30 (2008): 289–318; and, more generally, his *Whom God Has Called: The Relationship of Church and Israel in Pauline Interpretation, 1920 to the Present* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2010). The discussion, however, continues; for a vigorous defense of the position that "all Israel" (Rom 11:26) refers to the whole people of Christ, Gentiles included, see Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 1231–52; for a contrary view, see John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 544–61.

[74] For the importance of Rom 9–11 as a factor in the promulgation of *Nostra Aetate* and, more generally, in the significant shift in official Roman Catholic teaching on Jews and Judaism that it represented and fostered, see John Connelly, *From Enemy to Brother: The Revolution in Catholic Teaching on the Jews, 1933–1965* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012).

[75] Lloyd Gaston, "Paul and the Torah," in *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*, ed. Davies, 66. The article was reprinted (with slight modifications) in *Paul and the Torah*, a collection of essays in which his position was developed in more detail.

Although Gaston has not been able to convince many others,[76] a more certain example of this sub-type is found in the Pseudo-Clementine literature. While the composition history of this literature is complex and difficult to unravel,[77] there is general agreement that the Clementine *Recognitions* and *Homilies* (probably fourth century C.E.) make use of an earlier source document (*Grundschrift*; probably early third century) that can be partially reconstructed on the basis of verbally similar material found in both.[78] Without worrying too much about how to resolve the differences between the *Recognitions* and *Homilies* in the common material,[79] what comes into view is a Jewish Christian group that accords ongoing saving significance to both Moses and Christ: "Therefore, it is of the distinctive gift granted by God to the Hebrews that they should believe Moses, but to the nations, that they should love Jesus" (*Rec.* 4.5.5). "For this reason, Jesus is hidden from the Hebrews who have taken Moses as a teacher, but Moses is hidden from those who have believed Jesus. For since there is one teaching through both, God accepts the one who has believed one of these" (*Hom.* 8.6.1–2).[80] Of course, those who, like themselves, are able to believe in both are doubly blessed (*Rec.* 4.5.6–9; *Hom.* 8.6.5–8.7.5).

Concluding Observations

With the typology completed, only a few brief observations need to be made by way of conclusion. Since supersessionism was my point of departure, let me return to this.

---

[76] His most enthusiastic supporter has been John G. Gager; see *The Origins of Anti-Semitism* as well as his later *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). See also Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

[77] For a clear and concise survey, see Graham Stanton, "Jewish Christian Elements in the Pseudo-Clementine Writings," in *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, ed. Skarsaune and Hvalvik, 304–24.

[78] In addition to Stanton, see also James Carleton Paget, *Jews, Christians and Jewish Christians in Antiquity*, WUNT I/251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 487–92; F. Stanley Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines," in *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered*, ed. Jackson-McCabe, 285–304; and Annette Yoshiko Reed, "'Jewish Christianity' after the 'Parting of the Ways': Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines,'" in *The Ways That Never Parted,* ed. Becker and Reed, 189–231.

[79] See, e.g., Reed, "'Jewish Christianity' after the 'Parting of the Ways,'" 217; Jones, "The Pseudo-Clementines," 289.

[80] The translation is that of Jones; here "The Pseudo-Clementines," 295.

The most clearly supersessionist sub-types are those found in my second category ("a relationship of discontinuity and supersession"). For all intents and purposes sub-type 3.1, in which Christ functions as the sole point of continuity, is supersessionist as well. Any corporate representative defined in such a way as to exclude or disenfranchise rank-and-file members of the represented group can hardly be seen as effecting continuity in any real sense of the term. On the surface of it, sub-type 1.2, where Israel is presented as having contained two opposing groups from the beginning, is not supersessionist; the church is simply the continuation of a group that has been present all along. Still, one can be forgiven for thinking that such a tendentious construal of Israel's history simply serves as a cover for an essentially supersessionist pattern of thought.

On the other hand, the two sub-groups at the extreme ends of the spectrum are clearly not supersessionist. If Israel represents in some sense the polar opposite of the church (1.1), or if Israel continues to exist as a distinct covenant people alongside the church (5.2), supersession is not an appropriate term to describe the relationship between the two. Sub-type 5.1, having to do with the expectation that at the end "all Israel will be saved" through Christ, is ambiguous, in that it could be coordinated with either supersessionist or non-supersessionist understandings of the relationship between Israel and the church.

Finally, the remaining sub-types (3.2, 3.3, and 4) can be described as non-supersessionist but unstable. In that each of them is built on the existence of a distinctly Jewish group of Christ-believers, these sub-types represent an element of continuity and contested identity that would be similar to the self-definition of other sectarian, remnant, or renewal groups within a larger, diverse Jewish world. But circumstances conducive to the existence of such sub-types proved to be precarious. On one hand, it proved increasingly difficult for Jewish groups of Christ believers to remain within the Jewish world. On the other, the decision to include Gentiles led eventually to a demographic shift in which the Jewish component of the church diminished and major strands of the movement became largely Gentile. In such circumstances these sub-types tended to be transmuted into other, usually supersessionist, types.

In the end, however, a typology is a tool of analysis, which means that any value possessed by this one would need to emerge from its utility in providing insight into the more complex world of actual texts and social constructions—which is work for another day.