1

MINIM STORIES IN THE TALMUD: INTRODUCTORY DISCUSSION

It may indeed be undignified to give any answer at all to the statements that are foolish; we seem to be pointed that way by Solomon's wise advice, "not to answer a fool according to his folly." But there is a danger lest through our silence error may prevail over the truth, and so the rotting sore of this heresy may invade it, and make havoc of the sound word of the faith. It has appeared to me, therefore, to be imperative to answer, not indeed according to the folly of these men who offer objections of such a description to our Religion, but for the correction of their depraved ideas. For that advice quoted above from the Proverbs gives, I think, the watchword not for silence, but for the correction of those who are displaying some act of folly; our answers, that is, are not to run on the level of their foolish conceptions, but rather to overturn those unthinking and deluded views as to doctrine.[1]

(Gregory of Nyssa)

---

[1] Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit*, *MPG* 45, 1301–1333 (and "De Spiritu Sancto, Adversus Macedonianos Pneumatomachi," in Friedrich Müller (ed.), *GNO*, III:1 (Leiden: Brill, 1958), 89–115), English trans. in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd ser.* (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1893), V, Gregory of Nyssa, 315. Some of the text (but not this particular section) was translated and published in: Anthony Meredith, *Gregory of Nyssa* (New York: Routledge 1999), 39–46. This text is dated by scholars to either 380 (Jean Daniélou, "La chronologie des oeuvres de Grégoire de Nysse," in *Papers presented to the Fourth International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1963*, Studia Patristica 7, Frank L. Cross (ed.) (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1966), 163) or shortly after the Council of Constantinople of 381 (Gerhard May, "Die Chronologie des Lebens und der Werke des Gregor von Nyssa," in Marguerite Harl (ed.), *Écriture et culture philosophique dans la pensée de Grégoire de Nysse: Actes du Colloque de Chevetogne* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 59).

> Come and hear: A certain *min* once said to Rabbi, "He who formed the mountains did not create the wind, and he who created the wind did not form the mountains, as it is written: 'For, lo, He who forms the mountains and creates the wind' (Amos 4:13)." He replied, "You fool, look[2] to the end of the verse: 'The Lord, [the God] of hosts, is His name.'" Said the other, "A fool you call me?" …
>
> (Babylonian Talmud, *Ḥullin* 87a)

Gregory, the fourth-century bishop of Nyssa, begins his treatise "*On the Holy Spirit*" by explaining why there is a need to engage with false doctrines.[3] He regards his opponents' views as heresy and describes their claim as foolish, but also dangerous. This is a prime example of Christian heresiological writing, a genre which, I will argue, bears similarity to rabbinic literary engagement with what they considered to be heretical views.

This book is part of the scholarly research project which studies the literary contacts between rabbinic and Christian traditions as they appear in the Babylonian Talmud.[4] As part of this scholarly *zeitgeist*, this book focuses on a select group of stories that belong to the *minim* narratives in the Babylonian Talmud. I believe through this limited corpus we can more safely determine that the *min* figure is meant to be understood in a Christian context. I do not claim to identify a specific orthodoxy, Christian or rabbinic, as sides in this argument. Instead, I intend to identify contemporaneous ideas expressed in Christian sources, and argue for a rabbinic engagement

---

[2] Literally, "look down."

[3] More on the theological argument in Gerogry's "*On the Holy Spirit*," see Lucian Turcescu, *Gregory of Nyssa and the Concept of Divine Persons* (Oxford; New York: OUP, 2005), 109–114.

[4] This analysis is based on the presumption of connections between the two religious communities, and the possibility of detecting such connections in the Talmud. I have explored the reasons behind this scholarly assumption, and surveyed prior scholarship supporting this claim, in the first chapter of *Early Christian Monastic Tradition and the Babylonian Talmud* (Cambridge: CUP, 2013), 1–34. Additional explorations of this relationship have been published from different angles since that publication; see e.g. articles published in vols. 1 and 2 of *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 25 (2018), from the conference, "Talmud and Christianity: Rabbinic Judaism After Constantine," Cambridge University UK (June 2016), and the survey of new scholarship dealing with the traditions found in the writings of Aphrahat, and rabbinic parallels in the Babylonian Talmud: Alyssa M. Gray, "The People, Not the Peoples: The Talmud Bavli's 'Charitable' Contribution to the Jewish-Christian Conversation in Mesopotamia," *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 20 (2017), 137–167.

with these ideas. In essence, I identify with Bacher's question, framed in the (French) title of his article from 1899: "Does the word *minim* **sometimes** signify 'Christians' in the Talmud?" and with his positive answer: "sometimes it *also* signifies Christians."[5]

Minim stories in rabbinic literature, and specifically in the Babylonian Talmud, often follow an identifiable outline: they involve a rabbinic figure interacting with a heretic over a biblical verse. The *min* will ask a question, and the rabbinic figure will demonstrate its absurd premise, and will win the argument with a knockout. While the vast majority of these stories are found in the Babylonian Talmud,[6] they almost always feature a tanna. In other words, the Talmudic stories portray rabbis who lived before the amoraic time, in the neighboring empire – namely, the Land of Israel. Most of these stories are very short, no more than a few lines long.

Marcel Simon defined the challenges of this scholarly quest, and in effect outlined the parameters of this book over thirty years ago. In a chapter titled "The Christians in the Talmud" he writes:[7]

> The problem appears to be a simple one: to find a meaning for, give a content to, the word *minim.* To what body of peo-ple was this obscure label applied? On surveying the mass of works that attempt to answer this question, it may be said that their authors, with very few exceptions, have made two mistakes. First, they have put the question in the wrong way. The only solutions they have allowed themselves to consider have been ones that are too rigid, too absolute,

[5] Wilhelm Bacher, "Le mot 'minim' dans le Talmud désigne-t-il quelquefois des Chrétiens?" *REJ* 38 (1899), 44.

[6] This phenomenon, where rabbinic engagement with Christianity, in general, is found much more in Babylonian than in Palestinian sources has been dealt with by scholars who suggested different historical reasoning: Peter Schäfer (*Jesus in the Talmud,* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), viewed this as a result of different historical circumstances in which Babylonian Jews felt freer to critique the Christians (see also Holger Zellentin, "Margin of Error: Women, Law, and Christianity in 'Bavli Shabbat' 116a–b," in Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin (eds), *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 340–344); while Daniel Boyarin ("Hellenism in Jewish Babylonia," in Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), 336–363; and see also Aaron Amit, "A Rabbinic Satire on the Last Judgment," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129 (2010), 679–680, n. 4) argued that this is rather a chronological matter resulting from the Babylonian Talmud's later dating, when Christianity became a more pressing issue with which to contend.

[7] Marcel Simon, Ben F. Meyer and Ed P. Sanders (eds), *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135–425)* (New York: OUP, 1986), 180.

and that give the impression of having been preconceived. Second, they have tried to derive the answer from the Talmudic texts alone, and the material here is so slight as to call for extreme caution. In limiting themselves to these texts, they have neglected to observe that there are scattered texts among the Christian writings that provide opportunities for cross-checking. Hardly ever are these two sources brought together. Yet such a procedure would appear to be indispensable. Without it, we are in an impasse.

Simon outlines two problems in his reflection on the vast literature that engaged with the *minim* traditions in rabbinic literature. The first is inadequate methodology, which leads to skewed academic results. The second is the absence of engagement with parallel Christian traditions that might shed light on the rabbinic passages, and of equal import – on the relationship between the communities that preserved these texts.

While my solution will take a different turn than Simon's, I too will try and offer a framework for working with *minim* stories and methodology to determine the context in which these texts were created and were meant to be understood. I will examine a carefully selected set of stories from the Babylonian Talmud featuring a *min*, in light of contemporaneous Christian readings of biblical verses or motifs. The Babylonian Talmud stories that will be investigated appear in *b. Ḥullin* 87a; *b. Berakhot* 10a; *b. 'Eruvin* 101a; and *b. Yevamot* 102b.

In line with Simon's criticism, I shall also attempt to demonstrate my claim using Christian texts, instead of relying solely on the Talmudic passages. This point is especially crucial when dealing with *minim* stories that are often short and enigmatic; the heretical claim is often a single line. Admittedly, arguing a broader Christian context based on this textual evidence may appear ambitious. However, this methodology is supported by two facets: the parallel Christian texts seem to uncover a Talmudic shorthand, rather than force an ill-fitted theology on the rabbinic passage; and moreover, the fact that the selected stories all share a literary structure and terminology supports their characterization as a mini corpus, within the larger corpus of *minim* stories. All of the stories discussed in this book share the same structure: a *min* asks a seemingly unwise question or makes an easily refutable claim about a biblical verse; in response, the rabbinic figure addresses the claim, and ridicules the *min*, using the term "fool" in the process. Collecting these stories into a sub-corpus

enables a broader view which supports the analysis of each individ-
ual case, through the cumulative weight of the texts.

While my previous research focused on Eastern Christian
sources,[8] this proposed project expands its view to Western as well
as Eastern sources. My method of research is based on the paral-
lels that emerge between the sources. The comparative analysis
shows that the Babylonian Talmud is reacting and dialoguing with
very common Christian notions. The analyzed sources include well-
known passages from the New Testament, such as the Sermon on the
Mount, or Old Testament passages that have alternative versions in
the Septuagint and the Hebrew Masoretic text, which in turn become
the basis for conflicting theological notions in both religious com-
munities, both in the East and the West. In other words, in this book
I do not wish to make a specific geographical claim about rabbinic
knowledge of Syriac Christian traditions; instead, this book asks
what these stories can teach us of the Babylonian Talmudic knowl-
edge of Christian traditions. The passages analyzed in this book
demonstrate an acquaintance with well-known Christian traditions,
creating a literary dialogue with widely known Christian receptions
of various biblical verses and themes.

This mini-corpus of stories was selected due to their similar struc-
ture and to the shared semantic field in which the word "fool" was
used. This term appears in all of the selected *minim* stories, and is
used in Second Temple, early Christian and rabbinic texts. I will ded-
icate the next chapter to this claim, and demonstrate that the word
"fool" was meant as an accusation concerning the misunderstand-
ing of scripture. Fool is often accompanied by other related insults
such as "empty," ריק or its equivalent חלק. The insult's antonym is
the praise "not empty" which represents the right and "full" under-
standing of scripture. "Fool" vs. "full." The following chapters in
this book will each be dedicated to a single story, demonstrating the
Christian background against which the story should be read.

In this chapter I will outline the underlining methodology for this
book. I will explain my choice to read the *minim* stories as centering
on heresy, and why they are part of boundary-creating discourse.
I will explain my choice to translate *minim* as heresy, and in these
narratives, more specifically as heretics presenting contempora-
neous Christian arguments. My work is in line with Le Boulluec's
"Heresiological Representations," in its attempt to describe the

---

[8] *Early Christian Monastic Literature.*

Talmudic *minim* stories as part of late antique heresiological discourse. After a survey of the vast secondary literature regarding *minim* in rabbinic texts in general and the Babylonian Talmud specifically, I will situate my own argument within the scholarly discourse. I will then address the question of the "historicity" of these stories, and posit that they should be read as a rabbinic literary response to contemporary Christian views.

I will emphasize that the stories in the Babylonian Talmud are a literary genre that can potentially teach us about rabbinic awareness and anxiety of contemporaneous Christian biblical discussions. I will discuss my choice to situate the composition of these stories in later, rather than tannaitic times. I will outline the methodology that enables the texts to relate the history of the traditions, as well as the awareness of later, contemporary Christian traditions, and the sources of these traditions – from East and West. These include a possible awareness of Septuagint versions, which differ from the masoretic versions. I will discuss possible methods of integrating Christian traditions into the rabbinic Talmud: from Jewish-Christian encounters, to encounters with written texts and Christian liturgical processions in which New Testament passages were read. I stress that there is no need to determine the means through which the Christian traditions arrived in the Talmud; nonetheless, the oral nature of the passages, alongside awareness of secondary orality as "written word [which] leads to new forms of orality,"[9] is clearly important. In turn, the oral nature of the traditions enabled more flexibility in the transmission of the traditions from West to East, and from Christian to rabbinic circles, in the diverse communities of late antiquity.

The introduction will set the stage for the analysis of integrations of Christian traditions into the Talmudic text, and their role in creating heretic narratives with the purpose of delineating lines of difference between the "us" and "them."

Heretic Narratives of the Babylonian Talmud

The choice of the term "heretic" as a translation of the word *min* in the subtitle of this book, "Heretic Narratives of the Babylonian Talmud," was not without forethought. Scholarship has long debated

---

[9] Matthias Henze, "4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 131 (2012), 183, n. 6.

the precise meaning of the word *min* (singular; plural: *minim*) in sto-
ries that use this term to depict a character engaged in debates with a
rabbinic figure. The term is unique to rabbinic literature, but appears
to have been known by Christian writers, such as Justin Martyr and
Jerome.[10] While the exact etymology of the term *min* is unknown,
scholars agree that the most likely derivation is from the identical
word in Biblical Hebrew, meaning "type" or "kind."[11] The mean-
ing of the word was, thus, generally deduced from context, since the
derivation of the word is hard to determine.[12] Therefore, the schol-
arly debate of this question was tied directly to the attempt to link
the intended reference of these characters to specific groups in late
antiquity, based on the rabbinic passages themselves.

Minut As Heresy

The vast majority of scholars tended to align the use of *min*, and
its noun abstraction *minut*,[13] with heresy. According to this inter-
pretation, *minim* are heretics, who hold false or harmful beliefs.[14]

---

[10] Jerome's 403 letter to Augustine and Dialogue with Trypho 80, David
M. Grossberg, *Heresy and the Formation of the Rabbinic Community* (Tübingen: Mohr
Siebeck, 2017), 50, n. 2.

[11] George F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries*, III (Cambridge, MA: Harvard
University Press, 1930), 68; Martin Goodman, "The Function of 'Minim' in Early
Rabbinic Judaism," *Judaism in the Roman World; Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill
2006), 163– 173, there p. 167; Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of
Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 55; Alan
F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 4–5, and n. 2; Ismar Elbogen,
Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung (Hildesheim: Georg
Olms, 1962), 36; Simon, *Verus Israel*, 181. See additional less likely suggestion in
Jacob Levy (ed.), *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und
Midrashim* (Leipzig: Brockhaus 1876–1879), III, 104a (from the Arabic root *man* –
"to speak falsely"), and see Robert T. Herford, *Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash*
(London: Williams & Norgate, 1903), 362–365, for a possible connection to the root
זן (Wilhelm Bacher in his review of Robert T. Herford's "Christianity in Talmud and
Midrash," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 17 (1904), 178, suggests this idea is taken from
Friedmann, in his commentary on *Pesiqta Rabbati*, 101a). Herford also discusses other
options, such as מאמין (suggested by Manuel Joël, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte
zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts* (Breslau: Schottlaender, 1880), II,
71) and מאני; see Herford, *Christianity*, 365. See also Bacher, "Le mot 'minim,'" 45.

[12] Goodman, "Function of 'Minim,'" 167.

[13] Goodman (p. 166) notes that the creation of an abstract noun for discussing
the religious beliefs of a group is unique in the early rabbinic strata – there is no
Pharisaism or Sadduceism in tannaitic literature. Marcel Simon goes further by sug-
gesting that Justin's use of *hairesis* is "the translation of the Hebrew *minuth*" (p. 106).

[14] See e.g. the phrasing in Yaakov Sussmann, "The History of Halakha and
the Dead Sea Scrolls – Preliminary Observations on Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah
(4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989), 54, n. 176 [Hebrew]. See also Boyarin, Goodman,
Simon and many others.

This reading of the term *minut* aligned the rabbinic passages with a parallel development in Christian sources. The "mutual and parallel shaping of heresy as otherness" in ancient Christian and contemporaneous rabbinic writings was described by scholars such as Daniel Boyarin[15] and Martin Goodman.[16] Similarly, Marcel Simon concluded: "It seems that the term *hairesis* has undergone in Judaism an evolution identical to, and parallel with, the one it underwent in Christianity."[17] Shaye Cohen proposed "nearly identical" theories of self-definition by the rabbis and church fathers, and suggested both were influenced by the "Oriental polemic against Hellenism."[18]

Such scholarship used the vast body of literature on Christian heresiology to better understand *minut* in rabbinic and earlier Second Temple sources.[19] John Glucker describes the historical development of the word αἵρεσις. He begins with the verb αἱρέομαι, "to choose,"[20] and describes its later uses and the emergence of αἵρεσις as an abstract concept, "school of thought" and "persuasion." He emphasizes that, even when the term begins to be used to denote heresy, it always advocates orthodox doctrines, and never indicates an institutional concept.[21] Heinrich von Staden demonstrates how these more neutral descriptions were used in patristic writings denoting "breaking away," and "separation."[22] Scholars

---

[15] Boyarin, *Border Lines,* 55. See also Stephen Goranson, *The Joseph of Tiberias Episode in Epiphanius: Studies in Jewish and Christian Relations* (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1990), 97.

[16] "Function of 'Minim,'" 165.

[17] "From Greek Hairesis to Christian Heresy," in William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken (eds), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem R. M. Grant* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1979), 106.

[18] Shaye J. D. Cohen, "A Virgin Defiled: Some Rabbinic and Christian Views on the Origin of Heresy," *USQR* 36:1 (1980), 1–11, here p. 8.

[19] The scholarship on Christian heresiography from the classic Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1884; rep. Hildesheim, 1964), is vast. For a survey of more recent scholarship from 1930 to 1990 see Michel Desjardin, "Bauer and Beyond: On Recent Scholarly Discussions of Hairesis in the Early Christian Era," *Second Century* 8 (1991), 65–82. For an excellent summary, see the introduction to Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, "Making Selves and Marking Others: Identity and Late Antique Heresiologies," in Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin (eds), *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 1–27. For a good review on of history of scholarship on the non-Christian *haeresis* see David T. Runia, "Philo of Alexandria and the Greek Hairesis-Model," *VC* 53 (1999), 117–147.

[20] John Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 166–192, and specifically p. 168, n. 18.

[21] Glucker, *Antiochus,* 181, 192.

[22] Heinrich von Staden, "Hairesis and Heresy: The Case of the *haireseis iatrikai,*" in Ben F. Meyer and Ed P. Sanders (eds), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition,* III, *Self-Definition in the Greco-Roman World* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 76–100.

such as Marcel Simon[23] and Alain Le Boulluec[24] focus on the discursive study of the term's usage in ancient religious texts from Second Temple writers such as Josephus, the New Testament (Acts), Greek writers and specifically the writings of church fathers.[25] Such scholarship emphasize the importance of preventing confusion of the ancient misrepresentations of "the other" with actual socio-historical realities. They choose to describe the constructed character of "heresy" in literature, instead of viewing heresy as a representation of a historical reality. Building on Bauer's[26] argument that orthodoxy is a historical idea that evolved out of the second century of Christianity, Le Boulluec examines the development of heresy in five heresiographers: Justin, Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Clement and Origen. While focusing on the disjunctions between the church fathers' descriptions of the Gnostics and the "gnostic" documents discovered at Nag Hammadi, Le Boulluec stresses the constructed character of so-called heresy in these texts, which he calls "heresiological representations."[27] He finds that "with Justin there emerged an intellectual system aimed at excluding certain theological positions from Christianity," and explains how the concept of *haíresis* was "both simple and convenient."[28]

In addition to discussing the question of whether Justin was the inventor of heresy, or preceded by Greek, Roman[29] or even Jewish/rabbinic writers,[30] the function and use of the term heresy in this discourse is defined by Le Boulluec. According to his definition, heresy (1) deprived the "heretics" of the designation "Christians," (2) lumped together different groups and (3) ignored their historical and sociological connections to Christianity.[31] Heresy is, in fact, a method of converting difference into exclusion, instead of reacting and acknowledging the substance and development of differences.[32]

---

[23] "From Greek Hairesis," 101–116.

[24] Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque IIe–IIIe siècles* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985). And see David T. Runia's review of the book in *VC* 42 (1988), 188–207.

[25] See Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie,* 37–39, 41–48.

[26] Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). And see Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie,* 547–549.

[27] *La notion d'hérésie,* 19.

[28] Alain Le Boulluec, "Häresie," II, 2 ("Church History"), in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Brill online reference works. See also Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie,* 37.

[29] Rebecca Lyman, "2002 NAPS Presidential Address: Hellenism and Heresy," *JECS* 11:2 (2003), 209–222.

[30] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 41.

[31] *La notion d'hérésie*, 551.

[32] See Runia, "Philo of Alexandria," on this point.

Minim and Christian Heresy

In light of this background, Daniel Boyarin's book explores the par-
allel processes of heresiology, as found in rabbinic *minim* stories and
Christian writings, among others. But Boyarin goes one step further,
and claims that these processes play a "powerful role" in the crea-
tion of the difference itself, between the two religions, thus shaping
the religion itself. According to Boyarin, the heresiological differen-
tiation leads to the creation of the Christian *religion* as a category.
Rabbinic passages show that the contemporary rabbis acted similarly
by excluding the Christian "other," and thus created the "autonomy
brought by the self-definition of an 'orthodox' Judaism vis-à-vis an
'orthodox' Christianity, or Judaism as a religion."[33]

Adiel Schremer counters this basic assumption that *minim* are her-
etics; that *minut* is heresy; and that what makes them *minim* is their
false beliefs.[34] Schremer views this position as part of what he calls a
"Christianizing reading of rabbinic material," in which scholarship
incorrectly applies Christian notions to rabbinic sources.[35] The con-
clusion of his survey of early tannaitic material is that the term is not
used to denote theological difference, or a doctrinal disagreement,
but rather a social one. In other words, *minut* is not about beliefs,
but rather about action. Not what people believed but rather what
they did: "*Minim* accordingly, are constructed as Jews who separated
themselves from the community … *Minut* is frequently spoken of as
social segregation, and *minim* are depicted by various sources not
only as expressing dissenting *views* but also as having different cus-
toms and ways of practicing their Judaism."[36]

Thus, it should not be assumed that *minim* are specifically Christians,
and the polemics against *minim* should not be viewed as involving
dogma, but rather an objection to separatist notions. Schremer's argu-
ment has merit, especially since it follows in the footsteps of scholars
such as Adolph Büchler in differentiating between earlier and later

[33] Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 11–12.

[34] He was not the first to raise this issue. See e.g. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "At the
Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism," in Ed P. Sanders
(ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, II (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982),
115–156, and Cohen, "A Virgin Defiled." See Karin Zetterholm-Lund, "'Jewishly'-
Behaving Gentiles and the Emergence of Rabbinic Identity," *JSQ* 25 (2018), 321–344,
which argues that the problem with early *minim* is that they represent a certain ethnic
permeability between Jews and Gentiles.

[35] Adiel Schremer, *Brothers Estranged: Heresy, Christianity, and Jewish Identity in
Late Antiquity* (Oxford; New York: OUP, 2010), 15.

[36] Schremer, *Brothers Estranged,* 16.