

Providence College  
**DigitalCommons@Providence**

---

Theology Graduate Theses

Theology

---

4-1-2013

# Tertullian's Adversus Judaeos: a Tale of Two Treatises

John P. Fulton  
*Providence College*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/theology\\_graduate\\_theses](http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/theology_graduate_theses)

 Part of the [Religion Commons](#)

---

Fulton, John P., "Tertullian's Adversus Judaeos: a Tale of Two Treatises" (2013). *Theology Graduate Theses*. Paper 3.  
[http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/theology\\_graduate\\_theses/3](http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/theology_graduate_theses/3)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Theology at DigitalCommons@Providence. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theology Graduate Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Providence. For more information, please contact [mcaprio1@providence.edu](mailto:mcaprio1@providence.edu).

**TERTULLIAN'S *ADVERSUS JUDAEOS*: A TALE OF TWO TREATISES**

**THESIS**

**Submitted to Providence College in Partial Fulfillment**

**of the Requirements for the Degree**

**of**

**Master of Arts**

**by**

**John Peter Fulton**

**Approved by:**

**Director** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reader** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reader** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_ August 26, 2011

PROVIDENCE COLLEGE

TERTULLIAN'S *ADVERSUS JUDAEOS*: A TALE OF TWO TREATISES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY

BY

JOHN PETER FULTON

PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

JULY, 2011

To AFF, TL, CFS, TJW

...with deepest gratitude and love.

## CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
METHODOLOGICAL NOTES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	6
REFUTATION OF THE UNITY HYPOTHESIS	8
1 ARGUMENT FROM DIFFERENT PURPOSES	8
2 ARGUMENT FROM INDEPENDENCE	12
3 ARGUMENT FROM DUNN'S PROPOSED RHETORICAL STRUCTURE	16
4 ARGUMENT FROM INDEPENDENT RHETORICAL STRUCTURE	22
4.1 THAT PART I HAS A COMPLETE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE	22
4.2 THAT PART II HAS A COMPLETE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE	37
5 ARGUMENT FROM THE PRIORITY OF <i>ADVERSUS MARCIONEM</i>	43
5.1 ASSESSMENT OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRIORITY OF <i>ADVERSUS JUDAEOS</i>	44
5.2 ASSESSMENT OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRIORITY OF <i>ADVERSUS MARCIONEM</i>	47
5.2.1 ARGUING THE PRIORITY OF <i>ADVERSUS MARCIONEM</i> FROM THESIS	48
5.2.2 ARGUING THE PRIORITY OF <i>ADVERSUS MARCIONEM</i> FROM AUDIENCE	49
5.2.3 ARGUING THE PRIORITY OF <i>ADVERSUS MARCIONEM</i> FROM LITERARY CONTEXT	57
BEYOND THE UNITY HYPOTHESIS	63
THE TREATISE WITHIN	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A thesis is the work of many minds, and many hearts, and this thesis is no different. As I complete my exploration of Tertullian's *Adversus Judaeos*, I would like to acknowledge those who thought, felt, and prayed with me along the way. They are legion, and so I beg those who are not mentioned here to share in this expression of thanks with a few exemplars:

I thank my wife, Anna, for her loving support. She lifted me up, again and again, despite the many hours stolen from "us" for study.

I thank the Theology Professors of Providence College for their scholarship, for their integrity, and for their selfless service to students. For six years they have been my sanctuary. I dread taking leave of them, so much has their loving guidance meant.

I thank my Thesis Director, Dr. Urbano, for instilling in me an interest in the shared tradition of Judaism and Christianity, for his firm guidance, and for his confidence in me. He will always be the shepherd; I will always be the sheep.

I thank my Reader, Dr. Prassas, for her insights into early Christian history, for her insistence on the importance of context, and for her "love of the text."

Finally, I thank three old friends, Tommy, Clem, and Tom, for the examples of their lives, for their fraternal love, and for their unceasing prayers.

## METHODOLOGICAL NOTES

1/ The following conventions were adopted in the present study for the sake of consistency:

- “*Adversus Judaeos*” and “*Adversus Marcionem*” refer to the works attributed to Tertullian of Carthage.<sup>1</sup> Following Barnes,<sup>2</sup> they are called “treatises.”

2/ I have relied on several sources for English translations of Tertullian’s works (specified below in the bibliography of primary sources). Foremost among them is Dunn’s 2004 translation of *Adversus Judaeos*,<sup>3</sup> and Evans’ 1972 translation of *Adversus Marcionem*.<sup>4</sup>

3/ Following Sider,<sup>5</sup> the following rhetorical constructs, or “parts,” are used to structure the rhetorical analysis of *Adversus Judaeos*, listed in typical order of use:

- *Exordium*: Statement of subject with emotional appeal to audience
- *Propositio*: Thesis
- *Partitio*: Synopsis of argument [may incorporate *propositio*]
- *Praemunitio*: Preparation for an argument, including givens or presuppositions
- *Confirmatio*: Case (one or more arguments) in support of one’s position
- *Refutatio*<sup>6</sup>: Case (one or more arguments) against one’s opponent’s position
- *Amplificatio*: Reaffirmation and extension of an argument
- *Peroratio*<sup>7</sup>: Summary of arguments with emotional climax

---

<sup>1</sup> Geoffrey D. Dunn, *Tertullian* (London: Routledge, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> Timothy David Barnes, *Tertullian -- A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 30-56.

<sup>3</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 63-104.

<sup>4</sup> Ernest Evans (Translator and Editor), *Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).

<sup>5</sup> Robert Dick Sider. *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (London: Oxford University, 1971).

<sup>6</sup> Also called “*reprehensio*”

<sup>7</sup> Also called “*conclusio*”

## Tertullian's *Adversus Judaeos*: a Tale of Two Treatises

John P. Fulton

Tertullian's *Adversus Judaeos* is a controversial work of disputed origins.<sup>1</sup> Until recently, it was not given much scholarly attention, because it is unclear that Tertullian wrote it as an integral, finished work, intended for publication.<sup>2</sup> Problems abound. Parts of chapters 9-14 appear to be taken whole cloth from Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*, suggesting that the work may be a composite of two parts, the first written against the Jews, the second against the Marcionites (the latter adapted as an argument against the Jews).<sup>3</sup> Also, the treatise is disjointed, digressive, and repetitious;<sup>4</sup> it does not measure up to Tertullian's usual standards of authorship, suggesting that the work may not be genuine, or that it may have been collated from Tertullian's *corpus* by a redactor considerably less competent than the original author.<sup>5</sup> Finally, the rather flaccid attack in *Adversus Judaeos* does not square with Tertullian's pugilistic style in other *adversus* works, such as *Adversus Marcionem* and *Adversus Praxean*,<sup>6</sup> suggesting that the work may not have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Geoffrey D. Dunn, *Tertullian* (London: Routledge, 2004), 63.

<sup>2</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 63.

<sup>3</sup> Robert D. Sider, *The Gospel and its Proclamation* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1983), 45; also, see Ernest Evans (Translator and Editor), *Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), xix, "iv. *The relation of adversus Marcionem to adversus Judaeos*:" and Dunn, *Tertullian*, 63, who does not accept the primacy of *Adversus Marcionem* but nonetheless asserts: "Much of the material from chapter 9 onwards is virtually identical with sections of book three of *Against Marcion*;" indeed, in translating *Adversus Judaeos* himself, Dunn was guided, in part, by Evans' 1972 translation of *Adversus Marcionem* (Dunn, *Tertullian*, 68).

<sup>4</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 65.

<sup>5</sup> See Timothy David Barnes, *Tertullian -- A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 107, referencing Tränkle: "He [Tertullian] put the work aside, unfinished. Someone else published it, perhaps against his wishes. Tertullian had more important business."

<sup>6</sup> Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, xx, observes that the first eight chapters of *Adversus Judaeos*, at least, "lack much of the forthright vigour of Tertullian's usual writing." N.B., Evans believes that chapters 9-14 "are evidently copied from Tertullian," although he also allows, "unless indeed they are an earlier draft [of parts of Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*] written by himself." Geoffrey D. Dunn, *Tertullian's Adversus Judaeos, A Rhetorical Analysis* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 2008), 53, also recognizes a lack of stridency in chapters 9-14, relative to their parallels in *Adversus Marcionem*.



written in conflict with actual Jews.<sup>7</sup> In short, like the ugly duckling in Andersen's tale, *Adversus Judaeos* seems odd, swimming among Tertullian's treatises. At best, it fits the *corpus* poorly.

Nonetheless, history demonstrates that *Adversus Judaeos* is not easily dismissed. In fact, the debate about authorship, unity, and context has sputtered along for two centuries,<sup>8</sup> primarily because it *may* have something to say about relations between Christians and Jews in late second century C.E. North Africa, but also because it *may* have something to say about Tertullian. If genuine, *Adversus Judaeos* is one of Tertullian's oldest treatises,<sup>9</sup> written, perhaps, shortly after his conversion to Christianity,<sup>10</sup> providing insights into Tertullian's early theological issues, his *attack* in addressing them, and his early use of biblical exegesis (with which *Adversus Judaeos* is packed).<sup>11</sup> Therefore, this flawed work of dubious origins continues to intrigue.

---

<sup>7</sup> See Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 15-27, for a summary of the diverse scholarly opinion on this subject.

<sup>8</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 1-15.

<sup>9</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 65; Barnes, *Tertullian*, 53 and Appendix, "Barnes' Chronology of Tertullian's Treatises."

<sup>10</sup> Robert D. Sider, *Christian and Pagan in the Roman Empire, The Witness of Tertullian* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 2001), xi. Sider insists that "we know nothing about the time and circumstances of his conversion to Christianity," but nonetheless, a reasonable argument can be made that *Adversus Judaeos* could not have been written long after Tertullian's conversion. Barnes, *Tertullian*, 55-58, suggests that Tertullian wrote *Adversus Judaeos* in 197 C.E., when he was 27 or 28 years old. Although little is known of Tertullian's conversion, it is likely that it took place in adulthood, because he accuses himself of adultery (Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, 59), a sin committed presumably before his conversion. Therefore, *Adversus Judaeos* was likely written within a decade of Tertullian's conversion.

<sup>11</sup> N.B. Dunn, *Tertullian*, 69: "It (*Adversus Judaeos*) is one of the most scripturally based treatises he wrote;" and Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 3: "The point of difference [between Christians and Jews as presented in *Adversus Judaeos*] was over the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. ... It was Scripture that would give legitimacy to one or the other group's claim to be the authentic people of God [...]."

## **Background**

The winds of scholarly opinion about *Adversus Judaeos* have shifted over time, but lately seem to be drifting toward a new consensus.<sup>12</sup> For example, among the latest ten scholarly evaluations of the work (1972-2008), nine out of ten consider chapters 1-8 — collectively, let us refer to chapters 1-8 as “Part I” — to be genuine, penned by Tertullian himself.<sup>13</sup> Only one scholar<sup>14</sup> considers Part I to be of doubtful origins. Indeed, since Semler offered an opinion on the origins of *Adversus Judaeos* in 1776,<sup>15</sup> only five of 26 scholars have *not* considered Part I to be genuinely Tertullian’s,<sup>16</sup> and of these five, two merely questioned the originality of Part I, not its authorship, speculating that Tertullian’s work had been heavily redacted by an unknown editor.<sup>17</sup>

In contrast to Part I, chapters 9-14 (Part II) is the fly in the ointment of scholarly consensus. Of 26 opinions offered on its authorship in the past 135 years, ten favor Tertullian,<sup>18</sup> six equivocate,<sup>19</sup> and ten favor an unknown author.<sup>20</sup> *All* scholars, of course, recognize the parallels between Part II of *Adversus Judaeos* and Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*.<sup>21</sup> The unresolved issue is *primacy*, — which came first, *Adversus Marcionem* III or its parallels in *Adversus Judaeos*. Be that as it may, scholarly opinion about the *authorship* of Part II has firmed up in favor of Tertullian. Among the latest ten scholarly evaluations of the work, eight consider

---

<sup>12</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 8-15 and 21: “There is a growing chorus of scholars asserting Tertullian as author of the entire work.”

<sup>13</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15.

<sup>14</sup> Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, xx.

<sup>15</sup> Johann Salomo Semler, ed., *Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus, Opera recensuit* (6 vols. Hendel, 1770-1776), 5. 221-245.

<sup>16</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Semler and Burkitt reject the genuineness of Part I. Evans doubts its genuineness. Quispel and Quasten believe Part I was redacted.

<sup>17</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Quispel and Quasten.

<sup>18</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Grotemeyer, Noeldechen, Williams, Tränkle, Fredouille, Otranto, Aziza, Schreckenber, Barnes, and Dunn.

<sup>19</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Corssen, Harnack, Saflund, Sider, Evans, and Moreschini.

<sup>20</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Semler, Neander, Burkitt, Akerman, Quispel, de Labriolle, Quasten, Kroyman, Altaner, and Efrogmson.

<sup>21</sup> E.g., Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*, xx.

Part II genuine;<sup>22</sup> only two do not.<sup>23</sup>

So much for authorship. Opinion about unity and context is another story. Scholars differ in their willingness to call *Adversus Judaeos* a unity, written as an integral whole. Only three of 26 scholarly evaluations clearly argue for unity.<sup>24</sup> Alternatives to clear-cut unity have been offered by those who view Tertullian as author: only *part* of Part II is part of an original, unified work;<sup>25</sup> or Part II was copied from *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III and redacted to fit the argument against the Jews — by Tertullian or an unknown redactor;<sup>26</sup> or Part II represents a genuine but unfinished draft grafted onto the “finished” Part I by Tertullian or an unknown redactor.<sup>27</sup>

Scholarly evaluation of the context of *Adversus Judaeos* is even sketchier, probably because inferences about context (e.g., stimulus, audience, purpose) are bound to one’s position on unity. For example, if one argues from unity, then a single set of inferences will do, but if one does not, the question of context becomes layered. Furthermore, since scholarly opinion on the unity of *Adversus Judaeos* is quite speculative,<sup>28</sup> so also is scholarly opinion on the context of the work. Indeed, the latter represents speculation built upon speculation.

Geoffrey Dunn is the latest scholar to address the problems of *Adversus Judaeos*’ authorship, unity and context. Building upon the developing consensus about authorship (that Parts I and II of *Adversus Judaeos* are Tertullian’s), Dunn argues that the work *is* an integral whole,<sup>29</sup> using rhetorical analysis to develop evidence for his position. He presents a rhetorical

---

<sup>22</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Fredouille, Evans, Moreschini, Otranto, Aziza, Schreckenberg, Barnes, and Dunn.

<sup>23</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Altaner and Efrogmson.

<sup>24</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Williams, Aziza, and Dunn.

<sup>25</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Corssen.

<sup>26</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Harnack, Sider.

<sup>27</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15: Evans.

<sup>28</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 1-15: N.B. Dunn’s language in describing scholarly positions on unity: “doubts,” “suspicions,” “believed,” “suggested,” “seems to be evidence,” “unsure,” “unbridled speculation.”

<sup>29</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 30: “The *partitio*, the point at issue, is whether or not *Adversus Judaeos* was written

solution for the whole work, *as a unity*, that flows from *exordium*<sup>30</sup> through *peroratio*.<sup>31</sup>

Dunn's work has rekindled interest in *Adversus Judaeos* in two ways: 1/ by summarizing the scholarly literature, and in so doing, highlighting the recent consensus on authorship, and 2/ by using rhetorical analysis as a method with which the issue of unity may be addressed. Nonetheless, his results, which he offers in support of the work's unity, may be challenged, because rhetorical "solutions" — analytical constructs developed after the fact — are rarely so patently obvious as to be unique. Thus rhetorical analysis of *Adversus Judaeos* may yield several solutions. At least one, to be demonstrated, may be used to build an argument *against* the work's unity, leading to the conclusion that *Adversus Judaeos* is *not* an ugly duckling — *not* a poorly written treatise at all — but a *mongrel*, the poorly *redacted* issue of two *well-written* treatises: one, two-book apology, written ca. 197 C.E., and the other, *Adversus Marcionem*, published ten years later.

---

by Tertullian as a complete work according to the rules of classical rhetoric, and my thesis is that it was.”

<sup>30</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.1-3a, per Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 62.

<sup>31</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.11-14, per Dunn, 2008, *Adversus Judaeos*, 85.

## Summary of Argument

That *Adversus Judaeos is not a unity* may be demonstrated by comparing Parts I and II from several perspectives, asking, “How are Parts I and II different?” and “What may one infer about composition from these differences?” Such an approach clearly builds on the scholarly literature, which has wrestled with the mis-fit of Parts I and II over 135 years.

It has been said that “consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds,” and it is fair to say that Tertullian would have agreed. When the Master argued a point, his goal was victory, not consistency, or even elegance, and so one must allow for a certain leeway when making an argument from inconsistency about Tertullian’s writing. To be convincing, therefore, such an argument should be thorough, multidimensional, and preferably, *massive*. Its significance resides not only in the results of this analysis or that, but in the overall *pattern* of results.

Such a pattern — a pattern of independent differences — may be demonstrated in a comparison of the two “halves” of *Adversus Judaeos*. Solid arguments against unity may be made from quite distinctive perspectives, such as purpose, independence of argument, rhetorical structure, and the priority of *Adversus Marcionem* over *Adversus Judaeos* Part II.

Even Dunn’s argument — perhaps the best argument to date in favor of unity — may be rebutted on grounds of inconsistency — not Dunn’s, but the treatise’s. Dunn’s goal in pursuing this line of inquiry was “that my rhetorically derived conclusions will endorse many of the points made already by those who support the work's authenticity and integrity” and thereby “help resolve this controversy.”<sup>32</sup> He argues that the work is structured along traditional rhetorical lines, and therefore demonstrates integrity as a unified treatise. However, *using the same approach*, one may parse the arguments of *Adversus Judaeos* quite differently, presenting a strong argument

---

<sup>32</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 15.

*against unity*, and highlighting the separate “parts” of the work. That the latter is possible would be of little surprise to scholars who have speculated about the integrity of *Adversus Judaeos*. The work is not neat. It juts, and its juttings do not lend themselves to neat envelopments — not *one* envelopment, anyway.

My thesis is that *Adversus Judaeos* is a composite of two of Tertullian’s works, conjoined by an inexperienced redactor. A variety of arguments may be made in defense of this position, but perhaps none better than those which follow Dunn’s lead, building on rhetorical analysis. Thus Dunn’s signal contribution to the study of *Adversus Judaeos* may be used to good advantage, and although what follows seems to be a rebuttal of Dunn’s position, it is intended as a refinement of his insightful, ground-breaking work.

Following the path blazed by Dunn, I will attempt to demonstrate that Tertullian’s *Adversus Judaeos* is actually a poorly redacted conglomerate of two treatises: 1/ an original, rhetorically-complete, two-book Christian apology, and 2/ passages ripped (later) from Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*. I will argue that the former is grounded in historical issues pursuant to the reign of Septimius Severus, while the latter is grounded in theological issues pursuant to the persistence of Marcionism among followers of Christ. Furthermore, I will argue that the passages from *Adversus Marcionem* point to the primacy of *Adversus Marcionem* (that the parallel passages in *Adversus Judaeos* and *Adversus Marcionem* originated in the latter, not the former treatise), and away from Tertullian himself as the redactor.

## **Refutation of the Unity Hypothesis**

That *Adversus Judaeos* is not a unity, not an integral work, may be demonstrated by the many significant ways in which Parts I and II differ from one another. Arguments against unity may be made from several independent perspectives: 1/ that Parts I and II were written for different (although related) purposes; 2/ that the argument of Part I is not dependent upon the argument of Part II and vice versa; 3/ that the rhetorical structure proposed by Dunn in defense of the unity hypothesis omits many observable rhetorical elements; 4/ that Part I and Part II have independent rhetorical structures; and 5/ that parts of *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III were redacted to form a significant part of *Adversus Judaeos*, Part II, not *vice versa*. Taken together, these arguments make a strong case against integrality.

### **1 ARGUMENT FROM DIFFERENT PURPOSES: THAT PARTS I AND II WERE WRITTEN FOR DIFFERENT (ALTHOUGH RELATED) PURPOSES**

That the arguments of Part I and Part II have different (although related) purposes is easily demonstrated. Part I was clearly written to profess and explain the doctrine of Christian supersessionism — that Gentile Christians have superseded Jews as the chosen of God, while Part II was written as an exhaustive proof that Jesus is the Christ of the Creator God. The argument presented in Part I provides a nice apology for the roots of Christianity, its groundedness in *l'ancien régime*, a rebuttal to the charge of *novelty*, while the argument in Part II provides a firm foundation for orthodox Christology, one that stands in clear opposition to the alternate Christologies of Marcion, Hermogenes, Valentinus, and others of their ilk. These themes are related only insofar as Tertullian — or perhaps a later redactor, as may be argued — chose to complete the argument of Part I by demonstrating that the unseating of the Jews as God's chosen had been accomplished, and did so by arguing that the Jewish Messiah had come. This is the one clue with which those who argue for the integrality of the treatise as a whole may tie Part II to

Part I. Nonetheless, if one considers Parts I and II separately, the purpose of each is quite distinct.

Part I was written to profess, to unpack, and to defend the doctrine of supersessionism. A two-part *propositio* defines the doctrine succinctly, bracketing a *partitio* which comprises all of chapter 1 after a brief *exordium*. The *partitio* begins, “Gentiles are admissible to God’s law,” and ends:

From this, by means of the divine Scriptures, there is proof that they [the Jews] were marked out indelibly as answerable for the crime of idolatry. In fact, our people — that is, the later — having forsaken the idols to which previously we used to be devoted, were converted to the same God from whom Israel departed, as we mentioned above. For thus the younger people — that is, the later — rose above the older people, while it was obtaining the grace of divine honour from which Israel has been divorced.<sup>33</sup>

Gentile Christians not only share in God’s graces by means of the Abrahamic covenant, as twice promised,<sup>34</sup> but are now the sole beneficiaries, the Jews having fallen from God’s favor. The issue, as defined in the brief *exordium*, is whether or not the grace of God’s Law is intended for the Jews only. Tertullian argues that this is not so, as demonstrated by the evolution of the Law in God’s overarching plan for humankind, and further, that the Jews have forfeited their favored position *vis-à-vis* God’s grace, in favor of the Gentiles. The latter, by means of the Abrahamic covenant, have always been *of* the Law and *under* the Law — the Law eternal — and now possess it solely, God’s reward for their conversion from idolatry. The Jews, ever “marked out indelibly as answerable for the crime of idolatry,” have for that reason fallen from grace. Not only were these things foreseen in divine Scripture, (chapters 1-6) but they have been revealed in our time (chapters 6-8). In Dunn’s words (describing the entire treatise), “the work was meant to be

---

<sup>33</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.7b-8; Dunn’s 2004 English translation of *Adversus Judaeos* is used exclusively for quotation in the present study: Dunn, *Tertullian*, 68-104.

<sup>34</sup> Gen 12:3b — “and by you all the families of the earth shall bless themselves;” and Gen 22:18 — “and by your descendants shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves, because you have obeyed my voice.”



the definitive case to refute those who believed that the Jews were still the only people of God.”<sup>35</sup>  
That they are not is clearly demonstrated in Part I.

Part II, on the other hand, was written to prove that Jesus is the Christ of the Creator. At the very beginning of Part II, a concise *partitio* presents the issue to be addressed. First, the author puts forward a clear *propositio*, “Therefore, let us begin to prove that the birth of the Christ was announced by the prophets. [It is] just as Isaiah proclaims.” Then he adds, “the Jews say, ‘Let us challenge that proclamation of Isaiah,’”<sup>36</sup> setting up the Jews as stock foils. At the very end of Part II, a clearly identified *peroratio* mirrors and amplifies the argument introduced in the *partitio*. Jesus Christ fulfills ancient Jewish prophecy. “It is sufficient so far to have run through Christ’s condition in these things in the meantime, such that it is proven that he is such a one as was announced. And so now from that accord of the divine Scriptures, we may understand also that the things that were declared as going to be after the Christ may be believed to have been accomplished by reason of the divine arrangement.”<sup>37</sup>

Framed by *partitio* and *peroratio*, Part II contains an exhaustive demonstration of the fulfillment of Jewish messianic prophesy in Jesus Christ, thus knitting the old covenant with the new covenant, the Old Testament with the New Testament, and the reign of Christ with the salvific economy of the Creator. It may be used interchangeably as a rebuttal to Jewish hopes that the messiah is still to come — as in *Adversus Judaeos* — and to Marcionite claims that Jesus Christ, our Savior, has indeed come, but is not the Creator’s Son, not the messiah of the Jews<sup>38</sup> — as in *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III. In five separate arguments, Tertullian links prophecies of

---

<sup>35</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 3: “In the pamphlet, Tertullian argued for supersession: the Christians had replaced the Jews as God’s people. The work was meant to be the definitive case to refute those who believed that the Jews were still the only people of God.”

<sup>36</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1

<sup>37</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.11a

<sup>38</sup> Sebastian Moll. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 64-69.

the Old Testament with the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as proclaimed in the New Testament. Christ was born of a virgin.<sup>39</sup> He exhibited “all humility and patience and non-resistance”<sup>40</sup> in demeanor. He died and rose from the dead.<sup>41</sup> Now all the nations call Him Lord.<sup>42</sup> He has opened the eyes of the blind,<sup>43</sup> and unloosed the bonds of the bound.<sup>44</sup> For their unbelief, the Jews have suffered destruction and dispersion.<sup>45</sup>

In short, Parts I and II, taken separately, tell different stories. They pursue different lines of argumentation, as demonstrated by their *propositiones*. Simon, making this very observation, divides the treatise between chapters 5 and 6.<sup>46</sup> Nonetheless, he stands squarely for the integrality of *Adversus Judaeos*, arguing, in Dunn’s words, “that a work could have been written with several objectives simultaneously in mind,”<sup>47</sup> a position very similar to Dunn’s.<sup>48</sup> And of course, this would be so. Scholars who contend the integrality of *Adversus Judaeos* would naturally offer this explanation for the dual purposes evidenced by the treatise, namely, that a single work can have more than one purpose. Nevertheless, the main point of evidence — rather than argument — is that Parts I and II have demonstrably different purposes, and further, that Part II, standing by itself, would never be classified as a work expounding supersessionism.

---

<sup>39</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.7-8

<sup>40</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.27b

<sup>41</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.1-16

<sup>42</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.20, 10.8, for example.

<sup>43</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.30-31

<sup>44</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 12.2

<sup>45</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.19b-11.9

<sup>46</sup> Marcel Simon, “*Verus Israel*”: *A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (AD 135-425)* (2<sup>nd</sup> Eng. ed. Translated by H. McKeating. The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1996), 156: “In Tertullian’s treatise [*Adversus Judaeos*] the first part shows at the same time the rejection of Israel and the abrogation of its law, whilst the second is devoted to Christology.” In endnotes 1 and 2 on page 461, he defines “the first part” as Chapters 1-5 and “the second” as Chapters 6-14. Even though this is not the conventional “splitting” of the treatise, it is true that Tertullian’s treatment of Christology begins early in Chapter 6 and continues right through the end of Part II (Chapter 14).

<sup>47</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 19.

<sup>48</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 26.

## 2 ARGUMENT FROM INDEPENDENCE: THAT THE ARGUMENT OF PART I IS NOT DEPENDENT UPON THE ARGUMENT OF PART II AND VICE VERSA

The argument that Parts I and II were written for different purposes is buttressed by the independence of the arguments in each. Parts I and II each contain a complete argument. They make sense when juxtaposed, because a subset of the argument in Part II — that Jesus is the Christ of the Creator God — appears to be incorporated at the end of Part I<sup>49</sup> (there is a subtle but essential difference between the argument at the end of Part I and the main line of argumentation in Part II), but Part II is not necessary for Part I to stand on its own as a complete essay, and, of course, the argument for supersession in Part I is totally unnecessary to advance the argument of Part II. That Jesus is the Messiah is *not* dependent upon the notion that Gentile Christians have superseded the Jews in God’s favor.

Part I stands on its own as a treatise expounding the doctrine of supersessionism. Its two-part *propositio* (found in chapter 1) is that 1/ all nations are blessed through Abraham,<sup>50</sup> but that 2/ the Jews were divorced from God’s favor as they forsook God for idols (the golden calf, Baal),<sup>51</sup> even as the Gentiles won God’s favor as they forsook their idols (their pagan gods) for God.<sup>52</sup> “For thus the younger people — that is, the later — rose above the older people, while it was obtaining the grace of divine honour from which Israel has been divorced.”<sup>53</sup>

The argument Tertullian develops in defense of this thesis is twofold — first, that an unfolding of God’s law is part of His salvific plan for mankind,<sup>54</sup> and second, that the old Law has in fact ceased, and that the new Law has superseded it, as prophesied.

---

<sup>49</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.2-8.18

<sup>50</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.3b

<sup>51</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.6-7

<sup>52</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.7b

<sup>53</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.7b-8

<sup>54</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 2-6

*Argument 1: The Mosaic Law is merely a temporal manifestation of God's Law.*

- God did not give His Law to mankind exclusively through Moses.<sup>55</sup>
  - God is equitable; thus God gave His Law to all the nations through Adam.<sup>56</sup>
  - Therefore, the Law of Moses is not the sole law.<sup>57</sup>
    - It was preceded by the Law unwritten.<sup>58</sup>
    - It was superseded by a new Law.<sup>59</sup>
      - Spiritual circumcision has superseded carnal circumcision.<sup>60</sup>
      - A Sabbath eternal has superseded the Sabbath temporal.<sup>61</sup>
      - Spiritual sacrifice has superseded carnal sacrifice.<sup>62</sup>
  - That a Law temporal was given to Israel, while a new Law was foreseen in the patriarchs and foretold by the prophets, points to the supervention of the former by the latter.<sup>63</sup>
- 

*Argument 2: The Mosaic Law has ceased. The New Law applies.*

- As people of the Law eternal, “it is incumbent upon us to show and prove that, as much as that old law has ceased, so too the promised new law now applies.”<sup>64</sup>
  - We may do this by demonstrating that He whose advent was announced by the prophets as the demarcation between the Old Law and the New has in fact come.<sup>65</sup>
    - That “all clans have heard, that is, all clans have believed in him,” demonstrates that the Messiah has come. Only the Christ of God can reign over all nations, as has come to pass.<sup>66</sup>
    - That “the times of the future coming of the Christ,” as prophesied by Daniel — the nativity of Christ and the destruction of Israel — have been fulfilled, prove that Jesus is the awaited messiah.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.1b  
<sup>56</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.2  
<sup>57</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.1b-2.2a  
<sup>58</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 2  
<sup>59</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 3-5  
<sup>60</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 3  
<sup>61</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 4  
<sup>62</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 5  
<sup>63</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* 6  
<sup>64</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.2a  
<sup>65</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.2b-7.1  
<sup>66</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 7.2-9  
<sup>67</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.1-18

Thus, Part I may be seen as having a complete argument. Contrary to Jewish claims of exclusivity, *vis-à-vis* Mosaic Law, the latter is only a temporal manifestation of the universal Law given to Adam for *all* humankind, Jew *and* Gentile. Furthermore, God has *replaced* Mosaic Law with a Law Eternal, inaugurated by God's Messiah in fulfillment of ancient prophecy. Jews have resisted God's plan, embracing idolatry and rejecting the Messiah, even as Gentiles have conformed to God's plan, forswearing idolatry and accepting the Messiah. Therefore, the latter have superseded the former in God's favor.

Part II stands on its own as a treatise expounding basic, orthodox Christology. Its thesis, asserted in chapter 9, is that the Jesus of the Gospels is the long-awaited Jewish Messiah, as foretold in Hebrew Scripture. In defense of this thesis Tertullian presents the threefold argument that ancient prophecies of the Messiah are fulfilled in the *life* of Jesus, in His *death and resurrection*, and in the very *character* of Jesus.

## Part II: Synopsis of Arguments

---

*Argument 1: Messianic prophecy is fulfilled in the life of Jesus.*

- He is called Emmanuel.<sup>68</sup>
- He conquered the heathen.<sup>69</sup>
- He was born of a virgin.<sup>70</sup>
- He plied the sword of a warrior.<sup>71</sup>
- He is "from the seed of David."<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.3

<sup>69</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.4-16

<sup>70</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.7b

<sup>71</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.19b

<sup>72</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.26b-27b

## Part II: Synopsis of Arguments (Continued)

---

*Argument 2: Messianic prophecy is fulfilled in the death and resurrection of Jesus.*

- His passion and death were foreshadowed in Hebrew Scripture.
    - By Isaac<sup>73</sup> Joseph,<sup>74</sup> and Moses.<sup>75</sup>
    - In the prophecies of Isaiah.<sup>76</sup>
    - In the verses of “the twenty-first psalm.”<sup>77</sup>
  - His passion and death fulfilled Hebrew Scripture.
    - He was led to the cross by the crimes of the Jews.<sup>78</sup>
    - When he died, the world grew dark.<sup>79</sup>
    - He was resurrected from the dead.<sup>80</sup>
    - In retribution for their actions, the Jews experienced ruin.<sup>81</sup>
    - In recompense for his sacrifice, Christ was given the world.<sup>82</sup>
- 

*Argument 3: Messianic prophecy is fulfilled in the character of Jesus .*

- He was to come “first, in humility.”<sup>83</sup>
    - He took on mortal flesh and died as “a victim for us all.”<sup>84</sup>
- 

Thus, Part II may be seen as having a complete argument. Jesus is indeed the long-awaited Messiah, the anointed of the Creator God. He is the prototype of which Isaac, Joseph, and Moses are types. He is sung in Jewish psalmody. He fulfills ancient Jewish prophecy about the life, death, and character of God’s anointed.

As shown, Parts I and II, when considered separately, have independent arguments. Part I, *per se*, does *not* need Part II to be a complete, orderly, and cogent whole. To be sure, it

---

<sup>73</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.6b  
<sup>74</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.6d  
<sup>75</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.10b,d  
<sup>76</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.11b  
<sup>77</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.13b  
<sup>78</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.15  
<sup>79</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.17b,d  
<sup>80</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.16b,d  
<sup>81</sup> Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos* Ch. 11  
<sup>82</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 12.1b  
<sup>83</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.1b  
<sup>84</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.7b,8b

incorporates elements of Christology to prove that the Law eternal has indeed replaced the Law temporal, but this is where the observed relationship ends. The doctrine of supersessionism, ably professed in Part I, *does not require* Part II's exhaustive treatise on the life, death, and character of the Messiah to be complete, even if the latter *extends* the Christology of Part I, as some have noted in defense of the unity hypothesis.<sup>85</sup> The argument of Part I merely requires *reasonable* proof that God's plan has progressed beyond the Law temporal (as evidenced by the fate of the Jews) to the Law eternal (as evidenced by the coming of a Law Giver, and His reign over all nations), and this it provides in chapters 7 and 8. Likewise, Part II, *per se*, does not require Part I to be a complete, orderly, and cogent whole, a concise yet surprisingly complete Christological primer. For support of this argument one need look no further than Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*, which, in the main, *is* Part II of *Adversus Judaeos* (with a few notable additions and light redacting throughout), and which, of course, is *not* preceded by an exegetical treatise on supersessionism. Writing in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Augustus Neander reached a similar conclusion, and on this basis hypothesized that Part II of *Adversus Judaeos* had been lifted, in the main, from Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, Parts I and II appear to have married in haste, with scant consideration of one another's needs, so independent are they of one another.

### **3 ARGUMENT FROM DUNN'S PROPOSED RHETORICAL STRUCTURE: THAT THE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE PROPOSED BY DUNN IN DEFENSE OF THE UNITY HYPOTHESIS OMITTS MANY OBSERVABLE RHETORICAL ELEMENTS.**

Dunn, proceeding from the position that *Adversus Judaeos* is an integral work, a unity,

---

<sup>85</sup> See Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 10. Dunn describes William's position: "He rejected the notion that the later chapters [N.B. Part II] did not belong: 'They do in fact continue the argument, though as it seems, in a rougher, more detailed, and less polished form.'"

<sup>86</sup> See Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 7. Dunn describes Neander's position thus: "Augustus Neander claimed that, because the passages in *Adversus Marcionem* were necessary for the integrity of the argument while those same passages in *Adversus Judaeos* were not, the second half of *Adversus Judaeos* derived from *Adversus Marcionem*, and was not by Tertullian himself but by a foreign hand." Dunn describes Grottemeyer's position thus: "The themes found in the second half of *Adversus Judaeos* were announced in chapter 6, thus indicating a 'Gedankenordnung' [intended order]."

argues that Tertullian composed chapters 1-14 with the following rhetorical intent:

<u>Rhetorical Element</u>	<u>Chapter &amp; Section</u>
<i>Exordium</i>	1.1 - 3a
<i>Narratio</i>	[None]
<i>Partitio</i>	1.3b - 2.1a
<i>Refutatio</i>	2.1b - 6.1
<i>Confirmatio</i>	6.2 - 14.10
<i>Peroratio</i>	14.11-14

Recalling that Dunn intended to build his own analysis of *Adversus Judaeos* on the signal work of Sider (*Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian*),<sup>87</sup> one is immediately struck by the simple structure Dunn proposes, incorporating a long, unbroken *refutatio* and a longer, unbroken *confirmatio*. The problem this poses should have been patently obvious to Dunn, who reported that “Sider stated that Tertullian did not follow any particular sequence regarding confirmation and refutation, often making them inseparable,”<sup>88</sup> and it becomes the more obvious as one parses the arguments found in the “*refutatio*” and “*confirmatio*.” For example, four separate arguments may be discerned within the confines of Dunn’s proposed *refutatio*, of which one — that circumcision “of the spirit was given as salvation for an obedient people”<sup>89</sup> — is actually a *confirmatio* (unnecessary for the grand rebuttal of Part I), in which Tertullian introduces a new *propositio* and argues it in the affirmative. Furthermore, each of the four arguments is nicely framed by a *praemunitio* and an *amplificatio*. Consider, for example, the *praemunitio* and *amplificatio* used to frame a *refutatio* of the Jews’ claim to exclusive possession of the Law in *Adversus Judaeos*, chapter 2 (2.1b - 10a):

[*Praemunitio*] For why is God, the founder of the universe, the governor of the whole world, the creator of humankind, the instigator of every clan, believed to have given the law through Moses to one people and is not said to have given it to all clans? For unless

---

<sup>87</sup> Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric*.

<sup>88</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 5, referencing Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric* 30-31.

<sup>89</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.7b



[God] had given it to all, there is no way [God] would have permitted even a proselyte from the Gentiles to have access to it. But, as is appropriate to the goodness and fairness of God, as creator of the human race, [God] gave the same law to all clans and, at certain definite times, directed it to be kept when, by whom, and as [God] wished.<sup>90</sup>

[The *refutatio* is developed here, arguing as follows: Originally, God gave the Law to Adam and Eve. It contains all the “hidden commands” of the Mosaic Law. In fact it is the source of *all* Law from God. He who writes the Law has the right to modify it, so it should not be surprising that God would reform or “finish” the Law over time. How could Noah or Abraham have been considered righteous if God’s Law had not been given before Moses? How could Melchizedek have been “called a priest of the most high God” without the equivalent of levitical law in place? In fact, God’s unwritten Law was kept “by the ancestors” for centuries before Moses.<sup>91</sup>]

[*Amplificatio*] From this we understand that the law of God was already in existence before Moses, as [it has been given] first neither at Horeb, nor at Sinai, nor in the desert, but [it has been given] first at a more ancient time — in paradise — then afterwards to the patriarchs. And thus also, it has been given to the Jews at certain times when [God] wanted, and has been reformed at certain times. The result is that now we do not pay attention to the law of Moses in such a way as though it were the first law, but as a subsequent one. At a certain time, God both produced this law for the Gentiles, as had been promised through the prophets, and has improved it, as [God] foretold would happen, with the result that, just as the law has been given through Moses at a certain time, so it may be believed to have been observed and kept for a limited time. 2.10 Nor may we take away this power of God to modify the commands of the law for human salvation, according to the conditions of the time.<sup>92</sup>

In a similar vein, chapter 6 contains a section at the beginning of the nine-chapter “*confirmatio*” (chapters 6.2 - 14.10) proposed by Dunn which is quite *exordium*-like, in that it introduces the subject to follow — “the promised new law now applies” — while establishing the author as fair and responsible — “because we have proclaimed [...] it is incumbent upon us to show [...].” The *exordium* begins:

And so, because we have proclaimed a new law foretold by the prophets, and not such as had been given already to their ancestors in the time when [God] brought them out of the land of Egypt, it is incumbent upon us to show and prove that, as much as that old law has ceased, so too the promised new law now applies. And indeed, I need to ask first whether a proposer of the new law, an heir to the new covenant, a priest of the new sacrifices, a

---

<sup>90</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.1b-2a

<sup>91</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.2b-8

<sup>92</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.9-10a

purifier of the new circumcision, and an establisher of the eternal sabbath is expected. This is the one who suppresses the old law, sets up the new covenant, offers the new sacrifices, represses the ancient ceremonies, suppresses the old circumcision together with its sabbath and announces the new kingdom, which will not decay.<sup>93</sup>

The *exordium* is followed by a well-defined *partitio* in chapter 7:

Therefore, let us take a position on this point of yours about whether the Christ was announced as going to come, has come already or whether his intended coming is still awaited. Now in order that the issue itself may be proved, the timing, in which the prophets have announced that the Christ was destined to come, ought to be investigated by us. This is in order that, if we recognize him to have come during those times of your making, we may without doubt believe him to be the same one whom the prophets prophesied would come and in whom they announced we — that is, the Gentiles — would believe. And when it has been agreed that he has come, we may believe without a doubt also that the new law has been given by him and we may not deny the new covenant drawn up for us in and through him.<sup>94</sup>

Other complexities abound, but these should suffice to affirm the wisdom of Sider's assertion.

When one accepts the complexity of rhetorical *praxis* (*versus* theory), the simplicity of Dunn's proposed rhetorical structure for *Adversus Judaeos* seems far too neat, *especially* for a work noted for discontinuity and jaggedness.

When one delves more deeply into the *logic* or *integrality* of the rhetorical structure Dunn proposes, other problems arise. For example, the *partitio* and the *peroratio* should be logically related but are not. A *partitio* presents the thesis of a work and introduces arguments in its defense, while a *peroratio* summarizes those arguments and amplifies the significance of the findings. In short, the *peroratio* ought to reflect the *partitio*. Indeed, one ought to be able to reconstruct the *partitio* — at least the *propositio* or *propositiones* — from a good *peroratio*. That one cannot do so *at all* from the rhetorical structure Dunn proposes for *Adversus Judaeos*<sup>95</sup> suggests (assuming that the treatise conforms to standard rhetorical forms) that one may be able

---

<sup>93</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.2; this is an excerpt the *exordium* actually encompasses 6.2-4

<sup>94</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 7.1

<sup>95</sup> N.B., even though his proposed *partitio* and *peroratio*, taken individually, appear to have strong face validity.

to find another *peroratio* — one that summarizes and amplifies Dunn’s *partitio* — and another *partitio* — one that leads to Dunn’s *peroratio*. This, in fact, is the case.

Within the confines of Part I, the two *propositiones* of Dunn’s proposed *partitio*

[*Propositio* 1] The Gentiles are able to be admitted to the law of God.<sup>96</sup>

[*Propositio* 2] For thus the younger people — that is, the later — rose above the older people, while it was obtaining the grace of divine honour from which Israel has been divorced.<sup>97</sup>

are completed nicely by a *peroratio* found in chapter 6.<sup>98</sup>

[*Peroratio*] It is clear that both a temporal sabbath has been shown and an eternal sabbath has been foretold. A circumcision of the flesh has been foretold and a circumcision of the spirit foretold beforehand. A temporal law and an eternal law have been announced. Carnal sacrifices and spiritual sacrifices have been foreshown. Therefore, because of this, it follows that, in the preceding time, when all those commands of yours had been given carnally to the people of Israel, a time would come in which the commands of the ancient law and of the old ceremonies would cease, and the promise of a new law, the acceptance of spiritual sacrifices, and the offer of the new covenant would come. This is because the light shining from on high has arisen for us, who were sitting in darkness and who were being held in the shadow of death.<sup>99</sup>

The *peroratio* summarizes the preceding arguments — “It is clear that [...] it follows that [...]” — and closes with an emotional climax: “This is because the light shining from on high has arisen for us, who were sitting in darkness and who were being held in the shadow of death.”

Within the confines of Part II, the trajectory of argument which ends in Dunn’s proposed *peroratio*<sup>100</sup> is introduced nicely by a *partitio* found at the very beginning of chapter 9:

Therefore, let us begin to prove that the birth of the Christ was announced by the prophets. [It is] just as Isaiah proclaims, “Listen, house of David! The human struggle is not a trifle for you as God is responsible for the contest. On account of this, God gives you a sign: see the virgin will conceive and will bear a son, and you will call his name Emmanuel, which means ‘God is with us.’ He will eat butter and honey, as before the

---

<sup>96</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.3b

<sup>97</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.8

<sup>98</sup> N.B., the *peroratio* here proposed is unrecognized as such in Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*.

<sup>99</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.1

<sup>100</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.11-14

infant knows how to say ‘father’ or ‘mother’ he will receive the wealth of Damascus and the plunder of Samaria against the king of the Assyrians.” And so the Jews say, “Let us challenge that proclamation of Isaiah, and let us make a comparison whether the name that Isaiah proclaimed and the signs of him that he announced, corresponds with the Christ who has come already.”<sup>101</sup>

Even though this *partitio* is rather simple, even serene, it embraces two essential elements of Part II: first, that the author will demonstrate a comprehensive correlation between Jewish messianic prophecy and the advent of Jesus Christ, and second, that the Jews are prepared to dispute it, point by point. A rebuttal of the Jewish position is implied. The *propositio*, “that the birth of the Christ was announced by the prophets,”<sup>102</sup> is reflected in the opening verse of the *peroratio*, “It is sufficient so far to have run through Christ’s condition in these things in the meantime, such that it is proven that he is such a one as was announced,”<sup>103</sup> as is the implied rebuttal of Jewish arguments, “Moreover, you are not able to contend that what you see is done will be done. Either deny that these were prophesied, when they are seen openly, or that they were fulfilled, when they are read. Or if you do not deny either of these, they have been fulfilled in him for whom they were prophesied.”<sup>104</sup>

When one examines each of the two well-matched *partitio-peroratio* sets of Parts I and II, the obvious *mismatch* between Dunn’s proposed *partitio* and *peroratio* is highlighted. Indeed, that the complete treatise ends weakly — from the perspective of the unity hypothesis — was recognized over a century ago by Noeldechen.<sup>105</sup> On the face of it, the *peroratio* fails to summarize the theses of the *partitio*, and therefore fails as a *peroratio*. But of course, it does not

---

<sup>101</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1-2a

<sup>102</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1b

<sup>103</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.11a

<sup>104</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.13b-14

<sup>105</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 9, summarizing Noeldechen’s rationale for this weakness (in defense of the unity hypothesis, to which Noeldechen subscribed), states: “Even though *Adversus Judaeos* does not have a clear rhetorical conclusion, what there is still relates back to the rest of the treatise and is consistent with how Tertullian ended a number of works.”

fail. It works perfectly well with another *partitio* (and the five main arguments of Part II), suggesting strongly that Dunn’s proposed rhetorical structure is insufficient to explain the actual complexity of the work. Furthermore, that Dunn’s proposed *partitio*, found at the beginning of Part I, is completed by a *peroratio* in Part I, and that Dunn’s proposed *peroratio*, found at the end of Part II, is set up by a *partitio* in Part II, strongly suggests that Parts I and II function as *separate rhetorical entities*, and in fact, this is the case. Each has a complete, independent rhetorical structure.

#### **4 ARGUMENT FROM INDEPENDENT RHETORICAL STRUCTURE: THAT PART I AND PART II HAVE INDEPENDENT RHETORICAL STRUCTURES**

##### **4.1 THAT PART I HAS A COMPLETE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE**

Part I has a complete rhetorical structure. In fact, that *two* complete, tandem, and independent rhetorical structures *might* be proposed for Part I should be no surprise to anyone familiar with *Adversus Judaeos* and the secondary literature it has spawned, because it contains two related — but separate — lines of argumentation: that Gentile Christians have superseded the Jews in God’s favor, and that the messiah foretold by the Jewish prophets has come. Without presenting details, Simon divides these arguments between chapters 5 and 6, and Dunn, with closer attention to rhetorical detail, recognizes a rhetorical division between Sections 6.1 and 6.2,<sup>106</sup> the demarcation between his proposed *refutatio* and *confirmatio*. Many years before (1865), Grottemeyer noted “that the themes found in the second half of *Adversus Judaeos* were announced in chapter 6,”<sup>107</sup> thus suggesting the hinge-like quality of the chapter for the treatise as a whole. Finally, the division Dunn proposes — that one argument ends with Section 6.1 and another begins with Section 6.2 — has strong face validity. In short, it is rather obvious that 6.1

---

<sup>106</sup> N.B., using divisions of chapter and verse as presented in the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*. See Dunn, *Tertullian*, 61.

<sup>107</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 9.

summarizes one argument with a *peroratio*-like quality,

It is clear that both a temporal sabbath has been shown and an eternal sabbath has been foretold. A circumcision of the flesh has been foretold and a circumcision of the spirit foretold beforehand. A temporal law and an eternal law have been announced. Carnal sacrifices and spiritual sacrifices have been foreshown. Therefore, because of this, it follows that, in the preceding time, when all those commands of yours had been given carnally to the people of Israel, a time would come in which the commands of the ancient law and of the old ceremonies would cease, and the promise of a new law, the acceptance of spiritual sacrifices, and the offer of the new covenant would come. This is because the light shining from on high has arisen for us, who were sitting in darkness and who were being held in the shadow of death.<sup>108</sup>

while 6.2-3 introduces another argument with an *exordium*-like quality:

And so, because we have proclaimed a new law foretold by the prophets, and not such as had been given already to their ancestors in the time when [God] brought them out of the land of Egypt, it is incumbent upon us to show and prove that, as much as that old law has ceased, so too the promised new law now applies. And indeed, I need to ask first whether a proposer of the new law, an heir to the new covenant, a priest of the new sacrifices, a purifier of the new circumcision, and an establisher of the eternal sabbath is expected. This is the one who suppresses the old law, sets up the new covenant, offers the new sacrifices, represses the ancient ceremonies, suppresses the old circumcision together with its sabbath and announces the new kingdom, which will not decay. [...]<sup>109</sup>

Closer inspection reveals a/ one complete rhetorical structure in 1.1-6.1, b/ a second, *almost* complete rhetorical structure in 6.2-8.18, and c/ two sequential but detached rhetorical elements, 10.17-11.11a and 13.1-23, that *seem* to complete a *confirmatio* begun in 8.10-18, adding a complementary *refutatio* and completing the lot with a fitting *peroratio*. The detached blocks *appear* to have been cut from Part I and pasted into Part II, so well do they fit the former, and so poorly the latter, creating the roughness noted by scholars. Henceforth, let us refer to 1.1-6.1 as “Part I.A,” and 6.2-8.18 plus 10.17-11.11a and 13.1-23 as “Part I.B.” (See Table 1.)

Part I.A has a rather complex, but nonetheless flowing structure, in which arguments are framed, on one end, by an *exordium* and a *partitio*, and on the other, by a *peroratio*.

---

<sup>108</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.1

<sup>109</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.2; 6.3 (not shown) completes the *exordium*.



main argument with concise assertions or questions. For example, consider the *praemunitio-amplificatio* set used to frame Argument 1, about the “anterior law.”

*Praemunitio*: For why is God, the founder of the universe, the governor of the whole world, the creator of humankind, the instigator of every clan, believed to have given the law through Moses to one people and is not said to have given it to all clans? For unless [God] had given it to all, there is no way [God] would have permitted even a proselyte from the Gentiles to have access to it. But, as is appropriate to the goodness and fairness of God, as creator of the human race, [God] gave the same law to all clans and, at certain definite times, directed it to be kept when, by whom, and as [God] wished.<sup>110</sup>

*Amplificatio*: From this we understand that the law of God was already in existence before Moses, as [it has been given] first neither at Horeb, nor at Sinai, nor in the desert, but [it has been given] first at a more ancient time — in paradise — then afterwards to the patriarchs. And thus also, it has been given to the Jews at certain times when [God] wanted, and has been reformed at certain times. The result is that now we do not pay attention to the law of Moses in such a way as though it were the first law, but as a subsequent one. At a certain time, God both produced this law for the Gentiles, as had been promised through the prophets, and has improved it, as [God] foretold would happen, with the result that, just as the law has been given through Moses at a certain time, so it may be believed to have been observed and kept for a limited time. Nor may we take away this power of God to modify the commands of the law for human salvation, according to the conditions of the time.<sup>111</sup>

The *praemunitio* sets up the main argument — that God’s Law was given to all peoples, and does not consist solely in the Law of Moses — with an appeal to reason, focusing on the equity of God. Is He not “Governor of the *whole* world?” Is He not “Creator of humankind” [implied: *in its entirety*]? Is He not “Instigator of *every* clan?”<sup>112</sup> If He *is*, would he have given the grace of His Law to one nation, only? Of course not! “But, as is appropriate to the goodness and fairness of God, as creator of the human race, [God] gave the same law to all clans.”<sup>113</sup> The *refutatio* follows, using key stories from Torah to illustrate the universality of God’s Law and the *specific place* of the Mosaic Law within it, followed by the *amplificatio*, which summarizes the rebuttal:

---

<sup>110</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.1b-2a

<sup>111</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.9-10a

<sup>112</sup> Italics added for emphasis.

<sup>113</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.2b



God's Law, given to mankind as a whole, has been "reformed"<sup>114</sup> over time, as foretold by the prophets. A final caution serves to amplify the preceding and to block counter-arguments by appealing to God's omnipotence: "Nor may we take away this power of God to modify the commands of the law for human salvation, according to the conditions of the time."<sup>115</sup> In short, no finite act of God serves to limit the infinite possibilities of God's actions in the future. Only God defines *omega*.

Other *praemunitio-amplificatio* sets frame the remaining four arguments effectively, as well, although not necessarily as mirror images. Consider how the *refutatio* addressing carnal circumcision is framed, for example. The *praemunitio*<sup>116</sup> sets up the argument. The Jews' position, as presented, is that the Mosaic Law is salvific; keeping it renders men "friends of God."<sup>117</sup> But this is obviously not true, because if the Mosaic Law were in fact salvific, if it purged one of sins, God would have circumcised Adam, and He did not. The *refutatio* itself turns the Jewish position upside down, arguing that, far from being given as a sign of salvation, carnal circumcision was commanded of the Jews to mark them for punishment, to prevent them from re-entering Jerusalem after its destruction, "as found in the words of the prophets."<sup>118</sup> In short, the Jews, who have "have abandoned the Lord and have provoked to indignation the Holy One of Israel,"<sup>119</sup> have therefore been given a carnal sign of God's judgment upon them. The *amplificatio*<sup>120</sup> concisely summarizes this refutation of the Jewish position, and amplifies it, by claiming the undeniable *accomplishment* of God's punishment.

---

<sup>114</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.9

<sup>115</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.10a

<sup>116</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.10b-11a

<sup>117</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.10b

<sup>118</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.4b

<sup>119</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.5

<sup>120</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.6

Following the five tightly framed arguments, an effective *peroratio* completes Part I.A, re-emphasizing its supersessionist theme. First, the preceding arguments are recalled. Sabbath, circumcision, law, and sacrifice have indeed been practiced temporally and carnally by the Jews, but prophecy envisions an eternal Sabbath, circumcision, law, and sacrifice to follow.<sup>121</sup> Therefore, a time must come when temporal practices cease and eternal practices commence.<sup>122</sup> Note especially the verb tense used to describe the transition from temporal to eternal: “a time would come,”<sup>123</sup> implying futurity *and* the possibility of current operation, followed by an emotional climax, exalting the current positions of the Gentiles. “This is because the light shining from on high has arisen for us, who were sitting in darkness and who were being held in the shadow of death.”<sup>124</sup>

Thus, Part I.A has a complete and effective rhetorical structure. It lays down two *propositiones*, and proceeds to prove them in detail. The Gentiles were not excluded from God’s law. Far from it. Indeed, *eternal* Law, that which graces all nations in the current age, was given to all nations — albeit in primordial form — well before *Mosaic* Law was given to Israel. Clearly, the Mosaic Law was intended as a temporary expedient, an example of God’s power, “to modify the commands of the law for human salvation, according to the conditions of the time.”<sup>125</sup> Thus, God requires Sabbath, circumcision, sacrifice, and other things from us, but in forms suitable to the times. And a new age has dawned. In the words of the Master, “because we see it accomplished, we recall it.”<sup>126</sup> The Gentiles, “having been instructed in the new law, observe it,

---

<sup>121</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.1a

<sup>122</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.1b

<sup>123</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 78.

<sup>124</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 78.

<sup>125</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.10b

<sup>126</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.6b

since the old law has been cancelled,”<sup>127</sup> and more than this, supersede the Jews in God’s favor. “For Israel, [...] has forgotten its Lord and God and said to Aaron, ‘Make gods for us who may go before us, for that Moses who brought us out of the land of Egypt has deserted us, and we do not know what has happened to him.’ And because of this we, who were not formerly the people of God, have been made [God's] people by accepting both the new law mentioned above and the new circumcision proclaimed earlier.”<sup>128</sup> The calculus is clear. God’s law is one. It may be reformed for the times, but it is quite universal, and following the law is Man’s lot. Those who choose God above all else shall supersede those who forsake Him in His favor.

In contrast to Part I.A’s complexity, the rhetorical structure of Part I.B initially appears to be rather simple, perhaps *too* simple, in that it appears to end abruptly, with neither *amplificatio* nor *peroratio* to complete it. Other than this problem, however, I.B appears to proceed with a rhetorical style not unlike I.A. As discussed previously, 6.2-3 is placed where an *exordium*, a *partitio*, or, as in the case of a supporting argument, a *praemunitio* might be found. That it is not a *partitio* may be argued from two perspectives. First, it is not very argumentative. It includes an agenda — that the Christ foretold in Jewish prophecy has come, and that His coming fulfills Jewish prophecy not only in the main, but in detail — but it does not lay out an argument *per se*; it does not say *how* the author intends to prove his point. Second, that which follows, 7.1-8.2, is *far* more argumentative, containing: 1/ a clear *propositio* in 7.1 — that if the Christ who has come can be shown to have fulfilled ancient prophecy about the times of his coming, “we may believe without a doubt also that the new law has been given by him and we may not deny the new covenant drawn up for us in and through him;”<sup>129</sup> 2/ a set of preliminary arguments in 7.2-9 which

---

<sup>127</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.10b

<sup>128</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 3.13

<sup>129</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 7.1

serve as *givens* for the main demonstration to follow<sup>130</sup> — that the Jews do not disagree that Christ *will* come,<sup>131</sup> and that the Gentiles universally believe that Christ *has* come,<sup>132</sup> and 3/ a description of the method to be employed in defending the *propositio* in 8.1b-2 — comparing the timing of Christ’s advent, the signs and activities of his life, and subsequent historical events with messianic prophecy, “in order that we may believe that everything anticipated now has been fulfilled.”<sup>133</sup> (Note that the latter reiterates the *propositio*.) Thus the *preceding* structure (6.2-4) serves either as *exordium* or *praemunitio*. One can make a case for either, depending on whom one perceives as the audience. A *sympathetic* audience might read Sections 6.2-4 merely as a *praemunitio*, a *segue* from Part I.A to Part I.B, a simple introduction to the argument to follow. In contrast, a *hostile* audience might read Sections 6.2-4 as an *exordium*, an appeal to their intelligence and sensibilities, a demonstration of fairness. In any case, this *exordium*-like part is followed by a *partitio-praemunitio-partitio* — let us refer to this section in its entirety as the *partitio* — containing thesis, givens, and methods.

Following the *partitio* is a *praemunitio* which introduces a well-developed *confirmatio*, in which the events attendant upon Christ’s advent are compared with the predictions of Daniel. Conformity is demonstrated. Christ’s life and death and the events following his death occur at the times foreseen by the prophet. “Vision and prophecy has been sealed,”<sup>134</sup> as the prophet predicts, for “after his coming and his suffering there is now neither vision nor prophet announcing the

---

<sup>130</sup> For example: that the Jews live in hope of a messiah’s advent; that the universal spread of the Gospel appears to fulfill messianic prophecy; that graces flow to believers; and that these phenomena are patently obvious. These arguments are all found in Chapter 7.

<sup>131</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 7.2a

<sup>132</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 7.2c-9

<sup>133</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.2

<sup>134</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.12

Christ as going to come.”<sup>135</sup> As well, Jewish sacrifice and unction have been “abolished” by the destruction of Jerusalem<sup>136</sup> “together with the coming leader.”<sup>137</sup> Jesus Christ fulfills prophecy. Attendant upon his advent, an age ends decisively. Vision and prophecy, sacrifice and unction — icons of Judaism — cease. At this point, Part I.B ends, and Part II begins. The transition does not work well from a rhetorical perspective.

One of the reasons *Adversus Judaeos* appears to be disunified is because of the rough transition between Parts I.B and II. It simply does not work, for two obvious reasons. First, Part I.B ends with abruptness.

And the suffering of the Christ was accomplished within the time of the seventy weeks under Tiberius Caesar, when Rubellius Geminus and Fufius Geminus were consuls, in the month of March at the time of Passover, on the 25th of March, on the first day of unleavened bread on which they slew the lamb at evening, just as Moses had instructed. And so the entire synagogue of the children of Israel killed him, saying to Pilate, when he wanted to release him, “His blood be upon us and upon our children,” and “If you release him you are not a friend of Caesar,” in order that everything might be fulfilled that had been written about him.<sup>138</sup>

The expected *amplificatio* or *peroratio* is missing. Second, Part II forges ahead as if Part I.B (in its entirety) did not exist: “Therefore, let us begin to prove that the birth of the Christ was announced by the prophets.”<sup>139</sup> *Begin* we? Haven’t we just read a concise monograph on this subject? The *non sequitur* is positively jarring. Can the author of *Adversus Judaeos* — the author who has given us nicely squared off arguments in Part I.A, each with its own *praemunitio-amplificatio* frame — have been this sloppy? Sloppy enough *not* to square off a major section (I.B), a small treatise in itself? *Apparently*, yes, but *actually*, no.

Apparently, Part I.B ends abruptly, as currently positioned in the treatise as a whole, but

---

<sup>135</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.13a

<sup>136</sup> Blood sacrifice and the anointing of Jewish kings took place in the Jerusalem Temple.

<sup>137</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.6

<sup>138</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.18

<sup>139</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1a

there is more to Part I.B than meets the eye, a great deal more, in fact, and for good reason. It was moved, or, to be more precise, it was adulterated with large swaths of *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III, and thus ended up in chapters 10, 11, and 13 of what has traditionally been considered Part II of the treatise. That the redaction was sloppy is what gives the reader pause when transitioning from Part I.B to Part II. It omits even a simple *Q.E.D.* at the end of Part I.B, and neglects to smooth the transition with any of several obvious devices.

That Part II uses large swaths of *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III whole cloth — or *vice versa*, as some have argued — is well established. One can easily demonstrate this by placing the two texts side by side, like a harmony of the Gospels, and seeing how one, or the other, was redacted. When one does so, in addition to the brief insertions, deletions, and modifications of a redacted text, one also finds two lengthier passages in *Adversus Judaeos*, Part II, unmatched in *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III. For the most part, these passages appear to be displaced from Part I.B, separated by insertions from *Adversus Marcionem*. When extracted from Part II and appended to Part I.B — without rearrangement — they complete the latter quite nicely. In fact, after reconstruction, Part I.B not only has a complete rhetorical structure, but one that is quite analogous to Part I.A, with two complete arguments, each framed by its own *praemunitio* and *amplificatio*, the entire framed with *exordium* and *partitio* (*partitio-praemunitio-partitio*) on the front end, and *peroratio* on the back end.

The nice *fit* between the two pieces of Part I.B, let us refer to them as I.B.1 (6.2-8.18) and I.B.2 (10.17-11.11a, 13.1-23) — may be demonstrated in several ways. First, the transitions between the separated passages work; they are naturally smooth, without need of further redaction. Second, arguments anticipated in earlier passages are found in later passages. Finally, one finds a general coherence of themes throughout I.B.

Consider the natural effortlessness of the transition between the end of chapter 8, “And the suffering of the Christ was accomplished within the time of the seventy weeks under Tiberius Caesar, when Rubellius Geminus and Fufius Geminus were consuls, in the month of March at the time of Passover, on the 25th of March, on the first day of unleavened bread on which they slew the lamb at evening, just as Moses had instructed. [...]”<sup>140</sup> and 10.18-19: “In fact, Moses also prophesied that you were going to do this at the beginning of the first month of the new [year], when he was foretelling that the whole crowd of the synagogue of the sons of Israel was going to sacrifice a lamb in the evening and were going to eat this solemn sacrifice of this day — that is, of the Passover of unleavened bread — with bitterness. He added that it was the Passover of the Lord — that is, the suffering of the Christ — because it was fulfilled in such a way that, on the first day of unleavened bread, you killed the Christ.”<sup>141</sup> Note especially the parallelism between *bread-lamb-Moses* (chapter 8) and *Moses-lamb-bread* (chapter 10).

Similarly, chapter 10 flows smoothly into chapter 11, where the *confirmatio* — thus far argued from Daniel — is strengthened with Ezekiel’s prophecy of Israel’s ruin, and from thence into an appropriate *amplificatio* (11.10-11a), including reaffirmation of the argument, “And so, since the prophecies were fulfilled through the coming of Jesus [...]” and extension “his coming seals vision and prophecy.”<sup>142</sup>

In turn, the *amplificatio* flows into the next segment of Part I.B.2 (13.1-2), a *praemunitio* in which the preceding argument, heavily dependent upon Daniel’s prophecy, is acknowledged, “although we have proven, from the times made known by Daniel, that the Christ who was announced has come already,” and the next argument, “It was proper to him to be born in

---

<sup>140</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.16b-18

<sup>141</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.18-19

<sup>142</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.10-11a

Bethlehem in Judaea. [...] However, if he has not been born yet, what leader was announced as going to come forth out of Bethlehem from the tribe of Judah?”<sup>143</sup> is introduced. Appropriately enough, the subsequent argument is a *refutatio* (13.3-6) in which the author argues that one cannot expect a Jewish messiah to arise from a place no longer inhabited by the Jews. The *refutatio* is summarized by a brief *amplificatio* (13.7): “Therefore, if there is no anointing, where will the leader be anointed who will be born in Bethlehem, or how will he proceed from Bethlehem when no one at all from the seed of Israel is in Bethlehem?”<sup>144</sup> Thence follows a *peroratio* which transitions from the preceding theme of desolation to an examination of the cross and its attendant theme of hope. The boundary between the *amplificatio* of Argument 2 and the *peroratio* which follows is clearly marked, as is appropriate with a major transition such as this, even though it comes in the middle of a chapter (13). Of course, if one assumes that I.B.2 was in fact adulterated with material from *Adversus Marcionem*, the original chapter boundaries would have been altered. Nonetheless, as in this case, they have not been totally obscured. Clearly, one senses that something new is about to happen when one hears, “Let us show again finally that the Christ has already come in accordance with the prophets, suffered, and has now been taken back into heaven from where he is going to come in accordance with the proclamations of the prophets.”<sup>145</sup> and indeed, that sense is correct, for a masterful summary and amplification follow.

Even as the literary transitions work when Part I.B is reconstructed, so do the logical connections. Arguments anticipated or set up in earlier passages are developed and completed in later passages. For example, consider how the *peroratio* (13.8-23) completes an argument introduced in the fulsome *praemunitio* of 7.1 - 8.1. A *praemunitio* is used, says Sider, as “a

---

<sup>143</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.1-2

<sup>144</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.7

<sup>145</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.8



preparation for the argument in the sense of prefortification: clearing away major obstacles over which no argument could proceed and building fundamental presuppositions into its base.”<sup>146</sup> The *praemunitio* of 7.1 - 8.1 reiterates the *aim* of I.B, presented in the short, exordium-like section that precedes it (to prove that Christ is come and, therefore, that the new law is operative), and develops three preliminary arguments, three givens, in preparation for the proof to follow: 1/ that Jewish prophecy anticipates a messiah; 2/ that the spread of Christianity to “all clans”<sup>147</sup> is a victory unprecedented in human history; 3/ that the universal reign of Christ is so patently obvious it cannot be denied. What remains to be shown in the main arguments that follow is that the life, death, and accomplishments of Jesus Christ conform to ancient Jewish prophecy.

The anticipatory themes of the *praemunitio* of I.B.1 are reiterated and amplified in the *peroratio* of I.B.2, thus tying all of I.B together. “Let us show again finally that the Christ has already come in accordance with the prophets, suffered, and has now been taken back into heaven from where he is going to come in accordance with the proclamations of the prophets.”<sup>148</sup> Christ has come, the savior of the world, the spotless lamb, the perfect sacrifice. The *peroratio* amplifies previous findings by revealing the fullness of meaning therein,<sup>149</sup> and ends with the greatest of the “relevant signs” of His,<sup>150</sup> “the glorious resurrection of him from earth into the heavens.”<sup>151</sup>

As well, the *peroratio* reaches back to the supersessionist themes of Part I.A, reiterating them, and tying them to the cross and resurrection.<sup>152</sup> The cross is life for all those who believe, especially the Gentiles, who, “having been approved by the divine word [...] have come back to

---

<sup>146</sup> Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric*, 22.

<sup>147</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 7.3

<sup>148</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.8

<sup>149</sup> N.B. Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.19, for example: Christ’s passion and death not only fulfill prophecy, but restore “what once had been lost in Adam on account of wood.”

<sup>150</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.2

<sup>151</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.23b

<sup>152</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.11

life by the tree of the suffering of the Christ through the waters of baptism, drinking the faith that is in him.”<sup>153</sup> But woe upon those who do not have “the faith that is in him.”<sup>154</sup> “Israel fell away from this faith.”<sup>155</sup> They have “exchanged their gods, and those gods of yours are not gods,”<sup>156</sup> and “nothing will come forth for them.”<sup>157</sup> Thus, as avowed in the *partitio* of Part I.A, “the younger people — that is, the later — rose above the older people, while it was obtaining the grace of divine honour from which Israel has been divorced.”<sup>158</sup> And thus *all* of Part I is pulled together by a masterful *peroratio*.

Several other themes link I.B.1 and I.B.2, providing further evidence of coherency. For example, *the end of prophecy*, a theme developed in the *confirmatio* of I.B.1,<sup>159</sup> is reiterated closely in the *amplificatio* which follows in I.B.2.<sup>160</sup> Compare this from the *confirmatio*:

[I.B.1] Therefore, as prophecy has been fulfilled through his coming, on that account he said, “vision and prophecy are sealed,” as he himself was the sign of all prophecy, fulfilling everything that the prophets had announced previously about him.<sup>161</sup>

with this from the *amplificatio*:

[I.B.2] And so, since the prophecies were fulfilled through the coming of Jesus — that is, through the birth that we have mentioned above — and suffering, which we have established clearly, on that account Daniel also said that vision and prophecy were sealed.<sup>162</sup>

Similarly, *the timeliness of the events of Christ’s life in relation to prophecy*,<sup>163</sup> a theme

---

<sup>153</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.12

<sup>154</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.12

<sup>155</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.13a

<sup>156</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.13a

<sup>157</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.13a

<sup>158</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.8

<sup>159</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.12-15a

<sup>160</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.10-11a

<sup>161</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.12b

<sup>162</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.10a

<sup>163</sup> That is, the timeliness of His birth and passion, and of the consequences of the passion, per Daniel.

developed in the *confirmatio* of I.B.1,<sup>164</sup> is summarized concisely in the *amplificatio* which follows it in I.B.2.<sup>165</sup>

[I.B.2] Therefore, showing that both the number of years and the time of the sixty-two and a half weeks have been fulfilled, we have proven that the Christ has come — that is, he was born — at that time. As to the seven and a half weeks, which have been subdivided by being separated from the former weeks, we have shown that the Christ has suffered within that time, and thus, with the seventy weeks brought to an end and with the city destroyed, that both sacrifice and anointing have ceased from then on.<sup>166</sup>

Also, *the destruction of the old regime*, a theme announced in the main *praemunitio* of I.B.1,<sup>167</sup> is developed extensively throughout I.B, as reconstructed: the *confirmatio* of chapters 8, 10, and 11 (“Vespasian, in the first year of his *imperium*, given that he ruled for twelve years, conquered the Jews. [...]”<sup>168</sup>), the *refutatio* of chapter 13 (“However, now we notice that no one of the clan of Israel has remained in the city of Bethlehem since the time when it was forbidden for any of the Jews to linger in the boundaries of that region [...]”<sup>169</sup>), and the *peroratio* of chapter 13 (“thus Scripture says, ‘Both city and sanctuary shall be destroyed at the same time with the leader.’ [...] he who was about to proceed from Bethlehem and from the tribe of Judah. [...]”<sup>170</sup>).

A final, curious observation about I.B supports the reconstruction thus far proposed, namely, that *supersession*, a key theme of Part I.A, is *absent* in I.B.1 (chapters 6, 7, and 8), but *present* in I.B.2 (chapters 11 and 13). In chapter 11, for example, the reference to Ezekiel recalls the supersessionist arguments of I.A. God will destroy Israel, but those emblazoned with the Tau — clearly, the Gentiles — will not be destroyed.<sup>171</sup> Later, in the *peroratio* of chapter 13, as we

---

<sup>164</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.10-18

<sup>165</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.10-11a

<sup>166</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.11a

<sup>167</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.1

<sup>168</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 8.16b-17a

<sup>169</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.3b-4a

<sup>170</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.9b-10a

<sup>171</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.1

have seen, references to Jeremiah and Isaiah recall the supersession of I.A, as well, e.g., “Without doubt, by not receiving Christ, the fountain of the water of life, they have begun to possess worn-out troughs — that is, the synagogues among the scattering of the Gentiles.”<sup>172</sup> Since Part I.B is introduced as a completion of Part I.A,<sup>173</sup> it makes rhetorical sense to recall the arguments of I.A in I.B. This is exactly what one observes when I.B is reconstructed, *but not before*. Thus, a curious exception to the generally tight argumentation of chapters 1-8 supports the notion that I.B.1 *plus* I.B.2 , as reconstructed, is a *better* representation of I.B, as originally written, than I.B.1 alone.

When fully reconstructed with missing segments, Part I — let us refer to it as Part I-Reconstructed, or simply I-Re — presents an exemplary rhetorical whole, a two-book treatise (I.A and I.B, the latter composed of I.B.1 and I.B.2) in which each book incorporates a complete, logical, and effective rhetorical structure. Each “book,” as it were, is capable of standing alone, the first, a short monograph on the development of God’s law and the relative positions of Jew and Gentile in God’s salvific plan, the second, a short monograph on the current state of the law and salvation history, with focus on the long-awaited Jewish messiah. However, the two books work so well together, so supportively, that the complete, two-book structure is convincing as a whole, a complete, logical, and effective treatise in its entirety.

#### **4.2 THAT PART II HAS A COMPLETE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE**

Having demonstrated that Part II may be a collation of Part I.B.2 of *Adversus Judaeos*

---

<sup>172</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.15a

<sup>173</sup> “And so there is incumbent on us a necessity binding us, since we have premised that a new law was predicted by the prophets, and that not such as had been already given to their fathers at the time when He led them forth from the land of Egypt, to show and prove, on the one hand, that that old Law has ceased, and on the other, that the promised new law is now in operation.” — Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 6.2a.

and large swaths of *Adversus Marcionem*'s Book III, one has a choice in approaching a rhetorical analysis of Part II. One may approach it either as presented in the existing treatise, *or after deconstruction*, that is, after cutting those segments of Part II that appear to complete Part I.B (I.B.2). When one does so, that is, when one removes those segments from chapters 10, 11, and 13 that complete I.B.1, one is left with a text — let us refer to it as Part II-Deconstructed, or simply II-De — that works well from a rhetorical perspective. (See Table 2.) A bare-bones *partitio* introduces the thrust of the monograph. “Begin we, therefore, to prove that the Birth of Christ was announced by prophets.”<sup>174</sup> The body of the “work” is divided into three well-defined

Table 2 - Proposed rhetorical structure of *Adversus Judaeos*, Parts I.B.2 and II-Deconstructed

Proposed Part I.B.2		Part II-Deconstructed [I.B.2 removed]	
<u>Rhetorical Element</u>	<u>Chapter &amp; Section</u>	<u>Rhetorical Element</u>	<u>Chapter &amp; Section</u>
		<i>Partitio</i>	9.1a
<u>Argument 1</u>	<u>Prophecy Fulfilled</u>	<u>Argument 1</u>	<u>Name and Signs</u>
<i>Confirmatio</i> [b]	10.17-11.9	<i>Praemunitio</i>	9.1b-2a
<i>Amplificatio</i>	11.10-11a	<i>Confirmatio</i>	9.2b-10.16
		* [Confirmatio] [b]	10.17-11.9]
		* [Amplificatio	11.10-11a]
		<i>Amplificatio</i>	11.11b
<u>Argument 2</u>	<u>Bethlehem No More</u>	<u>Argument 2</u>	<u>Sequelae</u>
<i>Praemunitio</i>	13.1-2	<i>Praemunitio</i>	11.11c-12
<i>Refutatio</i>	13.3-6	* [Confirmatio	12.1-2
<i>Amplificatio</i>	13.7	* [Praemunitio	13.1-2]
		* [Refutatio	13.3-6]
		* [Amplificatio	13.7]
<i>Peroratio</i>	13.8-23	* [Peroratio	13.8-23]
		<i>Confirmatio</i>	13.24-27
		<i>Amplificatio</i>	13.28-29
		<u>Argument 3</u>	<u>Error of the Jews</u>
		<i>Praemunitio</i>	14.1a
		<i>Confirmatio</i>	14.1b-9
		<i>Amplificatio</i>	14.10
		<i>Peroratio</i>	14.11-14

<sup>174</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1a

arguments, as laid out in each of three introductory *praemunitioes*: 1/ that Christ fulfills the messianic prophecies of Isaiah,<sup>175</sup> 2/ “that the things that were foretold as going to be after the Christ are recognized as having been fulfilled,”<sup>176</sup> and 3/ that the first advent of Christ, as foretold by the prophets, was humble.<sup>177</sup> Well-developed *confirmationes* lay out each of the three arguments, each capped by a nicely defined *amplificatio*. The monograph is completed with a strong and — after the deconstruction of Part II — tight *peroratio* which summarizes the preceding arguments —

It is sufficient so far to have run through Christ’s condition in these things in the meantime, such that it is proven that he is such a one as was announced. And so now from that accord of the divine Scriptures, we may understand also that the things that were declared as going to be after the Christ may be believed to have been accomplished by reason of the divine arrangement.<sup>178</sup>

— and challenges the Jews to refute the preceding demonstration, if they can:

Either deny that these were prophesied, when they are seen openly, or that they were fulfilled, when they are read. Or if you do not deny either of these, they have been fulfilled in him for whom they were prophesied.<sup>179</sup>

That Part II-De works as well as it does rhetorically is not surprising if one examines its roots, which lie firmly in the rich rhetorical soil of *Adversus Marcionem*. Looking at the correspondence between the two — Part II-De and Book III of *Adversus Marcionem* — one can see that the former was built with large, intact swaths of the latter. What the redactor did — assuming, for the moment, that Part II-De was indeed developed from Book III, and not *vice versa* — was to build Argument 1 from III.12.1-20.1a (omitting chapter 15, which speaks directly to Marcionism), Argument 2 from III.20.1b-23.7a (omitting chapters 21 and 22, which also speak

---

<sup>175</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1b - 2a

<sup>176</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 11.11c

<sup>177</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.1

<sup>178</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.11a

<sup>179</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.14

directly to Marcionism), and Argument 3 from chapter 7.

Table 3 - Correspondence between *Adversus Judaeos* and *Adversus Marcionem*

<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II		<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Corresponding Elements in Book III	
<u>Rhetorical Element</u>	<u>Chapter &amp; Section</u>	<u>Rhetorical Element</u>	<u>Chapter &amp; Section</u>
<i>Exordium</i>	[None]	<i>Exordium</i>	[None]
<i>Narratio</i>	[None]	<i>Narratio</i>	[None]
<i>Partitio</i>	9.1a	<i>Partitio</i>	R†
<u>Argument 1</u>	<u>Advent &amp; Ministry</u>	<u>Argument 1</u>	<u>Advent &amp; Ministry</u>
<i>Praemunitio</i>	9.1b-2a	<i>Praemunitio</i>	R (cf 12.1a)
<i>Confirmatio</i>	9.2b-10.16	<i>Confirmatio</i>	12.1b-end, 13, 14, 16.1-5a, R, 16.5b-end, 17.4b, 27.4a, 17.4c-end, 18, 19
* [Confirmatio [b]	10.17-11.9]	* [Confirmatio [b]	-----]
* [Amplificatio	11.10-11a]	* [Amplificatio	-----]
<i>Amplificatio</i>	11.11b	<i>Amplificatio</i>	20.1a
<u>Argument 2</u>	<u>After the Crucifixion</u>	<u>Argument 2</u>	<u>After the Crucifixion</u>
<i>Praemunitio</i>	11.11c-12	<i>Praemunitio</i>	20.1b-2a
<i>Confirmatio</i>	12.1-2	<i>Confirmatio</i>	20.2b-5a
* [Praemunitio	13.1-2 ]	* [Praemunitio	-----]
* [Refutatio	13.3-6]	* [Refutatio	-----]
* [Amplificatio	13.7]	* [Amplificatio	-----]
* [Peroratio	13.8-23]	* [Peroratio	-----]
<i>Confirmatio</i>	13.24-27	<i>Confirmatio</i>	23.1-5
<i>Amplificatio</i>	13.28-29	<i>Amplificatio</i>	23.6-7a
<u>Argument 3</u>	<u>Error of the Jews</u>	<u>Argument 3</u>	<u>Error of the Jews</u>
<i>Praemunitio</i>	14.1a	<i>Praemunitio</i>	7.1a
<i>Confirmatio</i>	14.1b-9	<i>Confirmatio</i>	7.1b-6, R, 7.7
<i>Amplificatio</i>	14.10	<i>Amplificatio</i>	7.8
<i>Peroratio</i>	14.11-14	<i>Peroratio</i>	20.1-3a 20.8b-10 21.4a

\* Refers to elements of I.B.2 identified in Part II

† R = "Redactor"

Additional text was strategically inserted in several places, either to improve the rhetorical structure, as at the very beginning of chapter 9,<sup>180</sup> or to supplement an argument, as in the

<sup>180</sup> The text added at the very beginning of Chapter 9 serves as a bare-bones *partitio* (9.1a) and transitions into the *praemunitio* of Argument 1 (9.1b).

*confirmatio* of chapter 14.<sup>181</sup> (See Table 3).

Arguments 1 and 2 of II-De, as assembled from *Adversus Marcionem*, add little to the arguments of I.B (I.B.1 plus I.B.2) except additional biblical proofs, which is why the former could be collated, albeit awkwardly, with the latter, and also why the result — the existing treatise — appears quite redundant in places. For example, similarly structured arguments about the destruction of Jerusalem appear in 8.1-18 and 13.8-23.<sup>182</sup> When 13.8-23 is not used in peroration, summarizing and amplifying the arguments of 8.1-18 (as proposed for I-Re), the two sections are simply redundant. Arguments about Christ’s uniquely universal reign in chapters 7 (Part I) and 12 (Part II)<sup>183</sup> are also redundant as used in the existing treatise.<sup>184</sup> Awkwardness and redundancy dissolve, however, when I.B.2 and II-De are teased apart.

As a matter of fact, II-De itself is tight enough, rhetorically, to stand on its own, as an effective rearrangement of arguments from *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III. Noteworthy is the effective use, through placement and redaction, of III.7 as Argument 3, “Error of the Jews,” and its transition into a strong *peroratio* assembled from elements of chapters III.20 and III.21. All II-De lacks as a rhetorically-complete work is an *exordium*. A more fulsome *partitio* is desirable, as well, but at least the bare-bones *propositio*, “Therefore, let us begin to prove that the birth of the

---

<sup>181</sup> “Nor will you be able to say that the man (there depicted) is the son of Jozadak.” Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* 14.8

<sup>182</sup> Three similar points are argued in Chapters 8 and 13: a/ Daniel predicts that Jerusalem had to be destroyed after Christ’s passion. b/ Jerusalem had to be destroyed because God foresaw that the Jews would reject the Christ. c/ Daniel’s prophecy has been fulfilled.

<sup>183</sup> Five similar points are argued in Chapters 7 and 12: a/ If Christ’s reign fulfills prophecy, then he must be the one prophesied. b/ Christ’s reign was prophesied. c/ Christ reigns. d/ Christ’s reign saves us from sin, as prophesied. e/ Christ’s reign is decisively unique.

<sup>184</sup> To be clear, the arguments about Christ’s reign found in Chapters 7 and 12 are *not* derived from the same sources. The argument in 12 is not merely a copy of the argument in 7, or *vice versa*. For example, in making the point that Christ’s reign over the nations was prophesied, Chapter 7 uses Isaiah as a proof text (“Thus saith the Lord God to my Christ (the) Lord, whose right hand I have holden, that the nations may hear Him: the powers of kings will I burst asunder; I will open before Him the gates, and the cities shall not be closed to Him.”), while Chapter 12 argues the point from the Psalms (“My Son are You; today have I begotten You. Ask of Me, and I will give You Gentiles as Your heritage, and as Your possession the bounds of the earth.”).



Christ was announced by the prophets,”<sup>185</sup> works to lay the main thesis of the work on the table. It is primarily the lack of an *exordium* that makes the transition to the next argument jarring: “And so the Jews say, ‘Let us challenge’ [...]”<sup>186</sup> The Jews? The argument demands context, a context which *is* addressed in II-De, but not soon enough to avoid confusion. This apparent flaw suggests one of two possibilities, either that II-De was written as a complete monograph and lost its introduction when collated into I.B of *Adversus Judaeos*, or that II-De was in fact ripped, argument by argument, from *Adversus Marcionem*, to supplement I.B, obviating the need for an *exordium* (or an elaborate *partitio*, for that matter). If one takes the second position, which of course has been argued by many of those scholars who do *not* accept Part II of *Adversus Judaeos* as authentic, then one must also conclude that he who did the ripping and collating was inattentive to the obvious redundancies created by the collation — redundancies which could have been eliminated — thus demonstrating lack of skill as a redactor.

Indeed, that the redactor who did this — who constructed the second half of *Adversus Judaeos* — was lacking in skills, is precisely what many scholars have asserted over more than a century of commentary. The arguments have varied, depending on the position taken about the authenticity of Part II (or the treatise as a whole), with those “against” seeing Part II as poorly redacted, and those “for” seeing it as unfinished, but scholars in both camps have recognized the “clumsiness,”<sup>187</sup> “untidiness,”<sup>188</sup> “grammatical infelicities,”<sup>189</sup> “lack [of] vigor,”<sup>190</sup> etc.

---

<sup>185</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1a

<sup>186</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.1b

<sup>187</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 7, on De Labriolle: “De Labriolle repeated the same general opinion, that, because of an uncharacteristic clumsiness in the last six chapters, they must have been borrowed from the *Adversus Marcionem* by someone other than Tertullian.”

<sup>188</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 9, on Grotmeyer and Noeldechen: “Grotmeyer had accepted the untidiness of the second half compared with the first, and so did Noeldechen.”

<sup>189</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 7, on Neander: “There are grammatical infelicities that occurred when the compiler attempted to alter clauses and sentences that referred to Marcion [in Part II of *Adversus Judaeos*].”

<sup>190</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 13, on Aziza: “Even though the last chapters may lack vigor, Aziza does not believe

The obvious problems which spawned these (and other) pejoratives are more easily understood when one deconstructs Part II, and that one may do has been anticipated in the observations of at least two scholars. As far back as 1890, Corssen speculated that verses 13.1-23 should have followed chapter 8, and had been separated by material from *Adversus Marcionem*,<sup>191</sup> but Corssen's thinking was criticized as too complex.<sup>192</sup> More than half a century later, Saflund picked up Corssen's torch, noting that 11.1-10 as well as 13.1-23 are written in Tertullian's style. Nonetheless, he believed in the integrality of *Adversus Judaeos*, offering a different explanation for the parallels with *Adversus Marcionem*: that the former had been used to write the latter.<sup>193</sup> Saflund's work was rejected by Tränkle,<sup>194</sup> who nonetheless believed in the unity of *Adversus Judaeos* and its priority over *Adversus Marcionem*, and there the matter dropped. Until now, no one has pursued the natural trajectory of Corssen's and Saflund's observations.

**5 ARGUMENT FROM THE PRIORITY OF *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM*, BOOK III OVER *ADVERSUS JUDAEOS*, PART II-De: THAT PARTS OF *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM*, BOOK III WERE REDACTED TO FORM *ADVERSUS JUDAEOS*, PART II-De, NOT VICE VERSA**

Scholars who argue that *Adversus Judaeos* was written as an integral whole must address the elephant in the room, the close parallels between Part II of *Adversus Judaeos* and Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*. Generally speaking, these scholars have addressed the problem by arguing that Part II of *Adversus Judaeos* was written first — that *Adversus Judaeos* has *primacy* over Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*. As we have seen, Tränkle takes this tack, but the approach is hardly new. Noeldechen made the argument in 1894.<sup>195</sup> Later, in 1935, Williams equivocated by arguing that *Adversus Marcionem* III was either derived from *Adversus Judaeos* or that the two

---

that they were taken from *Adversus Marcionem*.”

<sup>191</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 8, on Corssen.

<sup>192</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 9, on Noeldechen.

<sup>193</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 11, on Saflund.

<sup>194</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 11.

<sup>195</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 8-9, on Noeldechen.

treatises were *both* dependent upon common *testamonia*,<sup>196</sup> but the latter position did not become mainstream. In 1955, Saflund reprised Noeldechen’s unequivocal position on the primacy of *Adversus Judaeos*,<sup>197</sup> followed by Tränkle in 1964,<sup>198</sup> Barnes in 1971,<sup>199</sup> Moreschini in 1974,<sup>200</sup> Otranto in 1975,<sup>201</sup> Aziza in 1977,<sup>202</sup> Schreckenberg in 1982,<sup>203</sup> and of course, Dunn in 2008.<sup>204</sup>

Clearly, the primacy of *Adversus Judaeos* is key to the argument that the treatise was written as an integral whole, and if one of two conditions were to obtain — either that the evidence offered by scholars for the primacy of *Adversus Judaeos* is weak, or that a credible argument can be developed for the primacy of *Adversus Marcionem*, or both — the argument for integrality is weakened. Beginning, therefore, with the first condition, let us ask, what evidence is given for the primacy of *Adversus Judaeos*? What kind of arguments, based on the evidence, are made? How strong are they? Then, proceeding to the second condition, let us ask parallel questions concerning evidence for the primacy of *Adversus Marcionem*.

## **5.1 ASSESSMENT OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRIORITY OF *ADVERSUS JUDAEOS*, PART II, OVER *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM*, BOOK III**

Generally speaking, despite superficial variations in expression, the scholarly observations used to support the priority of *Adversus Judaeos* are rather circumscribed: *Adversus Judaeos* is *unkempt*. (See Table 4.) In fact, among Tertullian’s treatises, it is “singular” in its unkemptness. Few who have read the work, from Tränkle and Dunn, on the one hand, to the most casual reader, on the other, would disagree with this generalization. *Adversus Judaeos*, as it has come

---

<sup>196</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 10, on Williams.

<sup>197</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 10-11, on Saflund.

<sup>198</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 11-12, on Tränkle.

<sup>199</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, on Barnes.

<sup>200</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, on Moreschini.

<sup>201</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 15, on Otranto.

<sup>202</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 13, on Aziza.

<sup>203</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, on Schreckenberg.

<sup>204</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 177-78.

down to us, is sketchy, untidy, repetitious, and generally wordier than, say, *Adversus Marcionem*.

Table 4. Scholarly Observations of the “Unkemptness” of Tertullian’s *Adversus Judaeos* and Related Speculations about the Determinants of the “Unkemptness”

<u>Date</u>	<u>Scholar</u>	<u>Observations</u>	<u>Arguments</u>
1894	Noeldechen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud II is untidy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T reused Jud II in Marc III.</li> </ul>
1955	Saflund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Problems” are found both in Jud I and II, especially repetitions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T changed mind when writing.</li> <li>• Non-T finished Jud II.</li> <li>• Parts of Jud II were deleted or shortened before use in Marc III.</li> </ul>
1964	Tränkle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud I and II both have lecture-like qualities and the same form.</li> <li>• Styles of Jud I, II, and Marc III are all similar.</li> <li>• Jud has sketch-like qualities.</li> <li>• Marc III is more concise than Jud II in wording and sentence structure, more organized, more structurally coherent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T abandoned Jud.</li> </ul>
1971	Barnes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud abounds in doublets.</li> <li>• Jud has theological parallels with the <i>Apologeticum</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud is unrevised.</li> <li>• T used much of Jud for Marc. III.</li> </ul>
1974	Moreschini	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections of Jud repeat.</li> <li>• Jud is one of the most singular works of T.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud is an unfinished sketch.</li> <li>• Jud was published after T’s death with some additions in Jud II.</li> </ul>
1977	Aziza	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud displays coherence and integrity in the development of themes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ill-fitting nature of the work was intended by the author.</li> </ul>
1982	Schreckenberg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud displays the sketchy incompleteness of an early work in comparison with Marc.</li> <li>• Jud is not as well thought out and logical as T’s other works.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud written only in draft form.</li> <li>• T did not intend Jud to be published in its present form.</li> </ul>
2008	Dunn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud is more occasional, less systematic, less comprehensive than T’s other treatises.</li> <li>• Jud is inconsistent.</li> <li>• Jud displays many structural problems that might have been improved with revisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jud personifies “the orator of T coming to the fore.” (p. 175)</li> <li>• Jud remains incomplete.</li> <li>• “T’s characteristic terseness was a development in his writing.” (p. 177)</li> </ul>

Source: Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15, 175, 177.

Despite this convergence of observations, however, there is considerably less agreement about the determinants — and consequences — of the work’s singularity. Of course, that this

result should obtain from a unique example that, in the main, has been explored superficially<sup>205</sup> — should not surprise, given the lack of data generated by most scholars from which inferences may be drawn, *and therefore, the leeway to speculate*. The arguments that proceed from the singular unkemptness of *Adversus Judaeos* are several and dissimilar: Tertullian changed his mind while writing the treatise; he drafted it, but did not revise it; he abandoned it; he was inexperienced when he wrote it; his writing improved over time; someone else finished the work; it is merely a sketch; its unkemptness was intended. (Table 4) There are many stories here. None predominates. Therefore, the resulting position — the priority of *Adversus Judaeos* — is rather weak. Tränkle’s argument is characteristic of the position. “Daß die Formulierungen in Marc. III viel knapper und straffer, in Iud. dagegen schlaffer und umständlicher sind.”<sup>206</sup> In short, finished products like *Adversus Marcionem* are tighter than drafts like *Adversus Judaeos*. The point seems reasonable enough, until one asks, what evidence, other than the style of *Adversus Judaeos* itself, exists that might support this argument? The answer is, of course, *none*. No evidence, for example, is offered that Tertullian wrote *other* wordy drafts, then tightened them noticeably before publication. Nor can there be, because *Adversus Judaeos*, indeed, is, in Moreschini’s words, “*una delle più singolari opere di Tertulliano*.”<sup>207</sup> It is unique among Tertullian’s works.

Furthermore, one may ask, did Tränkle — and other scholars — get it backwards? Could it not be argued that the evidence offered in defense of the priority of *Adversus Judaeos* actually supports the priority of *Adversus Marcionem*? When one borrows material from one piece of writing to use in another, does one not have a tendency *to add* words and phrases? This, certainly,

---

<sup>205</sup> The two exceptions to this generalization are Herman Tränkle, *Q.S.F. Tertullian, “Adversus Judaeos.” Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964) and Dunn, *Tertullian and Adversus Judaeos*.

<sup>206</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 11.

<sup>207</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, on Moreschini.

is the position of most biblical scholars in addressing the Synoptic Problem.

Additionally, if one hypothesizes the priority of *Adversus Judaeos* over *Adversus Marcionem*, there is the equally thorny problem of selection. If Tertullian borrowed material from *Adversus Judaeos* for his masterpiece, *Adversus Marcionem*, would he omit useful scriptural evidence, even if his intent were to tighten *wording* and *argumentation*? A comparison of *Adversus Judaeos*, Part II, and *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III reveals much in the former that *could have been used* in the latter — for example, the argument from Daniel about the *timing* of Christ’s advent.

After dissecting I.B.2 from II-De, it is much easier to argue that *two* tightly argued treatises were written a decade apart by Tertullian (Part I of *Adversus Judaeos* as reconstructed, and *Adversus Marcionem*) for *two* distinct purposes, *two* distinct audiences, and that after *both* had been written, an unskilled collated arguments from *Adversus Marcionem* to expand *Adversus Judaeos*. This hypothesis does *not* require the use of speculative singularities, for which there is no evidence. One does *not* have to argue that the fastidious *rhetor* left behind an unfinished draft, of which there are no other examples. One does *not* have to argue that the author who wrote the great *Apologeticum* almost simultaneously had not yet learned to craft a cogent argument. One need only unravel and ponder the rhetorical evidence, which lays the “singularity” of *Adversus Judaeos* at the door of after-the-fact collation and redaction by a person or persons unknown.

## **5.2 ASSESSMENT OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRIORITY OF *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM*, BOOK III OVER *ADVERSUS JUDAEOS*, PART II**

Three characteristics of II-De fit *Adversus Marcionem* better than they fit *Adversus Judaeos*. One pertains to thesis. One pertains to audience. One pertains to literary context, *vis-à-vis* Tertullian’s literary *corpus*. Taken together, they support the priority of *Adversus Marcionem*.

### 5.2.1 ARGUING THE PRIORITY OF *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM* FROM THESIS

Two passages of *Adversus Judaeos*, Part II, assert the *equivalence* of Old Testament (old Law, old covenant) and New Testament (new Law, new covenant), challenging the central thesis of *Adversus Judaeos*, that *new* has superseded *old*. The passages are found in II-De, and therefore have parallels in *Adversus Marcionem*, Book III. Both support one of the central theses of *Adversus Marcionem*, that Old and New Testaments are a single harmonious revelation of the Creator, linking Christ prophesied with Christ incarnate. Both passages work, as Dunn puts it, “to rescue the Hebrew Scriptures from Marcion’s excision of them from Christian use.”<sup>208</sup>

Consider the following metaphor from chapter 9 of *Adversus Judaeos*, in which Old and New Testaments form a two-edged sword, the common military weapon of the time: “Let us see therefore whether there is a different meaning for that sword, which has so different an activity — that is, the divine word of God, twice sharpened from the two testaments of the ancient law and the new law, sharpened by the fairness of its own wisdom, giving back to each according to their action.”<sup>209</sup> A two-edged sword cuts both ways, and to be effective, must be symmetrical and balanced. In use, it might be swiveled in the hand with good effect, with one edge leading, then the other. In light of Part I, does this metaphor seem appropriate? Is supersession about equity? Clearly, although the author of Part I is respectful to *all* manifestations of God’s Law, his theme is one of development and improvement, not symmetry and balance: “Now we do not pay attention to the law of Moses in such a way as though it were the first law, but as a subsequent

---

<sup>208</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 26, discussing David Efroymson. “Tertullian’s Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by Association.” *USQR* 36 (1980) 25-37, esp. 29-30.

<sup>209</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.18 [II-De]; Cf Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* III.14.3: “And this has to be understood as the divine word, doubly sharp in the two testaments of the law and the gospel — sharp with wisdom, directed against the devil, arming us against the spiritual hosts of wickedness and all concupiscence, and cutting us off even from our dearest for the sake of the name of God.”) Evans’ 1972 English translation of *Adversus Marcionem* is used exclusively for quotation in the present study: Evans, *Adversus Marcionem*.

one. At a certain time, God both produced this law for the Gentiles, as had been promised through the prophets, and has improved it, as [God] foretold would happen, with the result that, just as the law has been given through Moses at a certain time, so it may be believed to have been observed and kept for a limited time.”<sup>210</sup>

Similarly, in chapter 14, the author describes his method as “that accord of the divine Scriptures,” wherein prophecy (Old Testament) is as important an event (New Testament) in proving that Christ is “such a one as was announced.”<sup>211</sup> *Both* Testaments, are necessary. *Neither* alone is sufficient. Is this a fitting end to a treatise expounding supersession? Clearly not, because the emphasis, “accord” (implying equity) undercuts the main thesis. For a better way of making the same point, one need not look very far, the *peroratio* of I-Re, which incorporates the theme of prophecy-fulfillment without weakening the theme of supersession. “Let us show again finally that the Christ has already come in accordance with the prophets, suffered, and has now been taken back into heaven from where he is going to come in accordance with the proclamations of the prophets.”<sup>212</sup> The same duet is staged, but without an emphasis on equity. “In accordance with the prophets” and “in accordance with the proclamations of the prophets” are mere statements of fact, consistent enough with the theme of supersession to avoid conflict.

### 5.2.2 ARGUING THE PRIORITY OF *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM* FROM AUDIENCE

Hermeneutics is a rich vein to mine in Tertullian’s treatises.<sup>213</sup> Tertullian, who “founded [...] exegesis in the Latin tradition,”<sup>214</sup> uses “Scripture as his primary source material in almost

---

<sup>210</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2.9b

<sup>211</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.11; Cf *Adversus Marcionem*, III.20.1

<sup>212</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.8 [I.B]

<sup>213</sup> Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis, The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (Boston: Brill, 2006), 593: “Tertullian’s tractates offer a rich variety of insights into his use of the Bible.”

<sup>214</sup> J. W. Trigg, “Tertullian, Quintus Septimus Florens.” In John H. Hayes (Ed). *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Volume II, K-Z. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 536-37. Also, see Dunn, *Tertullian*, 20: “Tertullian’s quotations from the Scriptures constitute the earliest extant Latin witness.”



every chapter of every work (the only exception being his apologetic works that were designed for pagan readers).”<sup>215</sup> The Bible is his “proof-text,” the ultimate source of “decisive [...] evidence.”<sup>216</sup> And, to buttress his primary arguments from Scripture, Tertullian frequently makes secondary arguments about Scriptural interpretation — a “stated hermeneutic” — from which hermeneutical principles may be abstracted and assembled. In short, he goes to some length “to announce”<sup>217</sup> his method, using “a technical vocabulary of exegesis.”<sup>218</sup> *Adversus Judaeos* and *Adversus Marcionem* are rich not only in exegesis, but also in Tertullian’s stated hermeneutic. It has been noted that Tertullian’s “general [hermeneutic] principles... are clear from his short work against the Jews,”<sup>219</sup> and also that “Tertullian presents, extensively in his work against Marcion, his further development of Christian exegesis.”<sup>220</sup>

*Adversus Judaeos* contains 13 examples of stated hermeneutic, representing eight rules of interpretation. The rules may be grouped in several ways, but the following simple categorization is proposed: 1/ Rules about prophecy (invoked seven times); 2/ Rules about levels of meaning (invoked three times); 3/ Rules about context (invoked twice); 4/ Rules about the importance of Old *versus* New Testament passages (invoked once). (See Table 5.)

---

<sup>215</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 19.

<sup>216</sup> Kannengiesser, *Handbook*, 593.

<sup>217</sup> T. P. O’Malley. *Tertullian and the Bible. Language — Imagery — Exegesis*. (Nijmegen/Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt N.V., 1967), 144: “This is an implicit appeal [of Tertullian] to an interpretation principle which has already been announced in *adu. Marc.* 3.5.3.” N.B., *adu. Marc.* 3.5.3: “Another characteristic will be, that very many events are figuratively predicted by means of enigmas and allegories and parables, and that they must be understood in a sense different from the literal description.” Also, e.g., O’Malley, *Bible Language*, 148, regarding Tertullian’s exegesis of Scriptural passages in *Adversus Marcionem*: “Tertullian enunciates the principle that this sort of interpretation... is to be applied there where what we would call the literal meaning is not possible.”

<sup>218</sup> O’Malley, *Bible Language*, 158. N.B. O’Malley analyzes “five key words in his [Tertullian’s] exegesis... *aenigma*, *allegorica*, *figura*, *portendere*, and *simplicitas*.”

<sup>219</sup> Eric Osborn. *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1997), 151. In making this assertion, Osborn references A. Viciano. “Principios de hermeneutica biblica en la tradato ‘Adversus Judaeos’ de Tertulliano (*Biblia Hermeneutica*, Pamplona, 1986), 637-44.

<sup>220</sup> Osborn, *First Theologian*, 152.

## Table 5 - Examples of Stated Hermeneutic in *Adversus Judaeos*, by Hermeneutic Rule

### *Rules about prophecy*

Rule: Prophecy is inerrant. / Prophecy is inerrantly and uniquely fulfilled.

- 6.4 “[...] the ancient law and the prophets could not cease unless the one had come whose coming was announced through the same law and the same prophets.”
- 9.7 “[...] the prophet is to be believed.”
- 11.12 “These things would not be found fulfilled in this manner, such that now they are proven, unless he had come, after whom the things that were being announced had to be accomplished.”
- 12.2 “If these things are coming to pass through Christ, they cannot have been prophesied of any other than him through whom we consider them to be accomplished.”
- 14.11 “[...] in no way would the things have happened that were declared as following on his coming, unless he had come after whom they had to be accomplished.”

Rule: Prophecy uses figurative language to predict great mysteries to avoid becoming a stumbling stone.

- 10.5 “[...] undoubtedly it had been necessary that the mystery [...] itself was uttered in prophecies. The more incredible it was, the more it would become a stumbling block if it were prophesied plainly”

Rule: Prophecy adumbrates great mysteries so that the hearer may seek the grace of God to understand them.

- 10.5 “[...] the more splendid it was, the more it needed to be obscured, so that the difficulty of understanding might ask for a favour from God.”

### *Rules about levels of meaning*

Rule: Certain passages of holy Scripture have a spiritual/figurative *versus* literal sense.

- 7.6 “[...] those words of yours also ought to be understood spiritually [...]”

Rule: Some passages of holy Scripture are properly interpreted spritually/figuratively *and* literally.

- 9.2 “[...] you should not only pay attention to the sound of the name, but the sense as well.”
- 9.13 “[...] this is nothing new for the divine Scriptures to make a figurative use of the transference of names from a comparison of crimes.”

### *Rules about context*

Rule: Holy Scripture must be understood in context.

- 9.2 “[...] they ought to be reminded to consider the context of this passage [...]”

Rule: If the literal interpretation of a scriptural passage is impossible, then the proper interpretation is figurative.

- 9.6 “Certainly, if nature nowhere permits this [...] it follows that the statement [...] must be seen as figurative.”

### *Rules about the importance of Old versus New Testament passages*

Rule: The Old and New Testaments are equivalent, balanced, and conjoined.

- 9.18 “[...] the divine word of God, twice sharpened from the two testaments of the ancient law and the new law, sharpened by the fairness of its own wisdom [...]”

---

Using stated hermeneutic, the author argues that Old Testament prophecy inerrantly predicts unique events, that passages of Scripture may have literal meanings, figurative meanings, or literal *and* figurative meanings, that passages of Scripture must be interpreted in context, and that Old and New Testaments are both “the Divine word of God,” equal in significance. These

arguments have a curious distribution. (See Table 6.) Despite the fact that biblical passages are

Table 6 - Parallel Examples of Stated Hermeneutic in *Adversus Judaeos* and *Adversus Marcionem*

<u>Stated Hermeneutic: <i>Adversus Judaeos</i></u>	<u>Stated Hermeneutic: <i>Adversus Marcionem</i></u>
6.4 “[...] the ancient law and the prophets could not cease unless the one had come whose coming was announced through the same law and the same prophets.”	
7.6 “[...] those words of yours also ought to be understood spiritually [...]”	
9.2 “[...] they ought to be reminded to consider the context of this passage [...]”	12.2 “My advice to you will be to consider the contexts of each of these two passages.”
9.2 “[...] you should not only pay attention to the sound of the name, but the sense as well.”	12.2 “[...] so that you should not only have in mind the sound of the name, but also its meaning.”
9.6 “Certainly, if nature nowhere permits this [...] it follows that the statement [...] must be seen as figurative.”	13.3 “But now, since nature in no country gives permission [...] it follows that the statement must be taken as figurative.”
9.7 “[...] the prophet is to be believed.”	13.3 “[...] you believe the prophet.”
9.13 “[...] this is nothing new for the divine Scriptures to make a figurative use of the transference of names from a comparison of crimes.”	13.9 “[...] for this is no unusual thing to the Creator, to make a figurative use of the transference of names when the things censured are of like character.”
9.18 “[...] the divine word of God, twice sharpened from the two testaments of the ancient law and the new law, sharpened by the fairness of its own wisdom [...]”	14.3 “[...] the divine word, doubly sharp in the two testaments of the law and the gospel — sharp with wisdom [...]”
10.5 “[...] undoubtedly it had been necessary that the mystery [...] itself was uttered in prophecies. The more incredible it was, the more it would become a stumbling block if it were prophesied plainly.”	18.2 “And certainly there were most cogent reasons why this mystery could not escape being prophesied by types and figures. The more incredible it was, the more offensive it would become if it were prophesied in plain terms.”
10.5 “[...] the more splendid it was, the more it needed to be obscured, so that the difficulty of understanding might ask for a favour from God.”	18.2 “[...] and the more marvellous it was, the more it needed to be covered in obscurity, so that difficulty of understanding might make request for the grace of God.”
11.12 “These things would not be found fulfilled in this manner, such that now they are proven, unless he had come, after whom the things that were being announced had to be accomplished.”	20.2 “For events are found to be happening as they were ordained, which could not have been the case apart from the coming of Christ which had to precede them.”
12.2 “If these things are coming to pass through Christ, they cannot have been prophesied of any other than him through whom we consider them to be accomplished.”	20.5 “If these things are coming to pass through Christ, they cannot have been prophesied of any other than him through whom they are coming to pass.”
14.11 “[...] in no way would the things have happened that were declared as following on his coming, unless he had come after whom they had to be accomplished.”	20.2 “For events are found to be happening as they were ordained, which could not have been the case apart from the coming of Christ which had to precede them.” [2 <sup>nd</sup> use]

distributed throughout the treatise, eleven out of 13 examples of stated hermeneutic are concentrated in II-De, passages in parallel with *Adversus Marcionem*. This distribution, by itself, is strong evidence of the priority of *Adversus Marcionem*. But this is not all. (See Table 7.)

Table 7 - Hermeneutic Rules as Expressed in Tertullian's *Corpus*

<u>Hermeneutic Rule Expressed</u>	<u>History of Use by Tertullian</u>		
<i>Rules about Prophecy</i>			
Prophecy is inerrant. / Prophecy is inerrantly and uniquely fulfilled.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part I & II-De	
	203	<i>De Carne Christi</i>	
	203	<i>Scorpiace</i>	
Cf: <i>Apologeticum</i> (197)	206	<i>De Resurrectione Mortuorum</i>	
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book III	
Prophecy uses figurative language to predict great mysteries in order that the prophecy may not become a stumbling stone.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II-De	{used exclusively
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book III	{in these treatises
Prophecy adumbrates predictions of great mysteries in order that the hearer may seek the grace of God to understand them.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II-De	{used exclusively
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book III	{in these treatises
<i>Rules about Levels of Meaning</i>			
Certain passages of holy Scripture have a spiritual / figurative (vs. literal) sense.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part I	
	197	<i>De Idololatria</i>	{Paranæsis
	198	<i>De Baptismo</i>	
	203	<i>De Carne Christi</i>	
	203	<i>Scorpiace</i>	
	206	<i>De Resurrectione Mortuorum</i>	
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book III	
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book V	
	210	<i>De Pudicitia</i>	{Paranæsis
Some passages of holy Scripture are properly interpreted spiritually/figuratively <i>and</i> literally.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II-De	
	198	<i>De Baptismo</i>	
	206	<i>De Resurrectione Mortuorum</i>	
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book V	
<i>Rules about Context</i>			
Holy Scripture must be understood in context.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II-De	
	206	<i>De Resurrectione Mortuorum</i>	
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> Book III	
	210	<i>De Monogomia</i>	{Paranæsis
If the literal interpretation of a scriptural passage is impossible, then the proper interpretation of the passage is figurative.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II-De	{used exclusively
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> III	{in these treatises
<i>Rules about the importance of Old versus New Testament passages</i>			
The Old and New Testaments are equivalent, balanced, and conjoined. Implied: They must be given equal weight of interpretation.	197	<i>Adversus Judaeos</i> Part II-De	{used exclusively
	207	<i>Adversus Marcionem</i> III	{in these treatises

When one places the spoken hermeneutic of *Adversus Judaeos* in context, i.e., in the context of *all* similar examples in Tertullian's *corpus*, another telling pattern obtains.

The hermeneutic rules professed in *Adversus Judaeos* are found *primarily* in treatises

written as refutation, as opposed to apology or *paranæsis*. Exceptions include *De Idololatria* (ca. 197), *De Pudicitia* (ca. 210), and *De Monogomia* (ca. 210), which are best classified as examples of *paranæsis*. Of these three, however, the latter two, written by Tertullian in his Montanist period, have very strong elements of refutation against mainstream catholic Christians, and therefore support the general pattern.<sup>221</sup> Thus, examples of spoken hermeneutic found in *Adversus Judaeos* II-De are generally found<sup>222</sup> in treatises defending Christian orthodoxy from *alternative Christian beliefs*<sup>223</sup> and therefore, seem out of place in *Adversus Judaeos*, ostensibly written for another purpose.

Furthermore, it is obvious from Tertullian's *corpus* that several expressions of spoken hermeneutic found in *Adversus Judaeos* II-De are used *exclusively* in *Adversus Judaeos* II-De and *Adversus Marcionem*. These four expressions are more relevant to the debate with Marcion than *any* debate with the Jews. Three of the four share a common theme: that divine Scripture must not be read superficially. Biblical passages have more than *face*; they have depth. God, in fact, *nuances* prophecy. He uses figurative language to avoid stumbling stones. He obscures. He helps the well-informed reader differentiate between literal and figurative by providing context.<sup>224</sup> Clearly, these hermeneutic rules address the restrictive literalism of Marcion's exegesis.<sup>225</sup>

This argument is wasted on Jewish rabbis, is it not? — they who *invented* figurative

---

<sup>221</sup> According to Barnes, *Tertullian*, 43-44, for example, both *De Pudicitia* and *De Monogomia* contain the following “ideas or expressions distinctive of Montanist beliefs,” all of which work to differentiate Montanism from mainstream Catholicism: a/ “mention of spiritual gifts possessed only by Montanists;” b/ “nos’ or ‘noster’ used to describe things or persons peculiarly Montanist;” c/ “vos’ or ‘voster’ used to contrast catholic Christians with Montanists;” and d/ “abuse of the Catholics as ‘psychici.’”

<sup>222</sup> *De Idololatria* is an exception.

<sup>223</sup> For example, *De Carni Christi*, which defends Christian belief in Christ's humanity from the Gnostics' docetic understanding of it, or *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, which defends Christian belief in physical resurrection from the Gnostics' non-physical understanding of it.

<sup>224</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 9.6: “Certainly, if nature nowhere allows this, [...] it follows that the pronouncement is visibly figurative.”

<sup>225</sup> Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 78-82, “Marcion's Literalism.”

interpretation? Consider, for example, Rabbi Akiba’s work in the second century, C.E., who is described by one Jewish Historian as having “perfected the practice of deducing laws and principles not only from the clear text of the Bible, but from its arrangement, its superfluous words, its very dots and dashes,”<sup>226</sup> or again, the proselyte Aquila’s second century translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, based on Akiba’s work, undertaken in part to address Christian interpretation of the Septuagint.<sup>227</sup> Of course, in traditional Christian-Jewish debate, one finds *many* differences in the interpretation of ancient Jewish texts, and indeed, some of these differences may be grounded in disputes about the appropriate *level* of meaning — literal *versus* figurative — but these are primarily differences in exegesis, *not* hermeneutics. Marcionism, on the other hand, rejects the *common* hermeneutic of Christianity and Judaism, opting for a rigidly literalist interpretation of ancient Jewish Scripture.<sup>228</sup> Thus Marcion can see the Creator’s anger, but not his mercy.<sup>229</sup> Marcion and the Jews *may* be lumped, as it were, as “those who reject Jesus Christ as the Messiah of the Creator God,” but certainly, they *cannot* be likened to one another on the basis of hermeneutics. Jewish rabbis would have dismissed Marcion’s interpretation of Hebrew Scripture as insane,<sup>230</sup> and perhaps did. For this reason, the three expressions of stated hermeneutic found exclusively in *Adversus Judaeos* II-De and *Adversus Marcionem* that address *the possibility* of figurative interpretation clearly support the priority of *Adversus Marcionem*. The fourth, in its own way, does as well.

As we have seen, *Adversus Judaeos* II-De contains two passages in which the equivalence

---

<sup>226</sup> Abram Leon Sachar. *A History of the Jews* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), 145-46.

<sup>227</sup> George Foot Moore. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of Tannaim* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 88.

<sup>228</sup> Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 78-82, “Marcion’s Literalism.”

<sup>229</sup> On the basis of Sebastian Moll’s recent (2010) work, one might go so far as to say that Marcion can see the Creator’s evil, but not his goodness. See Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, esp. 47-63, “The Evil God.”

<sup>230</sup> Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, esp. 79: “It goes without saying that Marcion did not read the Old Testament with the eyes of an orthodox Jew, as any Jew would have been appalled to see his God described the way Marcion did.”

of the Old Testament (old Law, old covenant) and the New Testament (new Law, new covenant) are asserted. The first, “[...] the divine word of God, twice sharpened from the two testaments of the ancient law and the new law, sharpened by the fairness of its own wisdom,”<sup>231</sup> is also an example of stated hermeneutic, and it bespeaks a rule of interpretation *iconic* of Tertullian’s debate with Marcion. Prophecy and its fulfillment are as *one* sword! Marcion, of course, saw the Old and New Testaments as revelations of two distinctively different Gods, one evil, one good, hardly “one” in any sense.<sup>232</sup> Indeed, this is why he went to such lengths to purge his New Testament canon of any positive reference to the Old.<sup>233</sup> Clearly, this example of spoken hermeneutic supports the priority of *Adversus Marcionem*, not only because it disputes the exclusivity of the Marcionite canon, but also because *it is totally irrelevant to the argument made in the second half of Adversus Judaeos*, which depends solely on a comparison of Jewish prophecy and historical facts — facts which are *not* dependent upon use of the New Testament as a proof text. The resurrection of Jesus Christ, for example, is not “referenced,” as it were, but simply mentioned as an accomplished fact: “For in this is shown the purpose of his grace, that it is to be a recompense for the insult of death. It is also shown that he will obtain these things on account of his death. He is to obtain them after death, at least after his resurrection.”<sup>234</sup> Note the matter-of-factness. “*At least* after his resurrection.” In another passage, the resurrection is worked just as casually: “However, that Joshua is the Christ, the high priest of God the Father, who, in his

---

<sup>231</sup> *Adversus Judaeos*, Ch. 9.18

<sup>232</sup> N.B. Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* I.19.4: “The separation of Law and Gospel is the actual and principal work of Marcion,” a point affirmed by Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 102: “Now, no one is going to deny that Marcion was opposed to the union of the Old and the New Testament.”

<sup>233</sup> References he attributed to “the testimony of ignorant Apostles and Judaist forgers.” (Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, esp. 103) Also see Evans, *Tertullian - Adversus Marcionem*, esp. xiv: “Marcion, as already observed, rejected the Old Testament, not as untrue but as non-Christian. He also rejected such parts of the New Testament as spoke with approval of the past, or brought Christ into any sort of relationship with the God who made the world.”

<sup>234</sup> NB: Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 10.16b

first coming, came in the humility of suffering human form; even in the period before his suffering. He was even proven through everything a victim for us all, who, after his resurrection when he was clothed in a robe, is named priest of God the Father for eternity.”<sup>235</sup> Note especially “Who, after his resurrection [...]” Strange, is it not, that in a debate with Jews, the ever-vigilant Tertullian would not nail down a point as important as Christ’s resurrection with a reference to the Gospels, or *Acts*, or Paul? Apparently, the historicity of the resurrection was not an important issue — not, at least, in II-De. Neither is the ascension of Jesus Christ: “Why so? Certainly after his resurrection from the dead, which was carried out on the third day, the heavens took him back [...] This is the glorious resurrection of him from earth into the heavens, neither whose birth nor whose suffering the Jews acknowledged.”<sup>236</sup> Finally, consider how the treatise ends: “Either deny that these were prophesied, when they are seen openly, or that they were fulfilled, when they are read. Or if you do not deny either of these, they have been fulfilled in him for whom they were prophesied.”<sup>237</sup> The issue in Part II is the fit between prophecy and *historical fulfillment*, not the equivalence of the Old and New Testaments. Thus, the *irrelevance* of the hermeneutic principle, “the divine word of God, twice sharpened [...],” supports the priority of *Adversus Marcionem*.

### 5.2.3 ARGUING THE PRIORITY OF *ADVERSUS MARCIONEM* FROM LITERARY CONTEXT

Tertullian’s literary *corpus* is pervaded by three distinct lines of thought, each pertaining to a distinct literary mission, as it were: apology, refutation, and *paranæsis*, used to defend Christians, orthodoxy, and morality, respectively. In essence, each treatise asks and answers one “big” question.<sup>238</sup> *Adversus Judaeos* is an exception, which is one of the reasons it seems so out

---

<sup>235</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.8

<sup>236</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 13.23a

<sup>237</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.14

<sup>238</sup> For example: *De Cultu Feminarum* — How may we cooperate in our own salvation? *Apologeticum* — Are Christians guilty of heinous crimes, as charged? *De Spectaculis* — What does it mean to be holy?



of place in the *corpus*, but it may be the exception that proves the rule. It asks and answers *two* distinctly different questions: 1/ “Are Christians legitimate heirs of the Law?” and 2/ “Who is Jesus Christ?” Therein lies one of the problems of the text, namely, lack of focus, but the problem goes deeper. Not only does the treatise address two questions, but the intent of each question is unrelated. The first is apologetic, while the second is refutational. The ambiguity suggests *collation* — collation of two works with different intent, and perhaps different audiences.

The first question — Are Christians legitimate heirs of the Law? — subtly disguises another: Do Christians have a claim to legitimacy in a culture that reveres ancient traditions, or are they to be “counted as a drop in the bucket or as dust from the threshing floor?”<sup>239</sup> The superficial question guides the argument from law through messiah to supersession, leaving it for the reader to draw the not-so-subtle inference that *Christians presently have whatever rights Jews previously had*. “In fact, our people — that is, the later — having forsaken the idols to which previously we used to be devoted, were converted to the same God from whom Israel departed, as we mentioned above. For thus the younger people — that is, the later — rose above the older people, while it was obtaining the grace of divine honour from which Israel has been divorced.”<sup>240</sup> The *intent* is wholly apologetic, wholly consistent with three other apologies written at the same time to defend the legitimacy of Christianity in a pagan world: (197-198 C.E.), *Ad Nationes*, *Apologeticum*, and *De Testimonio Animae*. In fact, that Tertullian used key arguments from *Adversus Judaeos* in his great apology, *Apologeticum*, is noted by Tränkle<sup>241</sup> and confirmed by Barnes,<sup>242</sup> informing the latter’s chronology of Tertullian’s *corpus*.<sup>243</sup> Barnes singles out chapter

---

<sup>239</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.3

<sup>240</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.7b-1.8

<sup>241</sup> Tränkle, *Adversus Judaeos*, lxvi-lxvii.

<sup>242</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 53, 108.

<sup>243</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 53.

21 of the *Apologeticum* as containing ideas from *Adversus Judaeos*,<sup>244</sup> but in fact chapters 18-20 introduce these ideas and therefore are strongly reminiscent of *Adversus Judaeos*, as well. In chapter 18 Tertullian introduces, ostensibly to a pagan audience,<sup>245</sup> the concept of divine revelation through prophecy, as memorialized in the Hebrew Scriptures. As an aside, he points out that the Hebrew Scriptures “are no secret.”<sup>246</sup> In chapter 19 the author claims authority for the Scriptures on the basis of their antiquity, stressing the importance of the latter within the context of Roman culture. “Supreme antiquity, then, claims for these books the highest authority. And among *you* it is almost a superstition to make credit depend on time elapsed.”<sup>247</sup> Moses, claims Tertullian, is “fifteen hundred years before Homer,” and “the rest of the prophets — they, of course, come after Moses, but the very last of them are found not to be later than the early ones among your sages and lawgivers and historians.”<sup>248</sup> Chapter 20 carries the argument for Scriptural authority one step further. “We offer the majesty of the scriptures if not their antiquity: we prove them divine, if we fail to prove them ancient.”<sup>249</sup> The conformity of current events to ancient prophecy is offered as evidence: “Here, in our presence, are the things that will teach us — I mean, the world, all time, all history. Everything that happens was foretold; everything now seen was of old heard.”<sup>250</sup> Finally, having introduced the Hebrew Scriptures as sacred revelation — not hidden from any, including Christians — and having ever-so-subtly co-opted them by championing their authority — thereby associating Christianity with antiquity and authority — Tertullian administers the *coup de grâce* in chapter 21. Jews, once so favored that God spoke to

---

<sup>244</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 108 fn 8: “*Apol* 21.4 ff.”

<sup>245</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 1.1: “the magistrates of the Roman Empire;” Glover’s 1931 English translation of *Apologeticum* is used exclusively for quotation in the present study: T. R. Glover (Translator). *Tertullian — Apology — De Spectaculis* (The Loeb Classical Library 250; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard, 1984).

<sup>246</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 18.5; N.B. *nec istae latent*; may be translated “that are not hidden.”

<sup>247</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 19.1; N.B. *fidem de temporibus adserere*.

<sup>248</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 19.3-4

<sup>249</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 20.1b; N.B. *Divinas probamus, si dubitatur antiquitas*.

<sup>250</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 20.1c-2a

them directly,<sup>251</sup> proved unworthy of God’s love. They rejected the Law, “turn[ing] from what they had been taught into ungodly ways.”<sup>252</sup> In turn, they were rejected by God and fell into ruin. Thus judged, “they stray the world over, without man or God for their king; they are not permitted even as foreigners to greet their native land, with so much as a footfall.”<sup>253</sup> And indeed, not only had the sacred writers “warned them beforehand,” but had “insisted at the same time (every one of them always, and in unison) that the day should come when in the last courses of time God would from every race, people, and place gather Himself worshippers far more faithful, to whom He would transfer his favor, and that in fuller measure, because they would be able to bear an ampler discipline.”<sup>254</sup> In short, that Gentile Christians would supersede the Jews in God’s favor was foretold in sacred Scripture. “So to remake, to illuminate that discipline it was proclaimed by God that Christ the son of God should come; and he came.”<sup>255</sup> The Jews, of course, “knew that Christ was to come, of course, for it was to them that the prophets spoke,”<sup>256</sup> but “what prevented them from believing was the result of their sin. They themselves read it written in scripture that they have been deprived of wisdom and understanding, of the fruits of eye and ear.”<sup>257</sup> This, of course, is the frankly supersessionist argument to which Barnes refers in claiming that *Apologeticum* “takes over some theological ideas formulated in the *Adversus Judaeos*,”<sup>258</sup> and the connection could not be clearer. Neither could its apologetic intent, explained prior to this argument, in the first two verses of chapter 21:

But now that we have stated that this school rests on the very ancient books of the Jews

---

<sup>251</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.4; N.B. “*ut de dei vocibus.*”

<sup>252</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.5

<sup>253</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.5

<sup>254</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.6

<sup>255</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.7

<sup>256</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.15

<sup>257</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.16

<sup>258</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 108, specifically referencing “*Apol* 21.4 ff.”

— this school which most people know to be rather modern, as dating from the time of Tiberius — a fact we ourselves admit — perhaps some question may be raised as to the standing of the school, on the ground that, under cover of a very famous religion (and one certainly permitted by law), the school insinuates quietly certain claims of its own; because (waiving all question as to age) [...] we have nothing to do with the Jews, as should surely be the case, if we were servants of the same God.<sup>259</sup>

The issue is *novelty*, that Christianity is “rather modern”<sup>260</sup> in the context of a culture for whom “credit depend[s] on time elapsed.”<sup>261</sup>

Given the strongly apologetic intent of the first question addressed by *Adversus Judaeos*, the second question, one that is *not* apologetic, namely, “Who is Christ?” appears out of place. To be clear, mention of Christ is not out of place, nor description of his life and its fulfillment of prophecy, as presented in Part I.B of *Adversus Judaeos*, nor even interpretation of “Christ as God”<sup>262</sup> in chapter 21 of *Apologeticum*. In the former, that Christ has come is offered as proof that “the promised new law now applies.”<sup>263</sup> In the latter, Christian belief is explained with analogies to pagan philosophy, to counter the idea that Christians are “worshippers of a man.”<sup>264</sup> What is out of place in *Adversus Judaeos* is an argument about the finer points of Christological doctrine, specifically the *human nature* of Christ, using words from the very clay of the Garden: “humility,” “affliction,” “infirmity,” “worm,” “human disgrace,” “outcast,” and “degradation.”<sup>265</sup> The argument is wasted on Jews and pagans alike. The Jews have no difficulty accepting Jesus as a human being. Similarly, the pagans are described in *Apologeticum* as “taking him [Christ] to be some man.”<sup>266</sup> To whom, then, is the argument addressed? Clearly, to those who reject Christ’s

---

<sup>259</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.1-2

<sup>260</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.1

<sup>261</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 19.1

<sup>262</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.3, “*de Christo ut deo.*”

<sup>263</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 6.2

<sup>264</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.3, “*hominis cultores.*”

<sup>265</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 14.1b-3

<sup>266</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 21.3, “*Christum ut hominum.*” In fact *Apologeticum*, written for a pagan audience, stresses Christ’s divinity, instead: “*Necesse est igitur pauca de Christo ut deo.*” (21.3)

human nature, such as Marcion and others of his ilk. In fact, the argument that seems irrelevant in *Adversus Judaeos* is essential in *Adversus Marcionem*. Tertullian uses it to build a masterful refutation of Marcion's docetic Christology<sup>267</sup> in Book III of the latter,<sup>268</sup> strongly suggesting the priority of *Adversus Marcionem* over *Adversus Judaeos*, and undermining the hypothesis that *Adversus Judaeos*, as it exists, was written as an integral whole.

---

<sup>267</sup> Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, 65: "Christ could of course in no way be linked to the created world, much less could he have been born in a cloaca — which is Marcion's term for the womb, this 'disgusting curdling of fluid and blood' (*humoris et sanguinis foeda coagula*)."

<sup>268</sup> Evans, *Tertullian - Adversus Marcionem*, xvii; also Barnes, *Tertullian*, 127: "The vast *Adversus Marcionem* (207/8) has a simple structure [...] the third [book] disproves Marcion's Christology [...]."

## **Beyond the Unity Hypothesis**

Having demonstrated good reason *not* to see *Adversus Judaeos* as an integral work, many questions remain about the existing treatise. Central among them are three. Who collated and redacted the *assemblage* as it exists? For what audience was it intended? To what purpose?

Of possible redactors (not authors), the scholarly literature has considered two: Tertullian and “not-Tertullian.” Although Dunn (and other scholars who support the unity hypothesis) come down on the side of Tertullian, he is actually the least plausible redactor, for two reasons. First, one has the rather intractable problem of *fit*. As discussed previously, *Adversus Judaeos* does not *fit* Tertullian’s *corpus*. Next, one has all the imperfections of Part II, and Tertullian is a perfectionist. His works *exude* perfectionism. They *scream* it. If one is not convinced of this after reading Tertullian’s works, a short walking tour of the recent secondary literature should suffice, where words such as *rigor* and *clarity*,<sup>269</sup> *reason*,<sup>270</sup> *dexterity*,<sup>271</sup> *perfection*,<sup>272</sup> and *genius*<sup>273</sup> are used to describe the Master. In contrast, scholars use words such as “did not understand,” “ignorance,” “grammatical infelicities,” and “clumsiness,” to describe the author of *Adversus Judaeos*.<sup>274</sup> Even “those who accept the work’s integrity and authenticity,”<sup>275</sup> according to Dunn, recognize the problems inherent in Part II, but either accept chapters 9-14 as “older material,”<sup>276</sup>

---

<sup>269</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 10: “He [Tertullian] had... the rigor and clarity of the [recently converted]...”

<sup>270</sup> Osborn, *First Theologian*, 256: “Deeper still is his [Tertullian’s] commitment to reason: he has to satisfy himself, not others, that a position is rationally justified.”

<sup>271</sup> Cahal B. Daly. *Tertullian the Puritan and His Influence* (Dublin: Four Courts, 1993), 10: “...exegetical dexterity...”

<sup>272</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 10: “Nothing less than perfection was the requirement for being his [Tertullian’s] kind of Christian...;” and Dunn, *Tertullian*, 38: “Rankin (1995, pp. 94-5) argues that Tertullian’s perfectionist streak did not emerge only after his Montanist conversion; it is evident throughout his literary corpus.”

<sup>273</sup> Daly, *Tertullian the Puritan*, 141: “...this strongly individual genius...”

<sup>274</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 6-15. Abstracted from Dunn’s summary of scholarly opinion.

<sup>275</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 8.

<sup>276</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 9, on Grottemeyer’s and Noeldechen’s positions.

“rougher [...] and less polished,”<sup>277</sup> “long winded,”<sup>278</sup> or “lack[ing in] vigor,”<sup>279</sup> or have tried to explain them, “as the result of the author’s change of mind during composition, writing more than had been intended initially,”<sup>280</sup> as “only written in draft form,”<sup>281</sup> as “unrevised,”<sup>282</sup> or as “*un abbozzo incompiuto*”<sup>283</sup> (an unfinished sketch). Much is left to be desired in these rationalizations, primarily because *Adversus Judaeos* is “*una delle più singolari opere di Tertulliano*”<sup>284</sup> (one of the most singular works of Tertullian). In short, there are no other rough or unpolished or long-winded works in the Master’s *corpus*, no other drafts or unfinished sketches, and scholars have *many* other treatises for comparison (thirty or thirty-one, depending upon how one counts them). *All* of them are solid pieces of writing, worthy of an experienced *rheto*r. *All* are of obvious interest to scholars. *None* has the *prima facie* problems of *Adversus Judaeos*. Therefore, characterizations of *Adversus Judaeos* as an unrevised draft of *Tertullian’s* are decidedly speculative. Given what we know of Tertullian and his *corpus*, *Adversus Judaeos* was not assembled by the Master himself, but by a far less skillful redactor.<sup>285</sup>

Of possible audiences, the scholarly literature has considered three: Jews, pagans, and Christians. Having reviewed the literature exhaustively, Dunn concludes, “This work was

---

<sup>277</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 10, on Williams’ position.

<sup>278</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 12, on Tränkle’s position.

<sup>279</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 13, on Aziza’s position.

<sup>280</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 10, on Saflund’s position.

<sup>281</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, on Schreckenber

<sup>282</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, on Barnes’ position.

<sup>283</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, quoting Moreschini.

<sup>284</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 14, quoting Moreschini.

<sup>285</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 7-8 has documented this position extensively: “De Labriolle repeated the same general opinion, that because of an uncharacteristic clumsiness in the last six chapters, they must have been borrowed from the *Adversus Marcionem* by someone other than Tertullian. Efroymsen accepts this as the majority view among scholars today and, for this reason, ignores *Adversus Judaeos* when commenting on Tertullian’s attitudes towards Judaism.” Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 7-11, also references Neander, Akerman, Quispel, Quasten, and Akerman in support of this position.

primarily for a Christian readership [...].”<sup>286</sup> This is, perhaps, the best conclusion one can reach about intended audience, but nonetheless is merely a deduction, based on the *implausibility* of either Jews or pagans as the intended audience of the existing treatise. For Jews, it is too aggressive, despite its mild tone, to persuade them of anything, and it is quite clear from Tertullian’s *corpus* that he wrote to persuade.<sup>287</sup> Part I presents a *fait accompli* to the Jews, an undesirable status from which there is no apparent exit. God has rejected the Jews and adopted Gentile Christians as His people. To make matters worse, Part II does nothing but rub salt into the wound. It is quite unnecessary to complete the supersessionist argument developed in Part I — *the* argument of the work, according to Dunn<sup>288</sup> — while presenting *far too much* christology for a Jewish audience to swallow at one sitting, if ever.

Similarly, Part II is too much for a pagan audience, but in yet another way. Its fine points of Scriptural hermeneutics, quite relevant for building an argument against Marcion,<sup>289</sup> are *totally irrelevant* for audiences not “of the book.” To a pagan, the *interesting* part of *Adversus Judaeos*, if anything, would have been the prophecy-fulfillment arguments made in Part I. Indeed, there is *little* in Part I that would *not* speak to a pagan audience (to be argued, below), while there is much in Part II that is superfluous from a pagan perspective, *and therein lies the problem*,

---

<sup>286</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 56. Also, to follow the argument leading to Dunn’s conclusion, see Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 16-24, noting well his discussion of Miriam Taylor’s position: “Tertullian’s *Adversus Judaeos* receives several brief mentions [in Taylor], and Taylor sees it as an example of theological anti-Judaism that focuses on appropriating Scripture for solely Christian use and posits the abrogation of the old law by the new.” See: Miriam Taylor. *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 178-187.

<sup>287</sup> N.B. Dunn, *Tertullian*, 9: “I think it can be said that every one of Tertullian’s treatises is controversial, in the sense that in each of them there was a situation that he saw as a problem and to which he responded with a literary solution;” and p. 29: “In every instance Tertullian wrote in order to win arguments.”

<sup>288</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 3: “In the pamphlet [*Adversus Judaeos*] Tertullian argued for supersession: the Christians had replaced the Jews as God’s people. The work was meant to be the definitive case to refute those who believed that the Jews were still the only people of God.”

<sup>289</sup> See, for example, Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, esp. 80-81, in which he discusses Tertullian’s critique of Marcion’s hermeneutics in Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*.



because Tertullian was nothing if not a master of cultural sensitivity.<sup>290</sup> Therefore, “the Christians” remain as a residual category, the audience-by-default — not a strong position, but assuredly the position of fewest objections.

Of possible purposes, the scholarly literature has considered several, but if one has already concluded that the Christian community of Carthage is the intended audience for the work, the purpose is best characterized as catechesis, or simply put, *instruction*.<sup>291</sup> Other purposes common to Christian literature of the times — paraenesis, apology, and refutation — are less plausible than instruction. Clearly, *Adversus Judaeos* is not a paraenetic work, nor can it be seen as an apology or a refutation, *if* its intended audience is the local church. Why defend a position against those who hold it? Why refute a position among those who reject it? In short, preaching to the choir is best categorized as “instruction.” Even Dunn, who sees *Adversus Judaeos* as a *controversia*,<sup>292</sup> describes its function as *clarification* and *preparation*, two common elements of instruction: “This work was primarily for a Christian readership in order to clarify their self-identity as well as prepare them for future encounters with Jews.<sup>293</sup> [...] He [Tertullian] was preparing them [Christians] for ongoing debates between Christians and Jews by offering them an already prepared version of the most persuasive arguments that could be used to prove that the Jews had been superseded by Christians.”<sup>294</sup> Thus, in the end, the existing treatise is more easily characterized by what it *is not* than what it *is*. It is not a publication of Tertullian’s. It is not directed at Jewish or pagan audiences. It is not intended to promote or defend or refute.

---

<sup>290</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 8. In addition, see Barnes, *Tertullian*, 219: “Tertullian had observed the world around him with some care.”

<sup>291</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 11: “He [Hermann Tränkle] argues that the second half of the treatise displays lecture-like characteristics no less than the first.”

<sup>292</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 36-38.

<sup>293</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 56.

<sup>294</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 57.

Therefore, it is a publication of an unknown redactor, directed at a Christian audience for the purpose of instruction. At the risk of stating the obvious, *the result disappoints*. It disappoints because it tells us so little about Tertullian, his *corpus*, or the times. Many, disappointed by similar results, have proceeded no further. This is unfortunate.

This is unfortunate, because there is much more to say about *Adversus Judaeos*. If one goes one step farther, one deductive step beyond simple plausibilities, it is possible to reach a much more significant conclusion: That for a simple catechist — the unknown redactor — to have compiled *Adversus Judaeos* from a short treatise on supersessionism and Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*, the former must have existed. *Part I of Adversus Judaeos must have existed as a separate work*. And when one considers Part I, finished by long-detached fragments in Part II,<sup>295</sup> as a whole-in-itself, one has a *gem* of apology. This result *does not* disappoint. It *fits* and *informs*. It fits the Man, the *corpus*, and the times, and informs our understanding of all three.

---

<sup>295</sup> As argued above, a *peroratio* is buried in Part II, inserted disjointedly into Tertullian's argument from Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*.

## The Treatise Within

That the scholarly consensus on the unity of *Adversus Judaeos* has been elusive for over two centuries is not difficult to understand. On the one hand, Parts I and II of the treatise are obviously different. On the other, scholarly diffidence in approaching the treatise systematically has allowed a desultory scholarly conversation about its unity to limp along for more than two centuries. Thus Dunn's tack — his direct, systematic, and unique study of *Adversus Judaeos* — is a timely and significant contribution to the literature.

Dunn's solid contributions to the literature on Tertullian's *Adversus Judaeos* are several, including a new translation of the treatise, a thorough review of the scholarly literature, and a rhetorical analysis of the text.<sup>296</sup> Nonetheless, his analysis is not decisive in proving the unity of *Adversus Judaeos*. The treatise as it exists just doesn't *satisfy*, even after Dunn's scholarly and methodical work. Dunn explains. "Accomplished and mature orators," like Tertullian, tended "to be creative and flexible in their approach to this standard pattern" of rhetorical structure.<sup>297</sup> As a result, rhetorical analysis is not definitive. Dunn himself, for example, has changed his mind about the rhetorical structure of *Adversus Judaeos*, specifically, the *narratio*, which he once identified as 1.3b-7 but now believes was excluded entirely.<sup>298</sup> To his credit, he thoughtfully weighs alternatives as he works through portions of the text, grounding his moves in Sider's masterful treatment of Tertullian's use of rhetorical structure,<sup>299</sup> as well as the ancient rhetorical theories of Cicero and Quintilian.<sup>300</sup> In the end, however, he must conclude, "This work [*Adversus Judaeos*] remains in an incomplete state. More time on it would perhaps have seen (or should have seen) a number of

---

<sup>296</sup> Translation: Dunn, *Tertullian*, 63-104. Literature review: Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 5-27. Analysis: Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 58-96.

<sup>297</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 61.

<sup>298</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 66.

<sup>299</sup> Sider, *Ancient Rhetoric*.

<sup>300</sup> E.g., Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 61.

revisions [...] incorporation of [...] elimination of [...] relocation of [...] addition of [...].”<sup>301</sup>

Nonetheless, Dunn’s rhetorical solution to *Adversus Judaeos* is not the only one possible, as the present analysis demonstrates. A text as jagged as *Adversus Judaeos* may yield several rhetorical results. It does not have to be analyzed as a unity, as Dunn attempts. In fact, freed of this assumption, rhetorical analysis may be used to build a case against unity. One such case is presented herein. No doubt alternative cases may be developed, as well.

Arguments against the unity of *Adversus Judaeos* are like light breezes on a calm sea. They propel, but not very far. None alone is sufficient to reach a safe harbor, but the general *drift* is disunity. One senses it upon the first read, but one can only develop a clear sense by exhausting the various ways in which the unity of the text may be studied. Fortunately, there are several, and they are reasonably independent of one another, avoiding circularity in the main. Each argument, taken by itself, suggests something about Part I of the treatise that doesn’t fit Part II, or *vice versa*. There is no Rosetta Stone among them, but as a whole, they add up. Together, all the jagged edges reveal a deeply *dis-integrated* work.

Thus *Adversus Judaeos* is most likely a composite, a composite of two texts, and, as it appears, texts arising from two very distinct streams of thought in Tertullian’s *corpus*. As noted previously, the Master spent considerable energy early in his career addressing serious *external* threats to the expanding but small Church, namely, episodes of intolerance by the dominant, pagan culture. Tertullian countered by writing several apologies in which he addressed the question, “What is Christianity?” At issue is *place*, the *status* of a deviant subculture. Part I-Re of *Adversus Judaeos* (Part I as reconstructed in the present study) is squarely placed between *Ad*

---

<sup>301</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 177.

*Nationes* and the *Apologeticum* in this stream of thought.<sup>302</sup> The *Apologeticum* builds on *Ad Nationes*, in part by using the argument developed in *Adversus Judaeos*, Part I-Re. Was the latter written as an addendum to *Ad Nationes*? Was it written as a modular argument for inclusion in the *Apologeticum*? Or was it written as an independent piece, to address the particular charge of Christian *novelty*? All are plausible.

Later, at the height of his career as a Christian *rhetor*, Tertullian refocused his work, addressing serious *internal* threats to the Church, namely, a variety of problematic theologies. Tertullian countered by writing several refutations in which he addressed the question, “Who is Christ?” At issue is Christ’s *lineage*, exactly *whose* Christ he is, the Creator’s, or some other god’s. In this *corpus* one finds *Adversus Marcionem*, arguably the greatest response to Marcion ever written, before or since.<sup>303</sup> Marcion believed that Christ was not the promised messiah of the Creator, the bad God, but the Christ of a greater God, the good God, whose intent was to save humanity *from* creation.<sup>304</sup> Tertullian’s comprehensive sketch of Christ — the Christ of the Creator, developed in Book III of *Adversus Marcionem* — deals squarely with this issue, and, as is obvious to even the casual reader, forms the pith and substance of *Adversus Judaeos*, Part II-De (Part II as deconstructed in the present study). Thus the latter contains neither more nor less than the foundation of Tertullian’s christology. As such, it has a greater affinity with *De Carne Christi*, *Adversus Hermogenem*, *Adversus Valentinianos*, *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*, *Adversus Marcionem*, and *Adversus Praxean*, than *Ad Nationes* and the *Apologeticum*. Was Part

---

<sup>302</sup> N.B. Osborn, *First Theologian*, 9. Osborn categorizes *Adversus Judaeos* among Tertullian’s apologies.

<sup>303</sup> N.B. Osborn, *First Theologian*, 249: “Tertullian owed most to his two great opponents” [Marcion and Praxeas].

<sup>304</sup> See Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*, esp. 67: “The good God [as portrayed in Marcion’s works] has not only come to free mankind but to strike back against the creator of all evil. The actual deliverance from the horrible world and the dreadful human condition as such - which is considered the main work of the good God by the Marcionites [...]”

II-De of *Adversus Judaeos* written *before* Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*? Is it a redacted draft of the latter? Or was Part II-De of *Adversus Judaeos* written after Book III of *Adversus Marcionem*? Is it a redacted copy of the latter? In the present study, independent arguments from thesis, audience, and literary have been made in support of the latter position.

Ultimately, what is important about *Adversus Judaeos* is not the whole, not the hybrid, but Part I as reconstructed. Standing alone, it is a cogent Christian apology, grounding the young Church in ancient tradition.<sup>305</sup> The issue it addresses, the issue of *novelty* in a pagan culture that valued ancient traditions, is made plain in *Apologeticum* (written shortly after *Adversus Judaeos*). Because Christianity “which most people know to be rather modern, as dating from the time of Tiberius — a fact we ourselves admit — perhaps some question may be raised as to the standing of the school, on the ground that, under cover of a very famous religion (and one certainly permitted by law), the school insinuates quietly certain claims of its own.”<sup>306</sup> Immature cults were subject to scrutiny and vulnerable to censure in an Empire that valued stability. “Nothing could be both new and true: such was the assumption, such the challenge Christian apologists had to meet,”<sup>307</sup> and Tertullian met it squarely, writing *Adversus Judaeos*, Part I (as reconstructed). His argument is simple and direct. Christianity is not new. It has been a part of God’s plan from the start, as memorialized in God’s promise to Abraham.<sup>308</sup> Christians trace their descent to Isaac and Rebekkah. “For indeed, God designed two peoples and two clans to come forth from the womb

---

<sup>305</sup> Even Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 56, who believes that *Adversus Judaeos* “was written primarily for a Christian readership in order to clarify their self-identity as well as prepare them for future encounters with Jews,” recognizes the possibility that the treatise may have been addressed to pagans: “I have not commented on the possibility that this work was addressed to pagans who were interested in choosing a monotheistic faith or who branded Christianity as an illegitimate offshoot of Judaism. All that needs to be said is that Tertullian could well have written the work with several simultaneous objectives in mind, these included, so it is a possibility I would not rule out.”

<sup>306</sup> Tertullian *Apol.* 19.1

<sup>307</sup> Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1997), 52.

<sup>308</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.3

of one woman,”<sup>309</sup> Jews and Gentiles (Christians). Christianity is younger than Judaism only in the sense that it traces its roots to the second of two siblings. Furthermore, that the younger has superseded the older in God’s favor was accomplished “according to the decree of the divine utterance.”<sup>310</sup> Thus even the recent ascendancy of Christianity is not really a new thing. “Is it a surprise if the one who established the directive adds to it, or if the one who began it finishes it?”<sup>311</sup> No, not if one understands God’s plan.

*Aversus Judaeos* belongs to a set of apologies written in 197: *Ad Nationes*, *Adversus Judaeos*, and *Apologeticum*. The latter, Tertullian’s great apology, draws upon the other two, virtually subsuming *Ad Nationes*, and incorporating the main thrust of *Adversus Judaeos*.<sup>312</sup> The first defends Christianity against a variety of calumnies, then attacks the divinity of pagan gods, while the second, as we have seen, addresses the issue of Christian novelty. Which of the two was written first? Was one found lacking in apologetic breadth, inspiring the other? Were they written to address separate Christian vulnerabilities in detail? Unfortunately, we cannot say. What we *can* say with confidence is that Tertullian devoted himself to apologetics in 197 C.E., and that the issue of novelty was sufficiently compelling that he wrote a monograph on the subject, developing a complete *theological* argument.<sup>313</sup> What threat stimulated this work?

Persecution *from Rome per se* was probably *not* the threat. Septimius Severus was Emperor,<sup>314</sup> and despite rough treatment of the Jews — he forbade conversion to Judaism<sup>315</sup> — it

---

<sup>309</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.4

<sup>310</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 1.5

<sup>311</sup> Tertullian *Adv. Jud.* 2:7b

<sup>312</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 108.

<sup>313</sup> Dunn, *Adversus Judaeos*, 24, who devotes considerable space to a description of Taylor’s 1995 typology of arguments arising from Jewish-Christian relations, notes that “Taylor sees it [Tertullian’s *Adversus Judaeos*] as an example of theological anti-Judaism that focuses on appropriating Scripture for solely Christian use and posits the abrogation of the old law by the new.”

<sup>314</sup> Pat Southern. *The Roman Empire from Severus to Constantine* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 37-50.

<sup>315</sup> Anthony R. Birley (Translator). *Lives of the Later Caesars* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1976), 216.

is doubtful that he exceeded the rule of Trajan in addressing Christians.<sup>316</sup> Even if one gives credence to Eusebius' account of Severan persecution,<sup>317</sup> one would be led to believe that Severus initiated his pogroms in 202 or 203 C.E., five or six years after Tertullian's burst of apology.<sup>318</sup>

Nonetheless, it is tempting to speculate that Septimius Severus, without lifting a hand against the Christians of Carthage, may have been the cause of their anxiety. Septimius was an African, a North African, in fact, from Lepcis Magna.<sup>319</sup> It has been said of him that he was "regarded by the Africans as a god,"<sup>320</sup> and it is not difficult to understand why. He was the first Emperor born in Africa, of mixed Roman and Punic ancestry, and recognized his roots openly, "favour[ing] fellow Africans in his government and in his army."<sup>321</sup> More to the point, after consolidating power in 197,<sup>322</sup> "Severus' generals [became] busy in the African provinces, extending the frontiers, taking in more territory, rationalising boundaries, protecting routes, and building new forts."<sup>323</sup> The Emperor's work in Africa has been characterized as a "spectacular success,"<sup>324</sup> and the position is indisputable, so great were the territorial gains and so firm the consolidation of Roman power. The entire process took a mere five years (197-202 C.E.), and was capped by a visit from the Emperor himself in 202-203 C.E. No wonder the locals saw their

---

<sup>316</sup> Birley, *Lives*, 217; Barnes, *Tertullian*, 31; Rankin, *Tertullian*, 13; Dunn, *Tertullian*, 17.

<sup>317</sup> "When Severus was inciting persecution against the churches..." Eusebius *History of the Christian Church* VI.1 [Paul L. Maier (Translator). *Eusebius — The Church History* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 2007), 188]

<sup>318</sup> Eusebius, *History of the Christian Church*, VI.2: "In the tenth year of Severus, when Lætus was governor of Egypt and Demetrius had just received the episcopate there after Julia, the flames of persecution became a fierce blaze, and countless numbers received the crown of martyrdom." Also VII.1: "At this time also, Jude, another author, composed a treatise on the seventy weeks in the Book of Daniel, closing his account in the tenth year of the reign of Severus. He also believed that the much-discussed arrival of the Antichrist was near — so greatly did the persecution of that time unhinge the minds of many.")

<sup>319</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 44.

<sup>320</sup> Birley, *Lives*, 213.

<sup>321</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 44.

<sup>322</sup> Joyce E. Salisbury. *Perpetua's Passion, The Death and Memory of a Young Roman Woman* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 17.

<sup>323</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 44.

<sup>324</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 45.



native son as a god, so well had he done for himself, the empire, and his homeland — and apparently, the feeling was mutual. As Southern tells it, “Severus rewarded faithful and successful generals well, just as he rewarded his home town of Lepcis Magna and other African Cities.”<sup>325</sup> May this activity have caused anxiety among Christians of Carthage in 197 C.E.? Quite possibly.

Consider. Generally speaking, Christians maintained a low profile. They were few in number,<sup>326</sup> worshipping inconspicuously in house churches,<sup>327</sup> “a tribe obscure, shunning the light, *dumb in public* though talkative in the corners.”<sup>328</sup> In the main they *got by*, unnoticed, helped now and again by charade, a stretching of the rules, a little incense, perhaps, or an occasional trip to the games. 197 changed all that. A neighbor, a North African by birth, had achieved the unthinkable, headship of the greatest empire on earth. For a while, at least, *nothing* in North Africa would remain obscure — *nothing* would avoid the light of *that* new star.

Imagine the excitement in Carthage when Severus defeated Albinus, his last serious rival, in February, 197 C.E. “Bonfires blazed in the streets, couches were trundled out of houses, the people feasted in every alley, the whole city took on the appearance of a gigantic tavern.”<sup>329</sup> At last, the Emperor — *their* Emperor<sup>330</sup> — could square things up in Rome and *govern*. He did so — on both counts — swiftly and decisively, sending a clear message to would-be rivals. Heads

---

<sup>325</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 45.

<sup>326</sup> Dunn, *Tertullian*, 5: 2,300 in a total population of 700,000 (one-third of one percent); cf. Salisbury, *Perpetua's Passion*, 61: “about 2000 Christians in a city of about 500,000” (four-tenths of one percent).

<sup>327</sup> Salisbury, *Perpetua's Passion*, 61.

<sup>328</sup> Ramsay MacMullen. *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100-400* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 34. MacMullen continues, “That sums up experiences in North Africa and perhaps other western areas;” cf. allusion to secrecy in Tertullian *Ad Uxorem* 4: “[...] to creep into prison to kiss a martyr's bonds,” and “wisdom” in Tertullian *De Fuga in Persecutione* 14: “Be your safeguard wisdom, not a bribe. [...] if you cannot assemble by day, you have the night.”

<sup>329</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 88.

<sup>330</sup> N.B. Anthony R. Birley. *Septimius Severus, The African Emperor* (Revised Edition, New Haven: Yale University, 1988), ix: “He [Septimius Severus] was the first emperor born and raised away from Rome and Italy, in his ancestral Tripolitania.”

rolled, appointments rolled out,<sup>331</sup> and Severus proceeded to strengthen the Empire on two fronts. He himself focused on the east, neutralizing the threat of Parthia, while hand-picked subordinates worked in Africa “with spectacular success [...] extending Roman control southwards over a much larger area.”<sup>332</sup>

Roman North Africa was strengthened and expanded<sup>333</sup> by a spate of newly appointed governors and new generals, Africans in the main, “*his* governors and generals.”<sup>334</sup> Nationalistic pride was intense. “In the spring and summer of 197, Carthage established an extraordinary festival season. Houses were decorated with laurel, great banquets were held, and sacrifices were made to the genius of the emperor.”<sup>335</sup> Try to imagine in that context “a tribe obscure, shunning the light, *dumb in public*.” Imagine *not* hanging laurels on the door.<sup>336</sup> Imagine *not* toasting “the genius of the victorious Emperor.”<sup>337</sup> Imagine *not* attending the celebratory spectacles.<sup>338</sup> “A loyal pagan could hardly fail to notice that not everyone shared this rejoicing.”<sup>339</sup>

In fact, “during the city’s celebration, it became clear that every Carthaginian did not join

---

<sup>331</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 38: “In tandem with punishments for opponents, rewards for supporters were just as useful in setting an example.”

<sup>332</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 45. Southern adds, “known from several inscriptions in Africa.”

<sup>333</sup> See the “assessment” of Septimius Severus’ reign in Birley, *Septimius Severus*, 197: “He [Septimius Severus] was indeed a *propagator imperii*. In Africa there was a new forward line, in Mauretania, Numidia and Tripolitania. [...] Various remarks of Tertullian in the *De pallio* refer to the flourishing state of Africa in Septimius’ reign.”

<sup>334</sup> Southern, *Roman Empire*, 45; emphasis added; also see Birley, *Septimius Severus*, 195: “Septimius favoured his fellow Africans, that cannot be denied.”

<sup>335</sup> Salisbury, *Perpetua’s Passion*, 81.

<sup>336</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 88.

<sup>337</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 88. N.B. Salisbury, *Perpetua’s Passion*, 20, on Septimius Severus and the imperial cult: “The historians of Septimius’s reign included frequent descriptions of dreams and omens as implicit proof that Septimius was connected to divinity. [...] One of his first acts as emperor was to create a public ceremony to deify the murdered emperor Pertinax, whom he claimed to be vindicating. [...] By visibly emphasizing the deification of Pertinax, Septimius surrounded himself, as Pertinax’s successor, with an aura of divinity.”

<sup>338</sup> Salisbury, *Perpetua’s Passion*, 19: “By the second century, one of the principal ritual acts of the emperors was to sponsor games in the arenas of Rome and the providences. Septimius fulfilled this obligation in lavish ways. The ancient historian Herodian described the impressive sacrificial games that the emperor offered to the Roman people. ... The sacrifices performed the traditional function of Roman religion: offer the gods something in hopes of a direct return in prosperity and peace (identified as obedience among the Latins).”

<sup>339</sup> Barnes, *Tertullian*, 88.

in. Christians and Jews both believed these celebrations were idolatrous, and thus they were forbidden to celebrate. Their houses remained undecorated, and they stayed sober while others celebrated. It is impossible to assess directly the impact of this highly visible separation of pagan from Christian and Jew, but it surely must have come to the attention of pious pagans.”<sup>340</sup> That accusations followed we are reasonably sure, because Tertullian responds forthrightly to two of them in the *Apologeticum*, “first, that Christians did not worship the gods of the state, and, second, that Christians neither offered incense to the genius of the emperor nor participated in pagan celebrations in honor of state and empire.”<sup>341</sup> For Christians of Carthage, no doubt, 197 C.E. meant nothing less than the end of obscurity.<sup>342</sup> For those uncovered *and* accused, it meant apostasy or martyrdom, a sere choice before the mob.<sup>343</sup>

Into the breach stepped Tertullian,<sup>344</sup> manning three lines of defense at once. The first, intended to slow the pagan foe, was built around the four apologies of 197-198. From this line *Adversus Judaeos* defended the community against the charge of *newness*, with the hope of luring some of the pagan neighbors to *reason*,<sup>345</sup> to *hesitate*, and thus, to *straggle* from the madness of

---

<sup>340</sup> Salisbury, *Perpetua's Passion*, 81; N.B. Salisbury references Eusebius for this account of events at Carthage.

<sup>341</sup> Sider, *Christian and Pagan*, 2.

<sup>342</sup> Sider, *Christian and Pagan*, xii: Sider, who uses six of Tertullian's works as “witness to the Church's relationship to its contextual world of paganism” — four of the six from the 197-198 crisis — describes “the community of Christians” in Tertullian's Carthage as “very self-conscious about its presence in the surrounding ‘pagan world.’”

<sup>343</sup> N.B. Salisbury, *Perpetua's Passion*, 79: “The crime the Christians were charged with was an existential one: they *were* Christians. Tertullian summed up the matter: ‘The confession of the name of Christian, not an investigation of the charged determined guilt.’ (*De Apologeticum*, Ch. II) This was a capital status offense, and it made the trial records quite brief. All that needed to be determined was that the accused was a Christian.”

<sup>344</sup> N.B. Barnes, *Tertullian*, 107. In an explanation of why Tertullian “put the work [*Adversus Judaeos*] aside unfinished,” Barnes explains, “Tertullian had more important business. Pagan hostility entailed persecution.”

<sup>345</sup> N.B. *Christian and Pagan*, 72: The “*communes sensus*, the common ideas [...] shared instinctively by all human beings, even those untouched by learning.” and xiii: “The waters of baptism did not wash from Tertullian's mind the philosophy of Stoicism so deeply imbued from his pagan education; hence, we can observe the appeal to reason [in Tertullian's work].”

the mob,<sup>346</sup> weakening its collective force. The second, intended to rally Christians, was founded on two paranaetic works, *De Spectaculis* and *De Idolotria*. In this line Tertullian called Christians to task, appealed to Christian values, and warned of the enemies within, fear of persecution, and temptation to compromise.<sup>347</sup> Behind both was the final line, the defense beyond which there is nothing, based on one treatise alone: *Ad Martyras*. To Christians awaiting death, the Master issued one last call to arms. “What must the true pearl be worth? Are we not called on, then, most joyfully to lay out as much for the true as others do for the false?”<sup>348</sup> To do, and to die?

From this perspective, Tertullian’s apologetic — and paranaetic — *burst* of 197-198 becomes quite comprehensible, as does the place of *Adversus Judaeos* (Part I as reconstructed) within it. All the pieces seem to fit. It was the best of times; it was the worst of times, a time of doing and undoing, of victories and defeats. Through it all, Tertullian stood like a beacon, an icon of strength, clarity, and truth. From amidst this struggle emerged *Adversus Judaeos*, directed at a great sea of festive pagans,<sup>349</sup> addressing the issue of Christian novelty by embedding the young

---

<sup>346</sup> N.B. Tertullian’s characterization: “[...] what the public hatred demands” in Tertullian *De Apologeticum* II; also Sider, *Christian and Pagan*, xiv, on Tertullian’s portrait of “a contemporary populace careless of evidence, eager for gossip, ready to believe the worst — even that Christians were cannibals.”

<sup>347</sup> Sider, *Christian and Pagan*, xiii, speaking of Tertullian’s Christian community: On fear: “The legendary fearlessness of Christians in the face of persecution was matched by widespread anxiety.” On compromise: “Making some sort of compromise with their world, Christians clearly did attend the pagan shows against which Tertullian thundered [...] and it is clear from Tertullian’s writing that some Christians were prepared to buy their way out of danger.”

<sup>348</sup> Tertullian *Ad Martyras* IV

<sup>349</sup> See Barnes, *Tertullian*, 92: “His [Tertullian’s] *Adversus Judaeos* was written to convert not Jews but pagans. Tertullian attempted to show that Christianity was the genuine spiritual heir of Israel in order to persuade the sympathetically inclined to join the newer religion rather than become Jewish proselytes.” I agree with Barnes’ assessment of the target audience, but not his suggested purpose. Too much was going on in Carthage at the time for Tertullian to have written a tract to *convert* the pagan neighbors. My argument is that it was written to *divert* the pagan neighbors — from attacking Christians. Barnes derives his position from Tertullian’s characterization of *Adversus Judaeos* as a measured response to a dispute “between a Christian and a Jewish proselyte,” (*AJ* Ch 1), while I derive my variant on a broader consideration of the historical context. Barnes recognizes the latter, but interprets the relationship between the times and the treatise differently. I see *Adversus Judaeos* as an answer to the times. Barnes believes an unfinished *Adversus Judaeos* was put aside so that Tertullian could turn attention to more important responses. See Barnes, *Tertullian*, 107: “Tertullian realized that the *Adversus Judaeos* was irrelevant to the real situation in Carthage. He put the work aside unfinished. Someone else published it, perhaps against his wishes. Tertullian had more important business.

Church in the most ancient of traditions, claiming that tradition as an inheritance willed by God. *Adversus Judaeos* memorializes a heroic time for the North African Church, a time whose events have been eroded from collective memory, but whose features may still be discerned, especially if one stands back, grasping the whole. One hopes it had its intended effect, creating islands of sober thought in a sea of intoxicated revelry. One hopes it gave pause, created respite, and saved.

## **Bibliography**

### **PRIMARY SOURCES:**

*The Holy Bible*. Revised Standard Version. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2006.

Eusebius *History of the Christian Church* VI.1 [Paul L. Maier (Translator). *Eusebius — The Church History* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel, 2007).

Tertullian, *Ad Martyras*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian, *Ad Nationes*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian, *Ad Scapulam*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian, *Ad Uxorum*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos*. Translated by Geoffrey D. Dunn. 2004. *Tertullian*. London: Routledge.

Tertullian *Adversus Marcionem*. Translated by Ernest Evans. 1972. *Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Tertullian *Adversus Praxean*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *Adversus Valentinianos*. Translated by Alexander Roberts. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *Apologeticum*. Translated by T. R. Glover. 1984. *Tertullian — Apology — De Spectaculis*. The Loeb Classical Library 250. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University.

Tertullian *De Anima*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Baptismo*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Carne Christi*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Corona Militis*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Cultu Feminarum I*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Cultu Feminarum II*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Exhortatione Castitatis*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Fuga in Persecutione*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Idololatria*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Jejuniis*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Monogomia*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Oratione*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian

Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Paenitentia*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Pallio*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Patientia*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Pudicitia*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*. Translated by Peter Holmes. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Spectaculis*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Testimonio Animae*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *De Virginibus Velandis*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

Tertullian *Scorpiace*. Translated by S. Thelwall. From: Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe (Eds). 1885. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 3. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co.

#### **SECONDARY SOURCES:**

Barnes, Timothy David. 1971. *Tertullian -- A Historical and Literary Study*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Birley, Anthony R. (Translator). 1976. *Lives of the Later Caesars*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.



- Birley, Anthony R. 1988. *Septimius Severus, The African Emperor*. Revised Edition. New Haven: Yale University.
- Daly, Cahal B. 1993. *Tertullian the Puritan and His Influence*. Dublin: Four Courts.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. 2004. *Tertullian*. London: Routledge.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. 2008. *Tertullian's Adversus Judaeos, A Rhetorical Analysis*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America.
- Evans, Ernest. (Translator and Editor). 1972. *Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem*. Oxford: The Clarendon.
- T. R. Glover (Translator). 1984. *Tertullian — Apology — De Spectaculis*. The Loeb Classical Library 250. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. 2006. *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis, The Bible in Ancient Christianity*. Boston: Brill.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. 1984. *Christianizing the Roman Empire A.D. 100-400*. New Haven: Yale University.
- Moll, Sebastian. 2010. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Moore, George Foot. 1997. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of Tannaim*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers.
- O'Malley, T. P. 1967. *Tertullian and the Bible. Language — Imagery — Exegesis..* Nijmegen/Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt N.V.
- Osborn, Eric. 1997. *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Sachar, Abram Leon. 1964. *A History of the Jews*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Salisbury, Joyce E. 1997. *Perpetua's Passion, The Death and Memory of a Young Roman Woman*. New York: Routledge.
- Semler, Johann Salomo (Editor). 1770-1776. *Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus, Opera recensuit*. 6 vols. Hendel.
- Sider, Robert D. 1971. *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian*. London: Oxford University.
- Sider, Robert D. 2001. *Christian and Pagan in the Roman Empire, The Witness of Tertullian*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America.

Sider, Robert D. 1983. *The Gospel and its Proclamation*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.

Simon, Marcel. 1996. “*Verus Israel*”: *A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire. AD 135-425* . 2nd Eng. ed. Translated by H. McKeating. The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization. London: Vallentine Mitchell.

Southern, Pat. 2001. *The Roman Empire from Severus to Constantine*. New York: Routledge.

Tränkle, Herman. 1964. *Q.S.F. Tertullian, “Adversus Judaeos.” Mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Trigg, J. W. 1999. “Tertullian, Quintus Septimus Florens.” In John H. Hayes. Ed. *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Volume II, K-Z.. Nashville: Abingdon.

Young, Frances M. 1997. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.