

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Judaism. The search for theological antecedents often assumes (falsely) that the text cannot be interpreted on its own grounds. Few comparative sources outside the New Testament can provide information about Paul's Theology, and the parallels adduced are often superficial. The principle of "intrinsic intelligibility" seeks to judge Paul by the critical stance he himself adopts.

Section 4 is a reconstruction of the historical Paul on the basis of the conclusions reached in Section 1, 2 and 3.

Section 5 is an imaginary letter written by one of Paul's opponents in Galatia.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

I explore the impact Marcion and other second century Pauline traditions could have for the future of Pauline studies. Finally, I argue the case for a deconstruction of current Pauline paradigms, which have interpreted Paul within the purview of Second Temple Judaism, and argue that these considerations call for the launch of a new Quest for the historical Paul.

Two methodological principles remain explicit throughout my dissertation:

1. *Radical Doubt*. In order to ascertain whether Paul's claims are credible, I treat with skepticism anything he has to say about his previous life in Judaism, his present status in the Jerusalem Church, his assessment of the predicament of Jewish culture, practice, and the nature of his conflict with his enemies. Although my interpretation of Paul is based on the Pauline Corpus as it stands, I do not rule out the possibility that it has undergone significant textual redaction and corruption. We know that Marcion's text differed from that used by the early orthodox theologians.

2. *Intrinsic Intelligibility*. I propose an independent reading of Paul and

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

A tackles the question of whether Marcion is to be regarded as a philosophical, Gnostic or biblical theologian. The sources inadvertently suggest the latter, which makes Marcion's Paul more plausible than commonly believed.

B and C examine the role of Marcion in the formation of the Pauline canon, if Marcion was the first to have shown an interest in Paul as his theological patron, and if he was the first to have made a collection of Paul's letters, this would suggest that he was concerned to represent Paul accurately. Investigation of chief sources suggests the possibility that Marcion's canon was more faithful than the one advanced by his detractors and that Marcion may have worked with an original and uncorrupted Pauline text.

D deals with Marcion's complex attitude to Judaism. I argue, contrary to popular opinion, that Marcion was neither an anti-Semite, nor anti-Jewish, nor did he even reject the Old Testament. This is important since it cuts to the heart of the alleged reason for Marcion's textual mutilation of the Pauline letters.

² By "Marcion's Paul" I mean Paul as understood and portrayed by Marcion.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Saul b) has a political and ideological agenda that has colored his respective representation c) has set out to create the impression that Orthodox Christianity was not characterized by internal squabbles, and that Paul, in particular, maintained good ties with the Jerusalem Church and Jewish Christians d) can be regarded as a reliable source for the life of Paul.

In C through E, I ask whether: a) Paul's Jewish claim can satisfactorily stand up to close internal scrutiny of the Pauline letters b) Paul can be interpreted within the purview of Second Temple Judaism c) Paul purposely fashioned his "Jewishness" in order to stake an apostolic claim with Jewish Christianity and legitimize his mission to the Gentiles e) Paul's religious experience and theology do not ultimately disqualify him from being a Jew, even though he may have been born and bred one.

Section 3 (*Part Two*) is an examination of the *external evidence* provided by the second century heretic Marcion and the implications Marcion's Paul¹ may have for the study of the historical Paul. This section is divided into five parts:

All Biblical translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.

Was Paul Sincere? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

SYNOPSIS

This dissertation is divided into five main sections.

Section 1 focuses on some of the problems inherent in current Pauline studies. I take an in-depth look at what is commonly called the "New Look" at Paul. This approach interprets Paul within the broad context of Second Temple Judaism. Special attention is paid to the work of E. P. Sanders and Alan F. Segal who are two of the outstanding exponents of the "New Look". I argue that the "New Look at Paul" is dishonest and motivated by a certain political correctness that exacerbates the problem of Christian anti-Semitism.

Section 2 (*Part One*) is an investigation of the *internal* evidence of the New Testament¹ apropos of Paul's Jewishness. Both Luke-Acts and the letters attributed to Paul imply that Paul was a devout Jew with strong ties to Judaism.

In A and B I seek to establish whether there are good grounds for thinking that Luke is: a) inconsistent in his portrait of Paul as the devout

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Paul Gerrard for his kindness and consistent willingness to help me at every turn. His gift is his ability to combine rare erudition and wisdom, with engaging humility and a readiness to learn from those who are well beneath him on the academic ladder. He also happens to have the most impressive theological library this side of the equator, which I am sure, he is now sorry he ever introduced to me. He also is someone whose *being* is always speaking the word of grace, in the true tradition of Paul the apostle, his namesake.

Schneier Levitt, a true and dear friend, deserves special mention. He was the first person to suggest to me that Paul may not have been Jewish. He has also been responsible for invaluable advice and redirection when I needed it most. I owe him a huge debt of ingratitude that can never be repaid. *Multa gratias.*

I dedicate this dissertation to my beautiful wife, Lucinda Katz, who is a singularity, a cataclysmic event, a primordial forest, the third movement of Beethoven's Hammerklavier Sonata, and is a never ending source of joy.

Was Paul Sinner? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

have seemed to suggest that the shipmaster from Sinope on the *Pontus Euxinus*, Marcion, stood closer to Paul than many would care to admit. Whether all this is true is debatable. The case can be argued and I have taken up the challenge. Biblical studies has, in my view, longed ceased to be a discipline engaged in the quest for truth. Probabilities are now the order of the day, and although this might result in chilling cynicism and resignation, it is a state into which scholars are often propelled against their will. Pauline studies are not exempt from the pressures of the broader biblical discipline and its resultant fragmentation.

Barrett (London, 1971) in his *Preface* to his commentary on Romans writes that he has always wondered whether Christianity is true. He continues by saying that if it is, he is convinced it finds its finest expression in the thinking of the likes of Luther, Calvin and Barth. I concur but would like to add that these three interpreters of Paul stand in an advantaged position of being heard, for they can speak for themselves. Marcion on the other hand has drunk from the river of Lethe and his ashes lie buried among the *Mones* with those of Marcion and the Marcionites. They are only heard through the voice of the conqueror in his apologetic war cry. *Their dumb mouths do open their ruby lips to beg the voice and utterance of my tongue.*

Was Paul Sael? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

contra voluntatem on the indictment of having "the Lilly white hands of a heretic" that my commiseration for heretics grew.

My first real rendezvous with Marcion came when sitting at my small proletarian desk freewriting at a passage of Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*. I was stuck on an insuperable Latin sentence, which seemed impossible to translate in spite of its simple grammar: (Marcion) *coacta est cum Iudaico errore sociari*, that is, "was compelled to form an alliance with the Jewish error." How could Marcion have formed an alliance with Jewish error? Remembering the discouraging words of one of my Latin professors to the effect that only the gifted few could translate Tertullian, I committed the unpardonable sin and turned to a translation. My Latin was not as base as I had thought. The sentence became a focal point for a fresh appreciation of Marcion, the results of which are contained in this dissertation.

In the scope of things I am a little fish swimming into a current caused by teaming leviathans, but my sole consolation is my love for theology. That alone abates me in the face of menacing mediocrity. Some who read this dissertation will remain unconvinced by its arguments. I only ask a fair reading, nothing more, nothing less. The fruits of my labors

PREFACE

Paul is my nemesis and this dissertation is the result of a prolonged love-hate relationship. The reasons for loving Paul need little explication if a person stands on his side of the fence. They are less obvious on the other side. The danger for Christian interpreters is that they can be swallowed up by Paul. I myself have not entirely avoided that inherent danger; hence I have adopted a defiant critical stance. The right way to treat Paul is to be radically critical with him. That is the approach of Luther, who, for all his flaws, cut through to the bone marrow itself. Reading his *Lectures on Galatians* (1935) makes me think that little has happened in the field for four hundred years. Luther's Paul has been surpassed, but not yet superseded. I forget not for a moment, however, that with respect to Paul, I am yet another impudent puppy dog barking at the feet of his master.

I discovered the idiosyncratic heretic Marcion through the dismissive glosses scattered about in books written by those *veraxi in consensu rebus*.

I thought it curious that Marcion, the first Pauline of the second century, could have departed so radically from the message of his master and in such a short time. It was only after my exile from the Church

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

DECLARATION

I **Raoul Commey** declare that this dissertation is entirely my own work
and has not been submitted for any degree or examination to any other
University.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

ABSTRACT

Paul the Apostle claims to be a Jew by birth and a Pharisee by Education. Investigation of the relevant texts reveals internal contradictions which suggest that Paul was not a Jew and that he fashioned his Jewishness in order to legitimize his status as an Apostle and his mission to the Gentiles. The heretic Marcion, the first Paulinist of the second century, corroborates the *internal* evidence and provides *external* evidence against Paul's Jewish claims. These considerations call for a deconstruction of the current paradigms of Pauline theology and a new Quest for the historical Paul.

**WAS PAUL SAUL? THE PROBLEM
OF PAUL'S RELATIONSHIP TO
JUDAISM**

by

~~Reed Cummings~~

A dissertation submitted in
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of

Master of Arts

University of the Witwatersrand

1996

Approved by

Chairperson of Supervisory Committee

Date

Was Paul Safe? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Schweitzer almost met with success, but no sooner had he initiated a new direction when Bultmann ingeniously foiled him and established Luther's grip on Paul (Sanders 1991, 131).

Alan F. Segal ("a believing Jew and a twentieth century humanist", Segal 1990, 281) offers a perspective consonant with Sanders', but he has another emphasis and different hermeneutic tool. I have chosen to give his work greater attention since he himself is a Jew.

Paul the Convert (1990) is one of the most unusual works on Paul to have appeared in years although its incisiveness does not always match its originality. Segal's strength lies in his refined knowledge of Judaism. When he comes to finding Paul within that purview, he is less successful. For Segal, Paul's conversion serves as a decisive model for understanding the apostle's life and thought. Against the trend to downplay the significance of Paul's conversion Segal believes that Paul's personal experience after conversion is what most affected both his theoretical thinking about the new basis for Christian community and the value of Torah in it: "Paul has revalued his life on the basis of his conversion" (Segal 1990, 126).

that not the very concern of Luther, whom Sanders and company are now trying to resist?

James Dunn (1990) likewise believes that Paul is not rejecting "legalism" or "works-righteousness," but a narrow view of "covenantal nomism." (A phrase that he has borrowed from E. P. Sanders.) Paul objects not to Judaism *per se* but to one type of Judaism based on another type (Dunn, 1990, 242-259; Bassler 1991, 124-146).⁴

Dunn's position is a modification of Sanders'. He likewise reduces the conflict by denying the grounds upon which the conflict is based. A conflict presupposes a common basis on which to fight and a common point of departure. Dunn has given a common basis as "covenantal nomism" (a phrase he dislikes but uses indiscriminately and inconsistently), but fails to explain what the point of departure is meant to be.

The struggle of these scholars stems from their bid to de-Lutheranize Paul as Albert Schweitzer had done at the turn of the century.

⁴ For a brilliant critique: Martyn's essay "Events in Galatia", in Bassler 1991, 160-79.

History of the Church the view that Judaism is a religion based on works righteousness. Few ancient Christian writers view Judaism in any other way. The modern way exemplified by Sanders and company hardly features. Sanders has not fully explored the reasons for the traditional interpretation. Perhaps the continued existence of the Christian religion depends to a large extent on its suppressive mentality.

- 5 Sanders minimises Paul's angry remarks about the Law and relegates the central theme of "righteousness by faith" to an inferior position in the overall cast of Paul's thought. Beker and Dunn have followed suit.
- 6 What Sanders has not done is to take into account a substantial body of writings which testify to another picture of Palestinian Judaism before 70 C.E., namely the New Testament. Consideration must be made of its critique for a proper perspective. Although some texts were written after 70 C.E. and do contain later Christian polemic against Judaism they nevertheless preserve earlier traditions. If we take their message seriously, are we not forced to concede that protestations do exist in them against works righteousness, and is

Was Paul Sane? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Sanders' influence on Pauline studies has been enormous, and without engaging in a lengthy dialogue I would like to raise a few objections to his central thesis:

1. Is it not strange that Paul, whose theology is described as un-Jewish by Sanders, should find himself so preoccupied with Jewish matters?
2. Sanders does not fully allow for the possibility (he only recognises it in a footnote, Sanders 1977, 4) that the Judaism which Paul attacked must have existed, even if it cannot be independently recovered from the sources.
3. Even if the literature of the Second Temple period is not particularly marked by legalism, this is not *per se* proof that the religion is not legalistic. There is often a discrepancy between the ideal of a religion expressed in its literature and its "demonic distortion under the tragic ambiguities of human existence."¹
4. Sanders fails to take into account the fact that there exists in the

¹ To use the language of Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., Chicago, 1951-64.

Sanders (unlike Stendahl) characterises Paul's thinking as un-Jewish. He accepts that such a thing as non-Jewish Judaism existed in the time of Paul, in the sense of a substratum of essential belief, covenantal nomism, but Paul does not conform to it. This does not mean that Paul rejected Judaism because he believed it to be a religion based on works righteousness, but because of his exclusive soteriology. Since for Paul salvation is only by Christ, the following of any other path is wrong.

Doing the Law, in short is wrong only because it is not faith (Sanders 1977, 557). What is wrong with the Law is that it is not Christ (551). In short, this is what Paul finds wrong in Judaism: it is not Christianity (552).

On the assumption that a religion should be understood on the basis of its own self-presentations we must say that Judaism of before 70 kept grace and works in the right perspective, did not trivialize commandments of God, and was not especially marked by hypocrisy. The surviving Jewish literature is as free of these characteristics as any I have ever read (427).

This does not lead Sanders to the conclusion that Pauline Christianity and Palestinian Judaism were independent and autonomous religions. Instead, as for the controversy in Galatians, he notes that Paul is not contending against Judaism or the Law as such, but against Christian missionaries and the view that the Gentiles must accept the Law as a condition of or as a basic requirement for membership (Sanders 1983, 19).

central place to passages like Rom. 9-11.

Stendahl also downplays the significance of Paul's conversion, and focuses instead on what he calls "the greater reality of his apostolic calling" (Stendahl 1976, 7ff.). Paul, we are told, experiences not a conversion but a call; serves the same God with a new and special calling; sees himself called in the manner of the prophets; and feels that the mystery of God's inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of Israel has been revealed to him (*ibid.*).¹ Since Paul did not convert from one religion to another, he is at ease with his former life in Judaism.

Sandlers is the leader of the pack. In his thorough, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (1977), and *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (1983), he attacks the view of Rabbinic Judaism as a legalistic religion based on works righteousness. He feels that this false picture has come about because of the unfortunate and enormous respective influences of scholars like Weber, Schurer, and Bouset on New Testament scholarship rather than from a critical examination of Jewish texts.

¹ Confer Is. 49.1-6; Jer. 1.5; Ezek. 1.28; 2.1-3; Acts 9.15; Rom. 11.25; Gal. 1.12; Rom. 16.25; Gal. 1.6; Beker 1980, ff; Bausler 1991, 145f.

² Confer Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 4.4; 2 Cor. 5.10-11; Acts 23.1; 24.16; Rom. 9.1; 2 Cor. 1.12.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Paul is often considered a principal player in the matter, it is thought that a fresh examination may yield positive results which could lead to a new interpretation of Judeo-Christian history, with brighter implications for future Jewish-Christian relations. It would be unwise to deny the political factors that have motivated the "New Look at Paul."

A. *Paulus Novus*

Krister Stendahl (1976) believes that the West has read Paul incorrectly by hailing him as a hero of the introspective conscience. When Paul speaks of justification by faith, Stendahl insists that Paul does not have in mind Luther's concern: "How can I find a gracious God?," but: "How can the Gentiles become full members of the people of God?" Justification for Paul, as far as Stendahl is concerned, is a *Jewish* problem. Stendahl holds that asking the wrong questions has led to the wrong answers and emphases, especially regarding the doctrine of justification, which holds a disproportionate place of emphasis in Pauline interpretation. In order for his thesis to work, Stendahl minimises those passages which seem to indicate that Paul is wrestling with "a damning conscience", for example, Rom. 7, while he gives

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

In some sense one can explain the position by a simplistic "guilt by default" mentality. Since Pauline Theology was full of invectives against Judaism, scholars believed that either Paul was right and by implication Judaism guilty, or Judaism right and Paul guilty. In other words, if Paul's polemics against Judaism were unjustified, Judaism must be true and Pauline Christianity false. Post-World War II scholarship in contrast made significant strides in its attempt to correct these abuses and reinterpreted Judaism independently of Pauline vituperation. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and examination of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha led to a fresh reappraisal of Second Temple Judaism, and Paul's place within it.

Consequently, during the last forty years there has been a dramatic shift in the direction of Pauline studies, led by such scholars as W. D. Davies, H. J. Schoeps, K. Stendahl, L. Gaston, J. G. Gager, E. P. Sanders, J. C. Beker, J. D. G. Dunn, and A. F. Segal - to name but a few. Despite their differences they all share a common goal. They wish to remove Paul from the clutches of his theological interpreters (notably Augustine and Luther) and relocate him within the context of the new interpretation of Second Temple Judaism. Part of their motivation has been to sever the connection between Paul and anti-Semitism. Since

Was Paul Sane? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

shadow over Christian Theology. Below is a passage (possibly) interpolated by a disciple of Paul, which bears sinister witness to the beginnings of anti-Semitism:

You have fared like the congregations in Judea, God's people in Christ Jesus. You have been treated by your countrymen as they are treated by the Jews, who killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets and drove us out, the Jews who are heedless of God's will and enemies of their fellow men, hindering us from speaking to the Gentiles to lead them to salvation. All this time they have been making up the full measure of their guilt, and now retribution has overtaken them for good and all (1 Thess. 2:14-16).

This attitude is not typical of Paul, but it must have its origins in him.

The sting in the tail is often removed by sensitive scholars who are perturbed by Paul's attitudes. They appeal to Paul's Jewishness and insist that he speaks to Judaism as friend from within, not as an enemy from without.

Pre-World War II Pauline scholarship was less sensitive and tried to solve the problem by characterising Judaism as corrupt. Paul's theology was viewed, in this scheme of things, as a sincere attempt to correct legalistic abuses endemic to Judaism at the time. This solution, offered by the so-called "History of Religions School" was not a new one. Most Christian literature after Paul adopted it. When taken to its extreme, it often resulted in the unwarranted demonization of the Jewish people.

I. THE JEWISH PROBLEM AND THE STATE OF PAULINE STUDIES

Christianity's relationship to Judaism is a paradoxical one. On the one hand it claims to stand within the history of Judaism; on the other hand it asserts itself as a corrective to Judaism. This paradox gave birth to the phenomenon of the New Testament. Paul the apostle proffers one solution to the "Jewish Problem," and although his is not the only solution, it is the most ingenious and problematic. At its heart is the struggle to present a Jewish Saviour-God outside of the parameters set by Judaism, that is, outside of Torah. This leads to the inevitable question of the Jews and their role in God's cosmic drama.

In Paul's writings the Jews are both extolled and marginalized. The former because the Saviour himself is born of the seed of David (Rom. 1. 3), the latter because they serve as an obstacle to the universalization of the message of salvation. Jesus Christ Saviour is the presupposition for Paul's proto-christian consciousness, inherited by all who lay claim to faith, and yet its dark side can be the torrid, raging, demonic hatred for the Jews who (allegedly) killed the Messiah, an irreversible tale whose unthinkable climax in the twentieth century has cast its deathly

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

C. Marcion's <i>Textus Corpusque</i>	97
D. Marcion <i>Judaïque</i>	104
E. Conclusions to Part Two: The Quest for the Historical Paul	115
IV. WHO IS PAUL?	138
V. EXCURSUS: THE LETTER OF BENJAMIN	143

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE JEWISH PROBLEM AND THE STATE OF PAULINE STUDIES

A. Paulus Aeneas	3
B. Some Conclusions on the New Look	6

II. PART ONE : INTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST PAUL'S JEWISHNESS

A. Was Paul Saul? The Evidence of Luke	21
B. Summary of Luke's Jewish Paul	31
C. Was Paul a Jew? The Evidence of Paul	31
1. Problems with Paul's Jewish Claims	31
2. Paul and Second Temple Judaism	36
3. Why the Jews? The Process of Judaizaton	40
D. Summary of Paul's Jewish Paul	54
E. Was Paul "Crucified"? The Nature of Paul's Revelation	57
F. Summary of Paul's Crucifixion	67
G. Was Paul an Apocalyptic? The Christological Factor	67
H. Summary of Paul's Apocalyptic	77
I. Conclusions to Part One: Summary of Four Theses	78
1. Saul was not Paul	78
2. Paul does not have a special relationship to Judaism	79
3. Paul's "revelation" has no precedents in Judaism	80
4. Paul transforms Jewish apocalyptic and uses it in his battle against Judaism	81

III. PART TWO: EXTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST PAUL'S JEWISHNESS

A. Was Marcion a Heretic?	82
B. Marcion and the Canon	83

Was Paul Safe? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

2. Luke refers often to Paul's "Roman citizenship," yet in his letters Paul is painfully silent about this. Can Roman citizens be flogged three times? Not according to Cicero (quoted by Conzelmann 1987, 189).⁹
3. In Gal. 2, Paul makes it clear that he had a major role to play in the Jerusalem conference, whereas in Acts 15, it is Barnabas, Peter and James who hold centre stage.
4. Luke portrays Paul as having gone first to the Jews and only later (because of their rejection of his Gospel) to the Gentiles. Paul's letters, however, give us the impression that he had the Gentiles in mind from the start.¹⁰
5. Paul denies having been in Judea before his revelation: "I remained unknown by sight to Christ's congregations in Judea" (Gal. 1.22), which is hard to reconcile with Luke's picture of him as a persecutor

⁹ See also Acts 16.37-38; 22.25-29; 23.27; 25.8-12,21; 26.32; 27.24; 28.19; 2 Cor. 11.25; confer Acts 22.25. In this regard Paul's appeal to Caesar is important: Acts 25.8-12; 31; 26.32; 27.24; 28.19.

¹⁰ Rom. 1.5,14,15; 11.13; 15.16; Gal. 1.16; 2.7,9; confer 1 Tim. 2.7.

Was Paul Son? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

take him from Antioch in Syria to regions as far west as Macedonia and Greece, that he is finally arrested on the last of three short visits to Jerusalem, that as a Roman citizen he appeals to Caesar after several hearings before local magistrates, and that he finally arrives in Rome for trial and awaits martyrdom. Without the text of Acts we would not know any of the above information. We would not learn it from Paul's letters. Luke seems to know more about Paul than Paul knows about himself.

Let us put this Lukan information to the test:

1. If Paul underwent thorough Rabbinic training and studied under Gamaliel, why Paul's silence? This information could have served him well in many embarrassing confrontations with Judaizers. Luke's inconsistency too about Paul's knowledge of Hebrew is humorously brought out in Acts 26:14. Though Jesus addresses Paul in Hebrew, Luke has him quote a common Greek proverb: "It is hard for you to kick against the goads."

* Euripides *Phaenissa* 794-795; Pindar *Pythian Odes* 2, 941.; Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1624. The attempt of Bruce 1990, 501, to reconstruct an Aramaic original, is unacceptable.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

In his book on Paul (1845), Baur insisted that a choice be made between the two divergent presentations of the Book of Acts and of Paul:

For the history of the Apostolic age the Pauline Epistles take precedence over all the other New Testament writings, as an authentic source. On this account the Acts must fill a secondary place (cited in Kummel 1972, 135).

In a tiny but a consequential book by John Knox, *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (1950), the basic methodological principle of Baur is given clear expression. Quoting Knox *in extenso* is worthwhile:

The incomparable value of the letters is such (a) that the merest hint in the letters is to be deemed worth more than the most explicit statement in Acts; (b) that a statement in Acts about Paul is to be regarded as incredible if it conflicts directly with the letters (as many statements do) and is to be seriously questioned even if a conflict is only suggested; and (c) that statements about Paul in Acts are to be accepted with confidence only if such statements are fully and explicitly confirmed by the letters. There can be no doubt that [Acts] contains true traditions of facts and episodes in Paul's life, but these traditions can never have the certitude which data obtained from the letters possess (Knox 1950, xvii).

Noteworthy for the present discussion is (c), information about Paul peculiar to Luke. Luke tells us that Paul is also called "Saul," that he is born in Tarsus, brought to Jerusalem at an early age and educated at the feet of Gamaliel, that he is a persecutor of the Church in Judea, that he speaks Hebrew, that he is dramatically converted "on the road to Damascus," that he ventures out on three missionary journeys which

II. PART ONE: INTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST PAUL'S JEWISHNESS

A. Was Paul Saul? The Evidence of Luke

Luke¹ tells us many things about Paul, but can he be trusted? Since the epoch making article by E. C. Baur, "The Christ Party in the Corinthian Church" (1831), scholars are disinclined to believe Luke when he writes about Paul. Baur disputed Luke's idea of a harmonious Church in the first century, and argued for a fundamental dichotomy between early Jewish Christianity, represented by the Petrine party, and Pauline Christianity, represented by the Pauline Party.² The Book of Acts, Baur argued:

is the apologetic attempt of a Paulinist to facilitate and bring about the rapprochement and the union of the two opposing parties by representing Paul as Petrine as possible and, on the other hand, Peter as Pauline as possible (cited in Kummel 1972, 133).

¹ By "Luke" I am referring to the writer of canonical Luke-Acts. By "Primitive Luke," I refer to a hypothetical source that underlies Luke-Acts and Marcion's Luke. I do not use the name "Luke" to imply that someone of the same name composed the Gospel. We do not know who is responsible for the Gospel in its final form, or who is responsible for the traditions that underlie the Gospel.

² For a full discussion of Baur and anti-Pauline polemic in the New Testament, see Schweitzer 1912, chap. 2 and 3; Kummel 1972, chap. 4; and more recently Ludemann 1989.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Sufficient cognisance has not been paid to the interior logic of Pauline Theology, to Paul's angry remarks against the Law and Circumcision, and to the fact that one so ostensibly devout and committed to Jewish matters could have espoused a Christology that is un-Jewish (belief in a divine Crucified Saviour). The boundaries and identities of Judaism and Christianity are not fully resolved and the question of Christian origins clouded. Furthermore, instead of unravelling the problem of anti-Semitism, the new view has tended to ignore Paul's involvement by failing to admit that a problem exists (for if Paul's prestige as a devout Jew is safeguarded, he cannot be accused of anti-Semitism).

For those who are swept off their feet by the "New Look", the voices of the Reformation were raised in vain. What Paul calls the "new creation" (2 Cor. 5.17) is domesticated beyond recognition, and not least because Paul's point of departure is obscured. Modern questions are substituted for Paul's, as though God had devised the Gospel in order to provide answers to questions defined by human beings. Yet apart from the radical Gospel of grace, one does not know what the question is. So the cat chases his tail, and calls this an exercise in exegetical theology.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Jew he claimed to be. Therefore, Pauline Christianity was really a form of Judaism. Therefore, Christians are heirs of Judaism. Therefore, Paul shares no guilt in the history of anti-Semitism.

The motivation of Sanders and ensemble is laudable since they wish to protect Judaism from Christian anti-Semitism, but there are better ways to achieve this than to downplay Paul's conversion. Conversion is a change from one state to another predicated on dissatisfaction. To argue that converts became dissatisfied after they have changed sides is *reductio ad absurdum*.

On the whole, what goes in the name of the "New Look" is, in my view, mostly a step backwards. It is Paul gained through strained exegesis and largely through the exigencies of the current theological climate. Since Judaism in the time of Paul is no longer considered "corrupt" and since the majority of Christian scholars would not readily concede that Paul is corrupt (or his protest against Judaism is invalid), the result has been to imply that neither is corrupt.

Consequently, the "Pauline paradox" has not been resolved and Paul's point of departure from Judaism obscured.

B. Some Conclusions on the New Look

I am convinced that despite the laudable efforts of these scholars to reinvent Paul, they have essentially misunderstood him and his role in the history of anti-Semitism. Their vision depends on two simple beliefs, both of which are difficult to sustain in the light of a critical reading of the New Testament: *Paul was a good Jew with strong ties to Judaism, and Paul's point of departure from Judaism was not a radical one.* The consensus, as I see it, fails to address the problem of Paul's Jewishness. Much is assumed and what seems to stand in the face of the evidence is brushed aside and hidden beneath the foliage in the hope that few will have the audacity to look there. The words of Stephen Neill made some thirty years ago about Jesus are equally applicable to Paul:

The danger for the liberal lies always in his tendency to domesticate Jesus Christ, to make him out to be less dangerous than he really is, to rob him of his mystery, and to offer solutions of the gospel problems which are no real solutions (Neill & Wright 1988, 46).

The logic of the "New Look at Paul" can be summarised as follows.

Second Temple Judaism was not a legalistic religion. Therefore, Paul's protest against the Law could not have been based on Paul's rejection of the legitimacy of Jewish cultic practice. Therefore, Paul was the devout

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

to true Jews? Segal shares Sander's view that Paul's attitude to Judaism was not predicated on any dissatisfaction with Judaism before his conversion. Paul did not convert because he felt that Judaism could not save him, or because it was a religion of works righteousness, or because it rejected the Messiah:

(People) completely misunderstand the program of Paul the Apostle, wrongly concluding that Paul's difficulty with Judaism was intellectual and theological—for instance, interpreting Paul as opposing Judaism because it practised self-salvation and volition (Segal 1990, 283, *confer* 169, 182, 255, 281).

Hence, Paul's dissatisfaction depended on his conversion experience and his postconversion experience in the community (Segal 1990, 121, 122). Yet can we believe that Paul failed to realise the reason for his conversion? Did he happen to take a Kierkegaardian plunge, only to discover subsequently and under group pressure, that he had made the right decision? If Paul was happy with Pharisaism why did he leave it behind? Surely, Paul's is not *sententia ex eventu*? Segal concedes the point: "One thing is clear from his language: Paul is no longer a Pharisee" (Segal 1990, 17).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

within Judaism (Segal 1992, 113). From another point of view Christianity is a new religion ("analytically complete in its own terms", Segal 1992, 182) and Paul converts to Gentile Christianity (Segal 1992, 224).

The following remark further obfuscates the matter: "Paul was a Jew who did not have to convert to become a Christian" (Segal 1992, 147, 214). What does Segal mean? That Paul could have converted to Jewish Christianity and did not have to convert to its Gentile version?

Theoretically, he could have just slid over as an adherent by claiming Judaism was fulfilled by the Messiah's arrival (Segal 1992, 147).

This Gentile version remains in some sense a kind of Judaism because it is constituted by "God-fearers." Yet Segal contradicts himself because he suggests that Jewish Christianity was Judaism, not Christianity, whereas Gentile Christianity was truly Christianity. How then could Paul have become a Christian, failing conversion? Furthermore, nowhere in Paul's letters are we given any indication that his conversion consisted in the transference from one community (Jewish) to another community (Gentile). If Paul did not have to convert, why did he convert? What caused a devout Torah-abiding Pharisee to join a subordinate group of Gentiles who did not have the privileges accorded

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

This is why Paul never uses the name "Christian" of his community (Segal 1990, 203). Paul was not converted from one religion to another, but from one variety of Judaism to another, his dissonance in retrospect inevitably proved too radical:

History after Paul judged Christianity to be different from Judaism. That fact seems undeniable today, but it is hardly so in the first century (Segal 1992, xiv).

Segal's approach is provocative but he arrives at many correct conclusions in spite of some flaws in his argument. He is not inclined towards a detailed exegesis of the Pauline texts, and makes unsupported generalisations such as: "nor did he (Paul) feel he had sinned in any way in his previous life" (Segal 1990, 268). What of the following *non sequitur*: "Israel has not shown any interest in Christ nor has the *parousia* happened" (Segal 1990, 282).

Furthermore, proof for the existence of the Noachic commandments is late and cannot be found in first century Jewish sources. The existence of a category of Gentile-Jews known as "God-fearers" is vague and unsupported. More important is the criticism of Anthony J. Saldarini who feels that the boundaries and identities of Judaism and Christianity are not fully resolved by Segal (Saldarini 1992, 392, 396). On the one hand Paul is a Jew who converts from one Jewish sect to another sect

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

(Segal 1990, 272).⁵

The crux of his argument is expressed as follows:

The vexing issue of the ritual status of the Gentiles - not their salvation or even philosophical issues of universalism or particularism or the value of work's righteousness - directly occasions Paul's meditations on Law (Segal 1990, 125, 202).

For Segal, within certain groups of Judaism it was accepted that Gentiles could be saved without having to convert. He quotes as an example the Pharisees who believed that Gentiles could be saved by keeping the "Noachic commandments." Salvation is not the issue. A new society is. The way in which Paul achieves ritual acceptability is through baptism which places Gentiles on the same level of ritual purity so as to engage in intimate social activities (Segal 1990, 138ff.). Jews and Gentiles are free to eat together and marry each other (Segal 1990, 194). What is the result of Paul's social reformation within Judaism? Christianity's exclusion and confirmation of its heretical status (Segal 1990, 205). Paul is a Jew but an apostate one:

What Paul did not wish and what he fought against is what eventually happened: The Church became a new, third entity he never felt he had left Judaism (Segal 1990, 263, 284).

⁵ Contra Stendahl 1976; Gaston 1970; and Gager 1983, who feel that Paul only denies that these laws are necessary for Gentiles; Segal 1990, 124, 129.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Employing comparative sociological and psychological data, Segal defines Paul's conversion as a wrenching, decisive change and transformation that leads to a change in community (Segal 1990, 6, 25). The most important key to unlocking Paul, thinks Segal, is this community, constituted by an arcane group of Gentiles known as "God-fearers," Gentiles who are attracted to Judaism, but do not go the whole way and convert:

God-fearer is the term used to refer to those Gentiles with varying degrees of commitment to Judaism, all of whom have been attracted to the synagogue but who were unwilling as yet to become full proselytes (Segal 1990, 93).

Segal takes this community as prescriptive for Paul's change in attitude towards Torah, ceremonial laws and ritual purity. What Paul has in mind is the establishment of a new community constituted by Jews and Gentiles but where the lines of ritual demarcation are no longer strictly drawn between the two groups, a community akin to the one Paul entered after conversion. This means that the performance of special laws of Judaism (like circumcision) no longer feature either for Jews or for Gentiles:

Paul offered something that no other Jewish proselytiser had been able to offer - the promises of Judaism but with the peculiar responsibilities of the special laws entirely optional

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

theology which consistently underscores the authority of the text.

2. Paul rejects the need for Circumcision and dietary laws as a prerequisite for participation in the elective people of God.

2. *Paul and Second Temple Judaism*

The consensus *notion* *disconsensus* on Second Temple Judaism can be summarised as follows:

Judaism was a rich, variegated and diverse group of religious sects with little or no coherent centre whose relationship to each other is impossible to define. The idea of a "normative Judaism" with an "essence" is obsolete, since the primary sources, the Old Testament, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, Josephus and (possibly) some writings of the New Testament, all testify to a variegated religion. Josephus' division of Judaism into four sects: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Zealots, is weighed against the picture of an even more diverse body of Judaisms in the literature, which testifies not to a religion *per se* but to a religion in the making. Other sects included: the Hasmoneans, the Hellenists, the Nazarenes, the Samaritans (?), the Boethusians, the Herodians (Nabatean converts), etc. A "pure" form of

stretches the limit of normal interpretation. He often adapts the text or gives new meaning to the passages he cites.¹⁶ He may use allegory¹⁷ or wrest a text from its original context.¹⁸ He often misrepresents the text or by clumping verses together. As an example, "Scripture said in advance that God justifies the Gentiles by faith" (Gal. 3.8). Here Paul adds the words "faith" and "righteousness" found in one part of the text, to the word "Gentiles" found in another part (he joins Gen. 15.6 to 18.8).¹⁹ An egregious example is the famous passage: "Death is swallowed up; victory is won! O death, where is your victory? O death, where is your sting? The sting of death is sin, and sin gains its power from the law" (1 Cor. 15.55, corrupted from Hosea 13.14, where the meaning and intention are the reverse). What of the unconscionable Gal. 4.24, where Paul defines Jews as the offspring of Hagar and not Sarah?

What makes Paul's relationship to the Hebrew Bible finally questionable is not the method he uses (which may or may not have its antecedents in Rabbinic interpretation), but the resultant

¹⁶ E.g. Hab. 2.4 in Rom. 1.17 and Gal. 3.11; Gen. 12.7 in Gal. 3.16.

¹⁷ Gen. 16.15; 17.16 in Gal. 4. 21-25.

¹⁸ Deut. 25.5 in 1 Cor. 9.9; Brown, Fitzmyer and Murphy 1990, 1384.

¹⁹ See Sanders 1991, 56ff.; *idem* 1983, chapter 1; Raisanen 1983, 93f.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

- s. Paul's opponents¹ consistently refuse to accept his Jewish claim. Throughout his letters he is under strain to defend his Jewishness. Why? As important are the anti-Pauline polemics in the *Clementine Homilies* and in the Ebionite denunciations quoted by Epiphanius and Irenaeus (Ludemann 1984; Maccoby 1979, 74). How are we to account for this hatred of Paul among Jews?
- n. Paul's use of the Jewish Bible stretches the limits of normal interpretation. A detailed investigation here is beyond the limits of this dissertation. Second Temple Jewish hermeneutics is so broad as to render it almost impossible to establish some objective criteria that would evaluate Paul's use of the Bible. There is also the matter of scarcity of comparable sources for first century Judaism. Rabbinic sources may provide clues but they are coloured by the developments that took place after 70 C.E.

Despite these caveats, however, even the most ardent defenders of Paul's use of the Hebrew Bible would be forced to concede that Paul

¹ I take Paul's opponents in Galatia and Corinth to be Jewish Christians rather than Gnostics or Gentile Christians who have undergone Circumcision, i.e. Judaizers. See Betz 1979, 6f.; Ludemann 1989; and my excursus (Section 5).

Was Paul Scribe? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Paul's first language is Greek and his letters betray no knowledge of either Hebrew or Aramaic. The style of his argument is that of the Greek Diaspora and he only quotes from Greek versions of the Hebrew Bible, mostly the LXX, even where they differ from the Hebrew text(s).¹⁰ Nor does Paul make use of Midrashic legends. 1 Cor. 12:4, for example, is not a Midrashic legend but is found in Pseudo-Philo, which was available in Paul's time in Greek (MacCosby 1991, 155).

3. Paul shows no interest in Jewish politics and history. This is peculiar seeing that Jesus was crucified on a political charge.

4. Socially the communities revealed in the Pauline letters show no visible connection or even contact with the synagogue.

The author of Acts, writing a generation later, sought to account for the separation by imagining Paul trying in every place first to win the Jewish community whole and withdrawing to the Gentiles only when forced to by Jewish hostility. Perhaps that happened, but Paul says nothing of it (Weeks 1983, 168).

¹⁰ The thesis of W. C. van Unnik: "It can safely be said, that Aramaic was Paul's earliest and principal tongue" is unacceptable (Unnik is quoted and discussed sympathetically by Hengel 1991, 22, 23).

Was Paul Sair? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

"Jewish problem", that is Israel's exclusive claim to be the chosen people of God. Below are some major problems associated with Paul's Jewish claims:

1. Paul never mentions his mother as expected. A Jew is one born of a Jewish mother (*Talmud Mishna Kiddushin* 3.12).⁷³

Paul never quotes any Rabbinical colleague. The view of W. D. Davies (*Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1965) that Paul writes or thinks in a Pharisaic and Rabbinic mode has been tackled by Maccoby (1991, chap. 5). There are three main objections. First, Rabbinism is not the continuous development of Pharisaism; therefore Pharisaism cannot be reconstructed by Rabbinic sources. Second, the scarcity of comparative sources for a pre-70 C.E. Pharisaism. Finally, the un-Rabbinic nature of Paul's thinking. I concur with S. Sandmel:

"Davies' book is an admirable book, indeed a great one and one with which I disagree almost 100 per cent" (Quoted by Maccoby 1976,

74).

⁷³ Confer Acts 23.14ff. on Paul's nephew. One could argue that Paul indirectly refers to his mother in Phil. 3.5.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

omitted from Paul's letter. It is not that Luke is unimportant in the search for Paul, only that Luke must be seen primarily as a writer who presents us with a "type" of Paul that conflicts with the "type" found in Paul's own letters. Consistent critical scholarship forces the Pauline scholar to choose between Acts and the Letters and the respective portraits they offer. Paul and Luke diverge at crucial points which suggests that Luke is uninformed and an unreliable source for the life of Paul. What he says about Paul's relationship to Judaism is suspect for this reason. A middle ground is maintained only through forced exegesis which ignores Luke's theological and political agenda.

C. Was Paul a Jew? The Evidence of Paul

1. Problems with Paul's Jewish Claims

It is now our task to consider Paul's role in the development of his Jewish identity. What are we to make of Paul's Jewish claims?¹⁴ These claims are not *per se* proof of Paul's Jewishness or of his fidelity to Judaism, but are inexorably bound up with his mission to the Gentiles, his apostolic status in Jerusalem, and his relation to the

¹⁴ Gal. 1.14; 2.11-21; Phil. 3.5; Rom. 11.1; confer Acts 13.21; 2 Cor. 11.22; Rom. 9.3ff.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Some may find the suggestions offered here odd in that they trivialise Luke as a historian and accuse him of deliberate tampering with the evidence. The truth is that Luke, even in terms of ancient historiography, is a weak historian, closer to Herodotus than Thucydides, closer to Curtius than Arrian, closer to Sallust than Caesar. He sets out to solve in retrospect (as opposed to Paul) the theological problem of the Law posed by the mission to the Gentiles. He creates the impression that if the early Christian movement was characterised by internal squabbles, Paul had nothing to do with it. Yet he is not engaged in the historical Paul, since he cites not one line from Paul's letters.

Luke's silence deals a severe blow to him as a "historian." The most significant non-event in the Book of Acts is Luke's failure to narrate the outcome of Paul's imprisonment. Death? Release? Martyrdom? (So Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.22.3). Luke's agenda is first politics, then theology and only then history.

B. Summary of Luke's Jewish Paul

Luke can no longer be used to supply details of Paul's life that are

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Homer, Plato, Euripides, Sophocles, Aeschylus and the like, is quite alien to him. The single exception is a citing of a "popular tag" from Menander (1 Cor. 15:33).¹ Luke's Paul is another matter. In Acts 17:16-34, the apostle is portrayed as the first Christian philosopher, brilliantly versed in Stoic ideas and skilled in Stoic argumentation.

For Luke, Paul the apostle is an ambiguous character with an ambiguous identity. He knows Paul was a "Jew" but not a faithful Jew, a Greek but not an educated Greek, a Roman but not a *Pius Romanus*. Given the contradictory nature of his identity, it is not surprising that Luke feels the need to improve upon it. He casts Paul as a Greek actor in a Jewish plot played out in a Roman theatre. Paul stands at the boundary of all three worlds, paradoxically Jew, Greek and Roman, par excellence. In Paul, Luke has a figure who represents a universal Christ, sufficiently tied to Judaism to attract monotheistic God-fearers, yet not restrictive in his application of a narrow "covenantal nomism." In short, the "Jew from Tarsus" is a literary device that serves as the womb from which the Orthodox Paul is born.

¹ On Paul's lacklustre Greek education see Hengel 1991, 35ff; Bornkamm 1971, 9f.; Knox 1950, 54.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Rome, the *Romanus Civis Paulus* is allowed to carry out his work unhindered (Haenchen 1971, 103; Knox 1959, 15f.).

Although there is little evidence to suggest that Christians were being persecuted or martyred during this period, Luke wanted to keep it that way by showing that Christianity implies no transgression of Roman Law. He does this by painting the Roman authorities as sympathetic to the cause of "The Way." His reason is clear enough. The Christian movement must be shown to be politically innocuous. As Jesus is murdered by Romans, so Paul is persecuted by them, yet in both cases, it is the Jews and not the Romans who bear the guilt.

Luke allows Paul to be the Greek he is, and, at the same time, the Jew and Roman he has to be. Paul emerges in Luke's hands as the archetypal Hebrew speaking Pharisaic Jew with an education in Judaism second to none, an archetypal Roman, not merely a member of the common *plebs*, but a *Romanus Civis* with all the privileges that go along with it, and finally, an archetypal Greek with a full *paideia*. Although it is certain that Paul underwent some education in Greek he did not undergo such in the traditional sense for he seems not to have been trained in Greek philosophy or culture, and the literature of

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

as successful as Paul because he lacks Paul's refinement and verve as a theologian. Whereas Paul manages to retain a place for Jews in God's plan of salvation-history, Luke resigns himself to a crude form of anti-Semitism, by flagrantly characterising them as Christ killers and persecutors of Christians: "This man you crucified and killed by the hands of those outside the Law" (Acts 2.36; 4.10). Even when Paul is faced with opposition by Greeks or Roman, the Jews have instigated it. They "hatch plots," "plan to murder," "are filled with jealousy and blaspheming," "stir up the Gentiles and poison their minds," etc. Luke only likes Jews when they are Christians, when they are no longer Jews."

The Romans on the other hand are sympathetically portrayed. The Roman procurator Sergius Paulus is converted (Acts 13.7); the proconsul Gallio dismisses a complaint against Paul (Acts 18); the Asiarchs (whose task it was to promote the cult of the Emperor) are friendly to Paul (Acts 19.31); the town clerk of Ephesus defends Christians against the charge of profanation (Acts 19.35ff.); the tribune of Jerusalem, Claudius Lysias (Acts 23); and finally, as a prisoner in

" Acts 9.23; 9.29; 13.45-51; 14.26, 19ff.; 16.22ff.; 17.4ff.; 18.6; 18.12ff.; 19.23ff.; 20.18, 19; 21.27-22.30; 23.12; 24.5, 6; 25.3; 26.21; *confer* 2 Cor 11-13; Haenchen 1971, 180.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

The dichotomy proposed by Baur is tempting, although the clash was more than one of Jewish ideologies about the Law and ritual observance. The nature of the conflict is only intelligible if Jewish Christianity saw in Paul's theology something entirely alien to its own position. Luke then writes to soften the dark lines of delineation and sets out, apologetically motivated, to bring the two groups together by making Paul out to be less of a threat to Jewish Christianity than he was. He becomes in Luke's hands a pristine Jew who works within the authoritative context of the Jerusalem "Church." The grounds for conflict are removed and the two streams that dominated early Christianity are made to merge into a united catholic Church.

It is not enough for Luke that Paul is a Jew. He must be an important Jew, trained in Judaism and faithful to his Jewish heritage, a Jew's Jew *par excellence*, or his "Gentile" intrusion into early Jewish Christianity is inexplicable and inexcusable. Luke is aware that Paul's opposition to Jewish Christianity must be overcome if the Church is to be catholicized.

Luke's solution to the "Jewish problem" differs from Paul's since he is far removed from the events (in my view ca. 125 C.E.). He is not nearly

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

in Jerusalem - he would hardly then have been unknown.⁵¹

6. Finally the Paul of Acts does not write letters. He makes speeches.

Between twenty and twenty-five per cent of the words of Acts 13-28 are words put in the mouth of the Apostle in line with the current practice of historians - such as Thucydides, Livy and Caesar. Such practice involved no infraction of ancient literary ethics (Knox 1952, 11, 12).

Peculiar is Luke's ignorance of the *Corpus Paulinum*, a point to which I shall return.

These few examples are sufficient to demonstrate literary rather than historical ingenuity on Luke's part. The least we can say is that much of the information Luke gives on Paul is wrong, either through Luke's ignorance, or because his sources were incorrect, or because he deliberately (for literary, theological and even political purposes) doctored the evidence.

⁵¹ Gal. 1.22 contradicts Acts 9.26-30; Acts 8.3, 9.1; 9.13f.; 9.21; 22.4ff.; 25.4ff.; 26.9ff.; *confer* Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 15.9,10; Eph. 3.8; 1 Tim. 1.13-15. On this problem and different solutions see Bornkamm 1971, 15, who likewise rejects the picture of Paul in Luke as a persecutor in Jerusalem; Haenchen 1971, 297ff.; Cozzalman 1987, 61, 210. For a contrary view: Bruce 1990, 232.

Was Paul Saved? The Question of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

ex- ass, Sabbath day law day, plant-animal clothing, Jew-Greek, etc. Is not the God of Paul the unthinkable mixture of God-man?

2. Paul's apocalypticism calls into question the particularist nature of the Covenant.

3. The Law is displaced by Faith in Christ.

4. The land and the temple do not feature in Paul's theology.

My point is this: whether or not we assign to Judaism a coherent centre, the result with respect to Paul is the same, that is, whether we compare Paul to a particular *kind* of Judaism (for example, Josephus or Philo) or whether we compare Paul to a particular *definition* embracing multifarious Judaisms, Paul emerges as a singularity. Not a single Jewish writer prior to Paul is audacious enough to make the assertions Paul makes regarding the end of Torah and Jewish cultic practice. In this Paul stands a strong, solitary figure.

Was Paul Still? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Judaism in the time of Paul was a diverse religion, difficult to essentialize. Yet even so, Paul seems ill at ease within it. Had I argued for a coherent centre it would have been easier to show that Paul does not subscribe to it. For example, James Dunn (1991, *passim*) identifies four characteristic marks of Judaism in the time of Paul: Monotheism (God is one), Election (A covenant people, a promised land), Covenant focused in Torah, and Land focused in the temple.

Let me assume for the sake of argument that Dunn is correct, that is, that Judaism in the time of Paul was marked by a certain degree of uniformity and that all Jews, irrespective of the particular type of Judaism they embraced would have felt it necessary to support the above four characteristic marks. Does Paul support any of these

"Pillars"? Hardly.

1. Paul's vision of Christ invites a re-definition of monotheism. The relationship of Christ to the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is the problem of Pauline Theology, and indeed it is Judaism's problem with Paul (for example, Leo Baeck 1933, 146f.). Implicit in the Jewish idea of God is the rejection of God-mixtures. In fact, "mixtures" of any kind are forbidden, such as that of man-woman,

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

validity of both the literal and the allegorical level of interpretation.

Both Philo and Josephus rank as the most important Jewish thinkers of the first century. However, as with Paul, they must be used with great caution for reconstructing a picture of first century Judaism. The idiosyncratic voices of a handful of Jewish intellectuals may prove negligible for our understanding of Judaism. Josephus, like Paul claims to be a Pharisee, but he would have been seen as a traitor by a large portion of the devout Jews. Philo is so steeped in Hellenism that his fidelity to Judaism is, in my view, radically called into question.

Yet even so, the atypical Jewish Philo and Josephus are more typically Jewish than Paul. The primary motivating factor for their writings is the desire to justify Judaism to the world around it, to lend it credibility. Their literature is apologetic and propagandist in form, designed to show that the Jews possess all that is most valuable in Greek thought. Clearly both represent the struggle of lesser nations within the greater Graeco-Roman context to achieve recognition and status of the greater culture. Paul's theology on the other hand is an apologetic against Judaism. He wishes to show that Judaism is now obsolete. Such a perspective is alien to Josephus and Philo.

Was Paul Sadr? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Vespasian's rise to power aided in his release in 69 C.E., when he was liberated and sent to Alexandria with Titus until the fall of Jerusalem. He then settled in Rome where he received Roman citizenship and a pension. His ambiguous role of Jew/Roman was viewed suspiciously by both groups. This stance comes through clearly in *Contra Apionem* which is *pro gentes*, and is an attempt to present an intelligent apology for Jewish history, culture and religion. He was fluent in Aramaic, Greek and Latin.

Philo of Alexandria was born to a wealthy Jewish family. He was trained both in Jewish tradition and in Greek philosophy. Relatively little is known about his life, but he did go to Rome ca. 40 C.E. at the head of a delegation sent to lay before the Emperor Caligula the grievances of Alexandrian Jews who refused to worship the imperial images. His work is important in that it gives an insight into the nature of a flourishing Jewish community of the diaspora. Philo's genius lay in the synthesis he attempted to forge between the Pentateuch and the philosophical wisdom of the Greeks, in particular that of the Middle Platonists, Aristotle, and the Stoics (above all Posidonius). Like Paul, Philo knew almost no Hebrew and his biblical interpretations are based exclusively on the LXX. His biblical hermeneutic maintains the

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

These few examples shatter any stereotypical picture of Judaism. It was a dynamic context into which Christianity was born. The difficulty lies in placing the movement. Can Christianity be accused of infidelity to a religion that had not yet defined its borders or developed a normative framework? If the Qumran Sect, Pharisaism, Philo, Josephus, etc., all count as legitimate types of Judaism struggling towards self-definition, then Christianity (and Paul in particular) is justified as standing alongside them as yet another "type."

How then does Paul feature within this diversity? Does his Jewishness alone entitle him to be spokesperson for Judaism? A comparison between Paul and other forms of Judaism is particularly welcome in the case of the writer of 4 Ezra (which will follow), but for now comparison of Paul with two of his more important Jewish contemporaries is necessary.

Josephus was a Jewish priest of aristocratic descent. Although he was a resolute defender of Jewish history, religion and culture, he was also pro-Roman. In 66 C.E. the Sanhedrin placed him in command of Galilee, where he failed to curb Jewish extremists. In 67 C.E. he was besieged at Jotapata and taken prisoner. His apparent prophecies about

vividly depict the vindictive nature of the Messiah's actions: he will in the strength of God's spirit destroy, purge, smash, and shatter (17.22-24). The object of such action is not merely the foreign enemy, the Romans, but also the puppet authorities in Jerusalem, the Hasmonians. However, although the Messiah's kingdom clearly has political implications, is not solely political. Rather, it combines spiritual and political aspirations. What is foretold is a kingdom where the ritual purity and ceremonial observances are restored to a level of righteousness (1.8; 2.3,5; 7.2; 8.12; 17.45). The means of such restoration is the establishment of Israel in terms of her ancient tribal system (17.28), something not to be achieved by violent revolutionary means, but rather by the divine intervention of the Lord himself, acting through his anointed.

For he will not rely on horse and rider and bow, nor will he collect gold and silver for war. Nor will he buy hope in a multitude for a day of war. The Lord himself is his king, the hope of the one who has strong hope in God (Psalm 17.33-34).

The Messiah is described as righteous, compassionate and even sinless (17.36). He holds the offices of King (17.21,32,42), Judge (17.26-29,43) and Shepherd (17.40-41) respectively. Since the writer is hostile to the Hasmonians, the notable exception is that of Priests.

Enoch, for example, presents a future guarantor of righteousness, a revealer of cosmic secrets, and the supreme judge who "shall loosen the reins of the strong and crush the teeth of sinners" (48:4). He is the staff for the righteous and the light of the Gentiles (48:4; confer Luke 2:32). He is to set in motion the final eschatological day when the wicked are extirpated and the righteous vindicated. Although the sphere of his authority is nothing less than divine, he is clearly a figure who will establish a new socio-political order. He judges and condemns the *status quo* in the form of the ruling class: kings, governors, high officials, etc. His messianic role is to ensure that sinners are punished: economic exploiters, political oppressors, and the socially unjust.

The Psalms of Solomon, written after the Romans conquered Palestine in 63 B.C.E. under Pompey, tries to come to terms with the latest military invasion in terms of apocalyptic messianism. There is more substance to the idea of the Messiah in the Psalms of Solomon than in any other extant Jewish writing. In Psalms of Solomon 17 and 18, the Messiah is identified as the Son of David (17:21), who will establish his rule over Israel. Depending on traditional texts such as Psalm 2 and Isaiah 11, a series of destructive verbs is employed by the writer which

separatist mentality (for example, at Qumran).

Jubilees, for example, was written during the Hellenistic crises of that period and provides an original source for the study of social, political, and religious views of one group of Hasidim during this period. The problem facing the author is the perceived threat of the mutual assimilation of Greek and Jewish culture, which he sees proliferating in Palestine. The approach to non-Jews is a no-nonsense one: unconditional separation.²⁴

Jubilees (ch. 23) points to one struggle among Jews to reject the pressures of Hellenization. Others saw a solution to the problem in terms of an otherworldly eschatological hope. Apocalyptic, with its radical dualism, resurrection of the dead, final judgement, vindication of the righteous and eternal punishment of the wicked, and especially the existence of messianic figures, like the so-called "Son of Man," proved to be a way for Jews to transcend the limitations of their marginalized position. (Paul's relationship to this type of apocalyptic is important and will shortly be given due consideration).

²⁴ Jub. 22.16; 22.4,20; 25.1; 27.10; 30.1-15.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Righteousness", a priest of Zadokite lineage originally leads his community (constituted by priests), into the Judean desert, who had been expelled (or had left) Jerusalem, ca. 150 B.C.E. Their exodus is seen to have been caused by the so-called "Wicked Priest" who is probably to be identified with Jonathan (c. 160-143), who accepted appointment as high priest from the hand of the Syrian King Alexander Balas (1 Macc. 10:18-21). Qumran literature is a cultic apologetic against this "Wicked Priest" who usurped the right of the "Teacher of Righteousness" to succeed as high priest after the death of Alcimus.

The death of Alexander the Great in 322 B.C.E. gave birth to an aggressive Hellenism. Jews struggled against it in different ways. By the beginning of the second century B.C.E., the Greek language and culture were widely spread over Judea. The revolt of the Maccabees against the extreme Hellenization of Antiochus Epiphanes obstructed the spread of Greek religion in Palestine, but not that of Greek culture. Some Jews sought assimilation. Often thoroughly Jewish convictions are wedded to profoundly Hellenistic perceptions. Josephus and Philo are not the only examples of this. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha abounds with Greek influences, not to mention others from Babylon, Egypt, Persia, Syria, Parthia and Rome. Other Jews maintained a strict

posture is marked. The plethora of cultural demands in the form of historical changes undermined the likelihood of a "normative" type of Judaism tied to the temple. The dramatic nature of the war of 66-70 C.E. made things easier. The struggle towards self-definition along cultic lines was irrevocably abandoned. A number of important Jewish sects perished with the war, including the Sadducees and the Essenes. The Rabbis replaced the priests as leaders; the synagogue finally replaced the temple as the focus of Jewish life, and Jamnia (Yavneh) became the centre of Rabbinical learning and the seat of the Sanhedrin. This change was more acute in Palestine, since the synagogue had been *de facto* the centre of religious life in the Diaspora for a long time.

Although it is true that there existed concrete opposition to the temple in much of the Jewish literature before 70 C.E. in the form of non-specific eschatological speculations of a future heavenly temple and as a more concrete attack on the cultus itself, the focus of the attack was not the legitimacy of the temple *per se*, but the legitimacy of the ruling priestly aristocracy who had monopolised the temple and who were guilty of corruption at the highest levels.

This is notably shown at Qumran where the "Teacher of

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

The consensus as it stands, cannot entirely be sustained since Judaism's existence seems to have been centralised in the temple cultus and a ruling body of Jews existed under the name *Beth Din Hagadol* ("The Great Law House"). The official "Sanhedrin" (from the Greek "sitting together") only came into being after 70 C.E. Although the existence of an establishment is different from a normative theological system, is it conceivable that discernible patterns of culture and history exist without corresponding patterns of religion?"

After the partial destruction of the temple by the Seleucids in 167 the temple served ironically to be the unifying force of early Judaism, and yet it also tended to spawn differences, as the struggles for control, and the corruption within the priesthood, produced opposition. The scrutiny from those who opposed any seemingly accommodating

"It could be argued that Greek and Roman religion likewise had no sense of theological homogeneity since religion was more a matter of cultic duty, *pietas*, rather than *credo*, i.e., the question of the devoted Jew was "What must I do?" and not "What must I believe?" This solution is simplistic, since it implies that religion in the ancient world was a-rational. We must beware too of interpreting Jewish religion in terms of its Graeco-Roman counterparts. The entire biblical tradition and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha show some concern for theological correctness, i.e., correct kinds of "God-talk." The cultus did not exist in a vacuum.

Judaism arose much later. The strain that represented Judaism's future and that after the destruction of the temple, the Pharisaic movement, was only one variety of Judaism among others.

The consensus depends on the assumption that the literature in question reflects widespread Jewish beliefs inside and outside Palestine²² in the first century. Since it fails to testify to any normative form of Judaism, it is believed that no such form existed. Furthermore, the tendency to interpret pre 70 C.E. Judaism on the basis of the religion that developed after it is rejected, that is, from the main bodies of Rabbinic literature: the Mishnah, Tosefta, Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds and the Midrashic collections.²³ This later Judaism (like Christian literature after 70 C.E.) is believed to be furnished with polemical motifs that disqualify it from being a reliable source for the period in question. If some continuity of religious traditions is preserved, and if there does exist some discernible link between the religious strains of pre 70 C.E. and post 70 C.E. theology it is a covert one.

²² A word used for convenience. There was no Palestine at the time. The Romans called the whole land (including Galilee etc.) *Iudaea*. It is called the land of Israel in Matthew 2. 20, 21.

²³ Davies 1965 is, in my view, guilty of this.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

ἡμετέρας προφητείας) is in the perfect tense and points to a definite experience in the past, the effects and implications of which are still being felt in the present: "I have been nailed to the cross with Christ, and am still hanging there with him" (Dunn 1993, 144).¹⁰ A direct correlation then between Paul's experience of "revelation" and that of "crucifixion" is made, an interpretation confirmed when we consider that the crucified Christ becomes the focus of Paul's gospel and the basis for his peculiar apostleship.¹¹

How Paul saw himself crucified with Christ is uncertain. The symbol of the cross has become so profoundly innocuous that its "shock value" has become almost negligible. We need to understand Paul's remarks within the Graeco-Roman context where crucifixion was considered an abhorrent form of capital punishment (Hengel 1986, 93-183). The identification then appears as a profound, if somewhat chilling form of "sacred-violence."¹² This violence is only intelligible if it is founded

¹⁰ It is instructive to compare "in me" in Gal. 2.20 ("it is Christ who lives in me") with "in me" of Gal. 1.15a: "God was pleased to reveal his son in me." *Confer* Eph. 3.3. "The mystery was made known to me by revelation"; 1 Cor. 15.8 "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared to me". Also Eph. 1.9,17; 3. 4-6; Col. 1.26f.; 2.2.

¹¹ 1 Cor. 1.2; 2 Cor. 4.10; 12; Rom. 6.5-11; 7.4; 10.9; Phil. 2.11; 3.10; 4.14; 5.11; 6.14; 6.17.

¹² I owe the term to Hamerton-Kelly 1992.

grammarians are often semantically superficial). In Gal. 1.15-16 where Paul says ὅτι δὲ ἐβόκησεν ὁ θεὸς ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, God is the subject of the revelation and the Son its content.

Paul's experience points to a profound religious confrontation with Christ that is visionary in nature, and yet involves an "inner" revelation (ἀποκάλυψις has this double meaning); that is, the experience is not merely "objective," but is presumed to take place in Paul (the phrase ἐν ἐμοί is locative).¹²

A clue to unravelling the mystery of Paul's ἀποκάλυψις is to be found in Gal. 2.19, 20. ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω Χριστῷ συνστρώσωμαι ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ ζῆ δὲ ἐμὸς Χριστός. Although Paul often uses the first person to suggest that his experience be prototypical for all Christians, here it is not merely rhetorical, but means first Paul himself, although it is true that others may share in his experience.¹³ The verb συνστρώσωμαι

¹² Of interest, is the brief remark in the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* 17.19.4, that Christ stayed with Paul for an hour and instructed him. The information may reflect a tradition before the Homilies.

¹³ Gal. 5.24, confer 6.14; Rom. 6.6, 8.13.

change. The one assertion Paul makes about his experience has a parallel in Luke, that he saw the Lord: "not only do the Acts accounts not mention this fact, they all exclude it" (Knox 1982, 97). This appearance was important to Paul since it qualified him as an apostle. The deutero-Pauline material is dependent on secondary traditions and has little or no historical value, and so one is left attempting to piece together statements, inferences and suggestions spread over the authentic Pauline corpus.

ἀποκαλύπτει is predominantly a Pauline word (13 out of 18 occurrences in the New Testament). It denotes a disclosure from heaven, with heavenly authorities, usually of heavenly secrets.² The word is regularly used with eschatological reference³ (Dunn 1993, 53). The phrase δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is ambiguous since the genitive could be objective (an appearance of Christ himself) or it could be subjective (a revelation from Jesus Christ). Taking it as objective is best (bearing in mind that the distinctions created by

² Acts 9.15-16; 15.1-3; Gal. 1.1, 17.19; 2.1-10; Rom. 1.1; 11.13; 1 Cor. 1.1; 4.9; 9.1-5; 15.7ff.; 2 Cor. 1.1; 4.6; 11.5; 12.11-12; confer Eph. 1.1; 1 Thess. 2.6; 1 Tim. 1.1; 2.7; 2 Tim. 2.1; Tit. 1.1.

³ 1 Cor. 4.6, 26; 2 Cor. 12.1.7; Gal. 2.2.

⁴ E.g. Rom. 2.5; 8.19; 1 Cor. 1.7; 2 Thess. 1.7.

⁵ Gal. 1.12; 2.2; confer Eph. 1.17; 3.3; 2 Thess. 1.7.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

F. Was Paul "Crucified"? The Nature of Paul's Revelation

Paul's ἀποκαλύψις, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal. 1.12) is important for interpreting his relationship to Jewish Christianity. The revelation is attested by three independent sets of witnesses: Paul himself,²⁷ Luke,²⁸ and the deutero-Paulines.²⁹ I intend to show that this revelation confirms my belief of Paul's dissonance with Judaism.

Paul's ἀποκαλύψις is only intelligible in the light of his experience of "crucifixion" which has no Jewish parallel. My approach is speculative for although a distinctive pattern arises in all our witnesses regarding the external facts of Paul's ἀποκαλύψις (previous life in Judaism, the conversion, $\rightarrow$ to the Gentiles, etc.) the exact nature and psychological origins of Paul's experience remain largely inaccessible to us. Luke's magnificent triple reconstruction of the events cannot be trusted. Only two significant parallels feature in both accounts. Damascus features and Paul is seen as a persecutor who experiences a revolutionary

²⁷ 1 Cor. 9.1; 15.8,11; 2 Cor. 12.1ff.; Gal. 1.1, 11-17; Phil. 3.4-13; Rom. 7.8,2.

²⁸ Acts 9.1-19; 22.1-21; 26.2-23.

²⁹ Eph. 1.9; 3.3,4-6; Col. 1.26f.; 2.2; 1 Tim. 1.12-14.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

subservience to tradition, but it does imply a creative interaction which takes the religion of his predecessors seriously enough to refuse the temptation to do theology without them. In order for Paul's vision of Judaism to be legitimate for Judaism, it must be related to the historical progression and continuity of the thought and life of Judaism. In my view, and in the view of Judaism, and, above all, in the view of Paul it is not:

For you have heard how I used to act when I was a Jew, how excessively I persecuted the Church of God and tried to destroy it, and went further in the Jewish faith than many contemporaries, of my own kind, since I was an extreme zealot for the traditions of our fathers. But when he summoned me by his grace... (Gal. 1:13, 14)

No matter what Paul once may have been, in his mind, he is no longer that.

D. Summary of Paul's Jewish Paul

Paul's claim to Israel's heritage is not in itself proof of his Jewishness or fidelity to Judaism. His attitude to Judaism is both ambivalent and filled with inconsistencies which call into question the very claims he doggedly defends. The presence of Jewish ideas and language in Paul's writings points to a process of *hellenization* whereby Paul arrogated his place within Jewish Christianity and appropriated its Jewish world view in order to transform it along the lines of his missionary ambitions.

Those who insist on Paul's Jewishness are resorting to *petitio principii*. At the end of the day it is really a question of fidelity to Judaism. Within the broad kaleidoscope of Jewish colours Paul is not at home. His point of departure is too radical. He either misunderstands Judaism or deliberately misinterprets it. He fails to fulfil an obligation to work within the framework set by the diverse Judaism of the period. By doing so he forfeits his right to call the resultant theology Jewish for it has disregarded a history essential to that identity. This does not mean that Paul would be expected to show an unqualified and so uncritical

Was Paul Sincere? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

"apostle." He therefore invented * himself along Jewish lines (the final brush strokes were made by Luke), claiming to have been a Jew all along. Paul the Hellenist makes his conversion to Christianity and then sets in motion a process by which he seeks to transform its essential message from (in his view) a narrow and provincial one to a universal one. If I am right, it means that Paul's encounter with Judaism was only ever an indirect one, through the prism of Jewish Christianity. This would explain Paul's ignorance of and disregard for central Jewish ideas.

²⁰ Did Paul do this wittingly? Was he aware of his actions? These questions are difficult to answer since Paul's psychology is a matter of speculation. A colleague in the Religious Studies department at the University of the Witwatersrand, Edward Antonio, has suggested to me that Paul's falsification could be interpreted in terms of ideology and Paul's political unconscious. That would imply that Paul was sincere but politically deluded. I adopt a similar view in the latter part of my thesis.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

proves nothing of Paul's ostensible dependence on Judaism for that idea. Fundamental differences in the two notions defy any dependence (21, 81).

Why then does Paul tie himself to Judaism? Paul presents himself as a Jew since he wishes to stake a claim in relation to Jewish Christianity. With that claim he hopes to assert his position as an insider and then go on to work the essential transformation, the de-Judaizing of Christianity along Hellenistic lines.

I go further than Macoby who asserts that Paul was an "uneasy convert" to Judaism (183), and further too than Levin (in a private letter), who believes that Paul was a Jew but only on his father's Benjamite side. I hold that before his conversion to Christianity, Paul probably had no direct association with Judaism. He embraced it only after his conversion and interpreted it through the prism of the Hellenistic Christianity he had learned at Antioch. Here he became acquainted with Jewish Christianity and not Judaism *per se*. Later he came to despise this form of Christianity for its commitment to Torah and its narrow concern for Israel alone, and yet he could not act without its sanction for that would discredit his position as an

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

and Jacob? The Greek gods were more than adequate, they were incarnated, they died and could rise again, they could be mystically appropriated, they were divine and had human qualities. All the elements were there for Paul's theology to flourish. Why complicate matters by adopting the tribal deity of a people who were obscure and strange by Graeco Roman standards? The only reasonable answer for Hengel, is that Paul was a Jew who had no choice but to take the God of Israel seriously. If he had not been a Jew, his concern to conciliate Jews would prove absurd. As a Hellenist, Paul would have had no reason to defend his Gentile mission to Jews - it could hardly then be called a "mission". Furthermore, Paul's conflict in Galatians with the apostles in Jerusalem is only intelligible if the question of his Jewishness is taken for granted.

The above argument fails, however, since Paul does not have to be Jewish to show an interest in Judaism. What we find in Paul is the process of *Judaization*,² "the clothing of un-Jewish ideas with a Jewish vocabulary" (Maccoby 1991, 79, 80, 130). The fact that Paul uses language conducive to Judaism proves nothing. For example, the fact that Judaism also had a doctrine containing the word "resurrection"

² I owe the term to Maccoby.

from non-Jewish converts, "Hellenist intellectuals hovering on the fringes of Judaism" (Maccoby 1991, 180). The latter position would undermine Maccoby's belief that Paul's relationship to Judaism was a non-essential one.

The real antecedents of Pauline Theology, for Maccoby, are not to be found in Judaism (whether it is Rabbinic or pre-Rabbinic) but Gnosticism and in the mystery religions. What is particularly un-Jewish about Paul's theology is its doctrine of salvation which finds no parallel in Jewish literature, canonical or otherwise (39-42). Central to this doctrine are the following: the hopeless moral condition of mankind; the descent of the divine saviour into a human body; the violent death of the divine saviour; the resurrection, immortality and divinity of the crucified saviour; the vicarious atonement effected by the divine death by those who have faith in its efficacy; and the promise of resurrection and immortality to devotees of the Saviour (chap. 3).

Martin Hengel is of the opposite conviction. The burden of proof, he feels, lies with those who deny Paul's Jewishness (Hengel 1991, 1983). Hengel has a point. After all, what on earth would Paul want with the God of this people called the Jews? Why the God of Abraham, Isaac

Was Paul Sack? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Gnosticism) functioned as a rival, and as a counter to the Jewish attempt to appropriate the Hellenistic supreme deity as identical with the God of Judaism (Maccoby 1991, 31).

Josephus, says Maccoby, bears witness to this type of Hellenistic anti-Semitism. In *Contra Apionem* Josephus justifies Judaism philosophically to counter anti-Semitic attacks which made themselves felt in many important historians, notably Apion of Alexandria. Gnostic anti-Semitism must be understood in relation to this type of anti-Semitism, and yet it represents a stage beyond it (Maccoby 1991, 32-36). Paul was himself influenced by this Gnosticism, and yet he too represents a further development.

Mere dislike of the Jews, or resentment of their religious pretensions could lead to some vicious anti-Semitic attacks by authors writing in Greek and Latin; but once the idea appeared, as it did for the first time in Gnosticism, that the Jews were the representatives of the wrong side in a war of cosmic scale, the way was opened to the diabolization of the Jews, and to schemes for their suppression or elimination. If the Gnostic dualistic scheme were to be taken over by some group who placed a higher valuation than the Gnostics on events taking place in this world, the Gnostic disdain could easily be transformed into a bitter enmity fraught with drastic consequences. This is precisely what happened in Christianity (Maccoby 1991, 37).

In order for Maccoby's argument to succeed it is important that he shows that Gnosticism evolved directly from mainstream Judaism, and

²⁶ The successor to Theon as head of the Alexandrian School.

3. *Why the Jew? The Process of Judaization*

Hyam Maccoby in *Paul and Hellenism* (1991) makes an attack on the "Jewishness" of Paul from another angle by asserting that Gnostic anti-Semitism is an important antecedent to Pauline Theology (and by implication to Pauline anti-Semitism). By "Gnostic anti-Semitism", Maccoby means the disparagement of the claim that Jews are the chosen people of God. This disparagement assumes three principal forms: demotion of the Jewish historical record, demotion of the God of Judaism, and denigration of the Torah.

Maccoby interprets biblical Gnosticism as a pre-Christian phenomenon that arose out of a group of marginal Jews. On examination, Gnostic texts reveal that Gnosticism could not merely have arisen as a response to Christianity since the type of anti-Semitism encountered there is not typically Christian. Many Gnostic texts betray a deep knowledge of Judaism and yet inherent denigration as well. This would imply that Gnosticism emerged from a group of Jewish proselytes who were sufficiently attracted to Judaism to consider it seriously enough, and yet equally frustrated by Jewish claims that they (the Jews) were the chosen people of God.

Gnosticism (or, rather, the biblically-inspired notions of

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

redeemed us from the curse of the Law by becoming a curse for us" (Gal. 3.13). The thesis formulated in Galatians, Torah is out, Faith is in, is Paul's central hermeneutic.³³

The difference between Paul and 4 Ezra is nowhere more clearly illustrated than in their use of the themes of grace and mercy. In 4 Ezra 8, the author disputes with an angel in a "Pauline way." He argues that sin is in some way the presupposition of grace:³⁴

But it is because of us sinners that you are called merciful. For if you have desired to have pity on us, who have no works of righteousness, then you will be called merciful.

Ezra is concerned with the eternal punishment of the wicked, and he "struggle[s] with the problem of reconciling God's mercy with the destruction of the wicked" (Charlesworth 1983, 517). His bountiful view of the compassion of God (7.62-70) is not shared by the angel who tells him to be more concerned with his own state, since the wicked get what they deserve (8.57-5.36). There is no room here for

³³ In this regard see Hubner 1984, who focuses his attention on perceived shifts between Paul's positions on the Law in Galatians and Romans, the latter presenting, in Hubner's view, a more mature and sane reflection. Confr. Raisanen 1983, who has persuasively argued that Paul's view of the Law is riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions; Westerholm 1988, 93-101.

³⁴ Confr. Rom. 3.19-26; 9.15ff.

Was Paul Sincere? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

that the fruit of the Law remains.

1. Man receives the Law (as the ground receives a seed).
2. Through disobedience the Law dies, that is, the seed planted in the ground. (Although he does not explicitly say the Law dies, this is the only logical inference to be drawn from his analogy.)
3. The death of the Law (the seed) causes man too to perish, something we would not expect since the ground that contains seed does not die when the seed does.
4. The conclusion of the argument: "the Law, however, does not perish but survives in its glory," is not supported by the facts adduced by the argument itself, but contradicts 2.

4 Ezra's view of the Law hardly is negative. Rather it is a courageous, but unconvincing attempt to account for the Law's (seeming) failure to prevent sinfulness.

For Paul on the other hand, Christ is the "end of the Law": "Christ

2. Paul modifies the traditional apocalyptic view of the escalation of the forces of evil in the end time.

3. Paul rarely uses the term "kingdom of God".

Paul does not engage in apocalyptic timetables, descriptions of the architecture of heaven, or accounts of demons and angels. He does not relish the rewards of the blessed or delight in the torture of the wicked (Beker 1989, 145).

4 Ezra which dates to the last decade of the first century C.E. is often said to resemble the thought and diction of Paul. Schweitzer (1956) makes much of the parallels. Yet, apart from the objection that Paul antedates 4 Ezra, the comparison is off the mark.

The question of the seeming failure of the Law is addressed by 4 Ezra in 9.31-36 (compare 14.30). The similarity in language is superficial and the conclusions reached by Paul and 4 Ezra regarding the function of Torah are very different. The writer begins by quoting a failed promise of deity: "For I sowed my Law in you, and it shall bring forth fruit in you, and you shall be glorified through it forever." (The quotation is drawn from 2 Esd. 3.19-20.) Why has God failed to deliver on his promise? ("Those who received it perished.") 4 Ezra attributes this to no failure by the Law, but to human disobedience. By means of analogy he argues

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

4. Paul's idea of history as the distinction between this age and the coming age expressed in the bifurcal nature of the resurrection: the NOW (the Christ event) and the not yet (the resurrection of the dead, judgement, cosmic and universal consummation of all things and the triumph of God).

5. Paul's pessimism and otherworldly hope.

6. Paul's attitude towards sin as an active "power".

7. Paul's rejection of the Law for justification.

8. Paul's theology of predestination (Beker 1989, 149ff.; 1980, chap. 8).

These points taken alone could provide compelling evidence for Paul's apocalyptic world view. However, Paul's version of apocalyptic is modified in at least three significant areas:

1. Paul does not use traditional apocalyptic terminology.

has been recently followed by Beker (1989) who argues for a revision of Pauline Theology with apocalyptic as its "coherent centre."

What are the central convictions of these "Pauline apocalyptists?"

Briefly, they argue that Pauline theology has its roots firmly within the soil of Rabbinic Judaism which until the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. was not strictly separable from apocalyptic Judaism. The depiction of a "pure" form of Pharisaic Judaism and a corrupt, lesser form of apocalyptic Judaism, articulated by scholars like G. F. Moore and W. Bouasser is rejected (Beker 1980, 137ff.) So too is the sharp delineation of so-called messianism and apocalypticism. Ideas prevailing in apocalyptic literature, especially those in 4 Ezra, 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, and the Wisdom of Solomon, are compatible with Paul's own and the following points of convergence are made:

1. Paul's unflinching belief in the imminent return of Christ.
2. Paul's belief in the resurrection of Jesus as the prototypic apocalyptic awakening of God's cosmic drama.
3. Paul's cosmic and anthropological dualism.

Was Paul Sad? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

G. Summary of Paul's Crucifixion

In the preceding sections we saw that it is common for Pauline scholars to minimise the dramatic nature of Paul's conversion experience. This is undesirable if only for the fact that Paul himself presents that experience in such a dramatic way. When he portrays himself as "crucified", the identification with Christ has a twofold effect. Firstly, it locates Paul's experience of faith within the sphere of God's eternal mystery and excludes the possibility that faith has its locus in the Flesh or the Law. Secondly, Paul thereby sets his experience of Christ apart from the experience of Jewish Christianity and sets out to establish his independence of the Law and ritual observance. (Confer my excursus, Section 5.)

H. Was Paul an Apocalypticist? The Christological Factor

Attempts were first made by Albert Schweitzer to find some place for Paul within the world of Second Temple Judaism, but where to situate this idiosyncratic Jew? The answer came from beneath the broad banner of "apocalyptic". More recently, Davies, Schoeps and Käsemann have asserted Schweitzer's position. Käsemann argued that "apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology" (Käsemann 1969, 102). He

his arguments (Koester 1990, 52-55).⁴ Only six explicit references to sayings or traditions may derive from Jesus.⁵

Paul's crucified Jesus is strictly mystical which would explain his reticence in revealing his experience to others and his opposition from Jerusalem. Paul never saw Χριστὸν κατὰ σάρκα, nor did he consult at any length with those who did.⁶ This became problematic for Paul's opponents in that it became a weapon they used to cast doubt upon his apostleship since the ability to bear witness to the resurrected Jesus was the indispensable foundation of apostleship (Barrett 1971, 201).

Although Paul claims to have seen the Lord, his revelation is utterly unique. It is not a traditional resurrection appearance κατὰ σάρκα but an ecstatic vision of the crucified Christ κατὰ πνεῦμα. As such it stands independent of the experience of James, John, Cephas and the rest.⁷

⁴ Levin's remark is more cogent: "Paul launched Christianity in the name of a figure, Jesus, long dead and in no position to protest" (in a personal letter).

⁵ 1 Cor. 7:10-11, 25; 9:14; 11:23-26; 14:37; 1 Thes. 4:15-17.

⁶ 1 Cor. 9:1; 1:1; 15:8-10; 2 Cor. 10-13; Acts 1:22.

⁷ I do not, however, mean to imply that Paul's *theologia crucis* exclude his equally prominent *theologia resurrectionis*.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

It is fleshly knowledge that Paul repudiates; this means that the view, based on a false interpretation of this verse, that Paul had no interest in the Jesus of history, must be dismissed (Barrett 1973, 171).⁴⁰

Bultmann hits closer to home (as he so often does):

Naturally Χριστός denotes, as is obvious in the context, Christ himself, as person. The Christ κατὰ οὐρανόν is Christ as he can be encountered in the world. He should no longer be viewed as such (Bultmann 1985, 156).⁴¹

Schweitzer gave classic expression to the argument:

Where possible he (Paul) avoids quoting anything from the preaching of Jesus, in fact even mentioning it. If we had to rely on Paul, we should not know that Jesus taught in parables, had delivered the Sermon on the Mount, and had taught His disciples the "Our Father." Even where they are specially relevant, Paul passes over words of the Lord" (Schweitzer, quoted in Schoeps 1961, 57).⁴²

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to give full attention to Paul's problematic relationship with the historical Jesus. I disagree with Koester, however, who feels that although explicit references to sayings of Jesus are relatively rare in Paul's letters, they play a certain role in

⁴⁰ Confer Martin 1986, 351.

⁴¹ Confer Schoeps 1959, 106; Brandon 1957, 68.

⁴² The sentiment has been echoed powerfully by Bultmann: "In relation to the preaching of Jesus, the theology of Paul is a new structure" (Bultmann 1952, 189). Also Schoeps: "For Paul, the *logos* of Jesus recede behind the cause of saving events the fact is that Paul preaches "only" faith in Jesus, not the faith of Jesus!" (Schoeps 1961, 57).

Whatever the precise meaning of the term, what is significant is that Paul uses it in the context of Christ's appearance to him. Again a causal relation between Paul's revelation and his physical disfigurement is forged. (The result of ecstatic crucifixion?) Furnish says convincingly: "Untimely born refers to some kind of unusual birth and may have been first used about Paul's conversion by his critics (in Meeks 1993, 2160). The meaning would then be something like this: "Last of all he appeared to me. The result is the abortion you see" ("In the end he appeared even to me. It was like an abnormal birth", NEB).

How does Paul's vision of Christ differ from the other apostles, the guarantors of Jewish Christianity? It has long been noted that Paul's theology of the cross is mystical rather than historical and that Paul shows no interest in the historical processes that led to the death of Jesus. When he speaks of the actual death of Jesus his speech is formulaic (Brandon 1957, 76ff.). Important in this regard is 2 Cor. 5.16: *εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκουμεν*. The attempt to soften the blow of these words by Barrett must be rejected. He takes *κατὰ σάρκα* to be adverbial (qualifying *ἐγνώκαμεν*) rather than adjectival (governing *Χριστόν*) and concludes:

thorn was stuck into my flesh." The noun *οκλῶν* can be used as a synonym for *στραπαζ*, as this is the way both Celsus and Origen, according to Bauer, understood the meaning of the word (Bauer 1979, 756). There seems then to be a direct correlation between Paul's revelation and his injurious thorn in the flesh. If we take *οκλῶν* to mean cross, Paul would be professing to carry the cross of Christ in his flesh as a direct result of his *ἀποκατάστασις*.

In 1 Cor. 15.8f., where Paul lists those to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection, he seems to imply that his vision of Christ was markedly different from that of the other apostles: "Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me. For I am the least of the apostles, unfit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God." *τὸ ἄκρωτον* literally refers to any kind of premature birth (abortion, stillbirth or miscarriage).⁴ According to Bjorck it means a "monster" or "horrible thing," according to Fee "something freakish" (Bauer 1979, 246; Fee 1987, 733). Since it is such an unusual pejorative term and since it occurs with the article, "the abortion," it ought to be seen as a term used by Paul's opponents to mock either his physical appearance (2 Cor. 10.10), or the nature of his conversion or both.

⁴ Especially in the LXX, Num. 12.12; Job 3.16; Eccl. 6.3.

death."

It is likely that there exists some relationship between Paul's ἀποκαλύψεις in Galatians and the ἀποκαλύψεις mentioned in 2 Cor. 12.1: ἐλθόντων δὲ εἰς ὄψαςτας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις. (The plural does not exclude this view.) Following the rest of antiquity, Paul seals his lips on the frontier of telling about his own exposure to great mystery. In accordance with the mystery religions, Paul refuses to divulge his journey into the third heaven since the mysteries are "unutterable" (ἄρρητα): "I heard things that are not to be told, that no mortal is permitted to repeat."⁴⁴ (12.4). Immediately after Paul's revelation in 2 Cor. 12.1-7, mention is made of his "thorn in the flesh." Latimore (1982) captures the directness and vividness of the Greek: "a

experienced ecstasy: Dan. 8.18; 10.2-9; 2 Bar. 9.1; 12.5, 20.5; 47.1; 4 Ezra 5.14-20).

⁴⁴ Also Rom. 6.3-11: "all of us who have been baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into his death we know that our old self was crucified with him." Confer Rom. 7.6; 8.17; Gal. 2.19; Col. 2.12-14; 3.3-4; 2 Cor. 4.10: "always carrying in the body the putting to death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus may also be made visible in our bodies. So death is at work in us, but life in you". Also Gal. 6.14: "May I never boast of anything except the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me, and I to the world." Confer Gal. 5.24; Phil. 3.10; Rom. 8.17; 2 Cor. 1.5ff.; 6.9-10; Phil. 1.12-18; Col. 1.24.

⁴⁵ Confer the "fourteen years" mentioned here in 12.2, with those in Gal. 2.1.

upon a direct experience of Christ's violent death on the cross. Paul says that Christ's crucifixion took place before the eyes of the Galatians, which in turn suggests that their experience closely approximates to his own: "you before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly displayed upon his cross!" (Gal. 3.2).

My interpretation is supported in Gal. 6.17: "I bear ($\beta\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$) the marks ($\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron$) of Jesus branded on my body." $\beta\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ is an obvious allusion to the "bearing of the cross,"⁴¹ while $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron$ alludes to the "wounds" of Jesus. It is possible that by "marks" Paul is speaking about wounds sustained during persecution, but it is hardly certain he means this. The verse points instead to a powerful and violent ecstatic experience of the crucified Christ that may have left Paul with some physical injury.⁴² The identification is taken to its most extreme. Paul is so at one with this Christ that his wounds are identical to those of Christ. A causal link between Paul's conversion and death is forged, a link that serves as the antecedent for Paul's theology of conversion and

⁴¹ Confer the use of this word in John 19.17 and Luke 14.27.

⁴² Paul does experience ecstasies & these are uncommon (he speaks in tongues, 1 Cor. 14.6,18, hears God speak to him and Christ too, 2 Cor. 12.9; Acts 18.9; 22.17, and his preaching and his work are "in the Spirit", 1 Cor. 2.14; 2 Cor. 12.11). Many of the apocalypticists

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

he was that the purpose of the fathers was not to be fair but to be victorious in battle with the heretics. (1987/8, 179-180).

The views of Marcion are not identical with those of his followers, and at times they are far apart. Therefore, when the Fathers allege something to be true of the Marcionites, it is not necessarily true of Marcion, unless the burden of evidence is overwhelming. The method of "dissimilarity" has its shortcomings, but it does have the useful effect of identifying and extrapolating extraneous accretions. The principle when applied to Marcion is more successful than for someone like the historical Jesus, since the Gospels were written by sympathetic followers. The reverse is the case here.

Studies on Marcion have been plagued by their uncritical and unsparing use of ancient sources. Anti-Marcionite literature spans at least five centuries. Care must be taken to avoid indiscriminate cutting and pasting in an eclectic manner all references to Marcion, and then reconstructing him on the basis of this amalgam.

Early dating is not, with Marcion, always the best criteria for ascertaining the most reliable witness. Justin, for example, though more reliable than Clement, is not more reliable than Tertullian, since

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Marcion's theology. Marcion alleged that the opposite was the case: Paul had undergone a metamorphosis at the hands of his opponents because they had wished to forge Paul's ties to the Jewish religion.

In this section I explore the broad implications that Marcion has for the study of Paul. More specifically, I will ask whether or not Marcion's portrait of a Paul who rejects Judaism, may or may not have been a close approximation of Paul's own position. The reason is clear enough: Marcion's un-Jewish Paul supports the Pauline interpretation forwarded in the first part of this dissertation.

Sources for the study of Marcion

No work of Marcion has survived. He is accessible only through the writings of his detractors, from whom we gain a comprehensible, though hardly comprehensive portrait. I treat with scepticism what the Fathers have to say about Marcion for reasons that need little explication. Hoffmann's astute word of caution though should always be borne in mind:

We should not mistake the accusations of Marcion's opponents for the substance of his opinions. The early characterisations are not based on a first-hand acquaintance of the teacher or his work but are without exception construed as attacks on his followers. It was Semler who first recognised the bearing of such animadversions on the nature of the patristic reports, veritable as

III. PART TWO: EXTERNAL EVIDENCE AGAINST PAUL'S JEWISHNESS

In the latter part of this thesis I will be examining the importance of Marcion, the second century heretic for the debate on Paul. The introduction of Marcion into the discussion is perhaps a little abrupt and jarring. After all, not only is it not considered good practice to support Pauline interpretations on the basis of second century sources, but it might be thought that little can be gained from a figure like Marcion who was (and is) unambiguously condemned as mutilator of the Pauline text.

Marcion, however, must be taken seriously since not only was he the first and most important Paulinist to have emerged in the second century, and not only did he force Orthodoxy to reconsider its own interpretation of Paul, but in many ways he holds the keys to two of the most daunting questions facing Pauline scholars: What constitutes the *Corpus Paulinum*? Has this *Corpus* undergone textual redaction and corruption? The early Christian apologists and heresiologists (Tertullian in particular) accused Marcion of corrupting the genuine letters of Paul and removing from them all that did not conform to

4. *Paul transforms Jewish apocalyptic and uses it in his battle against Judaism.*

Apocalyptic is often adduced as proof of Paul's Jewish background. Kasemann argued that "apocalyptic is the mother of all Christian Theology" (Kasemann: 1969, 122). He has been followed recently by Beker (1989) who revises Pauline Theology with apocalyptic as its "coherent center". 4 Ezra, for example, which dates to the last decade of the first century C.E., is often said to resemble the thought and diction of Paul. Close inspection reveals that the parallels adduced are superficial at best and that the conclusions reached by Paul and 4 Ezra regarding the function of Torah are different. Furthermore, Paul does not use traditional apocalyptic terminology, he modifies the traditional apocalyptic view of the escalation of the forces of evil, and he rarely uses the term "kingdom of God". He does, however, develop the idea of a revelation of apocalyptic righteousness bestowed on men through faith apart from the Law (Rom. 1.17ff.). Apocalyptic for Paul obviates the need for Jewish cultic practice, an idea without precedence in Judaism.

that is, the deJudaizing of Christianity along Hellenistic lines.

3. *Paul's "revelation" has no antecedents in Judaism.*

Paul's claims that his gospel and apostleship are received "directly" from Christ himself through some profound mystical and pneumatic experience. The nature of this experience is tied up with Paul's "crucifixion" (Gal. 2). In some dramatic way Paul sees the "Lord of glory" crucified and finds himself a co-partaker in the experience. He claims to carry in his body the cross of Jesus stuck into his side like a thorn, which determines the shape of his entire theology (2 Cor. 12). This crucifixion-revelation is in no way dependant for its content, form or origin upon the tradition of the Jerusalem Church since it is pneumatic rather than historical. Paul's initial attraction to Christianity may have been sparked off by its provision of a crucified figure corresponding to his own experience of crucifixion: "I resolved that while I was with you I would think of nothing but Jesus Christ - Christ nailed to the cross" (1 Cor. 2.2). This experience places Paul at odds with Jewish Christianity which "knew Christ according to the flesh", a claim Paul rejects for himself (2 Cor. 5.16).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

In short, the "Jew from Tarsus" is a literary invention that serves as the womb from which the Orthodox Paul is born.

2. *Paul invents his special relationship to Judaism.*

The Pauline Corpus suggests that Paul cannot be taken at face value when he describes himself as a "Pharisee of Pharisees" (Phil. 3:5). His alleged "Jewishness" must be interpreted within the context of Pauline rhetoric, which finds him forging ties with Judaism in order to stake an apostolic claim in relation to Jewish Christianity. Before his conversion to Christianity, Paul probably had no direct association with Judaism. Later he interpreted Judaism through the prism of the Hellenistic Christianity which he learned at Antioch. Here he became acquainted with Jewish Christianity and not Judaism *per se*. Later he came to despise this form of Christianity for its commitment to Torah and what he perceived to be its narrow concern for Israel alone. Yet he could not continue without its sanction for that would discredit his position as an "apostle". He therefore reinvented himself along Jewish lines (the final brush strokes were made by Luke), claiming to have been a Jew all along. With that claim he hoped to establish his position as an insider and then proceed to work the essential transformation.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Christology not only invites this "distortion," but demands it: "If any man be in Christ there is a new creation, old things are passed away, behold new things have come" (2 Cor. 5:17). Both Paul's religious experience (crucifixion with the mystical Christ) and his theology (apocalyptic defined in relation to this Christ) impose themselves so strongly on Judaism that they become its rivals rather than its friends. Paul's statements are unequivocal: in the new scheme of things there is no place for Torah, ritual observance, etc. In Christ, the New is here.

J. Conclusions to Part One: Summary of Four Theses

1. *Saul was not Paul.*

The writer of Luke-Acts characterizes Paul as a pristine Jew, Saul, whose relationship to Jewish Christianity is constructive. I argue that such a portrait is a literary creation of Luke who (apologetically motivated) gives the impression of a harmonious and undivided Church. He casts Paul as a Greek actor in a Jewish plot played out in a Roman theatre. Paul stands at the boundary of all three worlds, paradoxically Jew, Greek and Roman *per excellence*. Paul represents a universal Christ, sufficiently tied to Judaism to attract monotheistic God-fearers, yet not narrow in his application of "covenantal nomism".

can act and that no human claim has any basis in and of its own right. By inventing apocalyptic as he does, along the lines of Christology, Paul transcends what he perceives to be the narrowness of Jewish apocalyptic with its "I and Thou" mentality (which presupposes the possession and the manipulation of truth), and offers instead a radical gospel of grace with *Christus Victor* at its centre.

For the Son of God, Jesus Christ is not "YES and NO," but in him it is always "YES." For in him every one of God's promises is a "YES." For this reason it is through him that we say the "Amen" (2 Cor. 1.19,20).

This "YES" points solely to the weakness of God in the cross where every human claim is once and for all crucified with the Son of God.

I. Summary of Paul's Apocalyptic

Paul moves in a direction wholly inconsonant with apocalyptic Judaism. Yet he feels justified in doing just this. The Christ-event calls for a redefinition of God that is so radical that it simply does not allow Paul to remain within the framework of Jewish Christianity whose centre was the "Kingdom of God." God is no longer defined as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but as "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." This leads Paul to a distortion of the Torah. Yet

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Ironically, "the anti-enthusiastic battle waged by the apostle is fought under the sign of apocalyptic" (Kasemann 1969, 132). In 1 Corinthians 15.25-28, Paul argues that the resurrection implies the inevitability of Christ's Lordship: He must reign. Yet even this Lordship will inevitably give way to the Lordship of God. Paul writes:

Then comes the end when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father. When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to the one who put all things in subjection under him, so that God may be all in all (1 Cor. 15.28).

Kasemann is correct: "No perspective could be more apocalyptic" (133).

Yet, while Paul uses the categories of apocalyptic, he transforms them and uses them in his battle against Judaism. Namely, apocalyptic righteousness, the decisive content of which is Christ, revealed through faith for faith (Rom. 1.17). In this battle against the Law, the obvious catalyst is not anthropology but Christology.

Paul presents to Judaism apocalyptic defined in terms of a saviour who is crucified and risen. Apocalyptic becomes synonymous with Jesus Christ and Paul goes the way of the "Hellenistic Church." This "Christological apocalyptic" is not merely one "doctrine" among others, but is the theological principle by which Paul believes the Church exists. This principle says that in relation to God, God alone

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

hope, is nevertheless, in a certain manner already a present reality"

(278). He goes as far as to make the present reality the very factor that contrasts the conception of righteousness in Paul and Judaism:

Paul has historicized the Jewish apocalyptic speculation by conceiving the time of the Messiah's reign as the Now in which the proclamation is sounding forth (307).

The Church becomes the eschatological congregation because in it, the present reality of God's salvation is preached. Hope ceases to be a "temporal reality" but is man's freedom and openness for the future. Eschatology exists for man not as a future reality but primarily as a present possibility. As such, Paul is a representative of the Hellenistic Church.

Two problems immediately present themselves if Bultmann is correct.

First, how are we to account for the relics of future apocalyptic in Paul's thought? Secondly, if Paul's theology is consonant with the Hellenistic Church, do we not thereby remove the grounds upon which Paul's conflict with Corinth is based? Klaermann insists that Paul's apocalyptic is a compromise between present and future eschatology. In this way justice is done both to Paul's "anti-Judaic" side and to his anti-enthusiastic side.

sphere, "future eschatology" offers a realistic view of man in the world. Man is made to look forward realising that although his "givenness" in the world is full of ambiguity, nonetheless there exists a future orientation in a substantial and genuine hope centred in God. Käsemann's approach is more convincing than Beker's. He does not (like Beker) suggest that Paul began with a borrowed Jewish apocalyptic (as a result of his alleged Pharisaism), but that out of his anthropology (which is centred in Christology) grew his apocalyptic world view. Käsemann thus can account for the uniqueness of Pauline apocalyptic, and can dispense with causal links in the search for theological antecedents.

Käsemann's concern to interpret Paul anthropologically is consistent with Bultmann's. The difference however is that Bultmann's Paul views present eschatology and not future eschatology as the controlling centre of the Church. For example, the meaning of δικαιοσύνη, according to Bultmann, is "forensic-eschatological" (Bultmann, 1952, 271). It receives the verdict of God in the present life but must also await future verdict of righteousness.¹⁰ However, he diffuses the future verdict by asserting that "the eschatological life, though a matter of

¹⁰ Romans 2.13; 3.26,30; 5.5,19

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

unconditional grace. God is gracious to those who obey his Law and who acknowledge him "in their lifetime" (9-10). Faith and works are for the writer synonymous (9,7).

Ernst Käsemann in a seminal essay titled "Primitive Christian Apocalyptic" (1969) sets out to defend his thesis that "apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian Theology." As a point of departure Käsemann offers an exegesis of 1 Corinthians 15. He says that the community at Corinth oriented all of its theology around the *theologoumenon* *κύριος ἡνιοχός*, the exalted Lord who already rules over the principalities and powers and so over the world dominated by them (Käsemann 1969, 127). This was a "sacramental realism" which saw complete redemption as having already been effected. The result? Charismatic enthusiasm.

Unlike the Corinthians, whose eschatology was swallowed up by a Christological *κοινωνία*, Paul's apocalyptic emerged as a direct implication of his anthropology, a view of man that takes seriously the reality of the present and the hope of future deliverance from it. Unlike the enthusiasts whose "realised hope" results in an unrealistic glorying in a present illusion, where refuge can only be taken in some ethereal

Paulines before Marcion.

Appropos the *Regula Fidei*, Farmer (1984) argues persuasively that Marcion developed his from Gal. 6:16: "And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy also upon the Israel of God." This canon is distinguishable from Marcion's New Testament, but serves as its textual basis, and presupposes the doctrine of two gods, logically derived from Paul's separation of the Law and the Gospel. Farmer argues that the development of the idea of *Regula Fidei* in the writings of the Fathers was largely influenced by Marcion's *Regula Fidei*: "We conclude that the form of the *Regula Fidei* of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen, reflects the response of the Catholic Church to Marcion's *Regula*" (170). Farmer's view is supported by the following passage from Tertullian: "They (Marcionites) allege that in separating the law and the Gospel, Marcion did not so much invent a new rule as refurbish a rule previously debated" (*Adv. Mar.* 1.20.1). Gerhard May unwittingly concedes the same (May 1987/8, 149).

¹¹ On the other hand the remark by Balas is difficult to ignore: since Marcion claimed to have restored the original text, he himself could not have initiated the notion of the canon; Balas 1980 103.

from silence though prove tendentious, and the weight of evidence is such that Marcion must be given the benefit of doubt. There is little substantial evidence for the formation of any ten letter *Corpus*.

Dahl's work forms the basis of an innovative study by John J. Clabaux, *A Lost Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion* (1989). Clabaux gives detailed consideration to Dahl's conclusions, and concludes that if the Marcionite Prologues are not Marcionite they attest to the existence of a ten letter canon prior to Marcion. Through close analysis of Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Adamantius, Clabaux reconstructs certain sure Marcionite readings, removes from them what he considers to be textual alterations made by Marcion (or Marcionites) and unveils 82 secure "pre-Marcionite" readings. He then compares these readings with versions of the New Testament, and finds close relationship between them and the Old Latin and Syriac versions. This leads him to conclude that a pre-Marcionite Pauline canon existed and was widely circulated throughout the Mediterranean. It is the ancestor to the Latin Pauline *Corpus* underlying the Old Latin version, and also the basis for the text used by Marcion. As far as the provenance for Marcion's adoption of the text is concerned, Rome and Syria are presented as possibilities.

Clabaux's thesis cannot be summarily dismissed and must stand the test of close textual scrutiny. However, it cannot really be proved one or the other, unless a ten letter canon predating Marcion were to come to light. There is no evidence from the Fathers for its actual existence, and one wonders why they would have charged Marcion with fabricating a ten letter *Corpus* (as opposed to their fourteen letter corpus) had a ten letter corpus existed before him. Besides, Clabaux's alterations to Marcion's text are subjective and based on a pre-understanding of what must have offended Marcion's theological sensibilities. This leads to a form of circular reasoning. Clabaux reconstructs Marcion's text from the amendments alleged by the Fathers and then deconstructs it according to those very amendments.

Hoffmann is the most daring. He dates Marcion some three decades earlier than Harnack, sees him as the first collector of the New Testament, and the writer of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, which underlies the catholicized canonical Ephesians (Hoffmann 1984, chap. 8). Finally, it may be noted that even the conservative Westcott defended Marcion's claim to be the founder of the idea of a New Testament canon.²⁶

On the whole those who tend to interpret the apostate as a biblical, as opposed to a Gnostic or philosophical theologian, are more inclined to accord him a critical function in the formation of the canon. This not necessary a plausible inference, since the mere fact that Marcion used several letters of Paul, and that his is the earliest evidence for this procedure, does not exclude the possibility that Marcion used a pre-existing text that has not survived (Dahl, May, Clabeaux).²⁷ Arguments

²⁶ *General Survey of the History of the New Testament Canon, 1855-1896.*

²⁷ The essay of Dahl (1978), has in the mind of most, proved that the existence of the so-called "Marcionite Prologues" in the Latin Catholic Bible is best explained without reference to Marcion. The most obvious argument for a Marcionite origin is derived from the order of Paul's letters presupposed by the Prologues, which is identical to Marcion's *Apostolikon*. Dahl feels that this can be explained if we assume "an edition of Paul's letters similar to that of Marcion circulated even outside Marcionite circles" (263).

B. Marcion and the Canon

Marcion's role in the formation of the Bible is a controversial one. Of those who argue that Marcion's role in the formation of the canon is formative, Harnack is the most conservative. He sees Marcion as combating a four Gospel canon, and although not the creator of the canon, the one who gave it its initial impetus (Harnack 1921). Knox thinks Marcion's canon provided the structural principle and became the organising idea of the Catholic New Testament (Knox 1942, 31).

Campanhausen rejects Harnack's view (Campanhausen 1972, 153, 149, 172-173) and believes Marcion to have been the creator of the "idea and reality of the Christian Bible" (148-167). Campanhausen observes that the canonical arrangement of Marcion's canon, a Gospel followed by the *Apostolikon*, is nowhere else attested or attempted before Marcion, something that is only explicable in terms of Marcion's Paulinism (153).

Marcion chose his Gospel because Paul probably had used it (153).

Koester writes similarly: "The employment of the term *canon* as a technical designation for a written document by Marcion appears a revolutionary novelty" (Koester 1989, 381).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

the second century. The Gnostic writings reveal an intricate Pauline theology (Pagels 1975), and the letters of Paul exhibit, if not overt, then latent Gnostic motifs. The judgement of Streeter as far back as 1924 still holds true: "Marcion was the most Christian of the Gnostics" (Streeter 1924: 156). It also seems sure that the Gnostic motifs in Marcion's theology were taken a step further by his followers, especially Apelles. Tertullian attests as much: "Apelles was first a disciple of Marcion and afterwards an apostate" (*de Carne* 1; confer *Adv. Marc.* 3.11.2). Believing that Marcion was a biblical Gnostic is reasonable - like his master Paul.

3

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Gager (1972) asserts that the either Gnostic or biblical approach is too simplistic. Although he does not admit the importance of Cerdo or other Gnostics, Gager feels Marcion possessed some degree of philosophical sophistication (*contra* Harnack), and was influenced by Epicurean Philosophy in particular. This accusation is first levelled by Tertullian in the *Adversus Marcionem* and is supported by Marcion's use of the Epicurean argument from evil: God can be either good or omnipotent,¹⁰ and Marcion's rejection of allegory.

Marcion's theology is not typically Gnostic, lacking mythological and cosmological speculation. Marcion's god is absolutely unrelated to the creator god (not even a genealogical tie), he has no idea of any kind of kinship between man's inner self and the highest good, and he does not believe that salvation comes through Gnosis (Gager 1972, 59). Gager¹¹ is correct that the either a biblical or Gnostic thinker is outdated, and presupposes a false distinction between Paulinism and Gnosticism in

¹⁰ Tertullian alleges that Marcion is forever "tossing over the origin of evil - a preoccupation of heretics *Ex quo enim cum capo mali quattuor, unde malum?*" *Adv. Marc.* 1.2.2.

¹¹ I feel, however, that the charge of philosophical influence by the heresiologists is rooted in "dogmatic anachronism" (see Hoffmann 1987/8, 175).

It is debated by scholars to what degree the Gnostic teachers Cerdo and Saturninus influenced Marcion. The tradition of Marcion's association with Cerdo is supported by Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* 1.27.1), Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 1.2) and by the *Synagoga* tradition. Harnack (1921) would have none of it, preferring to interpret Marcion as a biblical theologian.

The issue is one of the most heated among scholars of Marcion.

Rudolph claims that Marcion's distinctiveness does not remove him entirely from the Gnostic orbit. "he cannot be understood without it and thus belongs to its history" (1983, 313ff.). Gunther agrees:

"Marcion's admiration for Paul does not necessarily make him less of a Gnostic than Cerdo was" (1971, 90). The same position is adopted by Blackman (1948, 69ff.), Aland (1973, *passim*), Balas (1980, 98) and May, whose rejection of Marcion as a biblical theologian is based on the alleged adulteration's in Marcion's text (May 1987/8, 146, 147). Aland says there are three characteristics of Marcion's thought that show a relation to Gnosticism: the sharp distinction between the Creator and the "alien" God, the idea of salvation from the world, and the use and evaluation of the Old Testament. The first two points are worth noting, but the third is plainly wrong, as we shall presently see (Aland 1973, 420-7).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

A. Was Marcion a Heretic?

Marcion, that shrewd Paulinist, grossly misunderstood Paul, corrupted the "authentic" Pauline text, divorced Paul from Judaism, and married Paul to a strange and obscure form of Gnostic philosophy. At least, that is the position of the heresiologists. It is not, of course Marcion's position, and a close reading of our chief source, Tertullian's brilliant *Adversus Marcionem*, brings us face to face with another possibility, alleged by Marcion himself: Marcion stood in close relation to Paul and closely represented his thinking, his *Corpus Paulinum* was the authentic one. Paul originally had no ties to Judaism, and if anything was alien to Paul's thinking, it was Judaism, not Gnosticism.

So important was the challenge Marcion posed to Orthodoxy that for centuries he and his disciples constituted the chief threat to Orthodoxy. Harnack, was perhaps a little too flattering when he described Marcion as "the most important figure in the history of the Church between Paul and Augustine" (Harnack 1989, ix), but no less an opponent than Saint Jerome gave Marcion the epithet "the Master" (*Con. ad. man.*).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

1. Ephraem Syrus (c. 320-73), Eznik of Kolb (5th cent.). Efforts to reconstruct Marcion on the basis of Syrian and Armenian writers have failed (for example, Driver 1987). Apart from the very late dating of these witnesses, they attribute to Marcion undocumented mythological speculation, which would not have escaped the attention of Tertullian had they been part of Marcion's world-view. On Eznik, I refer the reader to Williams (1944); on Marcionism in Syria, Gunther (1971).

2. The *Synagma* Sources. The following three sources: pseudo-Tertullian (*Adversus Omnes Haereticos*), Epiphanius (*Panarion*, 42, ca. 375 C.E.), and Filastrius underlie the lost *Synagma* of Hippolytus. These sources display traits of legendary style, for example, Marcion's "excommunication" by his father, and his "seduction by a virgin" (May 1987-8). Epiphanius' testimony cannot be trusted unless verified by other witnesses. He is the third witness to the *Marcionite Corpus* (after Tertullian and Adaxantius) and the most unreliable. Despite his claim to the contrary, he does not have a copy of the *Apostolikon* at his disposal (Pan. 42).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

5. Polycarp's *Epistula ad Philippianos* (c. 135) - contra Harrison (1936), Knox (1942), and Nielsen (1986) - and the Letters of Ignatius
6. The following books of the New Testament: The Pastorals, Ephesians, Colossians, The Epistles of John, 2 Peter. These books have often been thought to contain either anti-Marcionite or anti-pre-Marcionite polemics, and although this is not only possible but likely, it remains conjecture.
7. The following Apocryphal Writings: The Apocryphal Letter to the Laodiceans (Harnack first proposed the letter was a Marcionite forgery); 3 Corinthians; The Epistle of the Apostles; The Didascalia; The Acts of Paul. The latter could not be appraised without a close examination of its relationship to the Pauline letters, something beyond the scope of this dissertation, although comparing its Jewish portrait of Paul with that of Marcion would be instructive.

Category Two: Sources that for good reason are to be regarded as untrustworthy, either through the late age of the document or the ineptness of its author.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Marcionites on the ground of their own text, which rules out dependence of Adamantius on Tertullian.

Two categories of unreliable sources have been excluded from this study:

Category One: Sources for which there exist no certain proof of Marcionite origin, that is, the inability conclusively to identify Marcion or the Marcionites as those opposed in the work.

1. The "Marcionite Prologues" (Confer Hahl 1978).
2. The Prologues to the Gospels of Mark, Luke, and John (Confer May 1987\8, 132-3; Blackman 1948, 54ff.).
3. The Speech of the Elder used by Irenaeus in *Adversus Haereses* 4.27-32. The speech is best understood apropos Valentinian Gnosis, not Marcionism.
4. The anonymous heretical treatise opposed by Augustine in *Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum* (*ibid.*).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Tertullian works with a copy of Marcion's Antitheses on his desk and claims to be in possession of one of Marcion's letters (*de Car.* 2.14, *Adv. Marc.* 1.2.6; 4.4.3).

Our most valuable sources²⁶ for reconstructing the life and thought of Marcion are these:

Tertullian (c. 160-225): *Adversus Marcionem Libri Quinque* (*Adv. Marc.*); *de Carne Chrute* (*de Car.*); Justin Martyr (c. 100-165): *Prima Apologia* (*Apol.*); *Dialogus Trypho* (Trypho), *Epistula ad Diognetum* (*Diog.*); Irenaeus (c. 130-200): *Adversus Omnes Haereses* (*Adv. Haer.*); Clement (c. 150-c. 215): *Stromates* (*Strom.*); *Dialogue Adamantii* (*Adam.*, 300 C.E.).

This is the second most important witness for Marcion's *Apostolikon* after Tertullian. Although, unlike the latter, no effort to meet the

²⁶ The following are sources of secondary importance: Ignatius (c. 35-107) *Epistulae*; Hippolytus (c. 170-236) *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium*; Origen (c. 185-254) *Contra Celsum*; *Commentarius in Joannem*; Cyprian (d. 258) *Epistola 5. Cyrilli Ad Iubaianum*; *Contra Epistolam Stephan.* *De Haereticis Baptizandis*; *Consilia Carthaginensia*; *Epistula LXX*; Eusebius (c. 260-340); *Historia Ecclesiastica*; Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 315-386) *Catechesis*; *Panarion*; Pseudo-Tertullian *Liber de Praescriptionibus* (*de Praes.*); Jerome (C. 342-420) *passim*. Jerome is not an independent witness, and found his information in one of two sources: Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem* and Origen's Commentary on Galatians (now lost).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

untenable the deliciously tempting view of Harnack (*Neue Studien zu Marcion*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923) and Hoffmann (Hoffmann 1984, 1987:86, 182) that Marcion was a Jew. Harnack suggested that Marcion's juxtaposition of law and faith is based on his resentful departure from his Jewish past. The fact that there was a large Jewish community in Pontus in the second century, and that Jewish scholarship was well established in that province proves nothing. Marcion's belief in two gods is un-Jewish, and presupposes a polytheistic background. Furthermore, had Marcion been Jewish his enemies would have used it to express their incredulity at his rejection of the Old Testament. Tertullian, needless to say, would have had a field day.

Marcion is often branded as the "Jew hater" of the early Church. A vigorous modern example is J. I. Martyn:

Marcion's ontological antitheses, unlike Paul's apocalyptic antinomies, became anti-Judaic, with disastrous results, extending into the anti-Judaism that is yet present in some segments of the Church. Marcion misunderstands Paul, and his misunderstanding, being a matter ultimately of horrible consequence, must not be repeated (Martyn 1988, 8).

believed the Jew! (*videtur vulgus Judaeus*). But then, what other people could be the source of our bad name? (Gal. Nat. 1. 14. 1-2).

Wilson's insists that Marcion's Paul is a distortion since it is based on the exaggerated Paulinism of Galatians and on a "Gnostic" version of Paul current in Asia Minor (52).

Because of Tertullian's anti-Semitism, I am compelled to reject as

Tertullian's anti-Semitism has so ingratiated itself into his arguments that he often insinuates that a position or opponent is wrong simply on the mere fact that it is Jewish. Etroymson in a superb article "Tertullian's Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by association" writes: "The device appears in roughly two thirds of his writings, throughout his career, and against every major opponent" (Etroymson 1985, 26). Compare Etroymson's other article on anti-Semitism among the Fathers, "The Patristic Connection" (1979). I cite three examples of Tertullian's overt anti-Semitism from Etroymson's article (1985). For countless others I recommend a casual reading of any chapter of any of Tertullian's works (translations mine):

"Finally, it would be the kind of thing a Jew would do (*Ceterum, Judaeus fides nostra est*), to believe in God and refuse to consider the Son too. For what other difference would there be between us and that bunch except this disagreement? What need would we have of the Gospel?" (Id: *Praxas*, 31.1-2). Etroymson remarks: "Tertullian thus argues that monarchianism is Jewish; he does not argue that to be Jewish is wrong: *this is assumed*" (Etroymson 1985, 26).

"Though Israel may wash its body parts daily, it is never really clean. Its hands, especially, are always stained red with the blood of the prophets and our Lord himself. Mindful, therefore of this inherited stain of their fathers, they do not dare raise their hands to the Lord, in case Isaiah cry out or Christ abominate them. We, however, not only raise our hands, but spread them out, and imitating the death of our Lord, we confess Christ when we pray" (*Orat.* 2.30).

"Report has introduced a new calumny about our God. Not that long back, a desperate and corrupt man in that city of yours, a man who had even deserted his own religion, a Jew, carried about in public a caricature of us with this label: *Onocrotus*. This figure had the ears of an ass, and was dressed in a toga, with a book. And the crowd

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

3. Marcion's dispute was not with Jews but with Gentile Judaizers

(Rengstorff).

4. Marcion was initially a Jew (Harnack).

5. Marcion was driven primarily by a need to reassess the relationship of Christianity and Judaism following the Bar Cochba revolt (contra

Balas 1980, 99).

Wilson's view is that Marcion's attitude to the Jews was stimulated by Jewish Christian debate. Aware that the interpretation of the Old Testament among the Orthodox Christians was forced and exaggerated, Marcion felt that it undermined the faith and felt himself siding with the intellectual position of the Jews. He therefore takes it on himself to correct the situation (Wilson 1986, 57, 58).

Wilson's article falls short as it fails to concede that Marcion's anti-Judaism is derived logically from his Paulinism. Since Paul is no anti-Judaic, in Wilson's mind, Marcion could not have derived his view from Paul. How then does Wilson deal with Marcion's claim that Paul is the logical antecedent for Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament?

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

offer Marcion's alleged anti-Semitism as an alternative rationale.

Few studies have paid sufficient attention to Marcion's attitude to the Jews. The most reasonable explanation for this has been forwarded by Wilson: "Marcion's anti-Judaism is considered to be so obvious and extreme that it scarcely warrants analysis" (Wilson 1966, 45). Wilson's article redresses the imbalance and observes a curious tension in Marcion's view of Judaism. On the one hand, Marcion denigrates Judaism and the symbols precious to its life and faith. On the other hand "there is little to suggest Marcion was anti-Jewish" (55). What led Marcion to this position? Wilson summarizes some of the major views and they are worthwhile repeating in brief:

1. Marcion's view of the Old Testament speaks from his disquiet of the problem of Theodicy (Blackman).
2. Marcion rejected the God of the Old Testament, not the Jewish people (Goppelt).

confidence of Marcion's "witness" to a particular reading of a text, since his own text underwent several redactions:

- Marcion refused to recognise any corruptions or interpolations in the Old Testament and regarded it as absolutely reliable! (Harnack 1921, 67, 86)

In the light of the above caveats, it seems possible that the Fathers exaggerated or even invented their charges of Marcion's textual infidelity. Tertullian himself fights against this view in many instructive passages where he gives Marcion's view: Marcion had edited the text to rid it of corruption:

He simply amended what he thought was corrupt; though, indeed, not even this justly, because it was not really corrupt (*Adv. Marc.* 4.4). I say that my Gospel is the true one; Marcion that his is. I affirm that Marcion's Gospel is adulterated; Marcion that mine is (*Adv. Marc.* 4.5; *confer* 5.14).

D. Marcion Indisique

Marcion's relationship to Judaism cuts to the heart of this discussion since Marcion argued that his rejection of the Old Testament had its rationale in Paul's own rejection. Since scholars are reluctant to concede that Marcion understood Paul correctly, they are compelled to

revision is given too much attention by modern scholars, who shift the emphasis in Marcion's methods too far in the direction of historical and philological criticism (Campenhausen 1972, 165). If Marcion excised the text, his methods would have been common practice at the time. For example, Matthew and Luke both revised and corrected Mark, and the Fourth Gospel also manipulates his sources. The distinctive feature of Marcion's revision, according to Campenhausen, is that "he nowhere expands his source but on every occasion abbreviates it" (161). One may note that when Marcion wrote, the New Testament was not yet viewed as scripture.

3. Marcion's canon underwent several amendments at the hands of his followers. Tertullian charges that Marcion's disciples are "every day reshaping this Gospel of theirs" (*Adv. Marc.* 4.5.7.; confer *Adam* 2.18.). When Tertullian's Marcionite text of Luke is compared with that proffered by Epiphanius, there is considerable discrepancy. Passages thought to be retained by Tertullian are said by Epiphanius to have been excised, and passages thought by Epiphanius to have been retained have been excised according to Tertullian. This enigma is best explained by the existence of several Marcionite canons which came about after Marcion's death. We can no longer speak with

(Clabeaux 1989, 42-46).

Tertullian often charges Marcion with deleting material from Luke that is not in canonical Luke, but is to be found in Matthew or Mark. For example, the saying of Jesus in Matt. 5,17 about the Law and the Prophets (Williams 1989, 1991). This implies either that Tertullian confused certain passages of Scripture, or that his edition of Luke contained harmonisation with the other Gospels, or that Tertullian's charge that Marcion used only Luke is false.³ However we solve this difficulty, we are left with the some doubt as to the trustworthiness of Tertullian's assignments. Clearly, he was not as informed of the substance of Marcion's Gospel as he purports to be. It is unsure too whether Tertullian uses a Greek (so Zahn) or Latin version (so Harnack) of Marcion's *Apokalypse*. If a Greek version is used, this would still be no guarantee of a more reliable reading, since Tertullian's translations would then be *ad hoc* affairs.

4. Campenhausen makes the point that Marcion's rigorous dogmatic

³ In 1924 Hermann Reiche argued that *Mark* was Marcion's Gospel (cited in Wilson 1933, 136). That this argument could even be made, suggests that we cannot say with any certainty which Gospel Marcion employed.

the following passages were not in Marcion's text of Romans: the pericope in 1.16; 1.19-2.1; 3.31-4.25; 9.15-16 - but think how much that leaves of the epistle *intact*! According to Blackman at least 100 Marcionite readings of the New Testament are dogmatically neutral (Blackman 1948, 51). Many verses from the Old Testament are retained.²⁴ If Marcion wished to edit his canon for theological ends, why so many gaping inconsistencies?

2. Tertullian's allusions to and citations of Marcion's *Apostolikon* cannot be treated uncritically. Many negative characteristics of Tertullian's method, with respect to Marcion's text and to his general use of scripture have been provided by Clabeaux 1989, 11-41. For example, Tertullian freely alters Marcion's text for the purposes of argumentation, he cites Marcion's text more faithfully when dealing with the more important Pauline letters, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, and he often transposes scriptural citations, for example, his word order is often at a variance with the older Latin versions: "Tertullian is notorious for the variation of vocabulary in his scriptural citations" (Clabeaux 1989, 52). Tertullian also deletes sections of the text for economic or apologetic reasons

²⁴ See Harnack 1921, 112ff. for a full list.

for scrapping Tertullian's canards.

1. The theological motivation for Marcion's excision of the Scriptures (*Adv. Marc.* 4.2; 5.4) is not made clear by Marcion's critics (Confer the section that follows on Marcion and the Jews). A modern example is R. M. Grant (1957, 1984) who denies that Marcion was a textual or historical critic: "He took the Gospel of Luke and ruthlessly edited it to suit his own doctrines" (1957, 119). No reason, however, is given by Grant why Marcion would want to do this, or why Marcion retained so many verses that conflicted with his theology.

For example, the quotation from Malachi 3.1. in Luke 7.25 is retained by Marcion, as is the reference to Moses and the Prophets (Luke 16.29), the identification of Jesus as the Son of David (Luke 18.38), and the statement of Jesus that he wants to celebrate Passover (Luke 22.15; Williams 1982, 482). With Paul, the matter is no different. Marcion's text of Galatians retained Gal. 4.22ff. The extremely Jewish character of Rom. 2.12-16 poses no problem for Marcion (*Adv. Marc.* 5.13), nor is there any evidence that Marcion's Romans did not have chapters 10-11. We can be relatively sure that

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

But what serious gaps Marcion has made in this epistle especially, by withdrawing whole passages at his will, will be clear from the unmutated text of our own copy (*nostrum instrumentum*; *Adv. Marc.* 5.13).

Marcion expressly and openly used the knife since he made such an excision of the Scriptures as suited his own subject-matter (*de Praes.* 38).

The apologetic argument adduced by Tertullian still prevails today almost without question: Marcion excised from the text whatever failed to support his theological position (even *Harnack* believed Marcion guilty of textual corruption).⁴⁴ There are, however, convincing reasons

by Hoffmann (1984), but is rejected by Wilshire (1974), who tries to show the inconsistencies in Knox's method.

⁴⁴ "The Greek, whose mind was filled with certain fundamental features of the Pauline Gospel (Law and grace), who was thereby convinced that in all respects the truth was there, and who on that account took pains to comprehend the real sense of Paul's statements, could hardly reach any other results than those of Marcion. The history of Pauline Theology in the Church, a history first of silence, then of artificial interpretation, speaks loudly enough. And had not Paul really separated Christianity as a religion from Judaism and the Old Testament? Must it not have seemed an inconceivable inconsistency, if he had clung to the special national relation of Christianity to the Jewish people, and if he had taught a view of history in which for pedagogic reasons indeed, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort had appeared (in history) as one so entirely different? He who was not capable of translating himself into the consciousness of a Jew, and had not yet learned the method of special interpretation, had only the alternative, if he was convinced of the Truth of the Gospel of Christ as Paul proclaimed it, of either giving up his Gospel against the dictates of conscience, or striking out of the Epistles whatever seemed Jewish" (*Harnack* 1897, 282, emphasis mine).

incorporate into his canon the work of one so "Pauline" (and anti-Semitic). Besides, if Marcion had edited Luke, then he would have done the same with Acts. Either Marcion did not know of the existence of Acts, or the discrepancy between Luke's Paul and Paul himself led Marcion to reject the work,⁶² or Acts had not yet been written.⁶³

On Marcion's alleged excisions consider the words of our chief hostile witness:

⁶² It is possible that Marcion rejected Acts for the same reason he rejected Luke, i.e., he believed Acts had been written with the express purpose of forging Paul's ties to a religion with which he originally had none. There is more support for this view in the testimony of Irenaeus where Marcion is placed among the poorly esteemed group of Encratites, Montanists, and Valentinians (*Adv. Haer.* 3.13.3). Irenaeus inadvertently points to Marcion's critical skill as a biblical scholar, by indicating that Marcion rejected Acts because it conflicted with the testimony of Galatians. Irenaeus then refutes Marcion by harmonizing the differences, without making clear what they are or how he is to resolve them (Farmer 1984, 158, *confer de Praes.* 22.).

⁶³ Knox argues for the existence of "Primitive Luke," a work that lies behind both the canonical Gospel of Luke and Marcion's Luke. The presence of Markanisms in Marcion's Luke rules out the possibility that Marcion's Luke is identical to Primitive Luke. However, Knox will not accept either the view that Marcion's Luke is a mere abridgement of canonical Luke. Rather, he thinks the latter is an anti-Marcionite tract (Knox in "Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus" printed in Keck/Martyn 1968, Knox 1942). This possibility was first hinted at by the scholar Semler in the nineteenth century and argued by Baur in the eighteenth. It is also supported by Paul-Louis Couchaud (1936, cited in Blackman 1944, 401.), by H. Philip West, who sees the existence of Primitive Luke as a source of canonical Luke, Marcion's Luke, and also the Gospel of Matthew (1967), and

C. *Marcion's Textus Corpusque*

For his New Testament canon, Marcion proposed a single Gospel that in most respects resembled an edited version of the Gospel of Luke, although Marcion denied that his Gospel was Lukan. In his view, Luke was the one, in fact, who distorted the Gospel.

(Marcion believed Luke was) interpolated by the defenders of Judaism, for the purpose of such a conglomeration with it of the Law and the prophets as should enable them out of it to fashion their Christ (Adt: Marc. 4.5; confer 4.4).

In addition to a single Gospel was Marcion's *Apostolikon*, consisting of ten letters of Paul in the following order: Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians (under the name of To the Laodiceans), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. Finally, a work composed by Marcion himself, now lost to us, *Antitheses* or book of "contradictions," served as a kind of introduction to Marcion's New Testament. It did not, however, form part of Marcion's canon itself (Campenhauen 161-2).

Marcion spurned the Book of Acts. Friend in an otherwise helpful article may have been sleeping when he wrote: "Why he (Marcion) should want to exclude Acts is obscure" (Friend 1969, 330). The insinuation is clear: Marcion would have snatched at the opportunity to

Testament, in the Church Fathers and in the early Christian apologists. By "Orthodox" I do not mean "legitimate" nor do I mean to equate an Orthodox interpretation of Paul with Orthodoxy itself. I use the terms "Orthodox", "Gnostic" and "Marcionite" cautiously. In the early centuries the distinction between these groups is not clear cut. Cyril of Jerusalem even found it necessary to warn catechumens against slipping into a Marcionite meeting by mistake! (Cat. 18.26). My definition of "Orthodox" is negative and positive: negatively, a form of Pauline interpretation at odds with the Gnostic and Marcionite interpretations, positively, an interpretation based primarily on Acts and the Pastorals and not on the authentic letters of Paul. The Apocryphal Acts of Paul, for example, is not always "Orthodox" in its theology but is classified as representing an "Orthodox" Paul in that it is dependent for its picture on inauthentic Pauline sources.¹ With the notable exception of Tertullian, the book was well received by a number of the fathers, including Origen, Hippolytus, and Eusebius (Howe 1980, 33-47).

The second type of interpretation of Paul is proffered by the fully

¹ It is possible that the apocryphal *Acts of Paul* predates canonical Acts, although that does not effect my argument, since their similarities point to a certain "type" of Pauline reading, which is substantially at odds with the type found, for example, among the Gnostics.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

The literature of the second century attests to at least three major competing claims for Paul: The *Marcionite* claim, the *Gnostic* claim, and the *Orthodox* claim. The neglect of Paul in the writings of the latter has long been observed (Campenhausen 1972, 178ff). There is almost total silence, save for the following: Polycarp of Smyrna, Tatian, the Acts of Paul, Theophilus of Antioch, and the Epistle of the Apostles. Paul's influence on Ecclesiastical authority before Irenaeus is slight, since the fathers wished to avoid any association with the heretics. The letters of Ignatius betray almost no influence of Pauline Theology. The same may be said of Polycarp, the Apologists, Hegesippus, Justin, and Athanagoras (Pagels 1975, 161). The sources that do refer to Paul, often express hostility, for example, the Pseudo-Clementine literature. Prior to heretical appropriation, Paul is entirely absent from Orthodox dialogue. Only in response to the dual threat of Marcionism and Gnosticism, did the Church reclaim Paul. Tertullian himself never doubted this, and called Paul *apostolus Marcionis* and *apostolus Haereticorum* (Blackburn 1948, 110).

The Orthodox Paul begins with the Pastoral Epistles and the canonical Acts of the Apostles. These two sources form its heart. It is then developed in different directions in the apocryphal writings of the New

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

of Pagels (and Koester, her mentor) that we should not be forced to choose between the interpretations of Paul in the second century, since that would be to interpret the apostles' theology "in terms of categories formulated in second century debate" (Pagels, 164), we should not be overly sceptical. The historical Paul is not identical with the Paul of the respective Schools that developed in his name, but are we not allowed to pursue the possibility that the memory and theology of Paul was preserved in some way in the second century?

The scepticism voiced by Pagels is not warranted. It assumes the inviolable position of the History of Religions School: traditions degenerate since they always reflect a different *Sitz im Leben*. The early theologians are thought to have no concern for historical exactness since their pressing theological exigencies compelled them to reinvent or reinterpret traditions they had received. Yet is it not somewhat hubristic of scholars living in the twentieth century to assume that they are in a position to reconstruct the situation of Paul in the first century, whereas someone like Marcion, alive a mere fifty years after Paul's death, was incapable of doing so? Also, as I noted above, we have no guarantee that the letters bearing the name of Paul are the product of Paul and the first century.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

have a certain shape to it, we have no conclusive means of deciding which letters are Paul's and which are the product of a School operating in his name. Critical scholarship has done an important job of showing that the types of Pauline Theology represented in the New Testament are too different to have come from the same hand and therefore has forced the conclusion that Paul can only be reconstructed from one of these. Pauline scholarship in its present form will always depend on a form of circular reasoning which presupposes that it knows who Paul was.

The greatest puzzles facing the Pauline scholar are these: What constitutes the *Corpus Paulinum*? Has this *Corpus* undergone significant textual redaction and corruption? Even the text of Paul's "authentic letters" is far from us - a casual reading of 2 Corinthians reveals as much.

Pauline scholars have tended to answer these questions mostly on the basis of the internal evidence afforded by the letters attributed to Paul. Scholars are generally sceptical about utilising sources later than those in the New Testament for the purposes of reconstructing the struggles of the first century. Although there is an element of truth in the caveat

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Philemon. Yet there are several difficulties with this assumption, not least is determining which letters are authentic. The external evidence afforded by the Church Fathers is conflicting, while the intrinsic authenticity of Paul's letters is uncertain. Arguments from style are dubious since even within the "authentic" *Corpus* there are conflicting styles, and where a common style does exist, it is unsure that it originates with Paul, but could just as well be explained as a product of a "Pauline School". The New Testament canon testifies to a plethora of these Schools developing after the death of Paul. In 2 Peter 3.15-17 where the writer objects to deviant readings of Paul's letters which are "difficult to understand", we already have evidence of the struggle for "Paul."

More important, the authenticity of Paul's letters is for the most part determined on the basis of certain theological premises apropos of the nature of Pauline thought. Without the assumption, for example, that Paul's theology must be preoccupied with certain matters (for example, Jewish matters such as the Law and Faith), it is just as reasonable to regard the "authentic" *Corpus Paulinum* as the product of a School as it is to regard the so-called deuterio-Paulines as having come from the hand of Paul himself. Without the premise that Paul's theology must

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Judaism. The identification of the community as a Σαυραγογή is remarkable (as is the unusual spelling, χρηστου).

The inscription reads:

Σαυραγογή Μαρκτιανιστῶν κώμη; Αἰβάβου του κυρίου
καὶ οἰκιστοῦ Ἰησοῦ χρηστοῦ προνοῖα Παύλου
Προφιετόρου τοῦ ἀχ' ἔτους (Hittenburger 1923, 628).

It is also no mere coincidence that there is no record of persecution of Jews by Marcionites (Nicholson 1986, 58). Hoffmann's words provide a fitting conclusion:

There is no compelling evidence to support the judgment that Marcion's theology is anti-Jewish in design, and the familiar view that his "rejection" of the Old Testament made him the arch-anti-Semite of the ancient Church is uninformed (Hoffmann 1984, 231).

E. Conclusions to Part Two: The Quest for the Historical Paul⁷

Modern critical Pauline studies are predicated on the assumption that the historical Paul is recoverable through analysis of the extant "authentic" Pauline letters. The consensus is that there are at least five: Romans, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Philippians and

⁷ I use the term *historical Paul* to refer to the Paul recoverable through historical analysis. It is desirable to distinguish this Paul from the *historical Paul* (the "real" Paul) but unnecessary since the latter remains a methodological impossibility.

Was Paul Sane? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

scholars, Marcion clearly saw that nowhere in the Old Testament is it prophesied that the Messiah would suffer and die on a cross (*Adv. Marc.* 1.13.11). How Marcion could reconcile his two Christologies is unsure, although it is likely that his need to accord a place to Israel is based on Paul's own views in Rom. 10. It is peculiar that Rom. 9 with its anti-Jewish sentiments are absent from Marcion's text, and that Rom. 10 with its belated hope for the salvation of the people of Israel is retained (*Adv. Marc.* 5.14.6).

Perplexing "Jewish elements" to Marcion's theology are inconsonant with the consensus that Marcion's chief aversion was Judaism. The strict dietary and purificatory laws of the Marcionites are well attested in all the literature and not that easily distinguishable from the Jewish practices which the Orthodox Paul was well known to have rejected. (It seems that Marcion was no doting Paulinist!) Irenaeus makes Marcion the spiritual father of the Encratites, thereby establishing a Jewish provenance for their asceticism (*Adv. Haer.* 1.23.1. *confer* Hoffmann 1984, 22, 288). He also esteemed the Law and cited many Old Testament prophecies (Harnack 1921, 115; Blackman 1948, 114, 117, 118). Finally, the oldest extant dated inscription from a place of Christian worship is of a Marcionite Church, and it reveals a link with

Marcion rejected the Old Testament and is the most significant modern fallacy associated with the heretic from "Auge." What Marcion did do, was deny that the Old Testament had significance for Christians, and that the latter had no claim to it by means of bizarre allegorical, typological or esoteric interpretations. In accord with modern biblical

Marcion was not the first theologian of the second century to make the relationship of the Old Testament to the New Testament an issue, nor was he the first to evoke Paul as his champion in the struggle. The Gnostics as we have already seen were strictly anti-Judaic which led them to reject the Old Testament. Another example is the writer of the letter from Ptolemaeus to Flora (ca. 180) who wrote that the Law was the work of an "Intermediate Being," who was neither the devil nor the Perfect God, through whom Christ was manifested (quoted in Frend 1969, 330). Four other writers require some mention: The Epistle of Barnabas, The Epistle to Diognetus, The Apology of Aristides, and (ironically) the Letters of Polycarp. In all no element of revelation is credited to the Jewish religion. Few citations from the Old Testament or arguments from prophecy are made, and, surprisingly, in the Letter to Diognetus and the Letters of Polycarp there is heavy dependence on Paul as scripture to the near exclusion of the Old Testament (Nielson 1965, 1970, 1986).

Meecham (1949) and Nielson (1970) assign an early date to the Letter to Diognetus. Nielson insists that the writer's attitude to the Old Testament represents a pre-Marcionism since it does not display any of the violent anti-Marcionite polemics of the late second century when rejection of the Old Testament was an issue. Since the letter is an unconscious rejection, it is best to date it in the early part of the first century: "An orthodox document which ignores the Old Testament in all likelihood belongs to a time before Marcion" (Nielson 1970, 80). If true this would undercut the older Patrological view that within the early Church, the authority of the Old Testament was taken for granted. It would also reinforce the association of Paul with anti-Judaism as a pre-Marcionite phenomenon and not therefore Marcion's invention.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

argument sarcastically, which is a simple, yet poignant one: if Christ was the Messiah, then the Jews would have recognised him. Since, he was rejected by the Jews, he must have come from a god other than the God of the Jews. Rather than burden the Jews with the responsibility for murdering the Messiah, Marcion exonerates them by professing that they were incapable of such a mistake. Tertullian claimed that Marcion not only learned this argument from the Jews, but had formed an alliance with them in the matter. Tertullian's response is threefold: Jewish disobedience was foretold in the scriptures, all humans are capable of error, and Jews especially are the sort of people who commit an error of this magnitude (*quos credibile fuerat errasse*). "Jewish blindness and sinfulness in rejecting Jesus is on Tertullian's side of the argument, not on Marcion's" (Efroymson 1980, 29).

Marcion's reading of the Old Testament led him to the belief that the Jewish Messiah was still to come and establish his earthly kingdom.⁴⁴

This overt double Christology is an eyesore for Tertullian and is given no attention by the majority of modern critics. Marcion's retained belief in the Jewish Messiah can only be explained on the basis of a "high" view of the Old Testament. It is simply false to argue that

⁴⁴ *Adv. Marc.* 3.21.1; 3.23.6; 4.6.3f; 3.4.4ff; 4.6.3.

plainly based on mutual self-interest and a common hostility to the "Orthodox" Christian claim that Jesus was the Messiah of God the Creator. Unfortunately, the extant literature reveals little more than these bare facts. What is critical is that rejection of Judaism by Marcion no more constitutes proof of his anti-Semitism, than a rejection of Jesus by Jews constitutes hatred of Christians. The hatred of Jews ensues from one direction alone, Tertullian.

So then, since heretical madness was claiming that Christ had come who had never been previously mentioned, it followed that it had to contend that that Christ was not yet come who had from all time been foretold; and so it was compelled to form an alliance with Jewish error (*ita coacta est cum Iudaeo errore sociari*), and from it to build up an argument for itself, (*et ab eo argumentationem sibi struere*) on the pretext that the Jews, assured that he who has come was an alien, not only rejected him — a stranger but even put him to death as an opponent, although they would beyond doubt have recognised him and treated him with all religious devotion if he had been their own. It can have been no Rhodian law, but a Pontic one, which assured this shipmaster that the Jews were incapable of making a mistake respecting their Christ; although, even if nothing of this sort were found to have been spoken in prophecies against them, human nature alone, and by itself, wide open to deception, might have persuaded him that the Jews could have made a mistake, being men, and that it would be wrong to use as a precedent the judgement of persons who had likely enough been mistaken (*Adv. Marc. 3.6.*).

In this passage Tertullian sets out to dispute the view of Marcion that the Christ who was revealed came from a previous unknown God, and not the God of the Jews, the creator. Tertullian repeats Marcion's

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

that Christ was a phantasm: except that this opinion too will have had other inventors, those so to speak premature and abortive Marcionites whom the Apostle John pronounced Antichrists (*Adm. Marc.* 3.8).

This last passage is damning. Tertullian defines the Jews as the precursors of Marcion. In his treatise *de Resurrectione Mortuorum* he makes the same point with added gusto, but reverses the roles by accusing the Marcionites of being latter day Sadducees (*de Res.* 2.1-2). Commenting on Jesus' answer to the Sadducees about marriage after the resurrection, he writes: "Here you have the Lord affirming against the Jewish heretics precisely what is now being denied by these Christian Sadducees: the resurrection of the whole man" (*ibid.* 36.7). How strange that not a single modern critic accuses Marcion of being a Christian Sadducee!

Tertullian's crude association is meant to ridicule and rankle both Jews and Marcionites and would not have been appreciated by either side since their alliance was of an apologetic, not religious nature.

Tertullian's point though does not detract from the one I am making, that a certain kinship existed between the two groups, and that Tertullian through his rhetorical skill, inadvertently admits to it. I am not under any illusions as to the nature of the relationship, which was

Martyn makes the seasoned blunder of identifying anti-Judaism with anti-Semitism, and yet the former is not necessarily the logical implication of the latter. The Jewish scholar Leo Baeck was as cynical when he remarked that Marcion was the best Paulinist and thus the worst theologian before Luther (Quoted in Martyn, 8). Schoeps, also a Jewish scholar of no mean stature, described Marcion as "*ein schmerzlicher Sexualneurotiker und Verdammter*" (sic, quoted in Gager 1972: 54).

Yet in the *Adversus Marcionem* we see a different picture. Marcion forged an impressive intellectual alliance with contemporary Jews who supported his vision of the severance of Christianity and Judaism.

Ironically, in this ostensible "Jew Hater" the Jews found a theological ally. In Tertullian, Marcionite heresy and Jewish Error are lumped together and the hatred of both is disturbingly intense:

It is now possible for the heretic to learn, and the Jew as well, what he ought to know already, the reasons for the Jew's errors: for from the Jew the heretic has accepted guidance in this discussion, (*a quo ducatum mutatur in hac argumentatione*) the blind borrowing from the blind, and has fallen into the same ditch (*Adu. Marc. 3.7*).

The Jews are partakers of your (sc. Marcionite) heresy (*cum partiaris erroris tui Iudaeis, Adu. Marc. 3.16*).

Now, since you join the Jews in denying that their Christ has come (*Adu. Marc. 3.23*).

Let the heretic now give up borrowing poison from the Jew, - the asp, as they say, from the viper: let him from now on belch forth the slime from his own particular devices, as he maintains

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

reconstruct Marcion's Paul. This has never been comprehensively achieved. Marcion studies have been either apologetic in nature - defending Marcion against charges of corruption levelled by the heresiologists - or they have been concerned to reconstruct Marcion's theology.

We would no longer be talking of Paul, but of Paul(s): *Literary Paul(s)*; *non literary Paul(s)*; *Jewish Paul(s)* (for example, Romans, Galatians); *Mystical Paul(s)* (for example, Colossians, Ephesians); *Exegetical Paul(s)* (for example, Pastorals); *Eschatological Paul(s)* (for example, 1 and 2 Thessalonians); *Marcionite Paul(s)* (Marcion and his followers); *Lukan Paul(s)* (for example, Acts and Apocryphal Acts); *Gnostic Paul(s)*, et al.

The various "Paul(s)" would have to be categorised, arranged and considered in conjunction with the range of anti-Pauline polemics in the second century. Only then would it be possible to chart the linear development of Paulinism.

The main aim of this dissertation has been to question the current direction of Pauline studies. Many of the questions I have posed have been of a rhetorical nature: *Was Paul Saul? Was Paul a Jew? Was Paul Crucified? Was Marcion a heretic?* In their own modest way questions

Was Paul Still The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

only one student who understood him, Marcion - and this student
misunderstood him" (quoted in Marvin 1988, 81).

If the *internal* evidence against Paul's association with Judaism can be
matched with the *external* evidence of Marcion's claim, a case could be
made for a new Quest for the historical Paul.

A new Pauline methodology would be required. The authenticity of
Paul's letters would need to be reconsidered, letters such as Ephesians
and Colossians with their "Gnostic" character. It would no longer be
desirable to employ theological criteria *a priori* in deciding on the
authenticity of Paul's letters. In fact, notions of canonicity would have
to be abandoned, or at least rethought. All letters in antiquity claiming
to have been written by Paul would have to undergo new investigation
and reconsidered from the perspective of the particular "type" of Paul
they represent.

Attention would have to be paid to anti-Paulinism in the New
Testament and to its subsequent evolution in the second century, and
to the role Pauline Schools played in the development of the textual
forms of the Pauline Corpus. Studies would have to be undertaken to

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

133). Marcion on the other hand is the first critical writer of the second century to compose the *Corpus Paulinum*, and yet he and not Luke is thought to have falsely represented Paul. Even if one rejects the view of Knox that Acts is written in response to Marcionism, one should concede that Marcion's Paul is closer to Paul than the Lukan Paul.

The heart of the dissonance is, as I have argued, the degree to which Judaism is thought to feature in Paul's thought. The impetus for Marcion's entire theology is his attempt to rectify what he perceived to be the Jewish contamination of the Gospel by the Apostles and then by Judaizers ("For they maintain that the apostles intermingled the things of the law with the words of the Saviour" *Adv. Marc.* 5.2. *Confr. Adv. Marc.* 4.3., 4.11.; *Adv. Haer.* 3.2.2., 3.13.2.).

Marcion would not have interpreted Paul as cynically as I have done. Yet paradoxes in Pauline Theology are not resolved without laying some blame on Paul's shoulders. Marcion tried to make Paul's theology succeed where it failed, by expounding its many unspecified logical implications. We cannot say he was entirely successful, but what interpreter is? The saying of Franz Overbeck gives classic expression to the contradictory nature of Marcion's interpretation of Paul: "Paul had

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

had something in common, and if we may be allowed to go a little further, that the commonality consisted in rejection of Judaism as revelation for Christians? The fact that Paul's theology lent itself to the kind of canonisation evidenced in Marcion's *Corpus Paulinum* suggests that Pauline theology had an exclusive ring to it and that Paul must share some blame for the resultant appropriation of his thinking by Marcion.

Could it be that Marcion's Paul is a natural and logical progression of the Paul of history, conquered by the "Saul of Tarsus", a fabrication of canonical Luke? If Luke is incorrect, then so too are his predecessors Matthew and Mark, and successors like Tertullian. Marcion's Paul exists as a possibility and has done so since the second century.

The irony is that Luke's Jewish Paul, who shows no concrete relation to the historical Paul has survived, and barring moderate criticism, is still thought useful in reconstructing Paul's life. That Acts knows nothing of Paul's letters is very important and cannot be dismissed merely as *argumentum e silentio* (contra Schweitzer, 135). This silence ululates loudly. According to Vielhauer's reckoning the book of Acts contains not one specifically Pauline theme (cited in Hoffmann 1984,

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Paul better than anyone in the second century, and that he was more faithful than the other Pauline protagonists since he refused to hide behind fabricated Pauline letters, spurious Pauline traditions or esoteric Pauline fantasies.

If Marcion was a faithful Paulinist, we have good reasons for believing that he understood Paul well, and that his un-Jewish Paul was based on a faithful reading of Paul himself. This is not to say that the historical Paul was identical with Marcion's Paul. Marcion like all disciples, took the theology of Paul a step farther, sometimes for the worse (for example, his two gods), sometimes for the better (for example, his attitude to the Jews). He may have excised certain portions from the authentic *Corpus Paulinum*, but he had little reason to have done so. Marcion could have fashioned his case if he had only the orthodox Pauline text at his disposal. It is more likely that Marcion excised portions of the *Corpus Paulinum* added by "Orthodox" devotees, who in line with the tradition of I. C.'s had sought to tame Paul by bringing him in line with apostolic Christianity.

If we assume that Marcion's connection with Paul's letters was not an arbitrary one, are we not led to the conclusion that Marcion and Paul

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

which seem to run against the grain of his thinking. Unlike the Gnostics and the Orthodox he rejected the book of Hebrews.⁷¹ In this he is supported by every modern day critic. Unlike the Orthodox theologians he rejected the Pastorals. He is supported by modern critics in this too. He also rejected the book of Acts. I have tried to show that the historical Paul is barely contained in its pages. Marcion rejected spurious secret Pauline traditions, which were the exclusive properties of the Gnostics and laid no claim to specific gifts of the spirit, to prophecies, or to revelations (Blackman 1948, 42f.).

Marcion was a model conservative of the second century. The words of Paul *in epistulis* were his sole source of authority. If Marcion had wanted to recreate Paul in his own image, as the heresiologists alleged, why had he gone to such lengths to compose a canon consisting of only Paul's authentic letters, or at least of those letters universally regarded at the time as coming from the hand of Paul? Why not concoct an anti-Judaic theology and add it to his Pauline canon? Why not include his own Antitheses? Even if we were to assume that Marcion completely misunderstood Paul, we would have to concede that he understood

⁷¹ Not all those in the West accepted Hebrews, e.g. Tertullian. Perhaps he is influenced in this regard by Marcion?

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

his own, remains an enigma that Marcion's critics are unwilling to solve. Simply put, why in the world would Marcion have chosen Paul as the principal support for his rejection of the Old Testament and Judaism, if Paul's position was precisely the opposite? Paul was an unimportant figure in early Christianity, a fact borne out not only by Paul's letters, but by his influence in the second century. Had Marcion rejected the Old Testament first, and only then sought to introduce someone substantive to back up his case, he could have done better to have chosen another paragon, like the author of the Fourth Gospel, with his explicit anti-Semitism. Why *Paul*? It will not do to attribute to Marcion a lack of theological sophistication that would excuse his "deviant" reading of Paul. This is a common way for critics to carve their way out of the dilemma, that is, make Marcion out to be a simpleton and the problem goes away. So for example, Clabeaux: "the success of Marcion's movement was not due to the depth or consistency of his theology" (Clabeaux 1992, 516).

We know that Marcion was an intelligent and sensitive biblical scholar, a fact borne out by his New Testament canon. The charge that he butchered the text for theological ends cannot be conclusively supported for the *lack of evidence*. His canon contains many passages

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Christianity Jewish

Manen made an important contribution by recognising the attachment of Paul's letters to Marcion, and by considering its implications. The next step logically would have been to tie Marcion to Paul, but since he had already severed the connection, by denying the authenticity of Paul's letters, there was no way of regaining. Yet an unbridgeable gap still exists. How did an essentially Jewish conception such as the one Manen proposes degenerate into an anti-Jewish one? The great man himself, F. C. Baur, having laid the necessary groundwork as a classic division of two parties - Pauline and Petrine - then fumbled at the goalmouth, by concluding that the two parties kissed and made up because they were afraid of the alien threat of Gnosticism. Even H. J. Holtzmann (1832-1910), having recognised the element of gnosis in Paul's doctrines, went on to the odd conclusion: "Paul's world of thought differs fundamentally from any of the artificially excogitated gospels of Gnosticism proper" (quoted in Schweitzer 1912, 107).

The knife of historical interpretation has severed the vital nerve connecting Marcion to Paul. Yet why Marcion chose as his patron someone who apparently espoused a theology entirely different from

Albert Schweitzer, in *Paul and His Interpreters* (1912), an astounding work of acumen, writes:

So far as outward evidence goes it is hardly more difficult to defend the theory that the letters originated in an inner circle of Gnosticism and were gradually given out under the name of Paul (Schweitzer 1912, 119-120).

The view is not Schweitzer's own, but that propounded by the radical Tübingen critics, in particular, W. C. van Manen. In 1887 Maner reconstructed Marcion's text of Galatians from Tertullian.² His thesis was a reaction to the view classically represented by Baur, that only Romans, Galatians, 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians had come from the hand of Paul. Manen himself believed that even these letters betrayed an inconsistency of thought which make them doubtful. He argued that all of Paul's letters were the creation of a Gnostic school that had nothing to do with the historical Paul. Acts, in his view, was more historically reliable since it was improbable that an intensely anti-Jewish attitude could have existed in primitive Christianity. The anti-Jewish polemic in Galatians (for example) reflected a situation in the second century between Gnostics and those who tried to make

² This had already been done by Adolf Hilgenfeld in 1852, with disappointingly conservative conclusions. Hilgenfeld held that Marcion's text was corrupted and his effort to reconstruct the *Apostolikon* was nothing more than an anthology of citations (Harnack 1989, 153, 175).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Some conclusions are in order. Marcion is illustrious for two reasons: he was the first person to collate a New Testament canon based on a single Gospel and ten letters, *ca.* 240, and he rejected the Old Testament because its God is different from the Father of Jesus Christ. Marcion was a committed Paulinist, and yet few are willing to concede that his rejection of Judaism as revelation is the logical implication of his Paulinism. Even Harnack wrote: "The Pauline method of thought was absolutely closed to him" (1921, 251, note). Ironically, it is modern critics and not ancient critics who have been disinclined to find the roots for Marcion's expurgation of the Gospel in Paul himself.

Tertullian understood the antecedents for Marcion's theology (legitimately or otherwise) in Paul's separation of Law and Gospel:

Marcion says Christ who was by a previously unknown god, revealed for the salvation of all nations, is a different being from him who was ordained by God the Creator for the restoration of the Jewish state, and who is yet to come. Between these he interposes the separation of a great and absolute difference - as great as lies between what is just and what is good; as great as lies between the Law and the Gospel; as great, (in short) as is the difference between Judaism and Christianity (*ibid.* 4.6; 1.19).

Their reluctance stems directly from the belief I oppose in this essay: Paul was a good Jew with strong ties to Judaism. Without this Pauline credo nothing would preclude us from a serious reconsideration of Marcion's case.

the bodily resurrection on the basis of 1 Cor 15.50-52 (*ibid.* 85).

A comparison of the differences between Marcion and the Gnostic Paul is more telling. The Gnostics laid claim to esoteric Pauline traditions alleged to have been transmitted from Paul to a disciple Theudas, from Theudas to Valentinus, and from Valentinus to his disciples. They also believed that Paul intended his letters to be read and understood on two levels: a literal level typical of the α -pneumatic, and a symbolic level, practised by the pneumatic, that is, themselves (Pagels 1975, 7; *confer Adu. Haer.* 3.15.2). Naturally, Marcion rejected allegorical interpretations of Paul, and the idea of secret transmission of private Pauline revelations was entirely foreign to him. The Gnostics (like the Orthodox) diabolized the Jewish people (Pagels 1975, 103), Marcion rejected the Jewish God as revelation for Christians. He did not reject the Jewish people. The Gnostics felt the Old Testament was rooted in mythology. Marcion believed it was rooted in history (Blackman 1948, 119). The Gnostic claim to live in the spirit often resulted in antinomianism. Marcion's theology was strictly ascetic (Pagels 1975, 66-67, 158). The Gnostics accepted the book of Hebrews as "Pauline" like the Orthodox. Marcion rejected it (Pagels 1975, 115, 163, 164).

blown Gnostics like Basilides and Valentinus. Aside from the New Testament, the Gnostics laid claim to secret Pauline traditions which were the spiritual heritage of "pneumatic" Christians. We are indebted to Elaine Pagel, for her thorough analysis of the interpretation of Paul among the Gnostics (1975). Pagel identifies two antithetical traditions of Pauline exegesis, one that reads Paul Gnostically, another anti-Gnostically. A shortcoming of her work is that she does not specify where Marcion is to be located.

When we compare the Gnostic and Marcion's use of Paul, several significant findings consistently indicate that Marcion's appropriation of Paul was more critical than the Gnostics. Both claimed Paul as their champion, and revered him as "The Apostle" (Campenhausen 1972, 154f.). Both accused their Orthodox opponents of an uncritical use of biblical texts (Irenaeus: "They turn and accuse these same scriptures as if they were not accurate or authoritative", *Adv. Haer.* 3.2.1.; 3.11.1.). Both accused the Orthodox of accepting the Pastorals as authentic (Pagel 1975, 5, 115), argued that Peter and Luke preached another Gospel and another god (*ibid.* 102) and that they did so "under the influence of 'Jewish opinions'" (*Adv. Haer.* 3.12.12-15). Both objected to the un-Pauline traditions of Acts (Pagel 1975, 161), and both denied

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

the difficulties experienced by any ministerial committee when it comes to the matter of the selection of candidates, the standards expected from them, and the creative talents they need to possess. I have known Paul for some years now, ever since he first preached the Gospel in this territory, during his so-called "First Missionary Journey."

During this period I came to regard him as a very intense, intelligent, and creative person, but now see him for what he is *an enemy of Torah*. For a man of his age he impressed me enormously with his desire to preach the Gospel of Messiah to the Gentiles. I was so convinced of his vocation that through a most remarkable and providential way, I arranged for financial assistance to be paid towards his missionary excursions. What then has led me to reconsider my position? You will have heard of the crisis that rocked our Churches due to the confrontation between the so-called "circumcised party" and Paul over the matter of obligatory circumcision and food and dietary laws."

Initially we had regarded Paul as a devout Jew who held to the Pillars of Judaism. We felt that as a Pharisee, a Benjamite, and "Hebrew born of Hebrew parentage," the Messiah he proclaimed would be consonant with the heart of the Jewish faith, but this was not so. A few of us felt

V. EXCURSUS: THE LETTER OF BENJAMIN

Benjamin, a slave of God and of the Messiah Jesus, who fulfilled the promises of God made by the prophets, and who brings to all those who belong to Moses, and are faithful to the Covenant that the Lord established through his Eternal Torah, righteousness and grace. To the Elder at the congregation of Rome: Greetings.

I have decided to document a few remarks and observations in respect to the application of Paul "the apostle" to be accredited as a missionary in Spain. Last week I was a little concerned if not disappointed to hear that his application had been positively approved by your council. I understand that this is the result of a testimonial written by two of his close associates, Silas and a certain Timothy. I in turn, was approached by several friends and acquaintances who requested that I write and explain to you in full our reasons for feeling that Paul is unsuitable as a candidate. We believe that aspects of his background, personality and theology make him a dubious choice for further missionary excursions. I would like to comment on these respective points, but before doing so, may I say that for five years I have been an Elder of the Galatian Churches. I say this to make it quite clear that I am perfectly aware

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

anti-Marcionites, a branch of pseudo-Paulinists who have strong ties with the remnants of Jewish Christianity. Among them is a writer called Luke, whose double treatise is an anti-Marcionite tract. The first part of Luke's treatise, the canonical Gospel of Luke, is a doctored version of proto-Luke employed by Marcion and his followers. The second part, the canonical Acts of the Apostles, brilliantly dequodifies Paul, fuses him with an obscure but devout Jewish character Saul, and incorporates all the divergent strains of the early Christian faith into an all embracing whole.

The struggle of the two opposing groups continues for centuries. The Marcionites are rooted out finally but remain strong in Syria, the home of Paul's original mission.* Luke's triumph proves one thing: political power is also theological power. Looking back over the course of Pauline studies this century, it is surprisingly how little things have changed.

* Antioch is not only situated in Syria, but so too is Damascus: the well known place of Paul's conversion, and the home of Marcion's teacher, Cerdo and Saturninus.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

indeed allied with madness (2 Cor. 9:12). Does Paul know himself?

After several bungled missions, failed attempts at recognition, and a handful of tragic and masterfully written letters which fall on deaf ears, Paul is arrested and taken to Rome. From there he vanishes into obscurity.

The anti-Jewish polemic in Paul's theology is later misconstrued by his faithful (but intellectually inferior) disciples. They take his process of *Judaization* a step further by adding passages from the Old Testament to his writings (for example, Rom. 3:11-18). The presence of directly anti-Semitic remarks such as those found in 1 Thess. 2:14-16 show that once the hand of Paul is removed, the process only degenerates into extreme hatred for Jews.

In the middle part of the second century, a devoted disciple of Paul, Marcion, seeks to undo the process of *Judaization*, remaining true to the spirit, if not to the letter of Paul's theology. He collects Paul's letters into a canon and purges them of spurious interpolations made by other followers. Perhaps he goes a step further and excises from Paul those elements of his theology that are alien to their true Gnostic character. The emasculation process sounds alarm bells for the

message he has learned. Such a process demands that Paul show himself to be someone within the movement rather than outside it. He claims to be of Jewish descent and origin, a claim he hopes will lend credibility to another, that of apostolic status (since he cannot effect the transformation as minor player). With a mind steeped in Hellenistic thought, Gnosticism, and with sore experience in mystery religions, Paul reinvents himself, and the faith of Messiah he has learned. He preaches now not the Kingdom of God, but the Mutilated-God (1 Cor. 2:8).

His theology undergoes the process of *Judaization*, and his un-Jewish ideas are married to thoroughly Jewish language. Three ideas, central to the original sect, are transformed beyond recognition. God is given a mixed identity: Father-Son, Torah is displaced by faith in the Saviour, the Jews as the elected people of God are replaced by the Gentiles. A paradoxical relationship to the sect slowly begins to germinate. Paul resents his status as a subordinate, yet he loves this people who have made his transforming religious experience possible. Paul wishes to be a Jew, yet he knows himself to be a true Jew and member of the true Israel. This consciousness produces in Paul a cognitive dissonance and results in a world view that is theologically schizophrenic. His genius is

Jesus he thinks, would be far more effective without the Law. In fact, the Law is obstructing Messiah's salvific power (Rom. 5, 7; Gal. 3).

Paul needs to be saved. The sect offers a mode of life, not deliverance. He pursues an unmediated Christ, a Christ of the Spirit, disjoined from the powers Law and Flesh. Allied with Antiochian Christianity, he suggests the possibility of the meal of ecstasy, something he learned in Eleusis, where the followers of a god devour his flesh and drink his blood and bring the god back to life. During the rite Paul has an ecstatic experience, a life-transforming hallucination. He sees himself violently crucified with Jesus. Through this experience Paul finds all the cosmic powers defeated: Satan, Sin, Flesh, Death, and yes, Law too - all nailed to the cross with Christ, once and for all. The crucified Messiah is resurrected and the "Lord of Glory" born (1 Cor. 2, 8). Paul is justified.

The strange amalgam of Jewish and heathen practice meets with resistance. The opposition becomes intense and Paul and a number of his followers take leave. So begins Paul's story and his "mission to the Gentiles," which involves more than the proselytization of non-Jews. It consists instead in a concerted effort on Paul's part to de-Judaize the

IV. WHO IS PAUL?

Who is Paul the apostle and what is his relationship to Judaism?

Speculation is not entirely without merit: *ne forte in vacuum currat aut cucurrit* (Gal. 2, 2).

Paul, a non-Jew, joins an obscure Jewish sect in Antioch. The provisos are these: he must be baptised, he must refrain from eating certain foods, he must shave his head, take a vow (Acts 18, 18), and be circumcised (?). Then he is taught about Moses, Torah, the Prophets, and the "Kingdom of God" proclaimed by the Messiah Jesus, recently crucified outside Jerusalem on a charge of sedition. In these matters Paul becomes proficient, but the imprint is superficial. Torah makes little impression on him as he is a man plagued by nagging doubts and a pessimistic sense of his own worthlessness. (Levin calls this condition SINosis.) Paul also believes he is in the grip of the Archons, Demon-rulers, "the god of this World," Satan, and the semi-divine-demonic powers of Sin and Death (Rom. 5-7; Gal. 4.8; 1 Cor. 2. 8; 2 Cor. 4. 4). Tormented, he pours himself over the Scriptures, and doubtfully looks to the Law for redemption. None is forthcoming. Consequently, he resents the Law's failure to save him (Rom. 5. 12ff.).

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

anything, it seems that Marcion was more "Jewish" than Paul.

Removed from the situation of Paul and the struggles of the first century he could approach the Jewish issue with greater impartiality.

By eliminating Marcion the Church performed a hatchet job on Paul too, who lies dead until he is resuscitated by Augustine in the fourth century, where he undergoes radical metamorphosis. No, for anti-Semitic germs in the New Testament we need look to those writers who insist not that Christianity is an autonomous religion that at its heart is different from Judaism (Paul), but who insist that it is a child that serves as a corrective to its father (writers like Luke and John).

Bultmann's words are worth consideration: "Israel's history is not our history and in so far as God has shown his grace in that history, such grace is not meant for us" (quoted in Gossai 1988, 154), and again: "To Christian faith the Old Testament is no longer revelation" (quoted in Brown, Fitzmyer, and Murphy 1990, 1150).

As long as Paul remains Saul and as long as Christianity insists in staking its claim in relationship to Judaism the seeds for anti-Semitism lie in wait for a conducive environment and hard rains.

"Jewish problem," which is a radical one: sever the branch from the trunk by one blow of the ax. This is precisely where the irony thickens. One would expect to find in Marcion and Paul the germs for anti-Semitism, but they do not exist. (Here I disagree with Maccoby.) Paul himself was antinomian not anti-Semitic. This does not mean that he liked Judaism or even that he liked Jews. The fact that he arrogated a position within Judaism is unforgivable and yet in some ways it is necessary if his vision of a new religion were to succeed. Anti-Semitism is a post-Pauline phenomenon that exists only if a false synthesis is attempted between Christianity and Judaism. Josephus' *Contra Apionem* bears witness to the fact that there existed Greeks and Romans in antiquity who despised Judaism and yet this does not mean they were anti-Semites.

Marcion like his predecessor Paul rejected Judaism as far as Christian faith goes, but he too was not an anti-Semite, unlike the Church Father Tertullian. Neither Marcion nor Paul could serve as a basis for Christian anti-Semitism for they are too radical. Once the mutual grounds for conflict are removed, the conflict itself dissipates. Marcion, as we have seen, even went further than Paul refusing to burden the Jews with the responsibility for rejecting and killing Messiah. If

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

For my part, I am cynical when it comes to reconstructing the historical Paul. All we really have are those letters attributed to the apostle. Yet how reliable are these sources, if they were moulded by a School bent on recreating Paul? The Quest for the historical Jesus has taught us many invaluable lessons, not least of which is that every age will mould Jesus according to its own image. Perhaps the single value of a Quest for Paul will be its resultant *scepticism*. The surefootedness previously associated with Paul may end if Pauline scholars applied similar criteria to Paul as their colleagues have applied to Jesus. A new Quest may convince us that we are as near to the historical Paul as we are to the historical Jesus. Perhaps the results will show that all we possess with any degree of certainty is the *Paul of faith*: the Paul that the Church saw fit to domesticate, embellish, and remould according to its own apostolic values and traditions. Would that conclusion leave us in a sorry state of angst? First Jesus, now Paul? The answers to these questions will depend on how much value the Church continues to accord with the Protestant principle *Sola Scriptura*, or how much it is prepared to trust the Fathers in their critical decisions of faith.

The Church branded Marcion a heretic for rejecting the Jewish Bible, thereby rejecting the implied solution he saw in Paul's theology to the

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

scholar today identifies Paul with the Pastoral Letters, or Hebrews, or other bogus Pauline works that were the legacy of Orthodoxy in the second century. All however, persist with the overall conclusions supported by that camp. Silently this is more a damning judgement of them than on the Orthodoxy they simultaneously embrace and reject.

The Quest for Paul may prove embarrassing or even offensive in that it may yield unpopular and unexpected conclusions. Yet Paul is no saint (*sic*). He is vitiated by the ecumenical spirit when it surrenders his message to the "spirit of the age" and to the niceties of scholarly discourse.

Why for example should scholars like Segal be at pains not to offend Christians? - not to mention the title of the book by the Jewish theologian Richard L. Rubenstein, *My Brother Paul* (1972). Why should scholars like Sanders ~~rein~~ I because they are uncomfortable with his implied anti-Semitism? After all, Paul writes with startling audacity, and his attitude to Judaism is at times patronising, sectarian and given to savage vituperation and blasphemous identifications - at least for Jews.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

like these may have the effect of challenging others upon which the entire edifice of Pauline scholarship is built. If a few of the bricks are shown to be shaky, then there exists the possibility that the entire edifice is vulnerable, and a new building needs to be erected, with new materials, new tools and new builders.

The contribution Marcion makes to the debate is really far greater than whether or not he or the Church fathers were correct. More important are the questions a study of Marcion poses for the historical Paul. Was the historical Paul a letter writer (as Marcion *and* the Church insisted), or was this Paul the product of schools operating in Paul's name? In Acts and the Apocryphal Acts, Paul is not a man of letters. Marcion may have been the chief legacy maker of Pauline scholarship if he was indeed a heretic, for his introduction of letters into the Pauline picture has set the form of Pauline scholarship for centuries to come.

If we assume, however, that Paul was a man of letters and that these letters have survived in one way or another, then Marcion's Paul would be an attractive starting point since Marcion worked with the same canon presupposed by modern critical scholarship. Only the content and the conclusions differ, chiefly with respect to Judaism. No critical

Was Paul Safe? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

living!"

In answer to the second problem: What is the purpose of Paul's journey? It is to "learn to know" Cephas. Yet the Suprapostles are not interested in this odd convert who shows no interest in them, but is off on his own private missionary venture to Arabia. Paul goes on to say that he is entirely unknown to the congregations in Judea. When he meets again with the brothers in Jerusalem it is fourteen years later! This time he takes Barnabas.¹¹ Why another fourteen years before meeting with the first disciples of our Lord? Paul is not in Jerusalem! Then why, you may ask, does he bother investigating it at all? Was the journey motivated by a desire to correlate his Gospel with that of the Jerusalem Church? Not at all! He goes in response to yet another revelation.¹² What is the outcome of the meeting? "These men of repute do not prolong the consultation."¹³

At the assembly, Paul's theological isolation is borne out by the way in which he casually ignores decisions reached concerning Torah.¹⁴ Here, it is agreed upon by the men of repute that circumcision, though not obligatory for Gentiles, cannot be denied to them "if they freely choose to adopt it as a seal of their election."¹⁵

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

did Paul feel the need to tell us that he did not confer with flesh and blood, nor go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before him? What prompted him to go to such great lengths to make us aware of his actions? He says: "Listen here, my Gospel is independent of any authority. Know it and know it well!" The second problem is related to the first, but not identical with it: if what Paul says is true, then why *in fact* did he not consult with the Jerusalem Church?

In answer to the first problem, Paul is obviously motivated to meet the taunts of his opponents, who have alleged that his Gospel is dependent on the Jerusalem authorities.¹⁰ But why would his opponents allege something like this? What have they to gain? The answer Paul gives is that his opponents wish to undermine his apostolic authority, and to achieve this effectively, they say that Paul's apostleship is derived and so dependent on Jerusalem. Yet isn't it? "

Never does Paul give the impression that he is willing to question the validity of his experience, or interpret it in relation to the experience of Messiah by the other apostles. He meets with them only after three years and then seems at pains to stress that it is only Cephas and James whom he meets: "What I write to you, listen, before God I am not

Was Paul Proud? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

the persecutor, he feels that all around are persecuting him. Is he aware of his sin? I hardly think so. He boasts openly that he considers himself blameless before Torah, and believes he stands with a clear conscience before God.⁴⁰

Now to the heart of the matter. The most problematic aspect of Paul's ministry is his independence. He claims not to have received his Gospel through human agency but through a revelation. How are we to understand the relationship between this revelation and the kerygma of the congregations he claims to transmit faithfully? ⁴¹ The question is bound up inexorably with three others including: the nature of Paul's conversion, his claim to apostleship and his relationship to the brothers in Jerusalem." His Gospel, and his apostleship which is inexorably bound up with it, is not "from men" nor "through men," nor is it by man's persuasion, nor does it seek to please men, nor was he taught it by man, but it came through "a revelation of Jesus Christ." What is certain about his private revelation is that it is direct and unmediated. Paul insists he does not "confer with flesh and blood," nor does he go up to Jerusalem to those who are apostles before him.⁴²

Two problems arise directly from Paul's statements here. First, why

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

As one man put it, "We have found this man to be a plague, one who stirs up dissension among all the Jews in the empire."¹⁰⁰ Festus, the Roman procurator over Judea is rumored to think Paul to be mad.¹⁰¹ Some say that Paul cannot get along with his own associates. A certain John Mark and former mentor Barnabas testify to his unyielding nature.¹⁰² As you know, Paul was once a violent persecutor of the Church of God.¹⁰³

That virulent character still exists. This zealot changes his cause, not his nature. Don't be fooled into thinking that he has undergone a dramatic conversion.¹⁰⁴ Paul shows no departure from his former life in Judaism - or shall I say in paganism? Paul sees himself called in the manner of the prophets.¹⁰⁵ He feels a mystery has been revealed to him and not to the others: God's inclusion of the Gentiles into the people of Israel.¹⁰⁶ This contradicts the claim of Messiah that he came only to the lost people of Israel.¹⁰⁷

If we look at the evidence, greater continuity emerges between Paul "before" and "after." He is as ruthless now in his methods as he was then, when he persecuted the congregations of Israel.¹⁰⁸ That hostility for Israel has remained as intense as ever. Only now, instead of being

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Naturally we are devastated. We wonder how that having opened our hearts and homes to Paul, having taken care of him when he was shunned by others because of his illness and disfigured appearance, he could suddenly turn on us in this fashion.¹⁰⁰ We ask ourselves: Is this man really whom he claims to be? A devout Jew? A Pharisee? Is Gamaliel his teacher?¹⁰¹ Or perhaps not? Greek in Tarsus?¹⁰² Does he really speak Hebrew as his friends have claimed? We have never heard him. Why does he quote from the Greek Scriptures? Furthermore, we realize that all along he has been painfully silent about his family, especially his mother. Surely a Jew mentions his mother? What were we to make of that claim to Roman citizenship? Can Roman citizens be flogged three times? Don't the Romans say "to bind a Roman citizen is a crime, to flog him an abomination, to slay him almost an act of murder?"

Our suspicions are confirmed. Reports flood in from every place. Paul has a rotten track record. His divisive nature leads to all sorts of disturbances. He is thrown out of every synagogue he attends. Wherever he goes, plots on his life, riots and great disturbances ensue. He is dragged before countless authorities, beaten, tried and imprisoned.¹⁰³

Was Paul Safe? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

inconsistently and is forever changing his mind? Besides, is there something wrong with *this* creation? It stands written: "And God saw everything he had made, and behold, it was very good."¹⁰⁰

Our authority is Moses. Who is Paul's authority? Support for his preposterous arguments is actually based on Torah, or so it seems! He uses Torah against itself! His methods of exegesis and theological arguments in turn, are confused, illogical and lack substantiation. He quotes no Rabbi to support himself, but seems content with proof texts, taking a word here, a word there, mixing them together, adding some more words, and coming up with his own statements. He then goes off on a wild-goose chase looking for more words to clump together to form more proof texts. Why does he do this? He wants to prove conclusively that circumcision is no longer necessary and he needs scriptural corroboration. Without recourse to any, he invents his own texts. He begins with a thesis: Torah is out, faith is in. Then he "proves" what he already knows to be true. A close look at his exegesis reveals a series of the highest order. Besides this, he has double standards: he tells us not to be circumcised, yet he circumcised Timothy.¹⁰¹

explicitly states: "None whose testicles are crushed or whose penis is cut off shall be admitted to the assembly of the Lord."¹⁰⁰ In another place it says: "If men get into a fight with one another, and the wife of one intervenes to rescue her husband from the grip of his opponent by reaching out and seizing his genitals, you shall cut off her hand; show no pity."¹⁰¹ Can a Jew really suggest that it would be good if circumcision, the sign of sonship to Abraham and membership in Israel, be transformed into castration? From now on all men who are circumcised are thus disqualified from membership in Israel?" This remark reveals a side of Paul's character until now undisclosed. It betrays an obsessive, fanatical and compulsive man, condemning and cursing righteous Jews and Gentiles alike! He then goes on to conclude: "For neither circumcision counts for anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation."¹⁰²

Our reply: Why didn't God hint to Moses that such a new creation would later come about? Scripture says: "You shall not add to the word which I have commanded you, nor take from it; that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."¹⁰³

Neither Moses nor any of the prophets foresaw a time when circumcision is expunged and dispelled. Are we to assume that God ~~and~~

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Torah are captive and oppressed with a yoke of slavery. When finally, after great effort and sorrow, they have worn themselves out with the works of Torah, the only reward they get is death." We argue instead that freedom without responsibility is not freedom at all, but a licence for the flesh, a demonic freedom, which at its heart despises God. This is slavery to our own selfish desires, to the world, and to the devil.

Paul says (he is angry and agitated): "Listen!" His language is emphatic:

"Mark my words, wake up fools!" Strong words indeed! We say:

"circumcision is the sign of one's entry into the gracious covenant which God made with his people Israel. All descendants of Abraham - that is, all who follow the commands of the God of Israel - are to be circumcised." As it is written: "Every male among you shall be circumcised. Any uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin shall be cut off from his people; he has broken my covenant."

At one point in his letter, Paul disgraces himself: "I wish you would go ahead and have your penises cut off!" His implication is that in accepting circumcision we Galatians have become inhuman. Paul spells this out by a crude joke, but he intends more than a joke. The Torah

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

that it is supplanted by faith. David inspired by the spirit of God says: "Blessed is the man whose delight is the Lord's Torah and who meditates on Torah day and night. He is like a tree planted by streams of water that yields its fruit in its season, and its leaf does not wither. In all that he does he prospers." Paul says: "For through Torah I died to Torah, so that I might live to God." He sees the apocalyptic nature of the Gospel as deposing Torah once and for all. Some of his Jewish friends have been embarrassed by these claims, and have sought to soften them. "What Paul is really doing," they say, "is to present to us a fully modified and corrected view of Torah in the context of an old and unacceptably narrow view of it." Nonsense! In Paul's mind Torah cannot bring blessing, only a curse.¹⁰⁰

If Messiah is the end of Torah, how am I then to live? Paul tells us:

"For freedom, Messiah has set us free. Stand firm, therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery." What is meant by "yoke of slavery?"¹⁰¹ Paul has in mind here the eternal Torah. He compares those who seek righteousness through Torah to oxen which have been subjected to a yoke. Just as oxen bear the yoke and get nothing out of it but their food and are at the end of the day slaughtered when they are no longer fit to bear the yoke, so those who seek righteousness through

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

were circumcised, they felt that Torah would serve as a restraining influence over them. "Spirit-Freedom" was too vague a notion. What was needed was something secure and concrete: circumcision, to overcome the flesh, not to please it. Paul had completely misunderstood our motivation. What is more, he took our position as a personal affront although it was not intended as such. *

The debate rages furiously. Paul's letter is a tireless source of strife and discord among us. Paul asks, "Is not faith enough to justify Gentiles?" We ask, "Can faith exist independently of Torah?" What Paul seems to misunderstand is the *relationship* of faith to Torah. He mistakenly asserts that our Gospel has its roots in the insufficiency of faith and the need for Torah to serve as a kind of "complement" to faith. This is not the way we see it. For us, a man is justified (participates in the people of God) by believing the God of Israel and his Messiah Jesus, and on the basis of the works of Torah, ritual observances and the like." The argument is not whether human beings can by good deeds merit salvation, but about the condition that needs to be fulfilled before Gentiles can become part of the people of God. "

At the same time, this does not mean that Torah is as good as dead, or

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

the need to validate our commitment to Jesus and to the God of Israel by accepting Torah and becoming circumcised." We were encouraged, but hardly coerced by devout Jewish Christians who had ministered with us when Paul founded the Churches."

Paul later implied that we had been "bewitched" by these people. The truth is that we first suggested circumcision. We willingly and eagerly embraced the Torah in response to the grace that God had poured out upon us." No sooner had we acted when we received a vitriolic letter from an embittered Paul in which he cursed the devout Jewish-Christians for "perverting" the Gospel of Messiah, and preaching "another Gospel."¹ The opponents had, in Paul's words, compelled us to be circumcised to avoid persecution, a remark that remains unintelligible to them and to us. Furthermore, Paul said that they had confused the Churches.² Yet it was he who was confounding the brothers. His Gospel had not provided an adequate means of dealing with the "flesh."³ His claim to "live in the Spirit" simply conflicted with the realities of everyday life.⁴

Some brothers had fallen into sin, and felt that they needed to adopt circumcision as a preventive measure against further sinfulness. If they

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

the need to validate our commitment to Jesus and to the God of Israel by accepting "Torah and becoming circumcised." We were encouraged, but hardly coerced by devout Jewish Christians who had ministered with us when Paul founded the Churches."

Paul later implied that we had been "bewitched" by these people. The truth is that we first suggested circumcision. We willingly and eagerly embraced the Torah in response to the grace that God had poured out upon us.¹ No sooner had we acted when we received a vitriolic letter from an embittered Paul in which he cursed the devout Jewish-Christians for "perverting" the Gospel of Messiah, and preaching "another Gospel."² The opponents had, in Paul's words, compelled us to be circumcised to avoid persecution, a remark that remains unintelligible to them and to us. Furthermore, Paul said that they had confused the Churches.³ Yet it was he who was confounding the brothers. His Gospel had not provided an adequate means of dealing with the "flesh."⁴ His claim to "live in the Spirit" simply conflicted with the realities of everyday life.⁵

Some brothers had fallen into sin, and felt that they needed to adopt circumcision as a preventive measure against further sinfulness. If they

xxiv. Is. 49.1-6; Jer 1.5; Ez. 1.28; 2.1-3.

xxv. Acts 9.15; Rom. 11.25; Gal. 1.12; confer Rom. 10.28; Gal. 1.10.
See Stendahl 1970, off.; Beker 1972, 3-6.

xxvi. Matt 10.6.

xxvii. In Acts, Paul is portrayed as having persecuted the Church in Judea before his conversion. I suggest that it only happened subsequently when his message was rejected by Jewish Christians. Luke has the right idea but the wrong time framework (and the characters Saul and Paul confused).

xxviii. Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 4.4; 2 Cor. 5.10-11; Acts 23.1, 24.16; Rom. 9.1, 2 Cor. 1.12.

xxix. 1 Cor. 11.2, 23; 15.3, confer 1 Cor. 11.16; 1 Thess. 2.13; Phil. 4.9.

xl. Acts 9.15-16; 15.4-5; Gal. 1.1, 12, 19; 2.1-12; Rom. 1.1; 11.13; 1 Cor. 1.1; 4.9; 9.1-5; 15.7ff.; 2 Cor. 1.1, 11.5; 12.11-12; confer Eph. 1.1; 1 Thess. 2.6; 1 Tim 1.1; 2.7; 2 Tim 2.1, 11; Tit 1.1.

xli. Gal. 1.16-17.

xlii. Duncan 1934, 29; Luedemann 1989, 45.

xliii. Suhl recognises the difficulty with this view: "Such an accusation would not be understandable from people who themselves are connected with Jerusalem" (quoted by Luedemann 1989, 111). However, he also misses the point (as does Bornemann 1971, 18, 19). In my view, Paul's opponents do contend for his dependence on Jerusalem, but not in order to call his claim to apostleship into question. Apostleship is not the primary issue in Galatians. Beker 1990, 42ff., though, makes much of it. He says: "the opponents concentrate their attack primarily on Paul's apostolate. They are convinced that once this has been accomplished, Paul's Gospel will be discredited as well. Indeed, the hermeneutic of apostleship is Paul's primary concern in Galatians, just as it is in 2 Cor. 10-13, for if that fails, the truth of the Gospel is likewise surrendered. Paul must defend both his apostolic status and the truth of the Gospel together. Paul's personal, apostolic defence occupies centre stage." This exegesis is improbable for three reasons.

the great Stoic centre of ancient times? Which city was the birthplace of the great Stoics: Antipater, Archedemus, Nestor, Athenodorus Cordylion, Zeno and Heraclides? Tarsus - of course! (Stabo 14.5.13).

There is an additional possible reason for Tarsus suggested to me by Levin. Is Tarsus not after all a Greek pronunciation of the Hebrew *Tarshish*, a generic term for a harbour town and maritime centre? (1 Kings 10.22; 22.48; 2 Chronicles 9.24; Psalm 48.7, etc.). A God driven prophet, Jonah, was sent out at Tarshish (1.3; 4.2) to declare a divine message in Nineveh. What better place for one chosen by God, Paul, to come out of, than from the saving habitation of Jonah, *Tarshish*, Tarsus? Luke knew Jonah's story unlike Paul who makes no mention of the prophet (Luke 11.29-32). I suggest an alternative location for the birthplace of Paul. The place where people were first called Christians: Antioch. In Gal. 2.11, Paul makes his only reference to Antioch. It is here that he "opposed Cephas to his face." The way in which he writes suggests that he is stationed in Antioch. Dunn says: "Paul implies that Peter, in coming to Antioch, had entered more into the realm of authority of the Gentile mission, which he, Paul represented" (Dunn 1993, 116). In Acts, Paul is based in Antioch together with Barnabas, who initially brings him here from Tarsus (Acts 11.25-26).

xxviii. Acts 9.33,29; 13.45-51; 14.2-6, 19ff.; 16.22ff.; 17.4ff.; 18.6,12ff.; Acts 19.3,23ff.; 20.18,19; 21.27ff.; 23.12; 24.5,6; 25.3; 26.21; confer 2 Cor. 11-13.

xxix. Tertullus: Acts 24.5,6.

xxx. Acts 26.24-25. It is quite possible to view Paul as mentally unbalanced as Levin 1969, 134ff.; 1970, 91ff. has done. Did Paul sometimes doubt his own sanity? See 2 Cor. 5.13; 2 Cor. 11.23; Confer 2 Cor. 11.1,17,21. On his mood changes see Johnson 1986, 24.

xxxi. Acts 9.27; 11.19-30; 12.25; 13.1-14.28; 15; 1 Cor. 9.3-5; confer Gal. 2.13; Col. 4.10.

xxxii. Acts 8.3; 9.1; 9.13ff.; 9.21; 22.4ff.; 23.4ff.; 26.9ff.; Gal.1.13; Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 15.9,10; also Eph. 3.8; 1Tim 1.13-15.

xxxiii. Acts 9; 22; 26; Gal. 1.11-17.

ancestral law."

Three possibilities present themselves: a) Paul was from Tarsus. b) The sources Luke used were wrong. c) It suited Luke's literary schema to locate Paul in Tarsus. As regards a) Paul's silence cannot itself speak heavily against this traditional view as he mentions no birthplace. Unlikely is b) since the only way to explain the mistake is to assume that Paul was associated with Tarsus, not because he was born there, but because he spent some time as a missionary there. Tarsus as a missionary station of the apostle then became confused with Paul's birthplace. I propose c) as most likely.

Luke demonstrates characteristic erudition when he has Paul say: "I am a Jew, from Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no insignificant city." Strabo says that Tarsus even surpassed Athens and Alexandria as a centre of culture and learning (Strabo 14.5.13; also Dr. Chrysostom, Or. 33.34). It was a city with important Jewish connections. According to W. M. Ramsay Antiochus Epiphanes provided the occasion for introducing many new colonists into Tarsus, many of whom were Jews. They were given citizenship rights as a body and were enrolled in a civic "tribe" of their own (1903, 32). If this is true, it could make Paul a citizen of Tarsus and not merely a descendant.

Tarsus also played an important role in Roman politics from the end of the Republic to the beginning of the Augustine Principate. In 67 BCE Pompey made Tarsus capital of Cilicia during his expulsion of pirates from the Mediterranean. Cicero resided as Proconsul in the city between 51-50 and was noted for his lenient rule. In 47 BCE, Julius Caesar met with representatives of the province and the city assumed the title *lulioptola*. Six years later Mark Anthony rewarded the city for siding with him against Cassius in the civil war and it was exempted from paying taxes. It was then that the famous meeting of Anthony and Cleopatra took place when she came to Tarsus sailing up the Cydnus adorned as Aphrodite. Finally, mention must be made of Roman Citizenship being bestowed by Augustus on a large number of the citizens in Tarsus because of their positive attitude to Rome in the period before the Principate.

In Acts 17.16-34, Paul is portrayed as a first Christian philosopher, brilliantly versed in Stoic ideas and skilled in Stoic argumentation. Where could he have acquired such skills? Which city was regarded as

circumcision, nor the rules of *kashrut*, nor the keeping of the Sabbath is anything." Instead, he surprises his readers by negating not merely Law observance, but also its opposite, non-Law observance. By doing this Paul tells the Galatians that the fundamental structures of the cosmos which are certain identifiable pairs of opposites (in this case circumcision and uncircumcision) are gone.

xxii. Deut 4.2.

xxiii. Gen. 1.31.

xxiv. Acts 16.3.

xxv. Gal 4.12-14.

xxvi. On Gamaliel see Acts 5.34; 22.3; Acts 21.39; 22.3; 26.24.

xxvii. The belief that Paul hailed from Tarsus has to my knowledge never been questioned. Yet Paul makes no reference in his letters to Tarsus as his place of birth. The only allusion is Gal. 1.21, where Paul speaks of his travels and not of his upbringing. Even here the reference is to Cilicia of which Tarsus was capital, and not to Tarsus proper.

Luke alone identifies Tarsus as the birthplace of Paul. All in all there are a handful of references: Acts 9.11; 9.30; 11.25; 21.39; 22.3, of which three associate Tarsus directly with Paul's birthplace. Acts 9.30 and 11.25 refer like Gal. 1.21 to travels and not to a place of origin, although these passages do imply that Paul was engaged in missionary activities at home. Strangely, when mention is made of a relative of Paul (a nephew), he is said to be living in Jerusalem and not Tarsus (Acts 23.16).

Acts 9.11 is clear enough. That leaves only 21.39 and 22.3 which appear in the same context. It is obvious that the mere mention and also repetition of Tarsus in these two passages suits the apologetic designs of Luke. Tarsus is repeated in 22.3 not only for the sake of consistency but also for the sake of emphasis. Luke did not repeat it because this is what Paul actually said in his speech. Before the Tribune Luke has Paul make much of Tarsus. "I am a Jew, from Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of an important city," but before the people, a thoroughly "Jewish" Paul, versed in Hebrew, is quick to point out that he was also "brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, educated strictly according to our

viii. Gal. 5.13, 16, 17, 19; 6.12; 6.13.

ix. Betz 1979, 8, 9.

x. See especially 4.12 ff.; 6.17 and 1.6 which is translated by Lattimore as: "I am amazed that you have so quickly forsaken the man (sc. myself) who summoned you by the grace of Christ, for another Gospel." *Confer* 5.8.

xi. Gal. 2.15ff.; 4.10.

xii. I take δικαιόω (as Sanders does) to indicate the transfer to the Christian life. See his excellent discussion of δικαιόω in Paul and Palestinian Judaism: 1977, 470-72 et *passim*; Paul 1991, 45-49; Paul the Law and the Jewish People 1983, 13ff.

xiii. Gal. 2.19.

xiv. Gal. 5.1.

xv. This is Luther's interpretation of Gal. 5.1. Luther 1535, 7-8.

xvi. Gal. 5.2. Paul's language ἵνα ἐγὼ Παῦλος is emphatic. In Classical Greek ἵνα is an imperative. In Koine it functions as a particle. Here the force of the imperative is retained.

xvii. Gal. 5.12.

xviii. Deut 23.1.

xix. Deut 25.11.

xx. Krentz 1985, 74, 75.

xxi. On the "new creation" in Paul see 2 Cor. 5.17; *Confer* 1 Cor. 15.42-50; Rom. 5.12ff.; Eph 1.9-10; Col. 3.10-11; Gal. 6.15. Martyn 1985, 410-24, has argued that Paul's conclusion in Gal. 6.15 (*Confer* 5.6; 1 Cor. 7.19) is an announcement of the horrifying death of the cosmos, and an announcement of the surprising dawn of the New Creation. He has observed that Paul's conclusion here is an odd one. We would have expected him in the immediate context to strike the final blow, directly and simply, against observance of the Law. He should say: "Neither

have enthusiastically met with the need to be circumcised! Bornkamm overcomes this difficulty by suggesting that Judaism of the Diaspora unlike orthodox Palestinian Judaism was fairly liberal and made no demands for circumcision. Although he cites no sources to substantiate this claim (12), Schoeps does. He quotes the view of Rabbi Joshua, who held that proselytes need not be circumcised provided that they underwent the rite of baptism (Schoeps 1961, 66). One should also consider the problem of circumcision from a practical and hence "pastoral" point of view. At the rate the Christian Church was expanding, it would have been a severe burden to ensure that all the converts were circumcised. It would also have had the effect of deterring some who were considering conversion. There are some health concerns involved in circumcising an adult male. We need to remember that surgical techniques were backward and unhygienic. There was no anaesthetic and no antibiotics. It is quite reasonable to assume that some converts became severely ill as a result of sepsis or bleeding due to the procedure, and that this weighed heavily on the minds of those who met in order to debate the issue at the "Jerusalem Conference." Confer the story of Simeon and Levi in Gen. 34.25.

vi. Neyrey 1990, 181-206, argues that Paul's charges in 1.8 and 3.1 are formal witchcraft/sorcery accusations. By this he means that Paul is indicating that his rivals are either the devil himself or persons controlled by him. Neyrey, building on anthropological models, takes Paul's words literally and not metaphorically: "When Paul asks, 'Who has bewitched you?' the word used there *βροματεύω* is a technical term for 'the evil eye' that harms and kills. Given his perception of a dualistic cosmos of warring figures, he labels the Judaizing preachers as agents of Satan who are corrupting God's people" (203). He argues too that in 1. 8 "an angel from heaven" refers to Satan in disguise. What is the function of these "witchcraft accusations?" Since they are directed against the rival preachers they have the function of reducing the status of these opponents and of protecting Paul's "turf." Neyrey's work can be appreciated for its creative and innovative look at Paul from the perspective of an anthropologist rather than a theologian. He says: "whereas theologians focus on these conflicts in terms of conflicting theologies, a social science model urges us to see them as evidence of an intense sense of rivalry, competition, and even jealousy" (204).

vii. Gal. 1.7; 5.10.

ENDNOTES

i. Acts 13-14; *confer* 16.1-5.

ii. I prefer to take Paul's opponents as "Jewish Christians" rather than "Gnostics" or "Gentile Christians" who have undergone circumcision (Judaizers). See also Betz 1979, 6f.; Longenecker 1990, xcv.

iii. Gal. 2.3; 5.2; 5.11; 6.2; 6.12.

iv. Most commentators (e.g. Betz, Bruce, Longenecker, Burton, etc.) argue that these "Jewish Christians" came to Galatia soon after Paul had left the region. Yet, there is no direct evidence from the text to support this view unless one stretches the meaning of Gal. 1.6; 4.13-14; 5.7. The epistle makes better sense if the Galatians had already been exposed to Paul's Gospel and that of his opponents while Paul was still in the region. This would explain not only Paul's discontinuity, but also his continuity with his opponents. Betz has noted: "Except for the demand of obedience to the Torah and acceptance of circumcision, their 'Gospel' must have been the same as Paul's" (Betz 1979, 7). Although I think Betz is wrong, this seems to be the way Paul's opponents perceive the situation. Paul clearly saw no correlation between his message and that of his enemies in Galatia. This would mean that there were two distinctive interpretations of the Gospel in Galatia campaigning for recognition. The Galatians evidently chose Paul in the matter of Torah, but soon afterwards began to regret the decision and switched allegiances. Although Paul does not mention them (*Confer* Gal. 1.6-7; 5.7-12; 6.12-13) he seems to know who his opponents are. Even if he doesn't know the actual names of the chief instigators (I infer this indirectly from 5.10: "but the one who is confusing you shall bear the blame, whoever he may be,") then he knows to which party they belong, for he names their historical predecessors (2.4-5, 12; 2.11-14; 3.1 and 5.7 are rhetorical). If this is correct, we can understand Paul's anger and bitter disappointment at being "betrayed." On the matter of being coerced into circumcision, this seems to run counter to Paul's sharp rebuke of the Galatians (Gal. 2, 6.12).

v. See Stendahl 1976, 70; 19f, who suggests that Gentiles would have found Jewish rituals attractive rather than unattractive. Bornkamm 1971, 6-9 takes the same view. I doubt however whether all would

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Messiah of the congregation at Jerusalem. His experience is independent and therefore also incompatible with that of the Superapostles. We think that sending him into a territory like Spain is far too risky for one who presents such an idiosyncratic Gospel of Messiah Jesus.

To the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob be glory both now and in the Day of the Lord. Amen.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

God. Still, my brothers, ability without character is wasted. Discipline is an essential element in character development. By his own admission Paul has great difficulty in submitting to the discipline of the Jerusalem authorities, not to mention the highest authority, Torah. Our greatest desire is to see him become what God wants him to be. We desire this to be a redemptive experience, even if it is traumatic.

Therefore, with no personal malice intended, we strongly urge you to reconsider in the light of our concerns. A decision in favour of Paul could mean a triumph for his brand of the Gospel. He already has strong support all over Greece, Macedonia, and Asia Minor. Sending him means the end of a firm commitment of believers to Torah and circumcision. The message of the authorities in Jerusalem is in danger of disappearing, and a Messiah with no Jewish roots will wreak havoc on us Jews!

We feel that the "Jesus" Paul preaches is different from the Jesus of Cephas and John and James. Paul writes chillingly in one of his letters: "Thus from now on we know no one in the flesh. Even if we did know Messiah in the flesh, we no longer know him thus."¹¹ For us it is plain that he whom Paul receives is not from men. He is different from the

Was Paul Sane? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Lord's table, denial of the resurrection are all reported! Members of the congregation even cry aloud in the services "the historical Jesus is a curse!" If it were not for Apollos and others like him, who knows, perhaps we would have had another Galatia on our hands."

Does Paul have any commendable qualities? Of course he does. He is a likeable and personable man. He is not in very good health and that might explain part of his erratic behaviour. Some say that he has a chronic illness, but he remains silent about it.¹⁰⁰ He is also a tireless worker, and supports himself with tentmaking, rather than being reliant on the congregations.¹⁰¹ He can perform miracles, something we have seen with our own eyes. The rumour however, that he raises the dead is entirely without substantiation.¹⁰² Above all, we know that he is eager to spread the message in the West.¹⁰³

We think Paul is sincere but deluded. His academic and intellectual abilities are obvious to all. His ability to express himself clearly and pleasantly come through.¹⁰⁴ His preaching is not brilliant, but very encouraging. He is an amateur orator, but this may be his inadequate Greek training. He is celibate, which is rare for missionaries these days.¹⁰⁵ These gifts and abilities could make him a model servant of

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Christian missionaries.¹ His later attempts at reconciliation by taking a collection for the poor in Jerusalem are unsuccessful. Initially we supported the collection, but have now decided not to do so, since we do not want those in Jerusalem to think that we belong to the orb of Paul's mission. The collection, it appears, is going to be refused by the recipients and trouble is expected. I personally fear for Paul's safety.²

The question you need to ask yourself is this: Can a person with this defiant character, dubious past, and damaging theology espouse the cause of the Gospel of Messiah Jesus? What is more, a man with his record could face severe setbacks and encumbrances with the leading authorities in Spain.³

We will admit that Paul is a successful missionary.⁴ He establishes churches all over: at Thessalonica, Philippi, Ephesus, Corinth, and many other places. The problem is that his Gospel has no staying power. No sooner does he leave when the people become dissatisfied and turn to someone else for stability, as is the case at Corinth, a congregation that exemplifies the failure of freedom outside Torah! Factions and strife, sexual immorality, incest, lawsuits, feminists, uncontrolled enthusiasm, exorcisms, food sacrificed to idols, abuse of the

Was Paul Sael? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Further stipulations are also made which are fundamental: "to abstain from idol offerings, and blood, and what has been strangled, and lechery." Paul violates these authoritative apostolic imperatives and tries to interpret the resolutions as a triumph for his own anti-circumcision polemic. He likes to give the impression that he is a main player and that he is directly responsible for convincing James, Cephas and John that he has a special Gospel to the Uncircumcised. The truth is that Paul plays little if any part in the proceedings and is practically ignored by the Pillars.

Furthermore, no clear-cut decision is reached regarding his mission to the Gentiles. Certainly there is no "right hand of fellowship!" When Paul is discussed, it is regarding his apostolic claims, which fall into disrepute since he has never seen Jesus "face to face," or consulted for any length of time with those who have. A source close to the events tells me that a decision on Paul is postponed until Cephas comes to Antioch. Of course, the seeds for dissension are sown. Matters come to a head - an ugly scene involving Paul, Cephas and Barnabas - with Paul ranting and raving as usual.

The result? A complete break between Paul and the other Jewish

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Ramsay, W. M. 1953. *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*. 7th ed. London.

Rubenstein, R. L. 1972. *My Brother Paul*. New York: Harper & Row.

Rudolf, K. 1983. *Gnosis*. English translation. San Francisco: Harper.

Sallarini, A. J. 1992. Review of Alan Segal's *Paul the Convert - The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 54: 588-592.

Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. London: SCM.

---. 1983. *Paul, the Law and the Jewish People*. London: SCM.

---. 1991. *Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schoeps, H. J. 1961. *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*. English translation, London: Lutterworth.

Schweitzer, A. 1912. *Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History*. English translation, London: Adam and Charles Black.

---. 1936. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. English translation, London: Adam and Charles Black.

Segal, A. F. 1990. *Paul the Convert - The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Stendahl, K. 1976. *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Streeter, B.H. 1924. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London.

Tillich, P. 1951-64. *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols., Chicago, 1951-64.

Went, H. P. 1967. "A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew," *New Testament Studies* 14(1): 75-95.

Weaverholm, S. 1968. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and His Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

— 1991. "Events in Galatia." In *Pauline Theology*, Vol. 1, ed by J. M. Bassler. Minneapolis: Fortress.

May, G. 1987-1988. "Marcion in Contemporary Views: Results and Open Questions," *Second Century* 6(3): 129-151.

Meecham, H. G. 1949. *The Epistle to Diognetus*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Meeks, W. A. 1983. *The First Urban Christians*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Meeks, W. A., ed. 1993. *The HarperCollins Study Bible NRSV: A New Annotated Edition by the Society of Biblical Literature*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.

Muehlenberg, E. 1979. "Marcion's Jealous God," in *Disciplina Nostra: Essays in Memory of R. F. Evans*, ed. by D. F. Winslow. The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Neill, S and T. Wright. 1988. *The Interpretation of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nielson, C. M. 1965. "Paul and the Scriptures," *Anglican Theological Review* 47: 199-216.

— 1970. "The Epistle to Diognetus: Its Date and Relation to Marcion," *Anglican Theological Review* 52(2): 77-91.

— 1980. "Scripture in the Pastoral Epistles," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 7(1): 4-23.

— 1986. "Polycarp and Marcion: A Note," *Theological Studies* 47(2): 397-399.

Neyrey, J. H. 1990. *Paul in Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox.

Pagels, E. 1975. *The Gnostic Paul*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Räsänen, H. 1983. *Paul & the Law*. English translation. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

— 1989. "From the Kerygma Gospel to the Written Gospels," *New Testament Studies* 35(3): 361-381.

— 1982. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kreutz, E. 1985. *Galatians*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg.

Kummel, W. G. 1972. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems*. English translation, New York: Abingdon.

Lattimore, R. 1982. *Acts and Letters of the Apostles. Newly Translated from the Greek Text*. New York: Farrar/Straus/Giroux.

Ludemann, G. 1989. *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*. English translation, Philadelphia: Fortress.

— 1984. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles*. English translation, Philadelphia: Fortress.

Levin, S. 1969. *Jesus: Alias Christ: A Theological Detection*. New York: Philosophical Library.

— 1970. *Adam's Rib: Essays on Biblical Medicine*. California: Ceren-X.

Longenecker, R. N. 1990. *Galatians*. Dallas, Texas: Word Publishers.

Luther, M. 1964. *Lectures on Galatians 13.15*. Vol. 27. *Luther's Works*. Saint Louis: Concordia.

Maxoby, H. 1976. "The Apostle As Jew," *Commentary* 76: 74.

— 1974. "Christianity's Break with Judaism," *Commentary* 78: 38-42.

— 1991. *Paul and Hellenism*. London: SCM.

Martin, R. P. 1986. *2 Corinthians*. Dallas, Texas: Word Publishers.

Martyn, J. L. 1985. "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *New Testament Studies* 31: 410-24.

— 1988. "Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 42: 1-15.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

--- 1986. *The Cross of the Son of God*. English translation. London: SCM.

--- 1991. *The Pre-Christian Paul*. English translation. London: SCM.

Holtman, R. J. 1984. *Marcion and the Reformation of Christianity*. Chico, California: Scholars.

--- 1987/1988. "How Then Knew this Troublous Teacher?" Further Reflections on Marcion and His Church," *Second Century* 6(3): 173-191

Howe, E. M. 1982. "Interpretations of Paul in the Acts of Paul and Thecla." In *Pauline Studies*, eds.

D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hubner, H. 1984. *Law in Paul's Thought*. English translation. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Jacobson, H. 1989. "Tertullian and Propagation," *Vigiliae Christianae* 43(4): 397.

Johnson, L. T. 1986. *The Writings of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Jonas, H. 1963. *The Gnostic Religion*. 2nd ed. Boston.

Käsemann, E. 1969. *New Testament Questions of Today*. English translation, Philadelphia: Fortress.

--- 1971. *Perspectives on Paul*. English translation, Philadelphia: Fortress.

Keck, L. E., and Martyn J. L. 1968. *Studies in Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK.

Keck, L. E. 1988. *Paul and His Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Knox, J. 1942. *Marcion and the New Testament*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

--- 1950. *Chapters in a Life of Paul*. London: SCM.

Koester, H. 1990. *Ancient Christian Gospels*. London: SCM.

Was Paul Saved? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

- Freund, W. H. C. 1969. "Marcion," *Expository Times* 82(11): 328-332.
- Furnish, V. P. 1984. 2 *Corinthians*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gager, J. G. 1972. "Marcion and Philosophy," *Vigiliae Christianae* 26(1): 53-59.
- 1983. *The Origins of Anti-Semitism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gaston, L. 1972. *No Stone on Another: Studies on the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gowat, H. 1988. "The Old Testament: A Heresy Continued," *Word and World* 8(2): 155-163.
- Grant, R. M. 1952. *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: SPCK.
- 1984. "Marcion and the Critical Method," in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of F.W. Beare*. Wilfrid Laurier Press: Ontario, Canada.
- Gunther, J. J. 1971. "Syrian Christian Dualism," *Vigiliae Christianae* 25(2): 61-93.
- Haerchen, E. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles*. English translation, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hammerton-Kelly, R. G. 1992. *Sacred Violence: Paul's Hermeneutic of the Cross*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Harnack, A. von. 1921 and 1924. *Das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- 1923. *Neue Studien zu Marcion*, Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- 1897. *The History of Dogma*. Vol. 1. English translation, Boston.
- 1989. *Marcion: Gospel of the Alien God*. English translation, Durham: Labyrinth.
- Hengel, M. 1983. *Between Jesus and Paul*. English translation, London: SCM.

Was Paul Saul? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Conzelmann, H. 1967. *Acts of the Apostles*. English translation. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Cousar, C. B. 1982. *Galatians*. Louisville: John Knox.

Dahl, N. A. 1978. "The Origin of the Earliest Psephogues to the Pauline Letters," *Semiotica* 12: 233-272.

Davies, W. D. 1965. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: SPCK.

Dittenberger, W., ed. 1923. *Oscire Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae*. Leipzig.

Driggers, H. J. W. 1987-1988. "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problems, Polemics," *Second Century* 6(3): 153-172.

Duncan, G. S. 1934. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dunn, J. 1992. *Jesus, Paul and the Law*. London: SPCK.

— 1991. *The Partings of the Ways*. London: SCM.

— 1993. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. London: A&C Black.

Efroymson, D. P. 1979. "The Patriotic Connection." In *Anti-Semitism and the Foundations of Christianity*, ed. by A. T. Davies. New York: Paulist.

— 1980. "Tertullian's Anti-Jewish Rhetoric: Guilt by Association," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 36(1): 25-37.

Epp, E. J. and Macrae, G. W., eds. 1989. *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Evans, E., ed. and trans. 1972. *Adversus Marcionem*. 2 Vols. London: Oxford University Press.

Farmer, W. R. 1984. "Galatians and the Second Century Development of the Regulae Fidei," *Second Century* 4(3): 144-170.

Fee, G. D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Was Paul Sane? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Bernkamm, G. 1971. *Paul*. English translation, London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Brandon, S. G. F. 1957. *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*. London: SPCK.

Brown, R. E., Fitzmyer, J. A. and Murphy, R. F., eds. 1992. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Bruce, F. F. 1982. *Commentary on Galatians*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

--- 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles. Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.

Pildemann, R. 1985. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. English translation, Minneapolis: Augsburg.

--- 1952. *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. English translation, London: SCM.

Burton, E. de Witt. 1920. *Galatians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Cadbury, H. J. 1943. "Review of Knox," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 62: 123-7.

Campanhausen, H. von. 1972. *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. English translation, Adams and Charles Black: London.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. 1983. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 1. London: DLT.

Childs, B. S. 1984. *The New Testament as Canon*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Clabaux, J. J. 1989. *A Last Edition of the Letters of Paul: A Reassessment of the Text of the Pauline Corpus Attested by Marcion*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 21, Washington.

--- 1992. "Marcion." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 4. New York: Doubleday, 516-520.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF CITED WORKS

- Aland, B. 1973. "Marcion: Versuch einer Neuen Interpretation." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 72: 422-47.
- Baarda, T. 1988. "Marcion's Text of Gal. 1.1. Concerning the of the First Verse of the Marcionite Corpus Paulinum." *Vigilae Christianae* 42(M): 236-250.
- Baeck, L. 1958. "The Faith of Paul." In *Judaism and Christianity: Essays* by Leo Baeck. Trans. by Walter Kaufmann. The Jewish Publication Society of America: Philadelphia.
- Bala, D. 1960. "Marcion Revisited: A Post-Harnack Perspective." In *Texts and Testaments: Critical Essays on the Bible and Early Church Fathers*, ed. by W. E. March. San Antonio: Trinity University Press.
- Blackman, E. C. 1944. *Marcion and His Influence*. London: SPCK. Reconstruction.
- Barrett, C. K. 1971. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A&C Black.
- 1973. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A&C Black.
- Bauser, J. M. 1991. *Pauline Theology*. Vol. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Bauer, W. 1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beker, J. C. 1989. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- 1990. *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul's Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Betz, H. D. 1979. *Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- 1992. "Paul." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Vol. 5. New York: Doubleday, 186-201.

15.19; 1 Cor. 14.18; 2 Cor. 5.13; Acts 18.9; 26.24; 17.32); halibness (Acts of Paul and Thecla). The illness is not inconsistent with Paul's energetic missionary activities or hard work (Acts 18.3; 2 Cor. 11.33-27) since it begins at the age of 25-32, and can progress very slowly, by which time Paul would have finished the bulk of his life's work.

lxiii. Acts 18.3; 25.34-35; Phil. 4.11; 1 Cor. 4.9-12; 2 Cor. 11.27; 1 Thess. 2.9; 4.11; 2 Thess. 3.7-9.

lix. On Paul as a miracle worker see 1 Thess. 1.5; 2 Cor. 12.12; *Confer* Rom. 15.18f; 1 Cor. 2.4; 4.19-21; 14.18; 2 Cor. 12.2-4; 7. Acts 16.16-18; 19.11-12; 20.7-12.

l. Rom. 1.13; 15.28-16.2

lxi. Contrary to Paul's own words in 2 Cor. 11.6; 10.10; 1 Cor. 2.2-3, he is a master rhetorician. His words of self-accrimination are usually rhetorically motivated. One should, however, be careful of analysing Paul's letters (as Betz has done, Betz 1979, 14-25) according to the Graeco-Roman rhetorical tradition, constructed from Quintilian, Cicero, and others. For an important corrective see Childs 1984: 300ff.

lxii. 1 Cor. 7.7

lxiii. 2 Cor. 5.16.

iii. Berz 1979, 153; see Acts 11.29; 24.16-28.31. On the collection see Gal. 2.10; Rom. 15.5-32; 1 Cor. 16.1-4; 2 Cor. 8 and 9. When Paul writes to the Romans, he deletes the Galatian Churches from the collection list (Rom. 15.26), whereas two years earlier he had emphasised their exemplary participation in the project (1 Cor. 16.1). Paul's letter obviously changed the situation dramatically. See J. L. Martyn's "Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters" 1988, 2 ff.

iii. It seems odd that Paul was able to travel so freely given the fact that he is said to have caused so much trouble. Roman Law has no clear and fast rules governing public disturbance. Each case would have been left at the discretion of the local governor or magistrate.

liv. Rom. 15.19ff.

lv. 1 Cor. 12.3.

lvi. Acts 18.24ff.; 19.1; 1 Cor. 1.12; 3.4ff., 22; 4.6; 16.12.

vii. On Paul's weak bodily presence see 2 Cor. 11.30; 12.8-10; 1 Cor. 3.8-13. On his physical ailment see 2 Cor. 4.10; Gal. 4.13-14. The exact nature of Paul's "thorn in the flesh" has been disputed since the earliest times. 2 Cor. 12.7 says: "Because of these, to keep me from self conceit, a thorn was stuck into my flesh, an angel of Satan, to hurt me and keep me from conceit. Concerning this I called upon the Lord to remove it from me; but he said to me: 'My grace is enough for you; your power is fulfilled in your weakness'" (translation by Lattimore). On the whole the debate is divided between those who view Paul's thorn as a metaphor for "opposition" and those who see here a reference to a physical ailment. For good surveys of the various proposals see Furnish 1984, 548-50; Martin 1986, 412ff.

A provocative proposal for the view that a physical ailment is being referred to is made by Levin, himself a physician. In his *Adam's Risk: Essays in Biblical Medicine* 1970, 91ff., he proposes that Paul suffered from Dystrophia Myotonica, a form of muscular dystrophy. The following features of the disorder were manifest in Paul: A disability of his fleshy body, of his muscles (2 Cor. 12.7; Gal. 4.14; 2 Cor. 13.10); eye trouble (Acts 9.9, 18; Gal. 4.15) speech defects consequent on myotonia of his tongue (2 Cor. 10.10; 11.6); impotence (1 Cor. 7.7-8, 27-40; also Acts of Paul and Thecla, where Paul repulsed religious advances of Thecla); psychiatric disturbances (2 Cor. 12.1-7; Rom.

xliv. Gal. 1.17; Confer 4.25; Acts 2.11; 1 Clem. 23.1; Rom. 15.19

xlv. Gal. 2.1.

xlvi. Gal. 2.2.

xlvii. Most commentators and translators (for an extensive discussion see Burton 1920, 89, 90) take *συμβουλευσάμενοι* to mean something differently here in 2.6 than in 1.16, where it means "to consult" or "take counsel with." Here it is supposed to mean either "to add or contribute something to someone" or "to lay before," "submit." Hence: "Those, I say, who were of repute, added nothing to me" (RSV). Of those who take the verb in this sense, Lattimore's translation is the most plausible: "those who were thought to have some standing did not make any additions to my Gospel." One wonders however, whether it is justifiable to give this word two entirely different meanings when it occurs in the same voice (middle), mood, and tense in both contexts. Bruce 1982, 119, gets around this problem by arguing that in 2.6 the word is used transitively, taking *οὐδέν* as an object, whereas in 1.16, it is used intransitively. It is, however, better to take both uses as intransitive, and in 2.6 to take *οὐδέν* as adverbial. I simply cannot see any good reason to translate the word differently, which occurs only here in the New Testament. If we adopt this possibility (that is, of giving the word the same meaning in both 1.16 and 2.6) we are presented with two more alternatives. The sense of the phrase could be either positive or negative. Negatively, "the leaders didn't want to consult with me at all" or "in respect to nothing did they confer with me," "the men of repute were eager to get rid of me." Positively, "for they laid nothing before me for decision, they did not make me their judge" or, "there was no more need to hold council, the men of repute had already recognised my calling."

xlviii. Gal. 2; Acts 15.

xlix. Rabbi Akiba, see Hornkamm 1971, 34. I have added this imaginary line since this seems to me to be the kind of conclusion the pillars would have reached.

i. Acts 15.28ff.

ii. Betz 1992, 188.

1. Only once in the letter (1.1) does Paul use the word *apostle* in relation to himself (in 1.17, 19 it is used with reference to those in Jerusalem). Even here, the verse is not to be read with the emphasis on the word *apostle*, i.e. "Paul an *apostle* not from men nor through man", but rather like this: "Paul an apostle *not from men nor through men*."
2. The nature of Paul's argument is substantially different here than in 1 Cor. 9 (and probably 2 Cor. 11) where he is defending his apostleship. Paul does not say: "Look here, I am an apostle, I have seen Jesus, he appeared to me. Don't believe these reports you hear about my not being an apostle, etc."
3. The opponents have another reason for alleging Paul's dependence on Jerusalem. In arguing this, they are affirming that the Gospel Paul preaches is essentially compatible with their own, since they too derive their authority from Jerusalem (Confer Gal. 2.4-5, 11-14, 4.26-26). This is supported by the fact that they have alleged that Paul still preaches circumcision (5.11; Betz 1979, 269). Therefore Paul's need to divorce himself from Jerusalem is primarily motivated by his desire to silence his opponents' charges of similarity between his Gospel and their own. His logic is somewhat skewed and goes something like this: "Listen! My Gospel is not like yours, and since your Gospel comes from Jerusalem, mine doesn't come from there."

Having distanced himself, Paul then proceeds to correct his opponents and argues that in fact their gospel is not wholly consonant with Jerusalem as they assume, for it was at Jerusalem that Paul was given recognition by the Apostles for his Gospel of uncircumcision: "they saw that I had been entrusted and gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." The logic is meant to deal a double blow to Paul's opponents: not only is his gospel independent of Jerusalem, but so too is theirs, since it does not accept the decisions reached in Jerusalem regarding Torah. The argument is weak. Paul has made a one hundred and eighty degree turn. He starts out by denying his connection to Jerusalem and ends by appealing to decisions made at Jerusalem. What is significant is that while Paul previously lays before the pillars his teaching regarding circumcision "lest somehow I should be running in vain" (Gal. 2.2), he does not appeal to Jerusalem to adjudicate the present crisis (Neyrey 1990, 201). The reasons are plain enough.

Was Paul Sash? The Problem of Paul's Relationship to Judaism

Williams, C. S. C. 1944. "Eznik's Resume of Marcionite Doctrine," *Journal of Theological Studies* 45: 65-73.

Williams, D.S. 1989. "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108(3): 477-496.

— 1991. "On Tertullian's Text of Luke," *Second Century* 8(4): 193-199.

Wilshire, L. E. 1974. "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? A Continuing Discussion," *New Testament Studies* 20(3): 246-253.

Wilson, R. S. 1933. *Marcion: A Study of a Second Century Heretic*. London: James Clarke and Company.

Wilson, S. G. 1986. "Marcion and the Jews." In *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Vol. 2: Separation and Polemic*, ed. by Wilson, S. G. Wilfrid Laurier University Press: Waterloo, Ontario.

Author: Concha M.E

Name of thesis: The formulation and standardisation of a battery of test of visual-perceptual-motor function for the adult cerebro-vascular accident patient 2 OF 2

PUBLISHER:

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

©2015

LEGALNOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.