

על הצדיקים of ברכה THE THEME OF THE

Although the general consensus holds that ברכת המינים was composed in opposition to Christianity, there are those who disagree:

תקון תפלה-וברכת המינים נראה בעיני שנתקנה לא נגד מעריצי הגלילי כמו שחשבו רבים מגדולינו ז"ל כי עדיין לא נפרצו כל כך בעת ההיא באופן שיצטרכו לתקן כנגדם ברכה מיוחדת, אלא עיקר תקנתה היה נגד כל הכתות השונות הנוטות ממקור דת ישראל לגרוע או להוסיף שנרבו בימים ההם כמו הצדוקים והבייסותים והאסיים וטובלי שחרית וכיוצא בהם. כל הכתות הללו היו נקראים אצל רבותינו זכרונם לברכה בשם מינים ולפי שכל המינים הנזכרים הזיקו רבה ליהודים ולהיהדות כידוע בקורות הימים, הוצרכו לתקן כנגדם את הברכה הזאת.

על הצדיקים of ברכה may support the position of the תפלה. The words: ותן שכר לטוב לכל הבוטחים בשמך באמת appear to be inappropriate because their recital contradicts the rule found in the following משנה:

משנה מסכת אבות פרק א' משנה ג'—אנטיגנוס איש סוכו קבל משמעון הצדיק; הוא היה אומר: אל תהיו כעבדים המשמשים את הרב על מנת לקבל פרס אלא הו כעבדים המשמשים את הרב שלא על מנת לקבל פרס ויהי מורא שמים עליכם.

Despite their apparent impropriety, we find that the words: שכר לטוב were a part of almost every version of the ברכה since its composition:

- ◆ מנהג ארץ ישראל—על גירי הצדק יהמו רחמיך ושלם לנו שכר טוב בזכות עשי רצונך. ברוך אתה ה' מבטח לצדיקים.
- ◆ סדר רב עמרם גאון סדר תפילה—על הצדיקים ועל החסידים ועל גרי הצדק יהמו נא רחמיך ה' אלקינו ותן שכר טוב לכל הבוטחים בשמך באמת ושים חלקנו עמהם ולעולם לא נבוש. ברוך אתה ה' משען ומבטח לצדיקים.
- ◆ רב סעדיה גאון— על הצדיקים ועל החסידים ועל גרי הצדק יהמו רחמיך ה' אלקינו ותן שכר טוב לכל הבוטחים בשמך ולא יבושו. ברוך אתה ה' משען ומבטח לצדיקים.

To understand why חז"ל included the words: ותן שכר לטוב within the ברכה of על הצדיקים, it is necessary to study an additional version of the משנה in מסכת אבות:

מסכתות קטנות מסכת אבות דרבי נתן נוסחא א פרק ה' ד"ה אנטיגנוס איש—אנטיגנוס איש סוכו קבל משמעון הצדיק; הוא היה אומר: אל תהיו כעבדים המשמשים את הרב על מנת

לקבל פרס אלא היו כעבדים המשמשים את הרב שלא על מנת לקבל פרס ויהי מורא שמים עליכם כדי שיהיה שכרכם כפול לעתיד לבא. אנטיגנוס איש סוכו היו לו שני תלמידים שהיו שונים בדבריו והיו שונים לתלמידים ותלמידים לתלמידים. עמדו ודקדקו אחריהן ואמרו מה ראו אבותינו לומר דבר זה; אפשר שיעשה פועל מלאכה כל היום ולא יטול שכרו ערבית. אלא אלו היו יודעין אבותינו שיש עולם אחר ויש תחיית המתים לא היו אומרים כך. עמדו ופירשו מן התורה ונפרצו מהם שתי פרצות צדוקים וביתוסין. צדוקים על שום צדוק; ביתוסים על שום ביתוס. והיו משתמשים בכלי כסף וכלי זהב כל ימיהם. שלא היתה דעתן גסה עליהם אלא צדוקים אומרים מסורת הוא ביד פרושים שהן מצערין עצמן בעולם הזה ובעולם הבא אין להם כלום.

The words: **על הצדיקים** of **ברכה** in **ותן שכר לטוב** may have been included to express opposition to the interpretation that **צדוק** and **ביתוס** gave to their teacher's rule. What caused the students of **אנטיגנוס איש סוכו** to err? They failed to distinguish between a **פרס** and **שכר**. In coining the **ברכה** of **על הצדיקים**, **הז"ל** were careful to choose the word: **שכר**. The **רמב"ם** explains the difference between the two words:

פירוש המשנה לרמב"ם מסכת אבות פרק א' משנה ג'—פרס ייקרא הגמול אשר יגמול האדם מי שאינו חייב לו בדין, אלא יעשה זה על דרך החסד וההטבה, כמי שיאמר לעבדו, או לבנו הקטן, או לאשתו: עשה כך, ואתן לך דינר או שנים. וזה הוא ההבדל בין פרס ושכר, כי השכר חייבים בו בדין. ואמר זה החסיד, שאתם לא תעבדו את ה' על תנאי שייטיב לכם ויגמלכם חסד, ותקוו לגמול ותעבדו בעבורו, אלא עבדוהו כעבדים שאינם מקווים לחסד ולא להטבה, רצה בזה: שיהיו עובדים מאהבה, כמו שבארנו בעשירי מסנהדרין. ועם זה לא פטרם מן היראה, ואמר: ועם היותכם עובדין מאהבה, אל תניחו היראה לגמרי, ויהא מורא שמים עליכם, כי כבר באה גם כן בתורה המצוה ביראה, והוא אומר: (דברים ו', יג') "את ה' אלקיך תירא". ואמרו החכמים: "עבוד מאהבה, עבוד מיראה". ואמרו: "האוהב לא יחמיץ מצוה, והירא לא יעבור על אזהרה", כי ליראה מבוא גדול במצוות לא תעשה, וביחוד במצוות השימעיות.

Not all agree with the distinction that the **רמב"ם** made between the words: **פרס** and **שכר**: שולחן ערוך אורח חיים סימן סא' סעיף יז—צריך להתיו זי"ן של תזכרו, דלא לשתמע תשקרו או תשכרו, והוי כעבדים המשמשים על מנת לקבל פרס. וכן צריך להתיו זי"ן של זוכרתם.

Scholars disagree on how much a threat Christianity posed to Judaism in the First Century CE. Undoubtedly, Christianity grew as a threat to Judaism each century thereafter. It may be best to conclude that language condemning the **צדוקים** was part of **שמונה עשרה** even before **רבן** was composed but that the advent of Christianity propelled **ברכת המינים** to give the condemnation of all sects that threatened Judaism a **ברכה** of its own.

TRANSLATION OF SOURCES

תקון תפלה-It appears to me that Birchath Ha'Minim was composed not in opposition to the followers of the Galilean as many Torah greats believed because at the time the Bracha was composed the Christians had not grown in number to the point that it was necessary to compose a Bracha in opposition to them. Rather the main reason that the Bracha was composed was in opposition to the many groups who at that time wandered away from Mainstream Judaism either by adding or reducing to its rules like the Saducees, the Baysussim and the Essenes and "those who bathed in the morning" and others like them. All of these groups were known among our forefathers as Minim. Because all the above Minim did damage to Judaism in those times, it became necessary to compose this Bracha.

משנה ג' א' פרק א' מסכת אבות-Antigonos, a man who hailed from Socho learned from Shimon Ha'Tzaddik. He would say: do not be like employees who serve their employer only for a the purpose of being rewarded but rather be like employees who serve their employer without thinking of what reward they may receive and may fear of heaven be upon you.

מסכתות קטנות מסכת אבות דרבי נתן נוסחא א פרק ה' ד"ה אנטיגנוס איש - Antigonos, a man who hailed from Socho learned from Shimon Ha'Tzaddik. He would say: do not be like employees who serve their employer only for a the purpose of being rewarded but rather be like employees who serve their employer without thinking of what reward they may receive. May fear of heaven be upon you in order that your reward in the future be twice as much. Antigonos, a man who hailed from Socho had two students who studied with him and would teach students. They stood and thought about what they learned and said: what caused our forefathers to say something like this; is it possible that an employee work a full day and not receive his pay in the evening. Had our forefathers known that there is a world after this world and there will be resurrection of the dead they would have never said something like that. They stood up and separated themselves from the Torah and established two branches; the Saducees and the Baysussim. They were named Tzedukkim because their first leader was Tazddok; Baysussim because their first leader was Bayssus. They continued to study the traditional text. They were not yet full of themselves except that the Tzuddikim would say: it is a tradition among the Perushim that they endure suffering in this world even though they know that in the Next world they have nothing.

פירוש המשנה לרמב"ם מסכת אבות פרק א' משנה ג'-A "peros" is a reward that a person receives even if he does not deserve it. The one who gives it to him does it as a favor like someone who says to his employee or his son or his wife: do this and I will give you one or two Dinars. That is the difference between a "peros" and "sichar". "Sichar" is something

that a person deserves by right. This righteous man, Anigonos, said: you should not serve G-d on condition that G-d do favors for you. You will then look forward to these favors and you will serve G-d only because He does you favors. Instead, serve G-d like an employee who expects no favors or benefits. Antigonos wanted that man to serve G-d out of love as we explained in the Tenth chapter of Masechet Sanhedrin. However, serving G-d out of love does not obviate the need to serve G-d out of fear. That is why Antigonos continued by saying: in as much as you serve G-d out of love, do not set aside your fear of G-d . Fear of G-d must be upon you as we learned in the Torah: Et Hashem Elokecha Tirah. Our forefathers said: Serve G-d out of love; serve G-d out of fear. They further said: One who loves G-d will not delay in performing a mitzvah; one who fears G-d will not violate even a warning. Fear is a great part of the negative commandments especially those involving listening.

יז שולחן ערוך אורה חיים סימן סא סעיף יז-It is important to enunciate the letter Zayin in the word Tizkiru in Kriyat Shema so that it does not sound like tishakru (lie) or Tisachru (receive a benefit) because then you will be considered as ones who serve G-d only in order to obtain favors. Additionally, it is necessary to enunciate the Zayin in the word: Oo'Zichartem.

SUPPLEMENT

A SCHOLARLY LOOK AT ברכת המינים

The following is an excerpt from an article by Philip S. Alexander, Professor of Post-Biblical Jewish Literature at Manchester University and Co-Director of the Centre for Jewish Studies on early Jewish Christian relations.

'The Parting of the Ways' from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism

B. Elements of a Rabbinic Policy Towards the Christians

b) The Cursing of the Heretics Bavli Berakhot 28b-29a:

- a. "Our Rabbis taught:
- b. Shim'on ha-Paqli arranged the Eighteen Benedictions in order before Rabban Gamliel at Yavneh.
- c. Rabban Gamliel said to the Sages: 'Is there no-one who knows how to compose a benediction against the heretics (*minim*)?'
- d. Shmu'el ha-Qatan stood up and composed it.
- e. Another year he forgot it and tried to recall it for two or three hours, yet they did not remove him." _____

Birkat ha-Minim (Palestinian Recension)¹:

- a. For apostates (*mešummadim*) may there be no hope,
- b. And the arrogant kingdom (*malkhut zaddon*) uproot speedily in our days.
- c. May the Christians (*no?erim*) and the heretics (*minim*) perish in an instant.
- d. *May they be blotted out of the book of the living, And may they not be written with the righteous* (Ps 69:29).
- e. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant." Bavli Berakhot 28a-29b is given as a baraita which claims to report events at Yavneh in the late first century C. E. It

1. See S. Schechter, "Geniza Specimens", *Jewish Quarterly Review* o. s. 10 (1896), pp. 656f. Further, J. Mann, "Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service", *Hebrew Union College Annual* 2 (1925), pp. 269ff.

should be noted, however, that the baraita is found only in the Bavli. Unit E above, regarding Shmu'el ha-Qatan forgetting the wording of the benediction, is paralleled in Yerushalmi Berakhot V,4 (9c) but not units A to D. Yerushalmi Berakhot IV,3 (8a), in a different tradition, also links the *Birkat ha-Minim* to Yavneh: "If a man says to you that there are seventeen benedictions, say to him: The Sages set 'Of the Minim' in the prayer at Yavneh." The existence of a *Birkat Minim* can be traced back with some confidence to the first half of the second century C. E. Perhaps the earliest securely dated evidence for its use may be found in Justin's references to the Jews cursing the Christians in synagogue (*Dialogue* xvi, xcvi). But the precise connection of the *Birkat ha-Minim* with Shmu'el ha-Qatan and with an editing of the synagogue liturgy at Yavneh in the time of Gamliel II is attested only in comparatively late strata of Rabbinic literature. This fact should be borne constantly in mind in reconstructing the history of the benediction, and too much weight should not be placed on the uncorroborated testimony of Bavli Berakhot 28b-29b.

The language of Bavli Berakhot 28b-29a seems carefully chosen and precise. The editing of the Eighteen Benedictions to which it refers was "official", since it took place in the presence of the Nasi' ("before Rabban Gamliel"). The editing took the form of arranging in order the benedictions (*hisdir/sidder... 'al ha-seder*). Shim'on ha Paqoli produced a *siddur* out of existing material: the implication appears to be that the substance of the benedictions was only minimally affected. In the context of this editing of the benedictions Gamliel asks someone "to compose" (*letaqqen*) a benediction against the *minim*. The implicit contrast between "ordering" and "composing" suggests that the *Birkat ha-Minim* was a new text. However, analysis of the *Birkat ha-Minim* itself throws this in some doubt. Though it is impossible now to reconstruct the original wording of the benediction from the numerous variant texts, it is clear that all the extant versions combine two quite disparate motifs: they pray for the overthrow of the "arrogant kingdom" (which would naturally be taken as a reference to Rome), and they pray for judgement on the *minim*. It is quite clear from Rabbinic literature that judgement on the *minim* is seen as the focus of the benediction: hence its title "Of the *Minim*". Why then introduce "the arrogant kingdom"? One solution would be to suppose that the reference to the arrogant kingdom is secondary and dates from after the time of Constantine when, to use the language of a late addition to Mishnah Sotah 9: 15, "the kingdom was turned to *minut*". The *minim* on this view would definitely be the Christians. But this suggestion is not entirely satisfactory. The motif of the arrogant kingdom actually forms the framework of the benediction: note how the concluding formula, which normally draws out the central point, refers to "humbling the arrogant" and makes no mention of the *minim*. It is more likely that the *Birkat ha-Minim* is a restatement of an earlier benediction calling for the overthrow of Israel's oppressors. The question remains: why insert a condemnation of the *minim* specifically into a benediction directed against the political oppressors of Israel? It has been suggested that the benediction as it now stands is a prayer for divine judgement and envisages that judgement as beginning first with the wicked of Israel and then extending to the nations². This is speculative and perhaps a little

2. W. Horbury, "The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy", *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982),

oversubtle. The point may simply be to condemn the *minim* by association, by lumping them together with the enemies and oppressors of Israel.

Who were the *minim* against whom the benediction was directed? Patristic evidence makes it clear that the *Birkat ha-Minim* was undoubtedly applied to Christians, and, indeed, the Palestinian recension quoted above specifically mentions "the Christians" (*noʿerim*), in what may be, in effect, an explanatory gloss on *minim*. However, the term *minim* in Rabbinic literature is not confined to Christians, but applies to "heretics" in general. Other pejorative terms are found in the various versions of the benediction: "wicked" (*reša'im*), "sinners" (*poše'im*), "slanderers" (*malšinim*), "informers" (*moserim*), "apostates" (*mešummadim*), "renegades" (*perušim*)³. But it should be noted that these terms are general and uncontentious in a way that *minim* is not. There would doubtless have been a consensus within a congregation that "apostates" and "sinners" should be damned: they had self-evidently put themselves beyond the pale. The term *min*, however, was much sharper, in that it discriminated among those who continued to worship with the Community and to proclaim their loyalty to Israel. It is as important to note the term *min* itself as it is to identify the specific group or groups to whom is referred. The term marks a significant attempt to draw a distinction between orthodoxy and heresy. In Rabbinic terms a *min* was basically a Jew who did not accept the authority of the Rabbis and who rejected Rabbinic halakhah. Hence insofar as it applies to Christians, it must refer primarily to *Jewish* Christians. In condemning the *minim* the Rabbis were in effect condemning all who were not of their party: they were setting themselves up as the custodians of orthodoxy. The original benediction against the arrogant kingdom may have contained also references to the "wicked" and other general types of miscreant. The Rabbinic reformulation, which almost certainly used the term *minim*, turned the benediction into a pointed attack on the Rabbis' opponents. This growing consciousness of orthodoxy shows a turning away from the more pluralistic attitudes of Second Temple times. Indeed, it is possible that the use of the term *min* in the sense of "heretic", rather than "member of a sect" (in a broadly neutral sense), was a distinctively Rabbinic usage⁴.

p. 42.

3. *Perušim* can, of course, mean "Pharisees" (see e. g. Mishnah Yadayim 4:4-6), but there was surely never a Benediction against the Pharisees! It is normally assumed (e. g. Jastrow, *Dictionary* 1222a) that *parus* was used in two opposed senses: (1) "seceder", "renegade", and (2) "abstemious", "saintly" = "Pharisee". However, it is possible that the Benediction against the *Perušim* was aimed not at seceders like the Samaritans, or even like the Qumran sect, but at over-scrupulous people, too holy to worship or socialize with the rest of the Community. Note Hillel's dictum in Mishnah Pirquei 'Avot 2:4; "Do not separate yourself from the Community" (*al tifroš min ha-ʾibbur*), and Tosefta Sanhedrin 13:5 (cf. Bavli Rosh ha-Shanah 14a): "But as for the *minim*, and the apostates (*mešummadim*), and the betrayers (*mesorot*), and the *'epiqorsin*, and those who have denied the Torah, and those who have departed from the ways of the community (*poreshin mi-darkhei ha-ʾibbur*), and those who have denied the resurrection of the dead, and anyone who has sinned and caused the congregation (*ba-rabbim*) to sin, and those 'who have set their fear in the land of the living' (Ezek. 32:24), and those who have stretched out their hand against Zebul [= the Temple], Gehinnom is closed in their faces and they are judged there for ever and ever". Note also the negative list of the seven types of *parus* in Yerushalmi Berakhot 9:7 (14b).
4. It is curious that the etymologies of the terms *min*, *mešummad* and *mumar* (which often interchanges with *mešummad* in the manuscripts) are *all* problematic. They *all* appear to be distinctively Rabbinic, in the sense that they are unattested outside Rabbinic texts. The definition of a *mešummad* in Bavli Horayot 11a as "one who ate animals not ritually slaughtered..." must surely represent an intensification and Rabbinization of the term. The definition of *mešummadim* in Sifra *Va-yiqra* 2:3 (ed.

What was the purpose of introducing the *Birkat ha-Minim*? If our earlier line of reasoning is correct, then the answer must be: To establish Rabbinism as orthodoxy within the synagogue. The power of cursing was taken seriously in antiquity: no-one would lightly curse himself or his associates, or put himself voluntarily in the way of a curse. A Christian, or any other type of *min*, could not act as precentor if the *Birkat ha-Minim* were included in the Eighteen Benedictions, for by reciting it he would be publicly cursing himself, and the congregation would say, Amen!. Nor could a *min*, even as a member of the congregation, easily say Amen! on hearing the benediction⁵. Thus the *minim* would effectively be excluded from public worship. There are other examples of ritual cursing being used in ancient Jewish liturgies as a way of publicly marking the boundaries of a group. The most pertinent example is the recitation of the negative form of the Priestly Blessing to curse "the men of the lot of Satan" during the festival of the renewal of the covenant at Qumran (1Qs II).

According to Bavli Berakhot 28b-29a the *Birkat ha-Minim* was formulated at Yavneh. But it would be wrong to imagine the Yavneh was in any position to force it upon the synagogues of Palestine, let alone of the Diaspora. The synagogue was not a Rabbinic institution and there was no mechanism by which the Rabbis could have imposed their will directly on it. How then was the *Birkat ha-Minim* introduced into the synagogue? A Rabbi, or a follower of the Rabbinic party, if asked to act as precentor in the synagogue, would have recited the Rabbinic form of the Eighteen Benedictions. Since the text of the prayers was still fluid, such innovation in itself would probably have caused little surprise. It is also possible that Rabbinic Jews would have interrupted the service from the body of the congregation and insisted on the Rabbinic *Birkat ha-Minim* being recited. Mishnah Megillah 4:9 alludes to the practice of rebuking a *meturgeman* publicly during the service if he delivers one of the forbidden Targumim⁶. A similar strategy could have been used to impose the *Birkat ha-*

Weiss 4b) as those who "do not accept the Covenant" is more likely to correspond to common usage.

5. Tan?uma Vayyiqra 3 (ed. Buber 2a): "He who goes before the ark and makes a mistake — in the case of all other benedictions he is not made to repeat, but in the case of the *Birkat ha-Minim* he is made to repeat whether he likes it or not, for we take into consideration that he may be a *min*. He is made to repeat so that if he should have a heretical tendency he would be cursing himself and the congregation would answer, Amen!" The argument of R. Kimelman ("*Birkat ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer", in: E. P. Sanders (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* [Fortress Press: Philadelphia 1981], p. 227) and S. T. Katz ("Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C. E.: A Reconsideration", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 [1984], pp.74f.) that the benediction against the *minim* would not be specific enough to cause problems for the Jewish Christians (since the Christian could always say to himself, "I am not a heretic; the benediction must apply to someone else") has some force. Magical praxis in the ancient world certainly tried to name the object of an incantation as precisely as possible. However, it should be borne in mind that the *Birkat ha-Minim* was a Rabbinic benediction (indeed, *min* = "heretic" may be a Rabbinic coinage: see note 13 above). So anyone opposed to the Rabbis would have felt threatened.
6. Mishnah Megillah 4:9: "If a man says in his prayer, 'Good men shall bless you!' this is the way of heresy (*minut*); if he says, 'Even to a bird's nest do your mercies extend', or 'May your name be remembered for the good you have done!' or 'We give thanks, we give thanks!' they silence him. He who paraphrases the laws regarding the forbidden degrees (Lev 18:6-18), they silence him. He who says, 'And you shall not give any of your seed to make them pass through [the fire] to Molech' (Lev 18:21) means 'And you shall not give of your seed to make it pass to heathendom', they silence him with a rebuke." Cf. Mishnah Berakhot 5:3. This tradition of interrupting the service to insist that a particular order should be followed, or particular forms of prayer used, should, perhaps, be set in the context of the long established tradition of "zeal for the Law", whereby private individuals had a right and a duty to enforce the Law, even to the extent of resorting to violence. See M.

Minim on the synagogues. Bavli Berakhot 29a states: "If a reader errs in any other benediction, he is not dismissed, but if he errs in that of the *minim*, he is dismissed, for he himself may be a *min*" (cf. Yerushalmi Berakhot V,4 [9c]). In this way the Rabbinic *Birkat ha-Minim* may have been introduced into the synagogue service. In the end it was accepted as standard, but this acceptance undoubtedly would have taken some time. It should be noted that the *Birkat ha-Minim* would not have been the only benediction of the Eighteen Benedictions that could have created problems for Jewish Christians in synagogue. The Eighteen Benedictions pray for the coming of the Messiah, and for the restoration of statehood and of the Temple service. This nationalism contrasts sharply with the more generalized language of the Paternoster, the distinctive early Christian prayer. The Palestinian recension of the Eighteen Benedictions from the Cairo Genizah is less specifically nationalistic than the Babylonian recensions. It is possible, therefore, that with careful exegesis Jewish Christians could have said Amen! in good faith to some forms of the Eighteen Benedictions (though not, of course, to the *Birkat ha-Minim*). There is evidence to suggest that some synagogue authorities hostile to Christianity used a formula for cursing J as a test of membership. This practice is alluded to by Justin (*Dialogue* xlvii, cxxxvii; cf. *I Apology* xxxi), and may lie behind 1 Cor 12:3 (cf. Acts 26:11). But it does not seem to have been advocated by the Rabbis. The Rabbis adopted a more subtle ploy: they appear to have set out first and foremost to establish Rabbinism as orthodoxy, knowing that once that happened the exclusion of the Christians from the synagogue would inevitably follow.

Professor Alexander refers to Justin and his Dialogues. Below is the text of the reference.

CHAP. XCVI.--THAT CURSE WAS A PREDICTION OF THE THINGS WHICH THE JEWS WOULD DO.

"For the statement in the law, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree, confirms our hope which depends on the crucified Ch-t, not because He who has been crucified is cursed by G-d, but because G-d foretold that which would be done by you all, and by those like to your, who do not know that this is He who existed before all, who is the eternal Priest of G-d, and King, and Chr-t. And you clearly see that this has come to pass. For you curse in your synagogues all those who are called from Him Christians; and other nations effectively carry out the curse, putting to death those who simply confess themselves to be Christians; to all of whom we say, You are our brethren; rather recognise the truth of G-d. And while neither they nor you are persuaded by us, but strive earnestly to cause us to deny the name of Chr-t, we choose rather and submit to death, in the full assurance that all the

Hengel, *The Zealots* (T. & T. Clark: Edinburgh 1989), pp. 146-228.

good which G-d has promised through Chr-t He will reward us with. And in addition to all this we pray for you, that Chr-t may have mercy upon you. For He taught us to pray for our enemies also, saying, 'Love your enemies; be kind and merciful, as your heavenly Father is. For we see that the Almighty G-d is kind and merciful, causing His sun to rise on the un-thankful and on the righteous, and sending rain on the holy and on the wicked; all of whom He has taught us He will judge.

Justin Martyr.

After the Bar Kokba war against the Romans, Ariston of Pella, a converted Jew, wrote, as is generally accepted, a dialogue in which the Christian Jason and the Jew Papiscus are made the speakers, and in which the nature of Jesus is discussed. This dialogue, already mentioned by Celsus, may be wholly imaginary and without historical basis. But the famous dialogue of Justin Martyr with the Jew Tryphon, which took place at Ephesus (Eusebius, "Historia Ecclesiastica," iv. 18) at the time of the Bar Kokba war, is strictly historical, as certain details show; for instance, the statement that on the first day no strangers were present, while on the second day some Jews of Ephesus accompanied Tryphon and took part in the discussion (Justin, "Dialogus cum Tryphone," cxviii.), a certain Mnaseas being expressly mentioned (*ib.* lxxxv.). The Jewish auditors are not only able to follow the intricate discussion intelligently, but their demeanor also is seemly; Tryphon especially proves himself a true disciple of Greek philosophy, and his scholarship is freely acknowledged by Justin (*ib.* lxxx.). At the close of, the debate, Jew and Christian confess that they have learned much from each other, and part with expressions of mutual good-will (*ib.* at the end). Justin was born and reared in proximity to Jews; for he calls himself a Samaritan (*ib.* cxx.), meaning thereby probably not that he professed the religion of the Samaritans, but that he came from Samaria.

Reproduced from www.questia.com