

Identity and the Other: the Emergence of Christianity

Deborah Sawyer

Two areas of interaction have contributed to the essential identity of Christianity from earliest to contemporary times. One relates to an external phenomenon, that is to say, Christianity as an entity encountering something it distinguishes from itself; and the other to an internal phenomenon, relating to an encounter from within which has allowed one group to be dominant. The external encounter is between Christianity and Judaism, and the internal encounter is between male and female.¹ Both are named by orthodox voices as the 'Other', both raise problems for Christianity today, although the solutions may be diametrically opposed.

There has been growing attention given to anti-Judaism in earliest Christianity, and the contemporary implications of this have been an issue taken up by a number of scholars over the past twenty years. Furthermore, writers such as Charlotte Klein,² Rosemary Radford Ruether,³ and John Gager⁴ were also aware that the attitudes of previous generations of scholars reflected anti-Judaism in their work. Charlotte Klein, in particular, noted the pejorative use of phrases such as 'Spätjudentum', *late Judaism* which German scholars used to describe the Judaism of Jesus' day.⁵ Today scholars of both Jewish studies and Christian origins would readily describe the same period as *early Judaism*, understanding that Judaism and Christianity both gained their essential identity during the first century c.e. What were those scholars of past generations telling us about their attitude to the Jewish people of their own day in their use of such a phrase? That Judaism was coming to an end with the advent of Christ? That Judaism should have ended with Christ? That Christianity succeeds Judaism?

Even liberal scholars today who want to reform Christianity can still be guilty of anti-Judaism. Judith Plaskow and Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza note the example of some feminist scholars who crudely explain any misogyny they find in the biblical text in terms of Jewish influence, making themselves culpable on two counts: in seeing Judaism as the only 'sexist' religion in the ancient world, and, furthermore, in

seeing Judaism as an external influence on Christianity, rather than as a renewal movement arising from within Judaism itself.⁶

Such observations of modern scholarship show that Christianity's understanding of Judaism as the 'other' is a characteristic that can exist as much today as it did in the last decades of the first century. But it is those early times that concern this paper because, it can be argued, without such an encounter with Judaism as that which occurred in the early period, Christianity would be something entirely different.

When we look at the very earliest form of Christianity, often referred to as the Jesus movement, it is a distortion to talk about an encounter with Judaism since this movement was part of that religion. Recent credible scholarship on the subject of the historical Jesus, including the work of Geza Vermes,⁷ Ed Sanders,⁸ Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza,⁹ and Chris Rowland,¹⁰ for example, tends to understand Jesus' ministry in terms of reform, and at times radical reform, rather than a series of attempts to found a new religion. Even when we move to the time of the ministry of St Paul, the Christian communities are still part of Judaism, and keen to remain so, as we learn from the evidence of his letters. Paul's own position remains central to pharisaic Judaism of his day, only differing in terms of eschatological perspective.¹¹ In Phil.3.2ff Paul refers to his Jewish heritage, and describes his position regarding the Law as pharisaic until his realisation that Jesus was the Messiah, and that righteousness came through faith in him. His particularly fierce tone in this passage can be understood when we take into account that people were coming into the community at Philippi and demanding that Gentiles be circumcised in addition to being baptised. This did not make sense in Paul's eyes, since in the New Age Gentiles as Gentiles were part of God's universal kingdom. Furthermore, circumcision was part of the Law that only applied in a non-eschatological context Gal.3.19-29: '... the Law was our custodian until Christ came ...' (vs.24).

Paul's Jewish eschatology as it relates to Gentiles is expounded further in Romans 11. This passage alludes to how the entry of the Gentiles into the promises of the Messiah is the fulfilment of the prophetic vision where all nations pay homage to the God of Israel on the holy mountain of Jerusalem, the heart of Judaism. Paul tells us:

Lest you be wise in your conceits, I want you to understand this mystery, brethren: a hardening has come upon part of Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles come in, and so all Israel will be saved; as it is written, "The Deliverer will come from Zion, he will banish ungodliness from Jacob"; "and this will be my covenant with them when I take away their sins." As regards the gospel they are

enemies of God, for your sake; but as regards election they are beloved for the sake of their forefathers. For the gifts and the call of God are irrevocable. (Rom. 11.25–29)

We have to realise the existence of Christianity *within* Judaism up to 70 c.e.¹², the date of the destruction of the Temple and the effective end of cultic Jewish religion, in order to understand the conscious effort required by both parties, but particularly Christianity, when survival demanded that they part. In recognising this oneness we are not, at the same time, blind to the ever-increasing ideas and events that were making it a diminishing reality. In this sense the belief that there was a sudden definitive break between Judaism and Christianity in 70 c.e. is a myth.¹³ As Christianity worked out the implications of God sending his Messiah into the world, and the nature of that messianic revelation, its perspective became increasingly distinct from the majority of groups which shared the shelter of the broad umbrella of first-century Judaism.

In believing that the Messiah *had* come, the earliest members of the Christian communities, in effect, set themselves apart from their fellow Jews, in a similar way as the communities that produced the Dead Sea Scrolls had done, because this belief meant that a radically different perspective on life was being experienced. They were living in the New Age: the end time had arrived, and history was coming to an end. Whereas most of their religious contemporaries looked with hope and expectation to a future time when God would bring about redemption for his people and his creation, the early Christians believed that that time had arrived, and God's redemption was to be enjoyed here and now. This conviction had implications that struck at the heart of Judaism as it was practised by the majority, since what mattered in this world might have a different significance in the World to Come. The Law was a case in point, and a vital factor in those early conflicts that are recorded in the Pauline correspondence. Should the Law apply in the same way in the New Age as it had done in former times? For St Paul it would seem the answer was 'no'. Now was the age when the Spirit would rule within the hearts of believers, as the prophets Jeremiah and Joel had foretold. The book of Isaiah, likewise, presents the eschatological vision of the paradise of Eden where a lion eats straw like the ox, and a baby plays over the hole of the asp, and a toddler puts her hand on the adder's den.¹⁴ This return to paradise reflects a time when there is no need for the Torah because God's reign is manifest throughout creation, in nature as well as within the lives of humanity.

Paul's blue-print for the New Age is drawn from the biblical prophets, since they are the ones who situate themselves within an

eschatological context that he can identify with. Jewish midrash, haggadic as well as halakic, does not speculate on the World to Come since its remit is to make it possible for believers to be holy in the sight of God in *this* world.¹⁵ Furthermore, it seems that Paul felt able to distinguish between the strict ethical code of the Torah and external practices such as food laws and circumcision, finding the former universally applicable while the latter were transitory in the light of the present reality. However, in holding this view at the time that he did, Paul was in the minority.

The example of Paul's attitude to the Law shows us that while such a debate can be understood as an internal debate within *Judaism*, its subject and the nature of the argument would inevitably lead to the separation of Christianity from its roots. In the past scholars have created a colourful scene to depict an historical moment, shortly after the destruction of the Temple, when the followers of Jesus of Nazareth and the Jewish religion formally became distinct. Such a picture inevitably confers on Christianity an importance within Judaism that is unrealistic. Judaism was in crisis: its foundations had been shaken, and its future existence was more a matter of hope than certainty. Christianity was not its primary concern.

The same cannot be said for Christianity. In the years following 70 c.e., the destruction of the Temple and all that it involved in terms of the Roman de-Judaising of Jerusalem, the early believers found themselves increasingly unwelcome in synagogues. Early Christians had not involved themselves with the Jewish Revolt (66–70 c.e.) that had led to the devastation of the Temple and the city of Jerusalem. From the Jewish perspective that became increasingly normative after 70 c.e., these people had put themselves outside a Jewish identity. Practices and beliefs that could have been regarded formerly as familiar eccentricity stemming from millenarianist excesses, now had a political dimension.

In being recognised by the outside world as part of the Jewish religion, the early believers had enjoyed the protection that the Jews had negotiated for themselves in the context of the Roman Empire. To exist apart from Judaism meant Christians had to ensure that such protection was not lost. The main solution to this problem that is evidenced from Christian literature is not one of gaining independent authority but rather one of supersessionism. In using this term 'supersessionism', we are bringing to the forefront the notion that Christianity identifies itself as superseding Judaism, and that its existence means that Judaism is an anomaly. Christianity demands the authority and respect owned by Judaism because it claims to be the legitimate fulfilment of it.

While such a claim allows Christianity a future, its obvious

implication is that Judaism is now invalid: a false manifestation in the light of the truth revealed in Jesus the Christ. The writings of St Luke, the Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles, present the clearest evidence for this development towards the end of the first century. In order to vouchsafe the status of the new religious movement, its mother religion becomes 'the Other' against which the new can be defined.¹⁶

St Luke presents us with the story of the rise of Christianity: from its birth with the news of the birth of John the Baptist announced to his father in the Temple in Jerusalem, to its maturity when the gospel is preached by St Paul at the very heart of the civilised world: Rome. In presenting his account, Luke shows his readers how Christianity springs from strong and authentic Jewish roots, and, in fulfilling the promises of that religion, supersedes it.

In order to show that Christianity bears no malice against Rome for the crucifixion of Jesus, the Jews become the scapegoats for his death, and alongside the demise of Judaism without the Messiah Jesus, comes the charge of deicide. Luke presents us with a Pontius Pilate who bears no resemblance to the account we have of him from ancient sources. As one of the most brutal Roman governors, his reluctance to crucify Jesus of Nazareth seems incredible.¹⁷ Yet according to Luke three times he asks the Jews to reconsider their wish to have him executed. In the case of Paul's arrest in Acts, this too comes about through Jewish initiative, and we are told it is because of them alone that when Paul at last appears in Rome he is in chains. In these accounts Luke at one and the same time whitewashes Rome of any blame regarding the death of Jesus or the persecution of the early church, and accuses Judaism of being both blind to the truth and guilty of shedding innocent blood. By the time Luke writes, Judaism has become the *bête noir*.¹⁸ It is already Christianity's 'Other'.

Where the church has sight to see that the Christ has come in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, Judaism is blind and demands his crucifixion. Judaism is the religious 'other' that enables Christianity to define its positive attributes: hope, freedom, election, and salvation. Judaism stands condemned in its shadow as an anachronism that should no longer exist, and Christian theology thrives and blossoms through the negation of its distorted presentation of Jewish beliefs. Christianity's truth-claims become the antithesis of a maligned and misunderstood Judaism.

These same arguments that form the basis of Christianity's supersessionism become normative and constant throughout the Church's history. In Christian are both before and after the reformation, Ecclesia and Synagoga are placed side by side to allow the sharp

contrasts to be clearly visible: sight versus blindness; life as opposed to death; grace versus works. In these pictures we are crudely confronted with a Christian theology derived from and defined by its opposition to the 'other' embodied in its perversion of the Jewish faith.

When we turn our attention to a second encounter that contributed to Christianity's essential identity, we can see familiar processes at work. In naming woman as the 'Other,' Christian theology was able to develop a sophisticated dualism between the sexes that provided, in both real and metaphorical terms, the solid foundation to a hierarchical system that survives to the present day. Feminist theology has made an important contribution to our understanding of the essential nature of Christianity in recognising the concept of woman as the 'Other' in central statements concerning human nature and humanity's encounter with the divine.¹⁹ This tendency can be recognised as pervading Christianity from the interpretation of Eve as seducer and Adam as victim to the dualism between nature (feminine) and spirit (masculine).

Twenty years ago Mary Daly presented Christianity, in particular Catholicism, with a systematic critique of woman as 'the Other'.²⁰ For Daly, women can only become whole once patriarchy has been recognised and destroyed. Religion is the sinister mainstay of patriarchy since it provides the theological underpinning that ensures its divine status and immortality. At the heart of patriarchy lies the notion of a sexual hierarchy, and this is validated through the first sex's recognition of and recourse to the second sex as 'the Other':

The image of the person in authority and the accepted understanding of 'his' role has corresponded to the eternal masculine stereotype, which implies hyperrationality (in reality, frequently reducible to pseudo-rationality), 'objectivity', aggressivity, the possession of dominating and manipulative attitudes towards persons and the environment, and the tendency to construct boundaries between the self (and those identified with the self) and 'the Other'. The caricature of human being which is represented by this stereotype depends for its existence upon the opposite caricature—the eternal feminine. This implies hyper-emotionalism, passivity, self-abnegation, etc.²¹

Daly would argue that such a dualistic and hierarchical system lies at the actual core of Christianity, from its roots to its fruit in our own day. It is true that there are very early Christian texts which support patriarchal hierarchy as a social and religious ideal. The household codes, for example, in Colossians, Ephesians and 1 Peter, reflect it clearly:

Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ. Wives, be subject to your husbands, as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its saviour. Husbands, love your wives. . . Eph.5.21–25.²²

Fiorenza's work on these passages shows how this hierarchy mirrors Aristotle's ideas on family as the microcosm of the hierarchical structure of society and government.²³ While the model found in the biblical household codes can be demonstrated to be taken from contemporary Greco-Roman philosophy, Christianity underpins it by providing the theological foundation. It becomes no longer a mere philosophical theory, or organisational model for a smooth running, successful state, but a divinely created order for society.

Within these codes, women are defined in terms of their obedience to their husbands because it is the husband who represents Christ in the family unit. No argument is given to explain why women are unable to represent Christ. Later Church writers provided a variety of answers to that proposition. For example, Augustine questioned women's possession of the image of God,²⁴ and Aquinas, echoing Aristotle, explained they are defective humanity in being misbegotten males.²⁵ Any doubt that might exist over the truth of such explanations was quickly answered by recourse to the story of Eve. There we have a fine example of what happens if woman is given authority and freedom of choice: she succumbs to the first cunning salesman that arrives on her doorstep.

The figure of Eve becomes the quintessential type for female identity, as we can illustrate from Tertullian's infamous sermon entitled *On the Dress of Women*. His diatribe against 'the devil's gateway', addresses the women in his audience as if they were Eve:

God's judgment on this sex lives on in our age; the guilt necessarily lives on as well. You are the Devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that tree; you are the one who persuaded him whom the Devil was not brave enough to approach; you so lightly crushed the image of God, the man Adam; because of your punishment, that is death, even the son of God had to die. . . .²⁶

From the argument outlined in this passage we can understand how the story of Eve becomes central to the development within Christianity of woman as 'the Other'. The act of disobedience against the will of God becomes Eve's sin, and the consequences of that act are seen in terms of Eve's punishment. It is Eve who introduces sin into the world, not Adam as St Paul tells us in Romans and 1 Corinthians. Adam

becomes the model of perfect humanity, made in the image of God, but defaced by Eve's sin. However, that imperfection is cancelled out in the redemption that comes through Christ. Man is redeemed but woman continues to bear the mark of Eve. This is evident from a biblical passage which was probably written at the end of the first century, and, although bearing St Paul's name, was probably composed after his death as the church was emerging with an identity that was in keeping as an institution within Greco-Roman society.²⁷ The passage is from 1 Timothy, and is the scriptural basis for the Tertullian sermon quoted earlier:

I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarrelling; also that women should adorn themselves modestly and sensibly in seemly apparel, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or costly attire but by good deeds, as befits women who profess religion. Let a woman learn in silence with all submissiveness. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty. 1 Tim.2.8–15

Here the writer identifies his female, Christian contemporaries with the fallen Eve, creating a precedent for Tertullian and subsequent theologians. It is hard to imagine a context, ancient or modern, where baptised and believing Christian men are described as 'in Adam'. The implication is that Mary Daly is right: Christian redemption is designed by men and for men. According to the passage from 1 Timothy woman's salvation comes through bearing children, and not through the saving act of God in Christ.

From the biblical examples of the household codes and the 1 Timothy passage we can see evidence of earliest Christian theology developing with the concept of woman as 'the Other' as a foundational element, or 'core symbolism' to use Daly's language. In Christian understanding of gender, the male embodies a potential for perfection and 'Christlikeness' accentuated by the female gender's inability to represent Christ in either a domestic or public context.

Feminist reformists like Fiorenza and Ruether argue that such categorising of woman as 'the Other' has become central and characteristic of Christianity, but it is not of its essence. Such dualism may have been part of Christianity from its beginning, influenced as it was by contemporary Greco-Roman culture, but there was an alternative

attitude towards woman in Christianity that was present in its earliest form, and could be observed as present from time to time throughout the history of the church. This attitude can be discerned as part of the radical teaching of Jesus on the Kingdom of God, and described in some of the Pauline in its application among the early communities. 1 Corinthians, for example, provides us with the model of a charismatic church where all who are baptised are equal members of Christ's body. This concept reflects the attitude portrayed in the Gospels, particularly in those of St Mark and St John where Jesus shows no distinction between male and female in terms of sexual hierarchy or any notion of woman as 'the Other'.

The story of the Samaritan woman in St John's Gospel is a good illustration of this point. Here Jesus engages in discourse with a woman who notes herself that his contemporaries would have nothing to do with her, a fact the author underlines with his description of the disciples' attitude:

Just then his disciples came. They marvelled that he was talking with a woman, but none said, 'What do you wish?' or, 'Why are you talking with her?' Jn 4.27

According to the reformists a model does exist in earliest Christianity, as early as the Jesus movement itself, for an egalitarian community where male and female can exist side by side, equal in the eyes of one another and of God. This model would seem to be identical with that offered by Leonardo Boff in his infamous book written twelve years ago.²⁸

For Mary Daly and other radical critics this alternative model is not a viable option because it is not Christianity. This model was never universally applied, and whenever adherents to an alternative model did emerge in the history of the church they were soon recognised as heretics: from the time of the writer of the Acts of Paul and Thecla and the founders of the Montanist movement in the second century, to participants in Womanchurch today. In the most recent edition of *Beyond God the Father*, Daly demonstrates her impatience with feminist reformists within Christianity, with her comment concerning their work in reclaiming the biblical text that a depatriarchalised Bible would make a very interesting pamphlet. Daly and the hierarchy of the Church, it could be argued, are at one in their definition of core Christianity, including the presentation of woman as 'the Other'.

Simply by taking the example of the question of the ordination of women to the priesthood, we can see reflected in the contemporary

teaching of the Church the continued presence of the notion of woman as 'the Other'. This teaching was clearly articulated in the 'Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Declaration Concerning the Admission of Women to the Ministerial Priesthood' at the behest of Paul VI in 1976; and was affirmed by John Paul II in his encyclical written for the Marian Year in 1988, *Mulieris Dignitatem*. The argument that it is inappropriate for a woman to represent Christ at the altar because there exists a unique symbolism of Christ as the bridegroom of the Church puts an inordinate emphasis on the biological gender of Christ. This is then seen to be the essence of the Incarnation over and above Christ's love or even the nature of his sacrifice.²⁹

Mary Daly's critique of Christianity is hard to answer, but it has to be addressed because it contains within it the assertion that misogyny is part of the essence of Christianity. Without the development of the notion of woman as 'the Other', the foundations of Christianity would be unrecognisable. The hierarchy, the sacraments, ecclesiology, and Christology itself would be entirely different. According to Daly this difference would be so radical that Christianity would change its identity. For Daly the concept of Womanchurch developed by feminists such as Fiorenza and Ruether is not Christianity. Her definition of the Godhead as 'the most unholy trinity: rape, genocide, and war'³⁰ can be applied by feminists as long as the hierarchy remains male and absolute in its authority. The affirmation that only men can represent Christ in the eucharist is a re-statement of the concept of woman as 'the Other', and provides clear evidence of how the development of that concept lies at the heart of Christian identity.

If we return now to our first example of Christianity's emergent identity through its encounter with 'the Other', again we can soon find a contemporary paradigm that can be seen to reflect how Christianity continues to regard Judaism as a phenomenon that reinforces its own identity, with the inference of supersessionism. The case of the Carmelite convent at Auschwitz is such an example. In many Jewish eyes, this is an example of Christian appropriation of their memory which distorts history and experience. To transform Auschwitz into a religious shrine with a presence of enclosed nuns praying for peace demeans its horror as a place without God. In her recent article on the Holocaust, Isabel Wollaston quotes the statement of the Presidium of European Rabbis who represent this view:

We cannot but deem it utterly incongruent to sanctify ground which is desecrated and cursed, drenched with the blood of victims brutally tormented and slaughtered in history's greatest genocide.

The very word Auschwitz has become synonymous with the Holocaust, and to have this place of infinite inhumanity serve as a religious shrine would cause affront and agony, particularly to the survivors of that infamous camp and their families.³¹

At the expense of Jewish identity, the Carmelite presence transforms Auschwitz into an aid for rediscovering Polish identity in the light of the end of communism and the flowering of neo-nationalisation; and as a means of dealing with the reality of death camps on Polish soil.

A key element of previous Polish nationalism had been fervent Catholicism affirmed through anti-semitism. Jewish protests against the convent have to be seen in that light. For many Jews the insensitivity reflected in creating a Christian presence at the site of the massacre of Jews has not been appreciated by many Catholics. This in itself is evidence of a continued understanding of Judaism as 'the Other': a religion whose existence can only be explained through its role in affirming the truth of Christianity.

Christian identity emerged through a variety of encounters; we have only discussed two. We might have included other examples which prompted Christianity to identify itself through its negation of them: gnosticism and pagan cults, for instance. The two examples that were chosen are exceptional in that they deal with issues that are still challenging the churches today, and still shaping their identity.

If churches want to reform themselves in terms of their attitudes to Judaism and women, then the question arises of how such reform would affect the identity of Christianity. This is a particularly pertinent question in relation to the ordination of women to priesthood in the Church of England. Here the rejection of the notion of women as 'the Other' by that church has prompted individuals to leave, feeling that such a development changes its essential identity, believing that in its decision to ordain women it has moved outside the authority of the apostolic community. The welcome extended to those individuals by the hierarchy of England and Wales reinforces the Roman Catholic notion of woman as 'the Other', as well as making a substantial number of Roman Catholic women feel even more uncomfortable than usual.

Contemporary Christian attitudes towards the Jewish religion and women demand radical and different solutions, as was mentioned at the start of this paper. In the case of Judaism, Christianity needs to leave it alone. It should treat it with the respect and distance it does other world religions, and only then can both Judaism and Christianity be unharmed. With the case of women the opposite applies. Here Christianity needs to uphold the Pauline maxim that all are equal in Christ, that within Christ

male and female are held together as in Creation when God first created humanity to be male and female. Christ in human form today, uniquely represented by the priesthood at the eucharist, should be represented by the wholeness of God's creation not its brokenness.

The cases of Judaism and women pose a challenge to the church, to the extent that radical arguments can be made that on both counts Christianity is beyond reform. This challenge could be met by naming what is both part of its identity and harmful to it, and by reform that builds on the heart of Christian theology which affirms the justice of God and upholds respect for all humanity.

For those who fear such challenges as those posed by reforming the traditional Christian understanding of women, or facing up to the nature of Christianity's relationship with the Jewish people, it should be remembered that Christian identity is not stagnant. Encounters have happened throughout the history of the church, and, being met with the comfort and support of the Holy Spirit, have shaped it into what it is today, and will shape it into the Church of tomorrow.

- 1 In relation to a later period, these same two examples were employed in Ilona N. Rashkow's study, *Upon Dark Places: Anti-Semitism and Sexism in English Renaissance Biblical Translation*, Almond Press, Sheffield, 1990. Both issues are also central features in the work of Rosemary Radford Ruether.
- 2 *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology*, SPCK, London, 1978.
- 3 *Faith and Fratricide. The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism*, New York, 1974.
- 4 *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1983.
- 5 *op.cit.*, pp. 15–38.
- 6 Judith Plaskow, 'Christian Feminism and Anti-Judaism', *Cross Currents*, 28 (1978), 306–309; Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, SCM Press, London, 1983, pp.106–107.
- 7 *Jesus the Jew*, London, 1975; *Jesus and the World of Judaism*, London 1983.
- 8 *Jesus and Judaism*, SCM Press, London, 1985.
- 9 *op.cit.*
- 10 *Christian Origins*, SPCK, London, 1985.
- 11 For a recent study of the Jewish context of Paul's life, see Alan Segal, *Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 1990.
- 12 A good biblical illustration of this is St Paul's attitude to Christianity prior to his realisation that Jesus was the expected Messiah. He (as Saul of Tarsus) zealously persecuted the early believers. For him these people were committing blasphemy against the beliefs of Judaism, that is, he regarded them to be entirely within his religious boundary as a pharisaic Jew.
- 13 A recent discussion of this period and how Christianity developed at the time can be found in N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, SPCK, London, 1992, see especially pp. 161–166 and pp.444–464.
- 14 Is. 11 .6–8; cf. 65.25.
- 15 When the topic of life in the New Age is introduced in rabbinic literature the rabbis refer to Is.64.4: '... No one has heard or perceived by the ear, no eye has seen ...'

- 16 For moderate and well researched comment on this point see Rowland, *op.cit.*, p. 173.
- 17 See, for example, Philo, *Embassy to Gaius*, 299ff.
- 18 A notable exception to this presentation of Judaism is Luke's treatment of Gamaliel in Acts 5. 33ff. Although this Jewish character is presented sympathetically, if we look at the account in context, the rest of Sanhedrin are said to want to kill the apostles. As a result of Gamaliel's intervention they are beaten instead and forbidden to speak in the name of Jesus. Gamaliel is presented as the exception.
- 19 Sallie McFague, *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*, SCM Press, London, 1982, notes that feminist critique of western culture, religion and society recognises this basic dualism: 'At the heart of patriarchy as root-metaphor is a subject-object split in which man is envisaged over against God and vice versa. God, as transcendent being, is man's superior Other and woman in this hierarchy becomes man's inferior other'(p. 148). This critique was developed at the beginning of the contemporary rise of feminist theology by Rosemary Radford Ruether, *New Woman-New Earth: Sexist Ideologies and Human Liberation*, Crossroad, New York, 1975 and Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*, Beacon Press Boston, 1973.
- 20 *Ibid.*
- 21 *Ibid.*, p.15.
- 22 These codes mention slaves as part of the domestic hierarchical system, and yet, while these passages are quoted in contemporary contexts to uphold traditional family values, no one would consider using them to support slavery today.
- 23 *op.cit.*, pp.245-284.
- 24 *De Trinitate*, XII, ch.7. For an accessible collection of the Church Fathers discussions on the female sex see Elizabeth A. Clark, *Women in the Early Church*, Wilmington, DE, Michael Glazier, 1983.
- 25 *Summa Theologica*, I, Q.92, art. 1, vol.IV, pp.275-276.
- 26 Translation E.A. Clark, *op.cit.*, p.39.
- 27 For a full discussion of the development of an institutional church at the end of the first century, see Fiorenza, *op.cit.*, pp.285-342.
- 28 *Church, Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*, SCM Press, 1985 (first published Brazil, 1981).
- 29 For a fuller discussion of the Christological implications of feminist theology see Ruether, 'The Liberation of Christology from Patriarchy', *New Blackfriars*, 66 (1985), pp.324-335 and 67 (1986), pp.92-93.
- 30 *op.cit.*, p.1 14.
- 31 *Theology*, 96, no.771, May/June 1993, p.197.